

Media Units 1 & 2

Practice Examinations

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/> or send a letter to Creative Commons, PO Box 1866, Mountain View, CA 94042, USA.

Attribution: Classbasics Pty Ltd, vwx.au

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander content has been excluded as accuracy cannot be guaranteed, and it is better to be respectful than cover the entire curriculum inaccurately.

Significant effort has been made to ensure this content is legal. Please send any areas of concern to admin@vwx.au with appropriate document/legal references so errors can be verified and changes be made.

Contents

Section	Page
Unit 1 Examination A — accessible	2
Unit 1 Examination B — standard	16
Unit 2 Examination A — accessible	31
Unit 2 Examination B — standard	47

Unit 1 Examination A — accessible

Reading time: 10 minutes. Writing time: 90 minutes. Total 60 marks.

All questions are compulsory. Answer all questions in the spaces provided. This paper is made up of written responses only: there are no multiple-choice questions, there is no formula sheet, there is no insert and there is no criteria page. Questions are grouped under the three Unit 1 areas of study. Question numbering runs continuously from 1 to 14.

Standing note — please read before you begin.

Units 1 and 2 of VCE Media have **no VCAA examination**. The study design states that all assessment at Units 1 and 2 is school-based, that procedures for assessing levels of achievement are a matter for school decision, and that those levels of achievement are not reported to the VCAA.

This paper is therefore a **school-decision revision paper**. It is written to the three Unit 1 outcomes so that you can rehearse them under timed conditions. It is not a VCAA examination, it is not a VCAA-format practice examination, and it does not predict one. Your school decides whether, when and how it is used, and what it counts for.

Structure of this paper

Area of study	Questions	Marks
Media representations	1–5	20
Media forms in production	6–10	20
Australian stories	11–14	20
Total	1–14	60

Approximate timing: about 1.5 minutes per mark. Questions 13 and 14 require narratives you have studied this year; there are write-in lines for them before Question 13.

Media representations

Question 1 (2 marks)

Outline the difference between the **nature** of a media representation and the **form** of a media representation.

Question 2 (4 marks)

Use Stimulus A to answer Questions 2 and 3.

Stimulus A — *Nine Streets*, a 40-second radio promotion

A community radio station has recorded a 40-second promotion for a new weekly program about the small town of Tallowmere. The recorded script and sound plan are set out below.

Time	Sound	Words
0:00–0:06	Birdsong; a screen door; a kettle coming to the boil	(none)
0:06–0:18	The same, held underneath	NARRATOR: “Tallowmere. Eleven streets, one bakery, and a footy oval that floods every second winter.”
0:18–0:30	Laughter in a large room; cutlery on plates	NARRATOR: “Every Tuesday, ninety people eat lunch together at the hall. Nobody organised it. It just kept happening.”
0:30–0:40	Birdsong returns; slow fade	NARRATOR: “ <i>Nine Streets</i> . Thursdays at six.”

Recorded but not used, and not replaced: the Tallowmere Road level crossing, where freight trains pass every nine minutes; the primary school, which closed in 2019; and the shopping strip, where four of the eleven shopfronts are empty.

Describe how **selection** and **omission** have been used to construct the representation of Tallowmere in Stimulus A.

In your response, refer to one specific selected element and one specific omitted element.

Question 3 (5 marks)

Explain how a listener would **engage with**, **consume** and **read** the representation of Tallowmere in Stimulus A.

In your response, use all three of those terms and keep them separate, and refer to the stimulus.

Question 4 (4 marks)

Use Stimulus B to answer Question 4.

Stimulus B — two representations of the same subject, 45 years apart

Product 1 — 1980. A full-page black-and-white advertisement in a metropolitan daily newspaper for the Tallowmere Show. A single photograph shows a man in a hat holding a ribbon beside a bull. The headline, in heavy serif capitals, reads THE SHOW IS ON. Below it, body copy lists the starting times of the woodchop, the show jumping and the fireworks. The Show Society's name and a telephone number sit at the foot of the page.

Product 2 — 2025. A 15-second vertical video posted by the Tallowmere Show to a short-video platform. Nine one-second shots cut on the beat of an upbeat track: hands lifting a toffee apple; a child on a father's shoulders; the sideshow lights at dusk; a dog trial; a queue at a food van. On-screen text reads "9 things you'll actually do at the Show". The final shot holds on a QR code.

Describe **one** difference in the way the representation of the Tallowmere Show is constructed in Product 1 and Product 2, and explain **one** factor that could account for that difference.

Question 5 (5 marks)

Explain **one social factor** and **one institutional factor** that influence which media representations reach Australian audiences.

Refer to a specific example for each factor.

End of the questions on Media representations

Media forms in production

Use Stimulus C to answer Questions 6–10. You are not required to have made this product. You are being asked to explain the decisions you would make.

Stimulus C — production brief: Corriwan Shire Mobile Library

The Corriwan Shire mobile library is a converted truck. It parks for three hours a week in each of five small towns. It has 2,400 registered borrowers, most of them aged over 60.

The problem. In March, the Shire's budget papers described the van as "a book-lending service". In September, nine councillors — most of whom have never been on board — will decide whether to replace the van when it is retired.

What actually happens on board. Books are borrowed. People also print and scan documents, use the wifi, get help filling in forms, collect a hearing-aid battery, charge a phone, and sit down out of the weather. Two of the five towns have no other indoor public space.

The intention. We want a media product that represents the van as **a place people use for many things**, not as a shelf of books. The audience is the nine councillors. They will see or hear the product **once**, at the start of a meeting.

What we can offer. Access to the van, its staff and its borrowers on any weekday; a budget of \$400; and one two-hour block in each town.

Question 6 (3 marks)

Name the media form you would work in to respond to Stimulus C, choosing **one** of the following:

- audio-visual sequence
- photographs
- print layout
- poster
- digital presentation

Media form: _____

Describe **one characteristic of that media form** that makes it suitable for the audience and the intention stated in the brief.

Question 7 (4 marks)

Describe **two pre-production documents** you would prepare for this production.

For each document, explain what it decides about **the representation itself** — not only about your schedule.

Question 8 (4 marks)

Explain how you would use **two media codes** during the production stage to construct the representation the brief asks for.

For each code, name **one specific technique or media technology setting** you would use, and state the effect it would achieve.

Question 9 (4 marks)

Stimulus C states three constraints: a budget of \$400, one two-hour block in each town, and an audience that will see or hear the product only once.

Choose **one** of those constraints. Explain how it would change **one decision you make at the production stage** and **one decision you make at the post-production stage**.

Constraint chosen: _____

Question 10 (5 marks)

Explain how you would evaluate whether your finished product achieved the intention stated in Stimulus C.

In your response, refer to:

- your own stated intention for the product
- one specific element of the finished product
- one method you would use to gather evidence from an audience before the councillors see it.

End of the questions on Media forms in production

Australian stories

Question 11 (4 marks)

Use Stimulus D to answer Question 11.

Stimulus D — a production decision in an Australian feature film

Sweet Country (2017) is an Australian feature film directed and photographed by Warwick Thornton, a Kaytetye man. It is set in the Northern Territory in the 1920s and premiered in Australia at the Adelaide Film Festival in October 2017.

The film carries **no musical score**. Its soundtrack is made up of dialogue and the sound recorded at the locations where the film was shot.

Thornton has given a public account of that decision. In an interview published in February 2018 he said: “Get rid of the score. Get rid of the music and listen to the actual location and suddenly it becomes a much more stronger character.” In the same interview he described a score as something “used in key points to make you laugh or cry”, and said that working without one meant “your actors also have to act a bit harder too because they don’t have a score to hide behind.”

Source: *Film Inquiry*, Alex Lines, “Interview With Warwick Thornton, Director Of *SWEET COUNTRY*”, 6 February 2018 — <https://www.filminquiry.com/interview-warwick-thornton-director-sweet-country/>. Accurate as at July 2026.

Source: *The Conversation*, Lucio Crispino, “Warwick Thornton’s *Sweet Country*: a tragic investigation of race on Australia’s frontier”, 10 October 2017 — <https://theconversation.com/warwick-thorntons-sweet-country-a-tragic-investigation-of-race-on-australias-frontier-84512>. Accurate as at July 2026.

Explain how the production decision described in Stimulus D shapes what an audience receives from the narrative.

In your response, refer to the media code of **sound**, and to **one other effect** that Thornton identifies in the stimulus.

Question 12 (3 marks)

Use Stimulus E to answer Question 12.

Stimulus E — the episode structure of an Australian non-fictional television series

Long Paddock is a six-part Australian observational series about a stock route. It screens weekly on a commercial free-to-air network. Every episode is built to the same plan.

Segment	Length	Content
Cold open	90 sec	One drover states, to camera, the problem this episode will deal with
Titles	30 sec	
Part 1	9 min	The drovers set out; something goes wrong
Advertisement break		
Part 2	9 min	The problem is worked on; a second, smaller problem appears
Advertisement break		
Part 3	8 min	The first problem is resolved, or is not
Tag	60 sec	A short scene at the camp, and a look ahead to next week

Describe **one effect** that repeating the same structure in every episode has on the audience, and outline **one reason** the broadcaster would want that structure.

The following two questions require Australian narratives you have studied this year. Write them on the lines below before you begin Question 13.

Fictional narrative studied, and its media form: _____

Non-fictional narrative studied, and its media form:

These two narratives must be in two different media forms. You must use them to answer Questions 13 and 14.

Question 13 (5 marks)

Explain how **one** institutional, economic, social or political constraint affected the **production or the distribution** of **one** of the Australian narratives you have named above.

State which narrative you are writing about, name the constraint, and explain what it changed.

Question 14 (8 marks)

Analyse how the **structural features** of the two Australian narratives you have named engage audiences.

Your response must:

- refer to **one fictional** and **one non-fictional** narrative, in **two different media forms**
- name **one specific structural feature** in each narrative
- explain how each feature engages its audience — not what the narrative is about.

Use evidence that is different from the evidence you used in Question 13.

End of the questions on Australian stories

End of examination questions

Unit 1 Examination A — solutions

Every model response below is one high-scoring answer, not the only one. Where a question asks for your own production decisions or your own studied narrative, the model shows the **shape** of a full-mark answer; substitute your own material and keep the structure.

Marks in this paper: Media representations $2 + 4 + 5 + 4 + 5 = 20$; Media forms in production $3 + 4 + 4 + 4 + 5 = 20$; Australian stories $4 + 3 + 5 + 8 = 20$. Total $20 + 20 + 20 = 60$.

Media representations — solutions

Q1. Command term — outline: give the key features briefly. Two marks: one mark for each term, correctly separated.

Model response:

The **nature** of a media representation is what representations are like by their very kind — the properties every representation has, whatever product it appears in. They are constructed out of media codes and conventions; they are partial, because something is always left out; and they carry the values of the time, location and context in which they were made, even when they look natural and unarranged.

The **form** of a media representation is the particular version of the subject that one product delivers — the claim it makes, which another product about the same subject could contradict. “Farmers are represented as isolated and worn down” is a form; “the film is about farmers” is only a topic.

(The word “form” is also used in this study for the media form a representation is realised in — moving image, still image, audio, print, digital. Either sense earns the mark provided it is clearly distinguished from “nature”).

Common errors: defining both terms as “what the representation is about”, which collapses the distinction; writing a topic where the form of the representation requires a claim; treating “nature” as a synonym for “subject”.

Q2. Command term — describe: give an account of the features. Four marks: one selected element with its effect, one omitted element with its effect, and a statement of the representation the two processes build together.

Model response:

Selection. The promotion selects sound that is domestic, slow and unpeopled at the edges: birdsong, a screen door, a kettle coming to the boil, held for a full six seconds before anyone speaks. It then selects the Tuesday lunch — “ninety people eat lunch together at the hall. Nobody organised it.” Both selections do the same work. The opening six seconds establish quiet as the town’s baseline, and the lunch supplies the town’s one large gathering as something that happens by itself. Selecting a fact that nobody arranged constructs Tallowmere as a place where community is a natural condition rather than an effort.

Omission. Three recorded elements are left out and not replaced. The most powerful is the level crossing where freight trains pass **every nine minutes**. That single fact contradicts the representation the promotion is building: a town interrupted by a train six times an hour is not the town the birdsong constructs. Omitting it protects the quiet. The closed primary school and the four empty shopfronts are omitted for a related reason — both would signal decline, and decline cannot sit beside “it just kept happening”.

The representation the two processes build. Together, selection and omission construct Tallowmere as small, quiet, warm and intact. The same forty seconds assembled from the omitted material — trains, a closed school, four empty shops — would construct a town under strain. Nothing in either version would be untrue. The difference is entirely in what was chosen and what was left out.

Common errors: listing what is in the promotion without saying what the choices construct; treating omission as an accident or a mistake rather than a construction process; writing that the promotion is “biased” or “lying” — a representation is partial by nature, and partiality is not deception; adding “emphasis” as a third process, when the study design’s triad is selection, omission and construction.

Q3. Command term — explain: give a how and why chain. Five marks: the three terms held apart, each tied to the stimulus, plus a statement of how the three combine.

Model response:

Consumption is the manner in which the listener takes the product in. A 40-second radio promotion is consumed in a way the listener does not choose: it arrives inside someone else’s schedule, on a community radio frequency, most likely through a car speaker or a kitchen radio while the listener is doing something else. It is heard once, in real time, with no ability to pause or replay, and often without full attention. Every construction decision in Stimulus A is shaped by that: the six seconds of birdsong at the top exist to make a distracted listener look up.

Engagement is how the listener is affected, emotionally and cognitively. Emotionally, the laughter and cutlery at 0:18 and the kettle at 0:00 work on recognition — these are sounds of an ordinary week, and they produce warmth rather than excitement. Cognitively, the listener is set small problems: where is Tallowmere, why does the oval flood every *second* winter, and how does a ninety-person lunch happen if “nobody organised it”? The line is constructed to be slightly incomplete so that the listener finishes it.

Reading is the meaning the listener actually makes. A listener who lives in a town like Tallowmere is likely to read the promotion as recognition — this is my sort of place, and it is being described without being laughed at. A city listener with no such experience may read the same forty seconds as nostalgia, or as charming and remote. The self-deprecating detail about the flooding oval is doing double work here: it invites the local to read the town as honest about itself, and it invites the outsider to read it as endearing.

How the three combine. They are not stages in a queue. Because consumption is single-pass and half-attended, the producer front-loads the emotional engagement; because the emotional engagement is warm and the cognitive engagement is a small unanswered question, the reading that most listeners make is “a close, ordinary, quietly generous town”. Change the consumption situation — the same forty seconds studied in a classroom with the script in front of you — and the reading changes too, because the omissions become visible.

Common errors: using the three terms as synonyms for “listening”; describing engagement as “the audience liked it”, when engagement is *how* they were affected; giving a reading with no evidence from the stimulus; sliding into audience **response** (an action or behaviour change), which is a fourth term and is not what this question asks for.

Q4. *Command term — describe, then explain. Four marks: two for a construction difference with evidence from both products, two for a factor that accounts for it.*

Model response:

The difference. The two products construct the Show as two different kinds of thing, and the difference is carried by the number of images and how they are arranged. Product 1 gives the audience **one** frozen photograph — a man, a ribbon, a bull — under a heavy serif headline, with the times of the woodchop, the show jumping and the fireworks set out as a list. Product 2 gives the audience **nine** one-second shots cut on the beat, each one a fragment of an experience: hands lifting a toffee apple, a child on a father’s shoulders, the lights at dusk. Product 1 therefore constructs the Show as a formal agricultural institution with a programme to be attended, and the audience’s position is that of a spectator being informed. Product 2 constructs the Show as a set of personal experiences to be had, and the on-screen text — “9 things you’ll actually do at the Show” — puts the audience inside it in the second person.

A factor that accounts for it. The most direct is **technological**. The 2025 product is built for a short-video platform consumed on a phone held vertically, where a viewer decides within about a second whether to keep watching. Nine one-second shots cut on the beat is a construction shaped by that consumption situation, and the QR code only works because the product is being viewed on the device that will scan it. In 1980 the available technology was a printed page: one still image at high reproduction cost, read at the audience’s own pace, so information could be listed rather than shown.

*(An **industrial** factor is equally creditable: in 1980 the Show Society had to buy space from a metropolitan newspaper and accept that newspaper’s format, whereas in 2025 it publishes directly to its own audience with no intermediary, and can therefore adopt the conventions of the platform rather than those of the press. An **economic** factor — a full-page metropolitan advertisement is expensive and must carry all the information at once, while a platform post costs nothing and can be one of many — is also creditable.)*

Common errors: comparing the **content** of the two products (“one has a bull, one has a toffee apple”) instead of their **construction**; offering “technology improved” as the whole explanation without saying which technology changed which construction decision; using the Unit 3 and 4 context frame here — the factors named in the Unit 1 Area of Study 1 introduction are **social, industrial, economic and technological**.

