The examining panel used a rubric to assess the folio and split into two smaller groups to assess print and TV/Radio.

Video/Radio

The examiners noted the following issues with the video folios:

- Clapper/count-down leaders – as per the guidelines, the only product that has a clapper and count-down leader is the commercial. A number of candidates had a clapper and count-down for all their products. The clapper is an industry-based identification system for commercials only.
- Credits – the only product that should have credits is the major. The ad and minor product DO NOT need credits. Some candidates tried to stretch the length of the major product by having 30 seconds of credits. In these instances, the examiners assessed the product then reduced the mark by 1 (eg A- moved to B+) on criterion 3.
- Cinema Bars – a number of candidates utilised cinema bars in post-production. A large number, however, did not consider this during the filming stages as images were cropped inappropriately when the bars were added in post-production.
- Narrative – a number of major productions did not have a narrative structure to them and were deemed to be not of a pre-tertiary standard. All products should tell a story.
- Word Count – the increase of the word count on the pro-formas allowed candidates to discuss their products in more depth. Some still struggled to make the minimum word count.
- Folio Contents – some candidates had obviously not read the guidelines or simply did not adhere to them as a number of items were missing including write-ups and products.

Print

- Printing – this aspect was definitely problematic and required a level of technical expertise and support from printers which teachers may need to organise well in advance.
- Photographs - The quality of photographs often let the products down and again teachers need to spend time on photography and candidates acquiring best images eg food photography was often mentioned as being very difficult.
- Layout/content - Generally layout, design and journalism was a very good standard but at times the amount of text was insufficient to maintain the magazine standard.
- In some cases the quality of the product (magazine) was predominantly strong but let down by the candidates not maintaining the same high standard throughout the entire magazine. It is important for the candidate to manage their time in order to produce a finished product that reflects the same standard on every page.
- The product (magazine) should reflect a professional style genre that could be picked up at any newsagency. Some candidates strayed away from this and their magazine felt more like 12 pages of their own personal interests (like a blog) and not a magazine at all! The audience/target market and genre should always be kept in mind to determine both the style and content of the product.
WRITTEN EXAMINATION PAPER

Question 1

The examining panel felt the wording of this question enabled candidates to better respond to the criteria; a vast contrast to the previous year. The stronger responses were able to critically analyse their own products from an objective point of view. They were able to discuss their use of the production elements to convey the codes and conventions of their chosen style/genre and also how successful they were at this.

A number of candidate’s responses indicate a lack of understanding of the criterion – ‘critically analyse’ as there were still candidates who wrote in a ‘dear diary’ style merely discussing the narrative of their product and who reiterated the challenges of the course eg ‘I spent 2 weeks developing my script, after which time, I through away and started again’. Successful candidates were able to analyse their productions in terms of the pre, production and post process and analyse the effectiveness in relation to the target audiences, codes and conventions, technical choice and idea development. Weaker candidates did not understand the production process utilised when creating a finished product.

Question 2 and 4

Some candidates fell into the trap of answering this question in relation to their own products which hindered their discussion as it became very similar to question 1.

While the question could be deemed ambiguous, it is implied that they are to discuss an ad/magazine/radio program that they have seen/heard in the media. Again, candidates struggled to discuss the technical aspects of how a product is made, nor how the conceptual choices and technical choices made the ad effective in reaching its target audience.

Strong candidates were able to pinpoint the successful attributes of their chosen ads/magazine/radio program. Weaker answers tended to outline the entire storyline of the ad rather than actually answering the question.

Some responses used the phrase ‘simplistic’ to describe the production elements and how easy it would be to produce something of this nature. This is a misnomer as it is actually very difficult to make something look simplistic in terms of production!

Question 3

Strong responses were able to discuss the difference between commercial and public broadcasters and the driving forces behind their content. They were also able to discuss how current affairs programs utilise the codes of conventions of ‘news’ and the news worthiness of some stories presented under this guise on the two contrasting broadcasters.
Only a small handful of candidates discussed news bulletins instead of current affairs programs while others were confused about what a ‘current affair’ show was citing Australian Story, The Today Show, Sunrise, The Drum, and The Project as their example.

‘A’ responses were able to discuss how public and commercial broadcasters use the same technical equipment and codes and conventions; however, their productions are vastly different in terms of content, host, story choice, ‘experts’, journalist techniques and post production. They were also able to provide justification as to why they vary in terms of target audience and aims.

**Question 5**

The candidates who chose to answer this question generally understood the question and were able to provide strong examples with names of papers, exact dates of publications and direct quotes from front pages.

