

Scholarship

2010 Assessment Report

Media Studies

COMMENTARY

Overall, performance was consistent with last year's cohort. The range of quotations enabled candidates to demonstrate their knowledge and critical thinking skills in an effective way. Many more candidates responded to the more generic quotations (e.g. 1B, 2A, 2B, 3C), and these candidates were more likely to reuse arguments developed for other standards or previous years' scholarship questions. The more specific quotations were less popular, but often elicited insightful and original responses. The best of these used a range of text and evidence. Furthermore, a number of candidates wrote outstanding essays on one quote but did not complete a second.

A significant number of candidates did not approach their argument with a clear idea of the terms of the quotation. Terms and concepts were often poorly or loosely defined (e.g. "quality content", "communicating with itself", "story") or completely misunderstood ("public broadcaster").

SCHOLARSHIP WITH OUTSTANDING PERFORMANCE

Candidates who were awarded Scholarship with Outstanding Performance typically:

- developed a clear, convincing argument that addressed the quote
- included well considered, thoughtful analysis with considerable insight and/or originality
- used evidence from a range of sources to support their argument in an effective way
- demonstrated a convincing and extensive understanding of the aspects considered
- wrote in an engaging, articulate way
- considered issues from various perspectives or positions
- used media theory in a knowledgeable and appropriate way.

SCHOLARSHIP

Candidates who were awarded Scholarship but not Scholarship with Outstanding Performance typically:

- developed a clear argument that addressed the quotation
- included well considered analysis with some insight
- used evidence from a range of sources
- demonstrated sound understanding of the aspects considered
- used media theory where appropriate.

OTHER CANDIDATES

Candidates who were not awarded Scholarship or Scholarship with Outstanding Performance typically:

- lacked analytical ability
- considered only one or limited perspectives
- used inappropriate or insufficient evidence
- referred to media theory without a clear understanding of its relevance
- developed simplistic arguments
- failed to define or understand the language or intent of the quotation
- used evidence and texts that were not appropriate in media studies (for example- novels, poems)
- did not attempt or complete both essays

- used arguments prepared for other standards or previous years' scholarship papers that were not well suited to the quotation.