Q5. *Command term — explain: a how and why chain, not a list. Five marks: one social factor explained with an example, one institutional factor explained with an example, and the two kept distinct.*

Model response:

An institutional factor: what an institution is obliged or funded to distribute. A media institution’s own rules determine what it will carry, and those rules sit above any individual producer’s intention. The Australian Broadcasting Corporation is established under the *Australian Broadcasting Corporation Act 1983* (Cth), and section 6 of that Act — the Charter — requires the Corporation to provide “broadcasting programs that contribute to a sense of national identity and inform and entertain, and reflect the cultural diversity of, the Australian community”. That obligation is an institutional factor with a direct effect on distribution: a representation of a small remote community, or a program made in a language other than English, has a route to a national audience through the ABC that it would not have through an institution whose only test is advertising revenue. The same factor works in the other direction — a subscription service selects for what will retain subscribers, so a representation with a small potential audience may never be commissioned, and if it is, it sits behind a paywall.

Source: AustLII, Australian Broadcasting Corporation Act 1983 (Cth), s 6 (Charter of the Corporation) — https://www.austlii.edu.au/au/legis/cth/consol_act/abca1983361/s6.html. Accurate as at July 2026.

A social factor: whether audiences pass a representation on. Distribution does not stop at the institution that publishes. Audiences redistribute representations through the social networks they already belong to — group chats, families, workplaces, sporting clubs, community pages — and a representation that is passed on this way reaches people the original distributor never addressed. When a regional newspaper publishes a photo essay on a town’s

volunteer fire brigade, the brigade's own members share it into local groups within hours, and the representation reaches an audience many times the paper's circulation. The social factor is not the platform; it is the existence of a group that recognises itself in the representation and has a reason to circulate it. The corollary matters just as much: a representation that no group feels ownership of stops where its publisher stops.

Keeping them apart. The institutional factor is about the **rules and interests of the organisation** that creates, produces or distributes. The social factor is about the **relationships between people** who receive it. Both change which representations reach which Australians, and they can pull in opposite directions — an institution may distribute nationally to an audience that never passes it on, while a small product with no institutional reach can travel a long way socially.

Common errors: naming a factor without an example; offering a **technological** factor (an algorithm, a streaming app) when the question asks for social and institutional ones; treating “social” as meaning “about society” rather than as the relationships through which distribution actually happens; writing about how a representation is **constructed** when the question is about how it is **distributed**.

Note on scope: Unit 1 does not require you to name Australian regulators or classification schemes. Those belong to Units 3 and 4. An answer built on institutional rules, funding and audience relationships is complete at this level.

Media forms in production — solutions

Q6. Command term — name, then describe. Three marks: one for a form that could actually meet the brief, two for a characteristic of that form tied to both the audience and the intention.

Model response (media form: audio-visual sequence):

Media form: audio-visual sequence.

The characteristic: it is built over time, and the maker controls the order and the pace. In an audio-visual sequence the audience receives one thing after another, at the maker's speed, and cannot skip ahead or choose where to look first. That characteristic is exactly what this brief needs. The councillors have not been on board the van, and the brief says they will see the product **once**, at the start of a meeting. A sequence can therefore be built to reveal the van's uses in a deliberate order — a woman printing a form, a man charging a phone, two people sitting down out of the rain, and only then somebody borrowing a book — so that by the time a book appears the councillors have already accepted a wider definition of what the van is. A print layout or a set of photographs would put every element in front of them at once and let them look wherever they liked, which for this audience means looking at the books first and confirming what the budget papers already said.

*(Other forms are fully creditable if the characteristic is matched to the brief. **Photographs:** the still-image form freezes a single frame, so a set of six portraits, each captioned with what that person came on board to do, makes the range of uses countable — nine councillors can take it in during a meeting agenda item. **Poster:** the poster is consumed in seconds at a distance, which suits an audience seeing the product once. **Digital presentation:** it can be paced by a presenter in the room and stopped for questions.)*

Common errors: naming a form and then describing the product instead of a **characteristic of the form**; naming a characteristic that is really a characteristic of your idea (“it will be moving and personal”); choosing a form the brief rules out — the councillors see the product once, in a meeting, so anything requiring them to browse at their own pace over time is working against the brief.

Q7. Command term — describe, then explain. Four marks: two documents, each described, each tied to a decision about the representation rather than about logistics.

Model response (audio-visual sequence):

Document 1 — a statement of intention. One paragraph, written before anything else, naming the subject, the representation, the audience and the form: “*This 90-second sequence represents the Corriwan mobile library as a place five towns use for many different things, for an audience of nine councillors who have never been on board.*” This document decides the representation itself, because it fixes the **claim** the product must make. Every later decision is tested against it: a beautiful shot of a full bookshelf is cut, not because it is a poor shot, but because it argues the

opposite claim. Without this document, “the van is good” becomes the working intention, and a product that argues nothing in particular gets made.

Document 2 — a shot list and storyboard. A numbered list of the shots to be captured, each with its framing, its location, its subject and its purpose, drawn as rough frames in the order they will appear. This document decides the representation because in an audio-visual sequence **order is meaning**. Placing three non-book uses before the first book decides that the audience meets the van as a service before it meets the van as a shelf; reversing those frames on the storyboard reverses the claim, without changing a single shot. The shot list also decides representation at the level of framing: specifying a medium close-up of hands working the scanner, rather than a wide shot of the van’s exterior, decides that the audience is shown people using the van rather than a vehicle parked in a street.

Common errors: describing what the document **contains** without saying what it **decides**; giving two documents that do the same job (a storyboard and a shot list can count as one planning decision if you treat them identically — differentiate them or choose two genuinely different documents); writing only about scheduling and logistics, which the question explicitly excludes; naming a document that does not belong to the form you chose in Question 6.

Q8. Command term — explain: a how and why chain. Four marks: two codes, each with a named technique or setting, each with a stated effect on the representation.

Model response (audio-visual sequence):

Code 1 — camera. I would shoot every use of the van as a **medium close-up at the height of the person’s hands, on a wide-ish lens held about a metre away**, rather than a wide shot from the doorway. The specific setting: a focal length around 24–35 mm on the camera I have, with the aperture opened to about f/2.8 so that the background of the van goes soft. The effect on the representation is precise. A wide shot from the doorway would show a small vehicle containing shelves, which is the representation the budget papers already carry. A medium close-up on hands filling in a form, hands at the scanner, hands plugging in a charger makes the **activity** the subject and the vehicle only the setting — which is the claim the brief asks for. Softening the background stops the shelves reading as the point of every frame.

Code 2 — sound. I would record **location sound in each of the five towns on a lapel microphone worn by the person speaking**, with a separate 60-second recording of room tone in each town, and build the sequence with no music at all. The specific technique: the lapel microphone clipped about 20 cm below the chin, gain set so that speech peaks around –12 dB, and the room tone laid underneath the cuts so the sequence does not go silent between shots. The effect is that the councillors hear five distinct places rather than one generic library — the rain on the roof in one town, the road noise in another — and hear borrowers describing their own use of the van in their own words. Refusing music also removes the soft-focus community-video register that a sceptical councillor would discount; without a score the material has to persuade on its own.

Common errors: naming a code and then describing the content (“I would film people using the van”) without a technique or setting; naming a technology instead of a code — “a camera” is a media technology, **camera** as a code means shot size, angle, movement, focus and framing; giving an effect on the audience (“it would look good”) rather than an effect on the representation; choosing codes that do not exist in the form named in Question 6.

Q9. Command term — explain: a how and why chain. Four marks: two for the production decision, two for the post-production decision, both traced back to the named constraint.

Model response (constraint chosen: one two-hour block in each town):

Why this constraint bites. Two hours in a town is a single visit. The van is only there for three hours a week, so there is no second attempt, no returning for a shot I forgot, and no waiting for somebody interesting to come aboard.

The production decision it changes. It changes how I shoot: I would abandon any plan to follow one borrower through a whole visit and shoot **short, complete, self-contained units instead**. In each town I would guarantee four items — a wide establishing shot of the van in its street, one activity in medium close-up, one 30-second interview answer to a single question, and 60 seconds of room tone — and I would shoot them in that fixed order, checking them off a list. The reason is that a two-hour block cannot be recovered from, so the shoot has to be designed to fail safely: five towns each yielding four usable items gives me twenty pieces, and losing any one of them does not break the sequence. If I instead spent two hours following one person and they left early, that town produces nothing at all.

The post-production decision it changes. It changes the structure I can edit into: with four comparable items from each of five towns and no possibility of a pick-up shoot, I would edit the sequence as a **repeating five-part pattern** — same shot order in each town, cut to the same rhythm — rather than as a single continuous story. That is a decision forced by the constraint, but it is also a decision that serves the brief, because five towns treated identically is itself the argument: the van does this in every town, not just the photogenic one. Where a town's interview answer is unusable, the pattern lets me cover the gap with that town's activity shot and room tone without the audience noticing a hole.

Common errors: naming the constraint and then describing the product, without showing a decision that would have been different otherwise; giving two decisions that are both at the same stage, when the question asks for one at production and one at post-production; treating a constraint as purely negative — a constraint that forces a clearer structure has shaped the product, not just limited it.

Q10. *Command term — explain: a how and why chain. Five marks: the stated intention restated as a testable claim, one specific element evaluated against it, one named evidence-gathering method, and a statement of what would count as failure.*

Model response (audio-visual sequence):

Turning the intention into something testable. My stated intention was: *this 90-second sequence represents the Corriwan mobile library as a place five towns use for many different things, for an audience of nine councillors who have never been on board.* That is testable because it predicts what a viewer should be able to say afterwards. If a viewer who has seen the sequence once can name three different things people do on the van, and does not describe it as “a library”, the product has done its job. If they say “it’s a nice video about a library van”, it has not — however well made it is.

Evaluating one specific element. The element I would evaluate hardest is **the opening eight seconds**, because the brief says the councillors see the sequence once, at the start of a meeting, when their attention is lowest. My opening is a medium close-up of a woman scanning a form on the van's printer, with no establishing shot of the vehicle. Measured against the intention, that is the right choice: it withholds the word “library” and shows a use first, which is what the representation has to do. Measured honestly, it carries a risk — a viewer who does not know where they are may spend those eight seconds working out the location rather than reading the action. That is a real weakness in the element, and naming it is part of the evaluation, not a failure of it.

The method for gathering evidence. Before the meeting I would run a **structured screening with eight people who match the audience** — adults who have never been on board the van, recruited through the Shire office rather than through the library. Each person watches the sequence **once**, exactly as the councillors will, then answers the same three written questions without discussion: (1) list everything you saw people doing on the van; (2) in one sentence, what is this van for? (3) at what point, if any, did you lose track of where you were? Answers go on a tally sheet.

What the evidence would tell me, and what I would change. Question 1 measures the intention directly: if the average viewer lists three or more uses, the representation is landing. Question 2 catches the failure the brief exists to prevent — if most sentences come back as “borrowing books”, the sequence has reproduced the budget papers. Question 3 tests the opening eight seconds specifically; if three or more viewers say they were lost at the start, I would add a two-second wide shot of the van in the street before the printer shot and re-test, accepting the cost to the opening in exchange for orientation.

Common errors: describing the product instead of evaluating it; evaluating against “was it good?” rather than against your own stated intention; giving a method with no questions and no record (“I’d show my friends and see what they think”); listing only strengths — an evaluation that finds nothing to change is not an evaluation; evaluating with evidence gathered after the councillors have already decided, which cannot change anything.

Australian stories — solutions

Q11. *Command term — explain: a how and why chain. Four marks: two for the effect on sound and what the audience consequently receives, two for a second effect drawn from the stimulus, tied to construction.*

Model response:

What removing the score does to the code of sound. In most narrative film, sound is layered: dialogue, effects, atmosphere and a musical score written to run underneath. The score is the layer that tells the audience how to feel

about what it is watching, and because it is composed after the shoot it can be applied to any moment at any strength. Removing it does not leave a gap — it promotes everything underneath. In *Sweet Country* the location sound recorded on site becomes the whole of the non-dialogue soundtrack, so what the audience receives at every moment is the actual acoustic character of the place the scene was shot in. Thornton's own account puts the consequence exactly: the location "becomes a much more stronger character". Sound stops being commentary on the setting and becomes evidence of it.

The consequence for the audience's reading. Because there is no score, the audience is never told what to feel at a given moment. Thornton says a score is "used in key points to make you laugh or cry"; with that layer gone, the audience has to derive its response from what is on screen and from what the place actually sounds like. The work of interpretation moves from the composer to the viewer, and the viewer's reading of a scene is no longer underwritten by an instruction.

A second effect Thornton identifies — the demand on performance. Thornton notes that without a score "your actors also have to act a bit harder too because they don't have a score to hide behind." This is a construction consequence, not a compliment: in a scored film, a performance that is slightly under-pitched can be lifted by the music, so the score does part of the acting's job. Remove it and the code of **acting** must carry the full emotional load, unassisted. What the audience receives is therefore a performance that has to stand on its own, in the same acoustic space as the crickets and the boots — which is what makes the film's quiet passages readable rather than empty.

Common errors: writing about what the film is **about** rather than about the construction decision the stimulus describes; treating "no music" as an absence rather than as a choice with consequences; naming sound but not saying what the audience receives differently as a result; going beyond the stimulus and the sources to interpret cultural meaning — this question is about a documented production decision and its effects on the audience, and an answer that stays there is a complete answer.

Q12. *Command term — describe, then outline. Three marks: two for an audience effect of the repetition, one for a broadcaster's reason.*

Model response:

The effect on the audience. Repeating the same structure teaches the audience the shape of an episode, and a taught shape becomes an expectation the audience can rely on. By the second or third week a viewer of *Long Paddock* knows that the problem stated in the 90-second cold open will be settled before the tag, that a second, smaller problem will appear in Part 2, and that the tag will look ahead. That knowledge changes how the episode is watched: the viewer stops working out what kind of program this is and starts following the specific problem, because the frame is already familiar. It also makes the series consumable in a half-attended way — a viewer who joins nine minutes late knows immediately where they are. The cost is that the same repetition removes surprise, so an episode that departs from the pattern reads as significant simply because it departs.

Why the broadcaster wants it. *Long Paddock* screens weekly on a **commercial free-to-air network**, and the structure is built around two advertisement breaks. Each break falls immediately after a problem has been opened and before it is resolved, so the audience has a reason to stay through the advertisements — which is what the network is selling. The repetition also makes the series predictable to schedule and to produce: each episode fills the same slot to the same minute, and an editor knows in advance exactly how much material each segment needs.

Common errors: describing the structure back to the marker instead of naming an effect; giving only the audience effect or only the broadcaster's reason when the question asks for both; asserting that repetition is "boring" without connecting it to how the audience actually consumes a weekly broadcast series.

Q13. *Command term — explain: a how and why chain. Five marks: the constraint correctly classified, the narrative named, and a specific change to production or distribution traced to the constraint.*

Model response (studied narrative: The Fitzroy Diaries, ABC RN, 2018–2021 — non-fictional or fictional as studied; here treated as the fictional audio narrative):

The constraint: institutional. *The Fitzroy Diaries* is an audio fiction serial written, directed and narrated by Lorin Clarke, produced and script-edited by Sophie Townsend, and made for and broadcast by ABC Radio National, where it originally went to air inside the program *Life Matters* before being released as a podcast. Being an ABC RN

commission is an institutional constraint in the precise sense the study design uses: the institution that commissions and distributes sets the conditions the narrative must be built to.

What it changed about production. Two conditions follow directly from the institution. First, the narrative had to be built to sit inside an existing daytime radio program rather than to stand alone, which fixes its episode length and requires each instalment to be intelligible to a listener who did not choose it and has not heard the previous one — hence a serial carried by a single narrating voice, with the narration doing the work of re-orienting the listener each time. Second, ABC RN carries no advertising, so the narrative is not built around commercial breaks and does not need a cliffhanger at a fixed minute. That is a constraint operating as an enabler: the absence of breaks is what allows the series to be observational and unhurried — Clarke describes the work as lyrical observations on life as an inner-city parent — rather than structured around retention points.

What it changed about distribution. As an ABC production the series reaches its audience twice and free of charge: once as broadcast radio, on a national network whose Charter under the *Australian Broadcasting Corporation Act 1983* (Cth) requires programs that contribute to a sense of national identity and reflect the cultural diversity of the Australian community, and again as a podcast available on demand. A comparable audio fiction serial made for a subscription platform would reach only subscribers, and would be built to a different length. The institution did not merely publish this narrative; it determined who could hear it and what shape it had to take.

Source: Lorin Clarke, “The Fitzroy Diaries” (creator’s own account of the work) — <https://www.lorinclarke.com/work-york/the-fitzroy-diaries-podcast-lfgnx>. Accurate as at July 2026.

Source: AustLII, Australian Broadcasting Corporation Act 1983 (Cth), s 6 (Charter of the Corporation) — https://www.austlii.edu.au/au/legis/cth/consol_act/abca1983361/s6.html. Accurate as at July 2026.

*An equally creditable **economic** answer:* the Australian Screen Production Incentive sets the Producer Offset at **40 per cent** of qualifying Australian production expenditure for a feature film produced for commercial exhibition in cinemas, and **30 per cent** for an eligible project produced for television or a subscription service, for projects that commenced principal photography on or after 1 July 2021. A producer deciding whether an Australian story is made as a cinema feature or as a television series is therefore making a decision with a different amount of money attached to each answer — an economic constraint that shapes the media form the narrative finally takes, before a word of it is written.

Source: Screen Australia, “Producer Offset” — <https://www.screenaustralia.gov.au/producer-offset/>. Accurate as at July 2026.