The Daily Telegraph and Rupert Murdoch’s News Ltd featured prominently in this question with most candidates able to discuss the concept of concentrated media ownership and the effect this can have on public opinion. Some candidates made generalised statements such as ‘media mogul Murdoch owns all of the media in Australia’, where as an ‘A’ candidate was able to quote percentages of newspaper ownership between News Ltd and Fairfax.

Most candidates chose to discuss how the Daily Telegraph helped shape public opinion about Guillard/Rudd and Abbott during the last federal election with an ‘A’ candidate citing figures relating to the number of negative/positive articles presented by each of the major newspapers in Australia. The examining panel googled the figures to check the validity and it was correct!

**Question 6**

A small number of candidates selected this question with strong responses indicating a firm understanding of stereotypes and social values. They were able to define each term and suggest the connection between the historical development of social values and the current trend to portray ‘old’ values in advertising eg the housewife/mother and worker/father.

**Question 7**

Most candidates were able to define the Code of Ethics, where they come from, who oversees them etc (ACMA/MEAA/Aus Press Council) and the role they play in overseeing the breaches in the code of ethics. They were also able to discuss effectively the role of Media Watch as a ‘media watchdog’ who has highlighted some serious breaches in the code of ethics.

Generally candidates were able to pick two different breaches of the code of ethics as outlined by Media Watch and were able to explain the role of Media Watch in society. Weaker responses merely outlined the story without bringing it back to the question while stronger responses chose their examples well and were able to discuss which code was highlighted and the impact the breach had on those involved/society.
Question 8

Weak answers were very general and confused in terms of who owns what and the statistics surrounding concentrated media ownership. Some took corporations to mean actual TV stations or magazines rather than corporations or companies who own particular media outlets. Little discussion was provided regarding the ownership laws in Australia and some facts were obviously incorrect and generalised eg ‘Murdoch owns TV stations as well as all newspapers and some radio stations’. The brevity and lack of discussion for some candidates did not see them fare well in this question.

Stronger answers linked discussion of ownership with implications for consumers, public discourse on issues and the essence of a healthy democratic system. They also included examples to back up their discussion with examples of clear political bias.

Question 9

All examiners noted an increased use of idioms, colloquial phrases stock expression in order to clarify or explain vital points within their analytical discussions eg ‘flash in the pan’.

The examples provided by candidates were often that of social media gossip posts presented as news and then discussed and evaluated with the premise of the question. Celebrity gossip posts were often presented as examples of ‘news’ and news stories for the purpose of analytical discussion. There was no discussion regarding the ‘news worthiness’. The examiners thought this should be avoided due to the nature or validity of the topic and its relevance to the question or criterion.

Question 10

There were some similarities to question 5 with some candidates using this question to discuss the role of tabloid journalism in the political landscape. Strong answers had a good understanding of politically biased programs/publications and also who produced them/funded them and were able to talk about the influences they have through their examples eg Murdoch via the Daily Telegraph ‘Get this mob out’.

Weaker responses discussed tabloid journalism in general terms eg the techniques used but were unable to draw their response back to the question to include a discussion on entrenched bias due to ownership.

Those who were able to provide concrete examples to back up their discussion obviously fared better than those who didn’t ie some candidates focused on examples that had nothing to do with political bias, instead opting for tabloid issues to do with celebrities.

Question 11

Stronger responses had some definitions on traditional media and detailed several new media products, speculating on their role with today’s consumers.

Greater discussion was needed on new adaptions of traditional media formats eg online newspapers.
Most discussed moving to online access/presence as the most and only example of convergence or new media.

Little discussion on platforms and the diverse nature on new media products
## Award Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>HA</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This year</td>
<td>4% (7)</td>
<td>18% (31)</td>
<td>41% (69)</td>
<td>37% (62)</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last year</td>
<td>13% (20)</td>
<td>16% (25)</td>
<td>46% (71)</td>
<td>25% (39)</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last year (all</td>
<td>10 %</td>
<td>19 %</td>
<td>39 %</td>
<td>32 %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>examined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subjects)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous 5 years</td>
<td>5 %</td>
<td>16 %</td>
<td>43 %</td>
<td>36 %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous 5 years</td>
<td>11 %</td>
<td>19 %</td>
<td>39 %</td>
<td>30 %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(all examined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subjects)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Student Distribution (SA or better)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Year 11</th>
<th>Year 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This year</td>
<td>57% (97)</td>
<td>43% (72)</td>
<td>22% (37)</td>
<td>78% (132)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last year</td>
<td>55% (86)</td>
<td>45% (69)</td>
<td>32% (49)</td>
<td>68% (106)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous 5 years</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>