Common errors: naming a constraint and then describing the narrative instead of what the constraint changed; classifying the constraint wrongly — money is **economic**, the rules and interests of the commissioning or distributing organisation are **institutional**, community expectation and sensitivity are **social**, and government policy, regulation and funding decisions are **political**; writing about a constraint on your own school production rather than on the studied narrative; treating every constraint as a limitation, when a constraint frequently produces the narrative’s defining feature; importing the Unit 3 and 4 context frame — the list this dot point uses is **institutional, economic, social and political**.

Q14. *Command term — analyse: break each narrative into its structural elements and show how they work on the audience, with specific evidence. Eight marks; all three bullet requirements must be met.*

Model response (fictional narrative: The Fitzroy Diaries, ABC RN, audio; non-fictional narrative: Muster Dogs, ABC TV, 2022, moving image):

The two narratives engage audiences through structure in almost opposite ways — one by refusing an accumulating plot, the other by building the entire series on a single deadline — and each choice is matched to the form it is made in.

Narrative 1 — The Fitzroy Diaries (fictional, audio). The structural feature is the **diary serial**: short instalments, each a self-contained observation, narrated in the first person by the same voice across the whole series, released inside a radio program and then as a podcast. Structurally this means no episode depends on the previous one for its sense, and no episode ends on a hook.

That structure engages the audience in a way that is specific to audio. Audio has no visual codes at all; a listener is usually alone, often with headphones, often doing something else, and cannot see who is speaking. A single narrating voice sustained across every instalment converts that limitation into the point — the listener is not watching a story, they are being told one by a person they come to know by sound alone, which produces intimacy rather than suspense. Because each instalment resolves, engagement does not depend on the listener remembering last week; a listener who joins at episode seven is not locked out. And because the narration is observational rather than plot-driven — Clarke’s own description of the work is lyrical observations on life as an inner-city parent — the cognitive work asked of the listener is recognition rather than prediction: the pleasure on offer is *I have noticed that too*, not *what happens next*. The structure engages by accumulating familiarity where a plot would accumulate tension.

Narrative 2 — *Muster Dogs* (non-fictional, moving image). The structural feature is a **deadline with parallel strands**: five kelpie pups from one litter are placed with five graziers across Australia, each of whom has twelve months to train their pup into a working muster dog; the graziers must hit training milestones under the guidance of trainer Neil McDonald, and the series ends when they reconvene for a final working-dog challenge. Four episodes cover that year.

Structurally, this does three things to the audience at once. First, the twelve-month deadline poses one question in the first minutes of episode one — will the pup be a working dog by the end? — and refuses to answer it until the last episode, which is what carries a viewer across four hours. Second, the five parallel strands mean the series is never dependent on any one of them: a viewer who is not held by a station in the Pilbara is likely to be held by a former stockbroker turned farmer, and the cutting between strands lets the series leave each grazier at the moment their story is most open. Third, the milestones supply repeated small resolutions inside the long unresolved arc, so the audience is paid off regularly without the central question being settled. The competitive endpoint then converts a documentary into something with the shape of a contest — the audience is invited to pick a grazier early and stay for the verdict. It is worth noting that all four episodes were made available on ABC iview on the day of the premiere, 23 January 2022, which means the same structure serves two consumption patterns: a weekly broadcast audience held by a deadline across four weeks, and an on-demand audience that can follow the same deadline in one sitting.

Across the two narratives. Both structures are engagement machines, but they are tuned to different consumption situations. *The Fitzroy Diaries* is built for a listener who arrives irregularly and alone, so its structure removes every barrier to entry and produces engagement through voice and recognition. *Muster Dogs* is built for a viewer who will commit to a series, so its structure creates one long question, divides the risk across five strands, and pays out at intervals. Neither structure could be swapped into the other narrative’s form: a twelve-month competitive deadline in a short audio serial would demand the listener remember a year of detail without pictures, and a diary of self-contained observations across four hours of television would leave a broadcast audience with no reason to return next week. That is the point — a structural feature engages an audience only in combination with the media form and the way that form is consumed.

Source: Lorin Clarke, “*The Fitzroy Diaries*” (creator’s own account of the work) — <https://www.lorinclarke.com/work-york/the-fitzroy-diaries-podcast-lfgnx>. Accurate as at July 2026.

Source: TV Blackbox, “All episodes of new heart-warming series *MUSTER DOGS* to drop together on ABC iview”, 7 January 2022 — <https://tvblackbox.com.au/page/2022/01/07/all-episodes-of-new-heart-warming-series-muster-dogs-to-drop-together-on-abc-iview/>. Accurate as at July 2026.

Band descriptors (out of 8):

- **High (7–8):** one fictional and one non-fictional narrative, in two genuinely different media forms; a **named** structural feature in each, described precisely enough that a reader could recognise it; the engagement explained as a consequence of the structure, not asserted; the media form’s characteristics brought into the explanation; specific evidence from each narrative; media language accurate and sustained; all three bullet requirements met.
- **Mid (4–6):** both narratives present and correctly classified, but at least one structural feature named only loosely (“it has a good structure”, “it is in episodes”); engagement described rather than explained; the two narratives handled in separate paragraphs with no comparison; evidence present but general; one bullet requirement partly missed — commonly two narratives in the **same** media form.

- **Low (1–3):** retelling of what the narratives are about; **theme** or **content** offered where a **structural feature** is required; only one narrative analysed; fictional and non-fictional confused, or no structural feature identified at all.

Common errors: retelling the narrative instead of analysing its structure — the leading fault on this question type; offering a **genre** convention or a **theme** where a **structural feature** is required; naming two narratives that are in the same media form (a film and a television series are both moving image) and so failing a stated requirement; asserting that a structure “engages the audience” without explaining the mechanism; writing about engagement in general when the marks are for engagement produced by the named structural feature.

End of solutions

Unit 1 Examination B — standard

Total 60 marks. Reading time: 10 minutes. Writing time: 90 minutes — about 1.5 minutes per mark. All questions are compulsory. Answer all questions in the spaces provided. Question numbering runs continuously from Question 1 to Question 14 across the three sections below, which are named for the three areas of study of Unit 1.

Marks by section: Media representations 20 marks · Media forms in production 20 marks · Australian stories 20 marks.

Standing note — read this before you begin. There is no VCAA examination at Units 1 and 2. The study design states that all assessment at Units 1 and 2 is school-based, and that procedures for assessing levels of achievement in these units are a matter for school decision; results are not reported to the VCAA. This paper is a **school-decision revision paper**. It exists to give you exam-style written practice across all three Unit 1 outcomes before you meet the graded written discipline of Units 3 and 4. It is not a VCAA examination, and it is not a VCAA-format practice examination.

Some questions ask you to write about a media product you have studied this year, or about a media production you designed and made yourself in Area of Study 2. Where this is required, a write-in line is provided. Use a different media product for each question that asks for one, unless a question tells you otherwise.

Media representations

This section is worth 20 marks. Questions 1 to 4 refer to Stimulus A and Stimulus B below. Question 5 requires an example of your own.

Use the information provided below to answer Questions 1 to 4. Both stimuli were published in 2026 and both represent the same subject: the Kerrawong District Saleyards and the people who work there.

Stimulus A — a photograph and caption published in *Weekend*, the Saturday magazine of a metropolitan daily newspaper (2026).

The photograph runs across two pages, with the caption printed beneath it. It is described below.

The image. A single wide frame, photographed from a low position at the foot of a steel gate. In the centre of the frame a woman of about twenty-five, in a blue work shirt with a clipboard under one arm, stands on the second rail of a pen, looking out across the yards. The pens run away from her in straight lines towards the back of the frame, filled with cattle. Above her, the roof struts and skylights of the shed cross the top third of the frame, and low early light comes through the skylights in bars. The buyers' walkway behind her is empty. She is the only person in the picture.

The caption. "Tuesday, 6.40 am. Jess Halloran, 25, works the rail at Kerrawong District Saleyards, where she is the youngest stock agent on the books. Her grandfather sold cattle in the same shed."

Stimulus B — *Sale Day*, a 60-second video published by Kerrawong Shire Council (2026).

The Shire owns and operates the saleyards. It published *Sale Day* on its own website and social accounts. There is a voice-over throughout. It is described shot by shot below.

Shot 1 (0:00–0:06). An aerial shot moving forward over the roof of the saleyards at first light. Trucks queue at the gate below. Voice-over: "Every Tuesday, before most of the district is awake..."

Shot 2 (0:06–0:16). Four shots of about two and a half seconds each: a gate swinging open; boots on a rail; a hand marking a card; cattle moving down a race. Voice-over: "...eleven thousand head a year come through these yards."

Shot 3 (0:16–0:30). A medium shot of a man in his sixties in a wide-brimmed hat, framed centrally, speaking directly to camera in front of a full pen. A lower-third graphic reads "Ray Petchell, agent, 41 years". He says the yards are the reason the district still has a stock and station business.

Shot 4 (0:30–0:42). Interior of the canteen: three shots of people eating, talking and laughing. Voice-over: "The yards employ thirty-one people, and every one of them lives within forty kilometres."

Shot 5 (0:42–0:54). A wide shot of the buyers’ walkway, full of people, then a slow tilt up to the Shire crest painted on the shed wall. Voice-over: “Kerrawong Shire has invested two point one million dollars in new roofing, water and animal-welfare facilities.”

Shot 6 (0:54–1:00). White text on green: “Kerrawong District Saleyards. Open every Tuesday.”

Question 1 (2 marks)

Identify the media form of Stimulus A and the media form of Stimulus B. For each, state one characteristic of that form that affects the representation it is able to construct.

Question 2 (3 marks)

Describe how **one** media code is used to construct the representation of Jess Halloran in Stimulus A. Name the code you are writing about.

Question 3 (5 marks)

Explain how a reader in the city and a reader who lives in the Kerrawong district could **read** the representation in Stimulus A differently.

In your response, identify what in the **construction** of the photograph and its caption makes both readings possible.

Question 4 (6 marks)

Compare the construction of the representation of the saleyards and the people who work there in Stimulus A and Stimulus B.

Your response must:

- refer to specific construction choices in **both** stimuli
- identify one point on which the two representations differ and one point on which they are continuous
- explain one social, industrial, economic or technological factor that helps account for a difference between them.

Question 5 (4 marks)

Discuss how the institutional relationship between an audience and one media organisation affects what that organisation chooses to **make**, and not only what it distributes.

Refer to one specific media organisation in your response, and reach a position. Do not use Kerrawong Shire Council or the newspaper in Stimulus A.

End of the questions on Media representations

Media forms in production

This section is worth 20 marks. Questions 6 to 9 refer to Stimulus C below. You are not required to have made this product; you are being asked to explain the decisions you would make. Question 10 asks about a production you made yourself this year.

Use the information provided below to answer Questions 6 to 9.

Stimulus C — commission brief: the Braewood Picture House.

The Braewood Picture House is a single-screen cinema in a country town. It is owned by a community association, staffed entirely by volunteers, and opens on Friday and Saturday nights. The building is ninety years old, and the projection box, the ticket window and the original seating are still in use.

Where we are now. We sell about sixty tickets on a good night, and almost all of our regular audience is over sixty. Younger people in town know the building is there — several have told our volunteers they

assume it is “for old people”, or that it only screens old films. It does not: our program is current, and it is chosen by a roster of volunteers.

What we want. We want people aged 15 to 25 in Braewood and the towns nearby to see a Friday night at the Picture House as something they would choose — an ordinary, affordable night out with friends. Not a museum visit, and not an act of charity towards a local institution.

What we can offer a maker. Access to the building, the projection box and our volunteers on any Tuesday; a small budget; and our own social accounts and the noticeboard in the foyer for distribution. Anything you make must be something we can publish, and keep publishing, ourselves at no ongoing cost.

Question 6 (4 marks)

Develop **one** idea for a media production that responds to the Braewood Picture House brief. Your production must be in **one** of the following media forms:

- moving image
- photography
- print
- audio
- digital and online media

Outline your idea using the boxes provided below.

Box	Your response
Intended audience	
Media form	
Title and outline of the product	
The representation you intend to construct	

Question 7 (3 marks)

Outline how you would research **one** existing media product before making the product you proposed in Question 6, and state **two** specific things you would take from that product into your own plan.

Question 8 (5 marks)

The association also wants a **second** product about the Picture House, in a **different media form** from the one you chose in Question 6.

Name that second media form. Explain how the media technologies you would operate would differ between the two forms, and how that difference would change the way each product constructs the representation.

In your response, name at least one specific media technology used in each form.

Second media form _____

Question 9 (3 marks)

You show a rough version of your Question 6 product to two people from the intended audience. Both of them misread the representation you intended to construct. You have one afternoon of work left, and no further access to the Picture House.

Describe **one** change you would make in response, and state **which stage of the media production process** you would return to in order to make it.

Question 10 (5 marks)

Evaluate how the characteristics of **one** media form you have worked in this year influenced a representation you constructed in it.

In your response, refer to at least two characteristics of the form, and reach a judgement about whether the form served the representation you had designed.

Media form _____

The representation you constructed _____

End of the questions on Media forms in production

Australian stories

This section is worth 20 marks. Each question requires an Australian narrative you have studied this year. Name the narrative on the line provided.

Question 11 (3 marks)

Describe how the structure of an Australian **non-fictional** narrative you have studied draws on a **cultural history** — a story, a tradition or a way of life that Australian audiences already recognise.

Non-fictional narrative _____

Question 12 (4 marks)

Explain how the voice of an Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander creator or producer has affected the way an Australian story is told.

In your response, name the creator or producer and the narrative, and refer to one specific construction or production decision.

Narrative _____

Creator or producer _____

Question 13 (5 marks)

Explain how **one economic** constraint and **one institutional** constraint shaped an Australian narrative.

In your response, show how at least one of the two constraints **enabled** something, as well as limiting something.

Use a different narrative from the ones you used in Questions 11 and 12.

Narrative _____

Question 14 (8 marks)

“An Australian story does not simply arrive at an audience. Its structure decides how the audience takes it in — a little at a time, all at once, or in an order the audience chooses for itself.”

Analyse how the structural features of **two** Australian narratives, in **two different media forms**, engage audiences and shape the way those audiences consume and read them.

Your response must:

- use two narratives in two different media forms, **one** of which is non-fictional
- refer to specific structural features in each narrative, not to the subject matter alone
- address engagement, consumption **and** reading, and keep the three terms separate.

You may refer to the statement above. You may reuse a narrative from an earlier question in this section, but you must use different evidence.

Narrative 1 _____ Media form _____

*End of examination questions***Unit 1 Examination B — solutions**

Every model response below is one high-scoring answer, not the only one. Where a question requires your own studied narrative or your own production work, the model shows the **shape** of a full-mark answer; substitute your own material and keep the structure.

Marks in this paper: Media representations $2 + 3 + 5 + 6 + 4 = 20$; Media forms in production $4 + 3 + 5 + 3 + 5 = 20$; Australian stories $3 + 4 + 5 + 8 = 20$; total 60.

Command terms used in this paper. *Identify* (1–2 marks) — name the thing, with no development. *Outline* (2–3) — set out the key features briefly. *Describe* (3–4) — give an account of the features. *Explain* (4–6) — build a how-or-why chain that reaches the audience or the representation. *Discuss* (3–6) — develop the point with evidence and reach a position. *Compare* (5–6) — set two constructions against each other on a stated basis and account for the difference; this is the Unit 1 Area of Study 1 key skill, which asks you to “compare the construction of representations within and across media products and forms”. *Evaluate* (5) — judge how well something worked, against stated grounds. *Analyse* (6–8) — break the thing into its constructed parts and show how they work together, with specific evidence.

Q1. *Command term — identify, plus a stated characteristic for each. Two marks: one per stimulus, awarded only when the form is correctly named **and** the characteristic named belongs to the form rather than to the individual product.*

Stimulus A is a **print** product carrying a **still image** — a photograph and caption published in a magazine. One characteristic of the form that affects the representation it can construct: it is **static and spatial**, so the representation must be carried by a single frozen instant and by the words placed beside it, and the reader controls how long they look and in what order they take the image and the caption.

Stimulus B is a **moving-image** product — a short online video. One characteristic of the form that affects the representation it can construct: it unfolds in **time and carries sound**, so it can show a sequence of events in an order the maker fixes, and it can assert things in a voice-over that an image alone could not.

Other creditable characteristics: for print and still image — it is durable and can be kept, returned to and read closely, which is why a caption can carry a fact the image cannot show; for moving image — the audience cannot pause the meaning as it plays, so emphasis has to be built into shot length, order and sound.

Common errors: naming the **media technology** (a camera, a drone) or the **product** (a photograph, a video) where the **media form** is asked for; giving a characteristic of the individual product (“it is 60 seconds long”, “it runs across two pages”) rather than of the form; naming “social media” as a media form — the form of Stimulus B is moving image, and the Shire’s accounts are a distribution platform.

Q2. *Command term — describe: give an account of the features. Three marks reward one code, named, with an account of what its use constructs — not three codes handled thinly.*

Visual composition. The photograph is built on a low camera position at the foot of the gate, so Jess Halloran is seen from below and her head and shoulders sit against the roof struts rather than against the pens. She is placed on the centre line of a wide frame, and the lines of pens run away from her towards the back of the picture, which makes her the point every line in the image returns to. The roof struts and skylights close the top third of the frame above her. She is the only person in the picture, and the buyers’ walkway behind her is empty.

That construction does two things at once. Placing a single figure at the convergence point of a large industrial space, photographed from below, constructs her as someone who holds a position rather than someone who happens to be standing there — the composition gives her the authority the caption then names. At the same time, filling the rest of the frame with empty walkway and unoccupied structure constructs the position as a **solitary** one. The representation is of a young person carrying a large, old working place largely on her own.

Other fully creditable answers: **lighting** — the low early light entering through the skylights in bars falls across the pens and separates her from the background, so the photograph reads as a deliberately made image rather than a snapshot, and the hard, striped light constructs the shed as severe rather than picturesque; **mise en scene** — the blue work shirt, the clipboard under the arm and the boots on the second rail construct her as at work and competent rather than posed for a portrait; **text and graphics** — the caption supplies the two facts the image cannot (“the youngest stock agent on the books”; “her grandfather sold cattle in the same shed”), and by naming a grandfather it constructs the subject as a link in a line rather than an individual.

Common errors: naming a code and then describing content (“there are cows and a woman”) without saying what the code choice constructs; writing thinly about three codes instead of one code well; treating the caption as neutral information rather than as part of the construction.

Q3. Command term — explain: build a how-or-why chain. Five marks need two genuinely different readings, each tied to what that audience brings, plus the construction features that make both readings available.

The city reader’s reading. A reader in the city has no prior reading of Kerrawong, of Tuesday sales, or of how a saleyard runs. What they have is the frame: a single young woman, photographed from below in bars of early light, in a very large shed with nobody else in it. That reader is likely to read the photograph as a portrait of **endurance and continuity under threat** — a young person holding on to a way of working that is emptying out around her. The empty walkway reads as absence, the caption’s grandfather reads as a line that might end, and the whole image reads as being about rural decline more than about a person.

The district reader’s reading. A reader who lives in the Kerrawong district brings different prior reading. They know that a sale starts later in the morning and that at 6.40 am the buyers’ walkway is *supposed* to be empty, because buyers have not arrived yet. For that reader the emptiness is not absence, it is the time of day. They may also know the yards, and possibly the family. That reader is far more likely to read the photograph as a portrait of **a particular person early to work** — a professional recognition, and possibly a local point of pride — rather than as a statement about the future of the district.

What in the construction makes both readings possible. The photograph **selects** a moment before the crowd arrives and **omits** every other person, so the frame supplies solitude without supplying a reason for it. The low angle and the converging lines supply significance without specifying what the significance is about. And the caption is constructed to give a time, an age, a job title and a generational fact, and nothing else: it withholds the one piece of context — that a sale has not started yet — that would settle the question. Because the construction is rich in mood and thin in context, the gap is filled by whatever the audience already knows, and the two audiences do not know the same things. That is why the same representation can be read two ways without either reading being a mistake.

Common errors: giving two **opinions** (“some people would like it, some would not”) rather than two readings grounded in what each audience brings; describing the two audiences without returning to the photograph; naming construction features but never connecting them to the divergence in reading; confusing **reading** (the meaning made) with **engagement** (being held) or **consumption** (how and where the product is accessed).

Q4. Command term — compare: set the two constructions against each other on a stated basis and account for a difference. Six marks need construction evidence from both, a difference, a continuity, and one named factor from the Unit 1 Area of Study 1 list — social, industrial, economic and technological.

The basis of comparison. Both products were made in 2026 and both represent the same subject: the Kerrawong District Saleyards and the people who work there. Because the subject and the year are held constant, the differences that appear come from the **media form** each product uses and from the **producer** behind it — a metropolitan newspaper’s weekend magazine in Stimulus A, and the Shire that owns the yards in Stimulus B.

Difference — the scale at which people are represented, and who is allowed to speak. Stimulus A represents the saleyards through **one person, silently**. There is a single figure in the frame, she does not speak, and everything the audience is told about her arrives in a caption written by someone else. The construction is a portrait: low angle, converging lines, a solitary subject, an empty walkway.

Stimulus B represents the saleyards through **numbers and crowds, with voices attached**. The opening aerial shot takes in the whole site at once; the second shot is four rapid cuts of hands, boots and gates, which represents work as plural and continuous rather than as one person's job; the canteen sequence shows people together; and the walkway that Stimulus A shows empty is shown full. Crucially, a worker is given a lower-third graphic and speaks **directly to camera**, and a voice-over asserts quantities — eleven thousand head, thirty-one employees, forty kilometres, two point one million dollars. Stimulus A constructs a person; Stimulus B constructs an operation, and uses a person as evidence for it.

Continuity — inheritance as the guarantee of value. Both products construct the saleyards as valuable because the work there is **handed down**. Stimulus A's caption ends on the grandfather who sold cattle in the same shed; Stimulus B's lower-third graphic reads "41 years", and puts a man in his sixties in the frame to say the yards are why the district still has a stock and station business. Different forms, different producers, opposite emotional registers — and the same underlying move: length of service is offered as the proof that the place matters. Both also use the **building itself** as evidence, Stimulus A by putting the roof struts across the top of the frame and Stimulus B by flying a camera over the roof. Noticing this matters: a comparison that reports only difference has not finished the job.

A factor that accounts for the difference — industrial. The two products are made by producers with different institutional purposes, and the purpose shapes the construction before any code is chosen. A metropolitan weekend magazine sells a photographic feature to readers who have no connection to Kerrawong: it needs one striking frame and one human subject a reader can enter the story through, and it is under no obligation to defend the saleyards, so solitude and ambiguity are assets to it. Kerrawong Shire is the **owner and operator**, publishing on its own channels to ratepayers and users: it must justify two point one million dollars of public money and keep the yards used, so ambiguity is a liability, and the construction is built to close the reading down — an authoritative speaker, hard numbers in the voice-over, a full walkway, and the Shire crest held at the end of a tilt.

*Also creditable, as a **technological** factor:* the aerial shot that opens Stimulus B is the kind of image that was, until recently, available only to a production that could afford an aircraft. Cheap drone capture lets a small local operator open on a whole-site view that establishes scale in six seconds, which is exactly the claim a single ground-level photograph cannot make — so an available technology and the argument the producer wants to make line up.

Band descriptors (Question 4, out of 6):

- **High (5–6):** a stated basis of comparison; specific construction evidence from **both** stimuli, named as codes or conventions (composition, lighting, editing, sound, text and graphics, layout); a genuine difference **and** a genuine continuity, both argued from construction rather than asserted; one factor correctly drawn from the Unit 1 list and shown to **account for** the difference rather than merely accompany it; media language precise throughout.
- **Mid (3–4):** both stimuli used, but one handled thinly or through content rather than construction; a difference established and a continuity asserted without evidence; a factor named but its causal work not shown ("they had better technology"); media language present but not sustained.
- **Low (1–2):** the two stimuli **described in turn** with no comparison made; content summary ("one is a photo of a woman, the other is a video about the yards"); no named codes or conventions; no factor, or a factor from a different unit's list imported without adaptation.

Common errors: comparing **content** instead of construction — the leading fault on this archetype; naming a factor and leaving it to speak for itself, when a complete explanation must say what the factor made necessary, possible or affordable, and therefore what changed in the representation; reporting only difference and never continuity; importing the Units 3 & 4 context frame (social, cultural, economic, political, historical) where Unit 1 Area of Study 1 names **social, industrial, economic and technological** factors; treating the Shire's video as dishonest rather than as differently constructed for a different purpose.

Q5. Command term — discuss: *develop the point with evidence and reach a position. Four marks need a named organisation, the institutional relationship described, a consequence for what gets **made**, and a stated position.*

Model response (organisation: the Australian Broadcasting Corporation):

The relationship between an Australian audience and the ABC is **institutional before it is commercial**. The ABC is a national broadcaster established under the *Australian Broadcasting Corporation Act 1983* (Cth), whose section 6 is headed “Charter of the Corporation” and sets out the functions the Corporation must perform — among them broadcasting programs that contribute to a sense of national identity, inform and entertain, and reflect the cultural diversity of the Australian community. The audience’s position in that relationship is as **citizens** who fund the service and to whom a statutory function is owed, not as a market segment assembled and sold to advertisers.

That relationship reaches the organisation at the **commissioning** table, which is earlier than distribution and matters more. A proposal to make a program representing a small, remote or commercially unattractive group can be argued for on the ground that it serves the charter, and can therefore be greenlit; the same proposal measured only against the advertising revenue it would carry would not survive the meeting at a commercial network, because the audience it assembles is not one advertisers pay a premium for. The **social** side of the same relationship pushes in the same direction: audiences hold a public broadcaster to expectations of accuracy and of national coverage, and say so publicly when those expectations are not met, so the institution’s standing incentive is to keep making things that no commercial calculation would fund.

Position. The institutional relationship does not merely decide where a representation is seen — it decides whether it is commissioned at all, which is a decision about what will exist. That is why two audiences in the same country, in the same week, watching two institutions with different relationships to them, are not offered the same picture of that country.

Source: Federal Register of Legislation, Australian Broadcasting Corporation Act 1983 (Cth), compilation — <https://www.legislation.gov.au/Details/C2018C00079>. Accurate as at July 2026.

Common errors: describing the organisation instead of the **relationship**; writing about distribution when the question asks about what is **made**; naming a platform (“YouTube”, “TikTok”) without identifying anything institutional in the relationship; asserting that public broadcasters are unbiased or that commercial broadcasters are dishonest — the question is about institutional conditions, not about virtue; ending without a position, when “discuss” requires one.

Q6. *Command term — develop, plus outline: generate an idea and set out its key features briefly. Four marks reward four specific boxes that answer the client’s brief. A vague box earns nothing, even behind a good idea.*

Model response:

Box	Model response
Intended audience	People aged 15 to 25 living in Braewood and the towns nearby, most with a licence or a lift, little spare money on a Friday, and no habit of going to the Picture House because they assume it is not for them.
Media form	Moving image — four vertical videos of 20 to 30 seconds each, made for the association’s own social accounts.
Title and outline of the product	<i>Doors at Seven</i> — four videos, each shot in the cinema on a Tuesday, each following a different pair of volunteers doing one ordinary job: threading the projector, filling the ticket roll, wiping down the seats, chalking the board outside. Each ends on the same shot of the lit sign and the same two words: “Doors at seven.”
The representation you intend to construct	The Picture House as an ordinary, current, slightly scruffy place that is open this Friday — not as a heritage building and not as a cause. The volunteers are represented as people who run a cinema, not as custodians of history; the building is represented as working, not as preserved.

Common errors: proposing a product that **advertises the brief itself** — a video explaining that the cinema would like younger patrons — rather than one that responds to it by constructing the representation asked for; unspecific boxes (“young people”, “a video”, “make it look modern”); an idea the association could not publish and keep publishing itself at no ongoing cost, which the brief rules out; naming the **subject** in the representation box (“a representation of the cinema”) instead of stating what the representation asserts about it.

Q7. Command term — outline: set out the key features briefly. Three marks: the research method outlined, plus two things taken across; the third mark is for the two things being genuinely different kinds of decision rather than two versions of the same one.

Model response:

The research. I would take one existing short-form vertical video series made by a small organisation about its own volunteers, and analyse three consecutive episodes of it against a written checklist: shot lengths timed to the second, where the cut points fall, what is said and by whom, how each episode opens and closes, and what is on screen when the viewer decides whether to keep watching. Researching a technique means measuring what a maker actually did, not liking the result.

Thing 1 — a structural device. The series I would study uses an identical closing shot and an identical sign-off line in every episode. I would take that across: every one of my four videos ends on the lit sign and the words “Doors at seven.” This is a decision about **structure**, and it does particular work for my brief — four separate videos read as one campaign, and the one piece of information the association needs a viewer to retain is repeated four times without being announced.

Thing 2 — a production technique. The same series shoots on available light and keeps the room’s own sound rather than laying music over it. I would take that across as a rule for my Tuesday shoot: no added lamp in the projection box, and the room tone kept under every shot. This is a decision about **construction**, and it serves the representation, because added light and added music are the two things that would turn a working cinema into a heritage advertisement.

Common errors: naming a product you would “look at” without any method, so nothing is actually researched; taking across a **subject** (“they filmed volunteers, so I will film volunteers”) rather than a technique or a structural device; two things that are really one thing said twice; taking a technique across without saying what it would do for **your** representation.

Q8. Command term — explain: build a how-or-why chain across two forms. Five marks need the second form named, at least one specific media technology named **in each** form, a real difference in operation, and the consequence for how each product constructs the representation.

Model response (second media form: photography):

Second media form: photography — a set of six still photographs for the association’s social accounts and the foyer noticeboard.

The technologies, and how operating them differs. For the moving-image product I would operate a camera body with a fast prime lens, a shotgun microphone on a boom, and editing software with a timeline. Three of those four exist because moving image runs in time: the microphone captures sound that must stay in sync, and the timeline is where shot order and duration are decided. For the photographic product the microphone and the timeline disappear entirely, and two other technologies become central — a **tripod**, which lets me hold a frame steady enough to shoot at a slow shutter speed in the low light of the projection box, and **image-editing software**, in which the decisions are exposure, crop and the order the six frames are hung or posted. In moving image I operate technologies that control **time and sound**; in photography I operate technologies that control **the single frame** and the set it sits in.

What that changes in the representation. The video can represent the volunteers **doing** — a thread being fed through a projector gate, in order, with the room’s noise under it — so competence is demonstrated in front of the audience and the building is heard working. Photography has no duration and no sound, so it cannot demonstrate

anything; it can only present a state. That pushes the photographic version towards the posed, which is exactly the museum reading the brief rules out. So the technology difference forces a construction decision: I would shoot the stills **mid-task** at about 1/60 of a second, so the hands carry a small amount of motion blur while the face and the machine stay sharp. Blur is the only evidence of time a still frame has, and without it the same six subjects in the same six places would represent the Picture House as a preserved interior with people arranged in it.

Common errors: naming two forms and then describing them separately, so no difference in **operating technologies** is ever explained; naming technologies without naming what you operate on them; stating that one form is better than the other instead of explaining what each makes possible; forgetting the second half of the question, which asks for the consequence for the **representation**, not for the workflow.

Q9. *Command term — describe: give an account of the features. Three marks: the change described concretely, the stage correctly named, and the change actually achievable within the stated limits.*

Model response:

The change. The two viewers misread the videos as being about the age of the building rather than about a night out that is on this Friday. The single change with the largest effect, and the only one available without returning to the cinema, is to **re-cut the opening two seconds of each video**. In the rough version each opens on a wide shot of the auditorium, which is the most heritage-looking image I have. I would replace each opening with a close shot already in the rushes — the ticket roll being pushed into the machine, the chalk hitting the board — and hold the wide shot until after the first cut, if at all. I would also bring the “Doors at seven” end card forward so it is legible for a full second and a half rather than half a second.

The stage. This is a return to **post-production**. Nothing new is filmed and nothing is re-planned; the change is made entirely in the edit, out of material already captured, which is why it fits an afternoon with no further access to the building. That is the media production process working as it is meant to: the stages are iterative and interrelated rather than a straight line, so evidence gathered late sends the work back a step instead of forward to release.

Common errors: proposing a change that requires re-shooting, when the question states there is no further access — the answer must fit the constraints given; naming the stage wrongly (calling a re-cut “production” or “development”); describing a change with no link to the misreading that prompted it; treating audience feedback as something that arrives after a product is finished, rather than as something that sends the process back a stage.

Q10. *Command term — evaluate: judge how well something worked, against stated grounds. Five marks need the form and representation named, at least two characteristics of the **form** (not of the product), evidence from the student’s own production, and a judgement that is reached rather than asserted.*

Model response (media form: audio; representation: the last hour of a school canteen at the end of term):

The form and the representation. I worked in the **audio** form to construct a representation of the school canteen in the last hour of the last day of term as a place that is exhausted and cheerful at the same time. The product was a four-minute narrated audio piece for a class podcast feed.

Characteristic 1 — audio has no frame. A microphone captures everything within its pattern, and a listener cannot look away from part of it or scan past it as they could with a photograph. This served the representation well. Overlapping voices, the till, the roller door and trays scraping arrived together as one wash of sound, which is precisely what “exhausted and cheerful at once” sounds like; I could not have constructed that simultaneity in a still image without staging it. It also worked against me: because there is no frame, I could not exclude the plate-scraping that dominated two minutes of otherwise usable material, and I lost that section entirely.

Characteristic 2 — audio is consumed in linear time and cannot be scanned. A listener receives the piece in the order I fixed and at the pace I fixed, and cannot skim ahead to see where it is going. That let me withhold the roller door coming down until the final twenty seconds, so the end of term arrived for the listener at the same moment it arrived for the people in the room. In a print or web version of the same story the reader’s eye would have reached the last line early, and the ending would have been spent before it happened.

Characteristic 3 — audio carries no image, so identity has to be constructed by voice alone. This cost me. The representation needed the canteen to read as a place used by the whole school, and a photograph would have made a range of ages visible at once. In audio I had to build it from five voices, and a listener cannot hear the difference between a Year 8 and a Year 10 student, so I added a narration line naming who was speaking — which turned a moment that was meant to be observed into one that was reported.

Judgement. On balance the audio form served the representation, but unevenly. The two characteristics that carry **atmosphere and time** — the unframed field and linear consumption — are exactly the ones this representation depended on, and they delivered it more efficiently than any other form available to me. The characteristic that carries **identity** worked against it, and I compensated with narration at a real cost to the observational quality of the piece. Had the representation been primarily about *who* uses the canteen rather than what the last hour feels like, the same characteristics that helped here would have made audio the wrong choice.

Band descriptors (Question 10, out of 5):

- **High (4–5):** form and representation both named precisely; at least two characteristics that are genuinely characteristics **of the form**, not of the individual product; each tied to specific evidence from the student’s own production; a judgement that is **reached** — including at least one point at which the form worked against the representation — rather than a verdict asserted at the end; media production language accurate.
- **Mid (2–3):** form and representation named; characteristics present, but at least one is a feature of the product rather than of the form; evidence general (“it sounded good”); the response describes the production rather than evaluating it; the judgement is a concluding sentence with nothing behind it.
- **Low (1):** a retelling of what was made, with no characteristics of the form named; the representation not identified; no judgement, or a judgement about whether the student enjoyed the task.

Common errors: describing the production instead of evaluating it — the leading fault on this item; naming characteristics of the **product** (“my piece was four minutes long”) where characteristics of the **form** are required; writing only about what went well, so no judgement is actually made; answering about a form the student did not work in this year.

Q11. *Command term — describe: give an account of the features. Three marks need a structural feature named (not a topic), a cultural history named, and the link between the two stated.*

Model response (non-fictional narrative: Muster Dogs, 2022):

Muster Dogs is an Australian observational documentary series produced by Ambience Entertainment and broadcast on the ABC in 2022, in which five graziers around the country are each given a kelpie pup to raise and train as a working muster dog. Its structural feature is a **trial run to a fixed deadline**: the series is built as four hour-long episodes, the five properties are cut in parallel inside every episode, each episode covers a stage of a single twelve-month training year, and the stages are measured against one another at the end.

That structure is not invented for television. It draws directly on a **cultural history** Australian audiences already recognise — the working-dog trial, and the agricultural show and field-day traditions that surround it, in which animals raised separately on different properties are brought to a common standard and judged on a set day. The narrative borrows that shape wholesale: separate properties, a common starting point, a fixed period of preparation and a comparison at the end. Because the audience already knows how a trial works, the series does not have to explain its own structure — viewers understand from the first episode what is being measured and when the measuring will happen. The twelve-month span is the second borrowing: the pastoral year, in which work is organised by season rather than by week, supplies the natural length of the narrative.

Source: Screen Australia, The Screen Guide, “Muster Dogs series 1” — <https://www.screenaustralia.gov.au/screen-guide/muster-dogs-series-1-39373/>. Accurate as at July 2026.

Common errors: naming a **topic** (“it is about working dogs”) where a **structural feature** is required; naming a cultural history but never showing it in the structure, so the answer becomes two unrelated facts; using a fictional narrative where the question specifies non-fictional; describing the structure of a single episode when the feature named belongs to the series as a whole.

Q12. Command term — explain: build a how-or-why chain. Four marks need the creator and narrative named, a specific construction or production decision, and a stated effect on how the story is told — not a general statement that representation matters.

Model response (narrative: The Australian Wars, 2022; creator: Rachel Perkins):

The Australian Wars is a three-part documentary series broadcast on SBS and NITV in 2022, directed and presented by Rachel Perkins, an Arrernte and Kalkadoon filmmaker. Perkins described the project on NITV in August 2022 in her own words: it “has taken years to bring to fruition”, and, she said, “My hope is that it is welcomed by Australian audiences and that it contributes to resetting the relationship with First Nations peoples and our nation.”

The production decision that changes how the story is told is that **the director is also the on-screen presenter**. Perkins is not a voice laid over other people’s footage. She appears in the frame, travels to the places under discussion, and puts the questions to the historians, archaeologists and descendants who appear in the series. Authorship, direction and presentation are held by one person, and that person is a First Nations filmmaker.

The effect on the telling is direct. In the conventional Australian history documentary an unseen narrator supplies an account, and the audience receives it as impersonal fact from nowhere in particular. Here the audience is placed with a named person who is visibly conducting the inquiry, so the account arrives as an investigation being carried out rather than as a summary being handed down, and the standpoint from which the questions are asked is identified rather than concealed. Because the series was broadcast nationally on free-to-air television, that standpoint reached an audience of mainstream television scale — which is what converts a single narrative into a change in what a national audience has been shown.

Source: SBS NITV, “Filmmaker Rachel Perkins reveals the truth of The Australian Wars — the battles fought on home soil”, 25 August 2022 — <https://www.sbs.com.au/nitv/article/filmmaker-rachel-perkins-reveals-the-truth-of-the-australian-wars-the-battles-fought-on-home-soil/1t4z93cxq>. Accurate as at July 2026.

Marker’s note on this item. Answers must be built on the **work and its construction**, and on what the creator has said publicly about it. Do not attribute cultural meaning to a work on your own authority; do not generalise from one creator to “the Aboriginal perspective” — the study design describes diverse cultures, languages and traditions, and a perspective belongs to the named creator, community or Country it comes from; and never invent cultural detail to strengthen an answer.

Common errors: writing about a narrative **about** Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people rather than one **by** an Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander creator or producer — voice is a question of authorship and control, not of subject matter or cast; naming the creator but giving no construction or production decision; asserting an impact with no evidence of how the narrative is made; treating one creator’s work as speaking for all First Nations peoples.

Q13. Command term — explain: build a how-or-why chain, twice. Five marks need one genuinely economic constraint and one genuinely institutional constraint, each traced to a consequence, plus at least one shown **enabling** as well as limiting. Two constraints from the same family cannot reach the top band.

Model response (narrative: an Australian feature documentary financed for television release):

The economic constraint — market size, and the terms of public support. Australia is a market of roughly 27 million people, so an Australian documentary cannot recover its cost from a domestic audience the way an equivalent production can in a market ten times larger. Public support is therefore structural rather than exceptional. The **Producer Offset**, administered by Screen Australia under Division 376 of the *Income Tax Assessment Act 1997* (Cth), refunds **40 per cent** of qualifying Australian production expenditure for an eligible feature film made for commercial cinema exhibition and **30 per cent** for other eligible formats, including television and online series.

How it limits. The offset is calculated on a certified format, so the format decision is partly a financial one: whether a story is made as a cinema feature or as a television series changes the proportion of the budget that comes back, and length, structure and delivery follow from that choice rather than from the story alone.

How it enables. This is the half most answers miss. Without the offset the budget does not close at all, and the narrative is not made. A refundable percentage of Australian expenditure is what makes a domestic documentary financeable in a market that cannot pay for it at the box office — so the same mechanism that constrains the format is the reason the work exists, and it also pushes spending towards Australian crews, because only Australian expenditure qualifies.

The institutional constraint — the commissioning broadcaster. Agency investment usually arrives with a **trigger**: a broadcaster or distributor must be attached before the money is released, which makes the broadcaster's requirements a condition of the film existing. A broadcaster commissions into a slot — a fixed running time, an episode count, a target audience and a house editorial standard — so the narrative is cut to that shape before a frame is shot, and at distribution the same institution decides the timeslot, the platform and whether there is a second series. That institutional obligation also creates work rather than only limiting it: under the *Broadcasting Services (Australian Content and Children's Television) Standards 2020*, a commercial licensee's primary channel must broadcast at least **55 per cent** Australian programming between 6 am and midnight, with further first-release Australian drama, documentary and children's requirements met through a points system. An obligation to broadcast Australian content is an obligation to commission it.

The chain. The two constraints are not independent. The offset makes a budget viable; the offset requires certification in a format; the format is chosen to suit a broadcaster whose attachment triggers the agency investment; and the broadcaster's slot then fixes the running time and the structure. Every one of those conditions was settled before the first day of filming, and each of them both closed options and opened the one that made the narrative possible.

Source: Screen Australia, "Producer Offset" — <https://www.screenaustralia.gov.au/funding-and-support/producer-offset>. Accurate as at July 2026.

Source: ACMA, "Australian content in TV programs" — <https://www.acma.gov.au/australian-content-commercial-tv>. Accurate as at July 2026.

Common errors: offering two constraints from the same family — a budget cap and a funding shortfall are both economic, and score once; naming a constraint without tracing a consequence; treating constraints as purely negative, when the question and the evidence both require the enabling side to be shown; being unclear about whether the effect described falls on **production** or on **distribution**; quoting rates or percentages with no date, when funding rules and content standards change.

Q14. Command term — analyse: break the narratives into their constructed parts and show how those parts work on the audience, with specific evidence. Eight marks; engagement, consumption and reading must all be addressed and kept separate, across two forms, one of them non-fictional.

Model response (Narrative 1: Fisk, television, fiction. Narrative 2: Trace, podcast, non-fiction):

Narrative 1 — *Fisk* (ABC, 2021), television. *Fisk* is an Australian comedy series created by Kitty Flanagan and Vincent Sheehan, written and directed by Flanagan, who also stars as Helen Tudor-Fisk, a contract lawyer who takes a job at a shabby suburban firm specialising in wills and probate. Series 1 is built as **six half-hour episodes**, and its structural spine is the **self-contained episode**: each half-hour opens on a new client and a new estate, resolves that estate before the credits, and returns the office to exactly the state it was in at the start.

Engagement. The self-contained structure supplies a complete comic problem and a complete solution every half-hour, so the audience is engaged **cognitively** by a small puzzle it can expect to see solved, and **emotionally** by a workplace that never changes underneath the puzzle. Because Helen's situation resets each week, engagement does not depend on remembering anything, which is what allows the series to keep being funny about the same character rather than developing her out of the joke.

Consumption. The same structure makes the narrative unusually tolerant of how it is consumed. A viewer watching one episode a week on broadcast and a viewer watching all six at once on demand each receive a complete narrative every time. Structure is what decides whether a narrative punishes the way an audience chooses to consume it, and this one does not.

Reading. Because nothing accumulates, the audience is invited to read the series as a portrait of a **place and a job** rather than as the story of a person changing. The estates change; the office does not. The meaning offered is that ordinary suburban working life is absurd and survivable, and that reading is produced by the structure rather than stated by any character.

Narrative 2 — *Trace* (ABC, 2017), podcast. *Trace* is the ABC's first true-crime podcast, created and presented by ABC reporter Rachael Brown, which re-examined the unsolved 1980 killing of Melbourne bookshop owner Maria James. Its structural spine is the opposite of *Fisk*'s: a **serialised investigation, released episode by episode while the investigation was still running**, with each episode ending on a question the next one takes up, and with Brown present in the narrative as the reporter doing the work.

Engagement. Serialisation with an open question at every episode boundary produces engagement by **incompleteness** — the audience is held not because it has been satisfied but because it has not been. Because the investigation was live rather than finished, listeners could contact the program with information while the series was still being made, which is a form of engagement the structure itself created and that no completed narrative can offer. The work won the 2017 Walkley Award for Innovation, awarded to Rachael Brown, Jeremy Story Carter and Jesse Cox at the ABC.

Consumption. Serial structure fixes consumption far more tightly than *Fisk*'s does. Episodes had to be taken in order, and while the series was first releasing, at the pace of release rather than the pace of the listener. The audio form fixes the situation of consumption as well: a podcast is typically consumed on headphones, alone, while doing something else, so a narrative carried by a single voice speaking directly to the listener is received in the most private conditions any media form offers.

Reading. The audience is invited to read *Trace* as an argument about a **system** rather than as a crime story, and again the structure produces that reading. Because the audience follows the reporting in the order in which it happened, it meets each obstacle at the point the investigation met it, and reads the failures of the original process as the narrative's subject rather than as background. A conventional documentary presenting the same evidence as a finished, ordered summary would have offered its audience a conclusion; this structure offers a process.

Across the two. Both narratives are Australian, and both rest on a structural decision about **how much the audience is given at once** — and in each case that one decision carries engagement, consumption and reading together rather than separately. *Fisk* gives a complete unit every episode and asks nothing to be carried between them, which produces a portrait of a place and a viewer who can enter anywhere. *Trace* gives an incomplete unit every episode and requires everything to be carried forward, which produces an argument and a listener who can enter only at the beginning. The forms make the difference practical: a broadcast half-hour comedy is built for a slot that repeats, and a podcast is built for a feed that accumulates. That is the statement's claim put precisely — structure is not the container a story arrives in, it is what decides what arriving looks like.

Source: Screen Australia, The Screen Guide, "Fisk series 1" — <https://www.screenaustralia.gov.au/screen-guide/fisk-series-1-38635/>. Accurate as at July 2026.

Source: Apple Podcasts (Australia), "Trace", ABC — <https://podcasts.apple.com/au/podcast/trace/id1249219269>. Accurate as at July 2026.

Source: Mediaweek, "Walkley Awards 2017: Full winners list", November 2017 — <https://www.mediaweek.com.au/2017-walkley-awards-winners-list/>. Accurate as at July 2026.

Band descriptors (Question 14, out of 8):

- **High (7–8):** two Australian narratives in two genuinely different media forms, one non-fictional; a **structural feature** named in each — not a topic, a theme or a subject; engagement, consumption and reading all addressed for both narratives and kept distinct from one another; evidence specific and tied to how each narrative is built; a comparison across the two that reaches a position; media language precise and sustained.
- **Mid (4–6):** two narratives present but one thinly handled, or both in the same media form; structural features named but at least one treated as subject matter; two of engagement, consumption and reading addressed and the third mentioned or folded into another; some evidence generic; the two narratives handled in separate halves that never meet.
- **Low (1–3):** plot retelling; one narrative only, or two narratives in one form; no structural feature named; engagement, consumption and reading used interchangeably; the statement restated rather than used.

Common errors: conflating **engagement** (how the audience is held), **consumption** (how the narrative is accessed, and in what conditions) and **reading** (the meaning made) — these are three distinct terms in the study design, and an answer that treats them as synonyms cannot reach the top band; offering subject matter where a **structural feature** is required; using two narratives in the same media form, which fails a stated requirement no matter how good the analysis; retelling the plot; restating the statement instead of using it; using a non-Australian narrative where Australian narratives are required.

End of Unit 1 Examination B solutions

Unit 2 Examination A — accessible

Please read this first. There is **no VCAA examination at Units 1 and 2**. All assessment at Units 1 and 2 is school-based, and procedures for assessing levels of achievement in these units are a matter for school decision. This paper is a **school-decision revision paper**, written to the Unit 2 outcomes so that you can rehearse them under timed conditions. It is not a VCAA-format practice examination, it is not modelled on the Units 3 and 4 end-of-year paper, and no result from it is reported to the VCAA.

Reading time: 10 minutes. Writing time: 90 minutes. Total 60 marks — approximately 1.5 minutes per mark. Sixteen questions, numbered consecutively, grouped under the three Unit 2 areas of study. All questions are compulsory. Every question on this paper is a written response; there is no multiple choice. Answer in the spaces provided.

Three questions ask you to write in your own material: Question 5 uses a media narrative you have studied this year, Question 11 uses a narrative production you made this year, and Question 16 uses a media industry issue you have investigated. Write these on the lines provided before you begin the question.

Area of Study 1 — Narrative, style and genre

Use the information below to answer Questions 1–3.

NITA FARROW — CREATOR PROFILE

Nita Farrow makes documentaries in the wheat district she grew up in. Two of her narratives are described below.

Grader Road (2021) — a six-part audio documentary series, 22 minutes per episode. Six people who live along one unsealed road describe a summer in which the road was closed for resheeting. Every episode opens with thirty seconds of the road itself — gravel, wind, a distant header — before anyone speaks. There is no presenter and no narrator. Every interview was recorded while the participant was working: in a shed, on a tractor, at a kitchen bench with a radio on. Farrow uses no music at any point; the only sound in the series is sound she recorded on location.

The Boundary Fence (2024) — a 70-minute observational documentary film. A shire council votes to remove a boundary fence that has divided two properties, and two families, for forty years. The film opens on a locked-off wide shot of the fence held for fifty seconds before the first line of dialogue. There is no narrator and no interviews to camera; people speak while they work, and the camera stays where it was put. Farrow uses no music. The titles and end credits are set in a single plain typeface, white on black, and held on screen far longer than a viewer needs to read them.

Two things Farrow says about her work. Farrow produced radio for eleven years before she made her first film, and says of the change: “I still cut for the ear first. If it works with your eyes shut, it will work.” She also screens a rough cut to everyone who appears in a production before she locks the edit, and will remove anything a participant asks her to remove: “That is the price of filming where people know your parents. Nobody here agreed to be a character.”

Question 1 (2 marks)

Identify **two** choices that Nita Farrow repeats across both narratives described above.

Question 2 (4 marks)

Describe the distinctive style of Nita Farrow as a media creator.

Your response must:

- name **two** features of the style, and
- support each feature with evidence from **both** narratives.

Question 3 (3 marks)

Explain how **one** of the two contexts described in the profile — Farrow’s eleven years producing radio, or the district she films in — influenced the construction of one of her narratives.

Use the information below to answer Question 4.

THE SILO — SIX-PART DRAMA SERIES

Catalogue entry. A body is found at the base of a grain silo on the morning of the local show. Detective Sergeant Ana Petrides is sent up from the city to a town that would rather the matter went away.

The first two minutes of Episode 1. Wheat at dawn, shot from above. A body face-down in grain, seen for less than a second. A hand-held camera moving fast through a crowd towards the silo. A title card in heavy serif type, white on black, over silence.

The last three minutes of Episode 6. The killer is never named and nobody is arrested. Petrides stands at the silo at dawn, in the same light as the opening. Behind her the show is set up and opened on time. She drives out past the town sign without stopping.

Question 4 (5 marks)

Explain how *The Silo* both **uses** and **subverts** the conventions of the crime genre to engage its audience.

Your response must:

- identify **one** genre convention the series uses, and what using it leads the audience to expect
- identify **one** genre convention the series subverts, and how it is subverted
- explain the effect of the subversion on the audience.

Identify the media narrative you have studied this year for ‘Narrative, style and genre’.

You must use this media narrative to respond to Question 5.

Media narrative: _____

Question 5 (6 marks)

- a. Analyse how the construction of this narrative influences the way its audience **engages with** it and the way its audience **consumes** it. Refer to at least one specific feature of the narrative’s construction. 4 marks
- b. Explain how **one** personal value held by a member of that audience could increase their interest in this narrative. 2 marks

Area of Study 2 — Narratives in production

Question 6 (2 marks)

Outline the purpose of the **development** stage of the media production process in the construction of a narrative.

Use the brief below to answer Questions 7–10.

PRODUCTION BRIEF — MARRINDAL SHOW SOCIETY

The Marrindal Show Society invites a Year 11 media class to produce a short **fictional narrative** to screen during the Marrindal Show in September.

- **Length:** 3–5 minutes.
- **Where it screens:** on a loop, on one monitor mounted at head height in the produce pavilion, with a single small speaker beside it. The pavilion holds livestock judging at one end and a cake competition at the other, and is noisy from opening to close.
- **Audience:** whoever walks past — children, showgoers of every age, exhibitors between judgings. Most will watch for under a minute and will arrive part-way through.
- **Story requirement:** the narrative must be set at the show and must feature at least one person who competes in it.
- **Crew:** four students.
- **Time:** six weeks from the day the brief is issued to the day the file is delivered.

- **Other conditions:** the Society will give the class access to the showgrounds on the two days before the show and on the show day itself. Anyone who appears on screen must sign the Society's permission form, and the Society must approve the finished file before it is loaded.

Question 7 (4 marks)

The brief says the narrative screens on a loop, that most viewers will watch for under a minute, and that they will arrive part-way through.

Explain how you would construct the narrative so that it still works for a viewer who joins it at any moment.

Your response must refer to:

- one decision about the narrative's chain of cause and effect, and
- one pre-production technique you would use to test that decision before the shoot.

Question 8 (3 marks)

The crew has four members.

- Describe the responsibilities of **two** different production roles during the production stage of this narrative. 2 marks
- Explain one way in which those two roles depend on each other. 1 mark

Question 9 (3 marks)

The narrative will be heard through one small speaker in a noisy pavilion.

Describe **one** technical skill the crew must develop to meet this condition, and outline how they would test that skill before the production stage.

Question 10 (4 marks)

- Explain how **one legal** constraint would affect the production or distribution of this narrative. 2 marks
- Explain how **one ethical** constraint would affect the production or distribution of this narrative. 2 marks

Identify the narrative production you created this year for 'Narratives in production'.

You must use this production to respond to Question 11.

Production title and media form: _____

Question 11 (4 marks)

Evaluate how well the narrative you produced suited **the audience it was made for**.

Your response must state:

- who that audience was, and the conditions in which they would consume the narrative
- one piece of evidence about how that audience actually responded
- your judgement, and one change you would make.

Area of Study 3 — Media and change

Question 12 (2 marks)

Outline what is meant by **convergence** in the media, and give one example.

Use the notice below to answer Questions 13 and 14.

VERSO — WHAT IS CHANGING ON 1 MARCH

Verso is an app on which people post spoken stories of up to ninety seconds. From 1 March:

- **Continue this story.** Every story gets a button. Tap it and you can record your own ninety seconds, which attaches to the original as a branch. Branches can be branched from in turn.
- **Branch ranking.** Branches are ordered by the share of listeners who reach the end of them, not by when they were posted.
- **A share of advertising.** Creators are paid a share of advertising revenue calculated from total finished listens across every branch that grows from a story they started.
- **A recommended feed.** The feed you open will no longer be the accounts you follow in the order they posted. It will be the stories Verso calculates you are most likely to finish.

Question 13 (4 marks)

Describe **two** characteristics of new media audiences that are shown in the notice above. Refer to the notice in your response.

Question 14 (4 marks)

The changes in the notice act on Verso's listeners and on the people who make stories for them.

Explain how the changes would alter **what a listener does** on Verso, and **what a creator builds into a story**.

Refer to at least two of the four changes in the notice.

Question 15 (4 marks)

Explain **one** influence of technological development on a media industry **or** a media institution. Refer to one specific example and give the date it occurred.

Identify the issue in the media industry from the last two years that you have investigated.

You must use this issue to respond to Question 16.

Issue: _____

Question 16 (6 marks)

Discuss **one** social, ethical or legal issue in the media industry from the last two years.

Your response must:

- state what is contested about the issue, and give one piece of dated evidence
- give the position of **two** parties whose interests conflict
- reach a position of your own.

End of examination questions

Unit 2 Examination A — solutions and marking notes

Mark allocation. Area of Study 1 — Narrative, style and genre: 2 + 4 + 3 + 5 + 6 = 20 marks. Area of Study 2 — Narratives in production: 2 + 4 + 3 + 3 + 4 + 4 = 20 marks. Area of Study 3 — Media and change: 2 + 4 + 4 + 4 + 6 = 20 marks. Paper total 20 + 20 + 20 = 60 marks, at approximately 1.5 minutes per mark for 90 minutes of writing.

This is an accessible paper. Every extended item carries a bulleted list of what the response must contain, eight of the sixteen items are supported by stimulus, and each area of study opens with a 2-mark entry item. No item requires more than one studied narrative, and no item requires a comparison across two studied narratives.

The four stimuli — the Nita Farrow creator profile, the Silo catalogue entry, the Marrindal Show Society brief and the Verso notice — are constructed for this paper. Nita Farrow, Grader Road, The Boundary Fence, The Silo, the Marrindal Show Society and Verso do not exist; the quoted lines attributed to Farrow were written for this paper. Constructed stimulus carries no source line. Every claim about a real media product, law, regulator or event in the model responses below is a matter of public record and carries its source where it is made.

Command terms used on this paper

- **Identify** — name the thing. One fact or term per mark; no explanation required.
 - **Outline** — give an overview, in more detail than ‘identify’ asks for, but without the worked explanation that ‘describe’ or ‘explain’ requires.
 - **Describe** — give the characteristics, features and qualities of the thing accurately. Go beyond listing: a described feature is a feature plus what it does.
 - **Explain** — carry a how or why chain through to a consequence. An explanation that stops at a definition has not answered an ‘explain’ item.
 - **Analyse** — identify the key components and the significance of the relationships between them, and draw out the implications.
 - **Discuss** — present a considered, balanced argument that identifies what is at issue and shows the points for and against, weighing the evidence before reaching a conclusion.
 - **Evaluate** — judge something against a stated intention or criterion, using evidence, and state the judgement.
-

Area of Study 1 — Narrative, style and genre: answers and solutions

Q1. (2 marks) *Command term — identify: name the thing. One mark per correct repeated choice. The choice must genuinely appear in both descriptions; a feature of only one narrative earns nothing here.*

Model response. Any two of the following.

1. Both narratives open with an extended stretch of the location alone before anyone speaks — thirty seconds of the road in each episode of *Grader Road*, fifty seconds of the fence in *The Boundary Fence*.
2. Neither narrative uses a narrator or presenter.
3. In both, people are recorded while they are working rather than seated for an interview.
4. Neither narrative uses music; both use only sound recorded on location.

Common errors: naming a feature that appears in only one of the two narratives (the plain white-on-black titles are described only for *The Boundary Fence*); describing the subject matter — a road, a fence, a country district — rather than a **choice** the creator made about construction; writing a sentence of explanation when the term is ‘identify’, which spends time the paper does not give back.

Q2. (4 marks) *Command term — describe: give the characteristics, features and qualities accurately, going beyond listing. Four marks buys two features described, each carried across both narratives: 1 mark for naming the feature in style terms, 1 mark for the evidence from both narratives that shows it is a pattern rather than a one-off.*

Model response. Farrow’s style is built on **withheld authorship**: she removes the devices a documentary normally uses to tell an audience what to think, and replaces them with duration.

Feature one — she hands the telling to the participants and takes the guiding voice out. Neither narrative has a narrator or presenter. *Grader Road* is carried entirely by six residents describing their own summer, and *The Boundary Fence* has no interviews to camera at all: people speak while they work and the camera stays where it was placed. In both cases nobody on the soundtrack is explaining the situation to the audience from outside it, so the audience is left to assemble the account from what participants happen to say while doing something else.

Feature two — she opens on the place and holds it, using only sound she recorded there. Every episode of *Grader Road* begins with thirty seconds of gravel, wind and a distant header before a word is spoken; *The Boundary Fence* opens on a locked-off wide shot of the fence held for fifty seconds before the first line of dialogue. Neither narrative uses music at any point. Holding a place for that long with no score and no voice does two things at once: it establishes the location as the thing the narrative is about, and it refuses the audience the emotional instruction that a music cue would supply.

Together the two features describe a creator who trusts the location and the participant to carry the meaning, and who treats a long, unscored, unnarrated stretch of real place as the strongest thing she can put in front of an audience.

Also creditable — an equally strong second feature. The camera is **fixed and patient**: *The Boundary Fence* opens locked off and “the camera stays where it was put”, which is the visual equivalent of the unbroken location sound that

opens each episode of *Grader Road*. A response that develops this instead of feature two, with evidence from both narratives, is worth the same marks.

Extension — the same method on a real creator. The three films Baz Luhrmann has grouped as his Red Curtain Trilogy — *Strictly Ballroom* (1992), *Romeo + Juliet* (1996) and *Moulin Rouge!* (2001) — are not connected by plot or character but by a repeated set of construction choices, including a theatre motif carried through each film: dance in the first, poetry and language in the second, song in the third. That is what a style claim looks like when it is properly evidenced — a pattern named, then traced across separate narratives — and it is exactly the move required above.

Source: British Film Institute, 'Where to begin with Baz Luhrmann' (Emily Maskell), 20 April 2026 —

<https://www.bfi.org.uk/features/where-begin-with-baz-luhrmann>. Accurate as at July 2026.

Common errors: adjectives in place of features — “her style is raw and honest”, “she has a natural style” — which describe an impression rather than a repeated construction choice; evidence from one narrative only, which shows a choice but not a **style**, since a style is a pattern and one instance is not a pattern; retelling what the two narratives are about; naming four features and evidencing none of them, when the marks are in the evidence.

Q3. (3 marks) Command term — explain: carry a how or why chain through to a consequence. Three marks: 1 for naming the context accurately, 1 for the construction choice it influenced, 1 for the causal link between them. A response that describes the context and then describes the narrative, without joining them, earns two marks at most.

Model response (Option 1 — the eleven years in radio). The context is the **production history Farrow brings from another media form**: eleven years producing radio before her first film, and her own account of what carried over — “I still cut for the ear first. If it works with your eyes shut, it will work.”

The construction choice it influenced is the **fifty-second locked-off opening of *The Boundary Fence***, held on the fence with no music and no dialogue. In the audio form, an opening like that is routine and necessary: sound is the only channel available, so a producer establishes a place by letting the audience listen to it, and *Grader Road* does precisely this for thirty seconds at the top of every episode. Farrow carried the habit into a form that does not need it — a film can establish a location in a second and a half — and the result is an opening that a viewer experiences as unusually patient.

The causal link is that a creator’s earlier form teaches them where meaning is stored, and Farrow learned it was stored in sound and in duration. That is why the film keeps the camera still and the score absent: both decisions protect the soundtrack, because a fixed frame and no music leave the location’s own sound as the only thing moving.

Model response (Option 2 — the district she films in). The context is **cultural**: Farrow films in the district she grew up in, among people who know her family, and she states the obligation that comes with it — “Nobody here agreed to be a character.”

The construction choice it influenced is her **rough-cut screening**, in which everyone who appears sees the edit before it is locked and can have anything removed. That is a construction choice, not a courtesy, because it means the final edit of both narratives is assembled from material that has survived its participants’ review.

The causal link runs through what that leaves out. Material a participant would be embarrassed by is gone before the narrative is finished, so Farrow cannot build a story around a person’s exposure, and the narrative has to find its tension elsewhere — in the place, in the length of the shots, and in what people say while they are working. The community’s expectations do not merely surround the production; they reach into the edit and shape what the narrative is able to be.

Common errors: naming the context and then simply describing the narrative, so the two sit side by side with no link — the mark is in the word “because”; treating “2021” or “2024” as a context, when a date is not a context until you say what about that time or place bore on the construction; substituting the era the narrative is *set* in for the context it was *made* in; writing about both contexts briefly instead of one properly, which halves the depth on a three-mark item.

Q4. (5 marks) Command term — explain: a how or why chain to a consequence. Five marks map onto the three bullets: 2 for the convention used plus the expectation it sets, 2 for the convention subverted plus how, 1 for the effect on the audience. Both halves must come from the stimulus.

Model response.

The convention used — the body discovered in the opening minutes. *The Silo* opens exactly where a crime narrative is expected to open: within two minutes the audience has been shown wheat at dawn from above, a body face-down in grain, and a hand-held camera pushing through a crowd towards the silo. The heavy serif title card over silence completes the signal. Placing a death at the front is the crime genre's oldest promise to its audience — a question has been asked, and the narrative exists in order to answer it. The series also uses the genre's outsider-detective convention, sending Petrides up from the city into a town that "would rather the matter went away", which sets up the second expectation: that an investigator with no local loyalties will get to the bottom of a place that is protecting itself.

The convention subverted — resolution. The convention the series subverts is the crime narrative's guarantee of a solved case. Episode 6 ends without naming the killer and without an arrest. The subversion is made pointed by how deliberately the final three minutes rhyme with the opening: the same silo, the same dawn light, the show set up and opened on time behind Petrides, and the detective driving out past the town sign without stopping. The series returns the audience to its starting image with nothing resolved and the town's routine untouched, which is the opposite of the ending the opening promised.

The effect on the audience. Because the opening taught the audience to watch for the answer, the withheld ending converts that attention into a different question — not *who did it* but *why this town could absorb it*. The engagement the genre built is not discarded; it is redirected onto the community, so that the audience leaves judging the silence of the town rather than the identity of the killer. Subversion works here precisely because the conventions were used properly first: an audience can only be denied a resolution it was led to expect.

Common errors: naming the genre ("it is a crime drama") without naming a **convention**, which is a category label, not evidence; calling something a subversion when the narrative is simply using the convention in a slightly unusual way — a subversion sets up an expectation and then refuses it; describing the subversion but never stating its effect on the audience, which is the fifth mark; writing that the ending is "confusing" or "unsatisfying" as though that settled the matter, when the task is to explain what the choice achieves; drawing on a narrative studied in class instead of the stimulus, when the question is anchored to *The Silo*.

Q5. (6 marks — 4 + 2) *Command terms — analyse (part a): identify the key components and the significance of the relationships between them; explain (part b): a why chain to a consequence. Both parts must be answered on the narrative declared above Question 5. Switching narratives between parts is a task-compliance error.*

Part (a), 4 marks: 1 for a specific construction feature, 1 for its influence on engagement, 1 for its influence on consumption, 1 for keeping engagement and consumption distinct. Part (b), 2 marks: 1 for a genuine personal value, 1 for the link to interest in this narrative.

Model response (studied narrative: *Bluey*, 2018–).

(a) *Bluey* is an animated series created by Joe Brumm and produced by the Brisbane studio Ludo Studio, which premiered on ABC KIDS on 1 October 2018 with 52 episodes of seven minutes each. *Source: Screen Queensland, 'Ludo Studio's Bluey to screen on ABC KIDS and ABC KIDS iview from Mon Oct 1', 4 September 2018 — <https://screenqueensland.com.au/sq-news/media-centre/media-release-ludo-studios-bluey-to-screen-on-abc-kids-and-abc-kids-iview-from-mon-oct-1/>. Accurate as at July 2026.*

The construction feature. The seven-minute episode is the decisive construction choice, and everything else is built to fit inside it. Each episode takes a single game as its whole narrative premise, so the story problem, its complication and its resolution all belong to one round of play and close within the episode. There is no serial arc a viewer must have followed to understand the episode in front of them.

Its influence on engagement. Because the premise is a game and the game is complete, a young viewer is given a narrative whose rules they already understand and whose stakes they can hold in mind for its entire length — engagement is available immediately and does not depend on prior knowledge. The construction also carries a second layer written for the adult in the room: the comedy of the parents' exhaustion and improvisation runs underneath the child-directed action rather than beside it, so two audiences engage with the same seven minutes for different reasons at the same time.

Its influence on consumption. Consumption is the where, when and how of access, and the seven-minute self-contained unit shapes all three. An episode fits the intervals in which small children are actually parked in front of a

screen — before school, in a waiting room, at the end of a day — so the product is consumed in short, interstitial bursts and is repeatedly re-watched rather than progressed through, because no episode is spoiled by being seen out of order or twice. The significance of the relationship is that the same choice produces both effects: the closed seven-minute game is what makes engagement immediate *and* what makes consumption casual and repeatable.

The exception that proves it. The series' first special, 'The Sign', ran 28 minutes — four times a standard episode — and premiered on Sunday 14 April 2024 on ABC Kids in Australia and the same day globally on Disney+, Disney Junior and Disney Channel. Breaking the seven-minute rule changed the mode of consumption with it: an audience accustomed to picking up any episode at any time was given something that had to be sat down for, and its release functioned as an event rather than as another interchangeable unit in a library. *Source: Disney+ Press, 'Bluey First Special, "The Sign," Sets Premiere For April 14', 25 February 2024 — <https://press.disneyplus.com/news/disney-plus-bluey-first-special-the-sign-sets-premiere-for-april-14>. Accurate as at July 2026.*

(b) A personal value that would increase an adult viewer's interest is **the belief that unstructured play is valuable in itself and not a lesser use of a child's time**. A viewer who holds that value is watching a narrative whose every episode is built on a game invented and run by children, in which adults join the game on the children's terms rather than redirecting it to a lesson. Their interest is higher than a viewer who does not hold that value, because the construction of the narrative keeps confirming something they already believe and rarely see argued for: the value is not stated in the dialogue, it is built into what the episodes choose to be about.

Band descriptors — Question 5 (out of 6):

- **High (5–6):** one construction feature named precisely and used throughout, rather than a list; engagement and consumption clearly distinguished and each linked back to that same feature; the relationship between them stated, not just implied; part (b) names a genuine value — a belief about what matters — and links it to a specific feature of the narrative's construction.
- **Mid (3–4):** a construction feature identified but described generally; engagement and consumption both addressed, but one thinly, or the two used almost interchangeably; part (b) offers a preference ("they like animals") rather than a value, or names a value without linking it to the narrative's construction.
- **Low (1–2):** retells the narrative's content; discusses audience reaction with no reference to how the narrative is built; treats consumption as a synonym for watching; part (b) missing or restricted to "it is their favourite show".

Common errors: confusing the three audience terms — **engagement** is the cognitive and emotional involvement in the moment, **consumption** is the physical way, place and time of access, and **reception** is the meaning the audience makes; naming a construction feature and then never returning to it, so the analysis floats free of the evidence; answering part (a) about one narrative and part (b) about another; offering a taste ("they enjoy comedy") where part (b) asks for a value, which is a belief about what matters and can be stated as a sentence somebody could disagree with.

Area of Study 2 — Narratives in production: answers and solutions

Q6. (2 marks) *Command term — outline: an overview with more detail than 'identify' asks for. Two marks: 1 for what happens at the stage, 1 for what it produces or settles for the stages that follow.*

Model response. Development is the stage at which an idea for a narrative is generated, tested and narrowed until it is worth planning in detail: the practitioner researches, tries out concepts, identifies the audience and the media form, and discards the versions that do not work. It produces the decisions everything downstream depends on — what the narrative is about, who it is for, and what form it will take — so that pre-production is planning a settled idea rather than still choosing one.

Common errors: describing pre-production instead — storyboards, shot lists, schedules and call sheets belong to the next stage; treating development as "coming up with an idea", which omits the testing and discarding that makes it a stage rather than a moment; listing the five stages of the process without answering the question asked about one of them.

Q7. (4 marks) *Command term — explain: a how or why chain carried to a consequence. Four marks: 1 for showing that the looping, drop-in condition has been understood; 1 for a specific decision about the cause-and-effect chain; 1 for the chain from that decision to why a viewer who joins part-way is served by it; 1 for a pre-production technique that tests the decision, with a criterion set before the test.*

Model response.

What the condition actually requires. A loop has no beginning. A viewer who arrives at the 2 minute 20 mark of a four-minute product and leaves fifty seconds later never sees the opening and never sees the end, so a narrative built as one four-minute chain running to a single climax delivers that viewer a middle and nothing else. The product has to be legible from any entry point without becoming a montage with no cause and effect at all — which is the trap, because the brief still asks for a narrative.

The decision about cause and effect. I would build the four minutes as **three complete cause-and-effect units of about seventy-five seconds each, all following the same character** — a sponge-cake exhibitor on show morning — rather than as one long chain. Each unit contains its own cause and its own consequence and closes on that consequence: she drops the cake and improvises a repair; she is short a doily and takes one from a rival's bench; the judge lifts her cake and says nothing. Wherever a viewer joins, they are at most forty seconds from a payoff and no more than thirty-five seconds from the start of a fresh cause. The three units also chain to each other in order, so the small thefts and repairs accumulate into a single arc for anyone who watches the whole loop: the drop-in viewer gets a complete short narrative, and the viewer who stays gets a longer one built from the same material.

I would support that with a **repeated visual anchor** — her competitor's number card, in shot in the first two seconds of every unit — so that a viewer joining cold re-establishes who this is and what is at stake without a line of dialogue, which matters when the sound is competing with livestock judging.

The pre-production technique that tests it. An **animatic**: the storyboard frames cut to their planned durations with scratch dialogue and a rough sound bed, exported as a loop. I would play it to five people who have not read the script, ask each to look away and then look back at a moment I do not choose, and after fifty seconds ask them two questions — who is this person, and what do they want. The criterion is written before the session, not after: four of the five must answer both correctly from any entry point. Where the animatic fails, the fault is in the shot order or the unit boundaries, and both are still free to change because nothing has been shot. That is what makes this a pre-production test rather than an expensive discovery in the edit.

Common errors: designing for a viewer who watches from the beginning, which is the one viewer the brief says will be rare; answering “keep it short and simple”, when the item asks about the chain of cause and effect, not about length; naming a pre-production technique with no connection to the looping condition — a storyboard “so we know what to film” is true of every production; proposing to solve the problem in post-production or with an on-screen recap, when the question asks how the narrative would be **constructed**; a test with no criterion, which is a preference rather than a test.

Q8. (3 marks — 2 + 1) *Command terms — describe (part a), explain (part b). Part (a): 1 mark per role, and a described responsibility is a task plus what it is for. Part (b): 1 mark for a genuine dependency, stated in both directions or with a clear consequence if it fails.*

Model response.

(a) Director. During the production stage the director is responsible for what is captured against what was planned: they run each take, direct the performers, decide when a shot is good enough to move on from, and hold the storyboard's intention against the material actually being got on a noisy showground. Their responsibility is the meaning of the footage — that what comes out of the shoot can be cut into the narrative that was designed.

(a) Sound recordist. During the production stage the sound recordist is responsible for capturing usable audio in an environment the brief describes as noisy from opening to close: placing and monitoring microphones, choosing takes on audibility rather than performance, and recording clean room tone and wild lines for the edit. Their responsibility is that the dialogue survives the pavilion's single small speaker.

(b) The dependency. The two roles decide the same thing from opposite ends: the director's choice of where to place the camera fixes how close a microphone can get without appearing in frame, and the sound recordist's judgement that

a take is unusable overrides the director's judgement that the performance was right. If they do not agree a take before moving on, the production delivers material that looks correct and cannot be heard — which, on a product screened through one small speaker in a noisy pavilion, is material that cannot be used at all.

Also creditable. Any two distinct roles from the crew of four, provided both are described at the **production** stage: producer and director; camera operator and director; camera operator and sound recordist.

Common errors: describing a role at the wrong stage — an editor's responsibilities are largely post-production, and a response that puts them at the production stage answers a different question; naming the roles without describing responsibilities; a dependency that is really a restatement ("they both work on the same film"); on a four-person crew, inventing a role structure that no four people could staff.

Q9. (3 marks) *Command terms — describe and outline. Three marks: 1 for a technical skill named precisely (a skill is something you can get better at, not a piece of equipment), 1 for describing what performing it well involves in this condition, 1 for a test conducted before the production stage with a stated criterion.*

Model response. The technical skill is **recording and mixing dialogue so that it stays intelligible through a single small speaker in a room with a constant noise floor.**

What performing it well involves. On location it means getting the microphone as close to the speaker as the frame allows, monitoring on headphones rather than trusting the meters, keeping levels high enough to sit above the pavilion's noise floor but below clipping, and recording at least thirty seconds of room tone at each set-up so the edit has something to patch with. In post it means mixing for the worst case rather than for studio headphones: dialogue carried by the mid-range where a small speaker is strongest, low frequencies rolled off because that speaker cannot reproduce them anyway, and a narrower loudness range so that quiet lines are not lost under livestock judging.

How I would test it before production. During the two days of access I would take a recorder and the actual monitor and speaker into the produce pavilion at the busiest hour, play three test mixes of the same thirty-second dialogue passage — one flat, one with the low end rolled off, one additionally compressed — and stand where a passer-by would stand, at head height, four metres away. The criterion is set before listening, not after: every word must be identifiable, first time, by a listener who has not read the script. Whichever mix fails that test is discarded, and the setting that passes is written into the production plan.

Common errors: naming a technology instead of a skill — "we would use a shotgun microphone" is equipment, and the skill is operating it; a test with no criterion ("we would check it sounds okay"), which is a preference rather than a test; testing in a quiet classroom, which does not test the condition the brief actually sets; leaving the test until after the production stage, when the question asks for a test that informs the shoot.

Q10. (4 marks — 2 + 2) *Command term — explain: a how or why chain to a consequence. Two marks per part: 1 for a constraint correctly classified as legal or ethical, 1 for its effect on the production or the distribution of this narrative. The most common failure on this item is putting an ethical constraint in the legal part.*

Model response.

(a) A legal constraint — permission to use a person's image, and the ownership of anything you did not make.

The brief requires that anyone who appears on screen signs the Society's permission form. That obligation acts on the production directly: the crew cannot shoot a competitor, a judge or a crowd member and sort the paperwork out afterwards, so a signed form has to be obtained before the camera rolls, and any planned shot for which permission is refused has to be replaced on the day. The same class of constraint acts on the finished file: music, images or footage the crew did not create cannot be used without a licence, so a song playing over the showground's own public-address system during a take is a legal problem in the recording, not just an aesthetic one. The consequence for distribution is concrete — an unlicensed track or an unsigned participant is grounds for the Society to refuse to load the file, and the narrative does not screen.

(b) An ethical constraint — the obligation not to make a person look foolish for the sake of the story. The brief requires that the narrative feature someone who competes at the show, and it screens in the pavilion where that person's neighbours are standing. A lawful shot can still be an unethical one: an exhibitor filmed losing, cut so the loss plays as a joke, is entirely within the signed permission and entirely outside what the person agreed to in spirit. The constraint acts on the edit — I would show the participant the cut before delivery and would not use material they

objected to — and on the writing, because a fictional narrative set at a real show should not build its comedy on a real competitor's expense. The consequence is a narrative the community can stand next to, in a venue where the audience and the subject are the same people.

Common errors: classifying an ethical obligation as legal, or the reverse — the clearest test is who can enforce it: if a court or a regulator can act, it is legal; if only your own judgement and your community's expectations govern it, it is ethical; naming a constraint without following it through to an effect on production or distribution, which is half the marks; treating "it's legal" as a complete answer to the ethical part, which concedes the ethical question rather than answering it; answering both parts with the same constraint in different words.

Q11. (4 marks) *Command term — evaluate: judge something against a stated intention or criterion, using evidence, and state the judgement. The object of judgement here is the **fit between the product and its audience**, not a single craft decision. Four marks: 1 for the audience named specifically together with the conditions they would consume it in, 1 for evidence of how that audience actually responded, 1 for a judgement that follows from that evidence, 1 for a proportionate change. The model below uses a constructed student production; your own production replaces it.*

Model response (production: *Six Minutes Past*, a four-minute audio narrative).

The audience and the conditions. The narrative was made for Year 9 and 10 students at my own school, to be listened to on phones with earbuds during a fifteen-minute form-group slot — a room with thirty other people in it, no volume control that anyone would push far, and no second listen. What I wanted that audience to understand was the single turn the narrative rests on: the night-shift cleaner keeps the envelope she finds because she **recognises the handwriting on it**, not because of what is inside it.

The evidence. Five students from that year level listened individually, in the form room, in the conditions above. Each answered the same three written questions afterwards, on a sheet I wrote before the session so the questions could not drift once answers started coming in. Two of the five could state why she kept the envelope. Three named money as the reason. One stopped at about the two-minute mark.

The judgement. On the thing that mattered, the product did not suit its audience. The recognition is carried in the mix by two seconds of held breath and a drop in the corridor ambience — a choice that works on the studio headphones I edited with and does not survive earbuds in an occupied room, which is the condition I actually built it for. The failure is a fit failure rather than a design failure: three of five listeners left with a wrong reading of the story's central event, and a narrative whose turn does not reach its audience has not done its job however well the turn is constructed. The fit was not uniformly bad, and the evidence says so — the four-minute length matched the slot, nobody reported losing the thread of the shift, and only one listener stopped early — so the product suited its audience in duration and tone, and failed it on the delivery of decisive story information.

One change. I would carry the recognition on a second channel as well as in the mix: one short line of dialogue as she turns the envelope over, so the turn survives a bad listening environment. And I would move the test earlier and into the right room — playing the rough cut on earbuds in an occupied classroom rather than at my desk, since that is the only condition the judgement is actually about.

Band descriptors — Question 11 (out of 4):

- **High (4):** the audience named specifically and pinned to real consumption conditions — where, on what, with what around them — not "teenagers"; evidence that could be shown to somebody else, gathered against questions set beforehand; a judgement that follows from that evidence, is willing to be mixed, and separates what suited the audience from what did not; a change proportionate to the fault found.
- **Mid (2–3):** an audience named but generically, or named without its consumption conditions; evidence that is really an impression ("people said they liked it"); a judgement asserted rather than derived from the evidence; a change stated so generally it could apply to any production.
- **Low (1):** describes what was made without judging its fit to anyone; treats "my class watched it" as evidence; "it went well" with nothing behind it; evaluates personal effort rather than the product.

Common errors: describing the production instead of evaluating it; evaluating your own effort or enjoyment rather than the product ("I worked hard on this"); naming an audience so broadly that no evidence could confirm or disconfirm the fit; evidence gathered after the judgement was reached, or criteria invented once the responses were in;

a judgement with no concession, since an evaluation that finds everything successful is usually one that was never tested; proposing a change so large it is a different production.

Area of Study 3 — Media and change: answers and solutions

Q12. (2 marks) Command term — outline, plus an example. 1 mark for the meaning, 1 mark for an example that actually shows it.

Model response. Convergence is the coming together of media forms, technologies and industries that were once separate, so that content, distribution and audience activity that used to require different devices, companies or products now happen in one place. An example is a single handheld device on which a person reads a newspaper, watches television, listens to radio, takes and publishes photographs and talks to other people — five activities that until recently required five separate technologies and five separate industries to supply them.

Common errors: defining convergence as “everything being on the internet”, which describes distribution and misses the merging of forms and industries; giving a technology as the example without saying what has converged in it; confusing convergence with **interactivity** — convergence is about forms coming together, interactivity is about what an audience can do.

Q13. (4 marks) Command term — describe: characteristics, features and qualities, going beyond listing. Two marks per characteristic: 1 for naming a genuine characteristic of new media audiences, 1 for the evidence in the notice that shows it. A response with no reference to the notice cannot score above half.

Model response.

Characteristic one — new media audiences are producers as well as consumers. A new media audience does not only receive a narrative; its members make and publish their own, often in response to what they have just consumed. The notice shows this directly in the “Continue this story” button: every listener on Verso is one tap away from recording their own ninety seconds, which then attaches to the original as a branch and can itself be branched from. The distinction between the person who made the story and the person who heard it is not a distinction the platform maintains — it is designed out.

Characteristic two — new media audiences are also the product. Members of a new media audience are sold, in the sense that their attention and their behavioural data are what the platform’s revenue is built on. The notice makes the mechanism visible: branches are ranked by “the share of listeners who reach the end of them”, creators are paid from “total finished listens”, and the feed is replaced by “the stories Verso calculates you are most likely to finish”. Every one of those three changes requires the platform to measure each listener’s behaviour continuously, and the measurement is what is being converted into advertising revenue.

Also creditable. *Audiences are no longer bound by place* — a Verso story can be branched by anyone anywhere, so the community around a story is one of interest rather than of location. *Audiences are fragmented and personalised* — replacing the chronological feed with a calculated one means two Verso users may share no stories in common at all.

Common errors: naming a characteristic and not pointing to the notice, which leaves it as a memorised list item; describing what the platform does rather than what its audience is like — the question asks about the **audience**; treating “they use their phones a lot” as a characteristic; using all four bullets of the notice to support one characteristic and leaving the second unevidenced.

Q14. (4 marks) Command term — explain: a how or why chain carried to a consequence. Two marks for the listener half and two for the creator half: within each, 1 for identifying the change in behaviour and 1 for the chain from a named feature of the notice to that change. A response that answers only one half caps at two marks, however good it is.

Model response.

What a listener does. Two of the changes act directly on the listener’s available actions. The “Continue this story” button converts responding into authoring: the listener’s reply is not a comment beside the story but ninety seconds attached to it as a branch, and because branches can be branched from, the thing being listened to is also material the listener may extend. The recommended feed acts on the other end of the same behaviour — the listener no longer

chooses what to hear by choosing whom to follow, because the order they open is calculated from what they have finished before. The consequence is that a listener's activity shifts from selecting and receiving to auditioning and adding: they attend to a story while consuming it for where it could be picked up and what it leaves open, and the pool they audition from has been chosen for them.

What a creator builds into a story. Ranking branches by the share of listeners who reach the end of them, and paying creators from total finished listens across every branch grown from their story, make **completion** the platform's currency. A creator paid on finished listens has a direct reason to front-load the hook, to keep the ninety seconds free of anything a listener might leave during, and to end not on a resolution but on an opening — a question, a reversal, an unanswered line — because an ending that invites a branch is worth more than one that closes the story. The revenue rule reaches further than the individual story: since the payment counts branches grown from a creator's original, the thing a creator now builds is a **premise that other people can extend**, not a finished narrative.

The loop between the two halves. These are not two separate effects. The measurement taken from listeners is what pays creators, and what creators build in response is what the recommended feed then selects among. An interaction that feels private to each listener is aggregated into an editorial force acting on what everyone is offered next.

Common errors: paraphrasing the notice rather than explaining an effect — restating a bullet is not a chain; answering only the listener half, which the tariff punishes hard; asserting that the platform will “engage audiences more” with no route from a named feature to a named behaviour; treating what a creator does as identical to what a listener does, when the notice deliberately pays the two differently; ignoring the instruction to refer to at least two of the four changes.

Q15. (4 marks) *Command term — explain: a how or why chain to a consequence, on a real example with a date. Four marks: 1 for the technological development, 1 for the industry or institution and what changed for it, 1 for the causal chain between them, 1 for a specific dated example. An undated example caps the response at three marks; the date is in the stem for a reason.*

Model response. The technological development is the **migration of audience attention and advertising to global search and social platforms**, which put the distribution of news into the hands of companies that do not produce it. The industry affected is **Australian news publishing**, and what changed for it is where the revenue attached to journalism is collected.

The causal chain. When most readers reach a news story through a search result or a social feed rather than through a masthead, the advertising revenue that once travelled with the audience is collected by the platform that showed the link, not by the newsroom that paid a journalist to report it. Publishers keep the cost of reporting and lose the audience relationship that used to pay for it, which is why the Australian response has been directed at the platforms rather than at the publishers.

The dated example. On **12 December 2024** the Australian Government announced a **News Bargaining Incentive**: a charge on large digital platforms that can be offset if they enter commercial agreements with Australian news publishers, designed to close the gap in the 2021 News Media Bargaining Code that allowed a platform to avoid its obligations simply by removing news content. *Source: Treasury Ministers (Assistant Treasurer Stephen Jones MP and Minister for Communications Michelle Rowland MP), ‘Albanese Government to establish News Bargaining Incentive’, 12 December 2024 — <https://ministers.treasury.gov.au/ministers/stephen-jones-2022/media-releases/albanese-government-establish-news-bargaining-incentive>. Accurate as at July 2026.*

Where it had reached. An announcement is not a law, and saying so is worth a mark on its own. Draft legislation for the News Bargaining Incentive was released for public consultation, with submissions open **until 18 May 2026**; under the draft, platforms are encouraged to do commercial deals with eligible news publishers as the preferred model, with offsets reducing their liability. As at July 2026 the Incentive has not been enacted. *Source: Treasury Ministers (Assistant Treasurer Daniel Mulino MP), ‘Consultation on the News Bargaining Incentive now open’, 28 April 2026 — <https://ministers.treasury.gov.au/ministers/daniel-mulino-2025/media-releases/consultation-news-bargaining-incentive-now-open>. Accurate as at July 2026.*

Also creditable. Any properly dated example of a technological development changing a media industry or institution — the shift of a broadcaster's audience from scheduled transmission to an on-demand service, the collapse of physical media sales in music or home video, or the arrival of streaming commissioning in Australian screen production — provided the chain from the technology to the change is explained and the date is specific.

Common errors: an example with no date, or dated only as “recently” or “in recent years”; naming a technology and an industry but never joining them, so the response describes two things instead of explaining one; citing an announcement or a bill as though it were law — announced, introduced, passed, commenced and enforced are five different things, and the distinction is worth marks; drifting into the effects on individual audience members, which is a different part of this outcome.

Q16. (6 marks) *Command term — discuss: a considered, balanced argument that identifies what is at issue and shows the points for and against, weighing the evidence before reaching a conclusion. Six marks map onto the bullets: 2 for the contested question plus dated evidence, 2 for two parties whose interests genuinely conflict, 2 for a position that is argued rather than asserted. An “issue” is something with at least two defensible sides — if you cannot state the other side in a sentence its supporters would accept, you have chosen a topic, not an issue.*

Model response (issue: Australia’s social media minimum age).

What is contested. Not whether young people are affected by social media — everyone agrees they are. What is contested is whether removing under-16s from social media platforms protects them or isolates them, and what the cost of checking everyone’s age is to everyone else’s privacy.

The dated evidence. Obligations under the *Online Safety Amendment (Social Media Minimum Age) Act 2024* (Cth) commenced on **10 December 2025**, requiring age-restricted social media platforms to take reasonable steps to prevent Australians under 16 holding accounts. The eSafety Commissioner published regulatory guidance on **16 September 2025** setting out what “reasonable steps” means, confirming that platforms are expected to use a successive-validation or waterfall approach to age assurance rather than relying on self-declaration alone, with civil penalties running to A\$49.5 million for systemic non-compliance. On **16 January 2026** the Australian Government announced that more than **4.7 million** under-16 accounts had already been deactivated, removed or restricted. *Source: DLA Piper Privacy Matters, ‘Australia’s Social Media “Ban” and the eSafety Commissioner’s Social Media Minimum Age Regulatory Guidance’, February 2026 — <https://privacymatters.dlapiper.com/2026/02/australias-social-media-ban-and-the-esafety-commissioners-social-media-minimum-age-regulatory-guidance/>. Accurate as at July 2026. Source: Prime Minister of Australia, ‘4.7 million accounts deactivated, removed or restricted’, 16 January 2026 — <https://www.pm.gov.au/media/4-7-million-accounts-deactivated-removed-or-restricted>. Accurate as at July 2026.*

Two parties whose interests conflict.

Parents and child-safety advocates want the exposure of young teenagers to recommended content, contact from strangers and continuous social comparison reduced, and they want the burden of achieving that moved off individual families and onto the companies that build the systems. Their interest is served by a hard line drawn at a fixed age and enforced against platforms with penalties large enough to matter, and the January 2026 figure is, on their reading, the measure of a law working.

Young people themselves, and the groups who reach them online, have the opposite interest in at least one respect. For a teenager who is isolated where they live — in a small town, in a family that does not accept them, or with a condition nobody around them shares — the account that was removed was also the route to a community and, in some cases, to support services. Their interest is in keeping that connection while the harms are addressed some other way, and their objection is that a blunt age line removes the good with the bad and does nothing about what remains for the person who turns sixteen the next day. A third party sits behind both: **every adult user**, whose interest is that age assurance is not achieved by requiring identity documents or face scans from the whole population, since a measure aimed at under-16s is checked on everyone.

My position. On the evidence available as at July 2026 the law is defensible, and I would keep it, because the alternative that was in place was not neutral: it left the design decisions with the platforms and the consequences with families, and a decade of voluntary undertakings did not shift either. The 4.7 million figure shows the obligation can be complied with at scale, which was the central practical objection to it.

The concession, and it is a real one. That figure measures deactivation, not wellbeing. It tells us accounts were closed; it does not tell us whether the young people behind them are better off, where they went instead, or whether the ones who most needed the connection are the ones who lost the most. Nor does it settle the privacy question, which falls on adults who were never the target. I would therefore attach two conditions to my support: that the effect on young people be measured directly and published, rather than inferred from account numbers, and that the age-assurance methods platforms adopt be audited for what they collect and retain about everyone else. What remains

unresolved is the hardest part — whether a rule that removes a harm also removes the support that travelled with it, and that cannot be answered from a compliance statistic.

Band descriptors — Question 16 (out of 6):

- **High (5–6):** the contested question stated precisely, not just the topic; evidence specific and dated inside the last two years, with the instrument named accurately; two parties whose interests genuinely pull against each other, each given its strongest form; a position that is argued from the evidence, contains a real concession, and says what is still unresolved.
- **Mid (3–4):** a real issue, broadly accurate, but evidence dated loosely or an instrument named without a date; two parties named but both effectively arguing the same side, or one given only to be dismissed; a position stated but not defended, or defended without conceding anything.
- **Low (1–2):** retells a controversy or an opinion; no dated evidence; parties described in general terms (“the government”, “society”); a position asserted in the first sentence and repeated in the last; example outside the two-year window.

Common errors: naming a subject (“AI”, “privacy”, “social media”) instead of naming what is **contested** about it; citing a bill or an announcement as law; using no date at all, when currency is part of what this outcome asks for; giving two parties whose interests point the same way, which shows no issue was found; treating “no law was broken” as the end of an ethical argument; reaching a position in the opening sentence and then presenting only the evidence that supports it, which is an opinion rather than a discussion.

Sources

All real-world claims in the solutions above are drawn from the following public sources. Constructed stimulus and constructed model-response material carry no source line, by convention.

- *Source: British Film Institute, ‘Where to begin with Baz Luhrmann’ (Emily Maskell), 20 April 2026 — <https://www.bfi.org.uk/features/where-begin-with-baz-luhrmann>. Accurate as at July 2026.*
- *Source: Screen Queensland, ‘Ludo Studio’s Bluey to screen on ABC KIDS and ABC KIDS iView from Mon Oct 1’, 4 September 2018 — <https://screenqueensland.com.au/sq-news/media-centre/media-release-ludo-studios-bluey-to-screen-on-abc-kids-and-abc-kids-iView-from-mon-oct-1/>. Accurate as at July 2026.*
- *Source: Disney+ Press, ‘Bluey First Special, “The Sign,” Sets Premiere For April 14’, 25 February 2024 — <https://press.disneyplus.com/news/disney-plus-bluey-first-special-the-sign-sets-premiere-for-april-14>. Accurate as at July 2026.*
- *Source: Treasury Ministers (Assistant Treasurer Stephen Jones MP and Minister for Communications Michelle Rowland MP), ‘Albanese Government to establish News Bargaining Incentive’, 12 December 2024 — <https://ministers.treasury.gov.au/ministers/stephen-jones-2022/media-releases/albanese-government-establish-news-bargaining-incentive>. Accurate as at July 2026.*
- *Source: Treasury Ministers (Assistant Treasurer Daniel Mulino MP), ‘Consultation on the News Bargaining Incentive now open’, 28 April 2026 — <https://ministers.treasury.gov.au/ministers/daniel-mulino-2025/media-releases/consultation-news-bargaining-incentive-now-open>. Accurate as at July 2026.*
- *Source: DLA Piper Privacy Matters, ‘Australia’s Social Media “Ban” and the eSafety Commissioner’s Social Media Minimum Age Regulatory Guidance’, February 2026 — <https://privacymatters.dlapiper.com/2026/02/australias-social-media-ban-and-the-esafety-commissioners-social-media-minimum-age-regulatory-guidance/>. Accurate as at July 2026.*
- *Source: Prime Minister of Australia, ‘4.7 million accounts deactivated, removed or restricted’, 16 January 2026 — <https://www.pm.gov.au/media/4-7-million-accounts-deactivated-removed-or-restricted>. Accurate as at July 2026.*

Teacher note — currency. Question 16 and the model response above are written to public record as at **July 2026** and every claim in them carries its date. The Unit 2 Area of Study 3 key knowledge names issues “in the last two years”, which dates by construction. Before running this paper, check each instrument for movement — in particular whether the News Bargaining Incentive has been enacted, and whether the eSafety Commissioner has published further compliance data on the social media minimum age — and replace any example that has fallen outside the two-

year window. The **issue** outlives the example: the argument about protecting young audiences without isolating them will still be live long after these figures are superseded.

End of Unit 2 Examination A

Unit 2 Examination B — standard

Please read this first. There is **no VCAA examination at Units 1 and 2**. All assessment at Units 1 and 2 is school-based, and the procedures for assessing levels of achievement in these units are a matter for school decision. Levels of achievement at Units 1 and 2 are not reported to the VCAA. This paper is a **school-decision revision paper** written to the three Unit 2 outcomes. It is not a VCAA examination and it is not written in a VCAA examination format.

Reading time: 10 minutes. Writing time: 90 minutes.

Total 60 marks. Thirteen questions. All questions are compulsory. Answer in the spaces provided in this book.

Questions are grouped under the three areas of study of Unit 2. Question numbering runs continuously across the whole paper, from Question 1 to Question 13.

Several questions require you to write about a media narrative you have studied this year, or about a media narrative product you have produced this year. Complete the write-in lines at the start of each group before you begin writing.

Narrative, style and genre

Questions 1–4. 20 marks.

Complete the lines below before you begin. You must use the creator and the narrative you name here to answer Questions 1, 3 and 4.

Media creator or producer studied: _____

Media narrative studied: _____

Media form of that narrative: _____

Question 1 (3 marks)

Describe the distinctive style of the media creator or producer you have named above.

In your response, refer to **two** specific choices that this creator repeats.

Question 2 (4 marks)

Read the catalogue entry below.

Stimulus 1 — streaming catalogue entry

THE LATE FEE — Romantic comedy · Feature film, 96 minutes · Released 2026

Cover image. Two people stand on either side of a library returns chute at night, each reaching for the same book. The light is warm and low, the pair are framed close and symmetrically, and the title runs between them in a rounded script with the tagline *Some things are overdue* beneath it.

Logline. Two strangers keep borrowing the same library book. Neither of them ever returns it on time.

The first four minutes. A montage of one city branch library across four seasons, cut to an upbeat pop track. Priya returns the book late. Marco borrows it the next morning. Marco returns it late. Priya borrows it that afternoon. A librarian re-shelves it between each visit. The two never appear in the same shot.

Notes released with the film. Priya and Marco share one scene, ninety seconds long, in the last ten minutes; nowhere else in the film are they in frame together. There is no declaration and no kiss. The closing shot is the book back on the shelf, and the final card names the four other borrowers who read it between them.

Using the stimulus, explain how *The Late Fee* **invokes** the conventions of the romantic comedy genre, and how its **subversion** of those conventions engages the audience.

Question 3 (5 marks)

Explain how the historical and/or cultural context in which the media narrative you named was **produced** influenced the way that narrative was constructed.

In your response:

- identify the production context by its time and place
- refer to one specific moment, sequence, page, episode or level of the narrative.

Question 4 (8 marks)

Analyse how the construction of the media narrative you named influences audience **engagement, consumption** and **reception**.

In your response:

- refer to at least two specific construction decisions — for example media codes, narrative conventions, structure, duration or release pattern
- address all three of engagement, consumption and reception, and distinguish between them
- use different evidence from the evidence you used in Question 3.

Narratives in production

Questions 5–9. 20 marks.

Complete the lines below before you begin. You must use the production you name here to answer Questions 5, 6, 7 and 9.

Media narrative product you produced this year: _____

Media form: _____

Role you undertook: _____

Question 5 (3 marks)

Outline **two** decisions you made during **pre-production** that fixed how the narrative of your product would begin.

For each decision, state what you intended the audience to understand from the opening.

Question 6 (4 marks)

Describe the role you undertook at the **production** stage of your media narrative product.

In your response:

- name two responsibilities the role carried at that stage
- describe one thing you handed over to another role holder — or to yourself working in another role — at the end of the production stage.

Question 7 (5 marks)

Explain how you applied **one** technical skill in the operation of a media technology to construct meaning at a specific moment in your narrative.

In your response, name the media technology, name the technical skill, and identify the moment.

Question 8 (4 marks)

Read the production diary entry below.

Stimulus 2 — production diary

Thursday. Recorded at the Barrenjoey Road community market for our eight-minute audio narrative *What the Stalls Know*. Twenty minutes of usable tape.

- Clean interview with Mrs Iona Petrakis, who has run the fruit stall for thirty-one years. She read and signed the release form.
- Her grandson, who is about nine, talks for forty seconds about helping her set up. It is the best material we have. Nobody signed anything for him.
- A busker is playing a well-known chart song under the whole market ambience. We were going to keep that recording as the bed under the opening and the closing.
- One stallholder told us on tape that another stallholder is being “pushed out by the council”. He asked us afterwards not to use his name. He is the only person at the market who sells plants, and the script currently calls him “the plant seller”.

Plan. Publish on the school’s public podcast feed on Friday week and post the link in the market’s community Facebook group.

Explain the **ethical**, **legal** and **community** constraints acting on the crew’s plan to publish *What the Stalls Know*, and describe **one** change the crew must make before publication.

Question 9 (4 marks)

Evaluate **one** decision you made during **post-production** on your media narrative product.

In your response:

- state the intention the decision was meant to serve
- state what the decision actually achieved
- judge the decision against that intention.

Media and change

Questions 10–13. 20 marks.

Question 10 (3 marks)

Describe how **one** new media technology has changed the way audiences consume media narratives.

Name the technology in your response.

Question 11 (4 marks)

Read the platform announcement below.

Stimulus 3 — platform announcement

Tidewater — what is changing on 1 September

Tidewater is an audio platform that hosts serialised narrative podcasts.

1. Every episode, in five languages. From 1 September, Tidewater will automatically generate translated versions of every episode using a synthetic voice matched to the original narrator. Creators may opt out. Listeners will see a small label reading “translated audio”.

2. Clip and share. Listeners will be able to select any thirty seconds of an episode and post it to other platforms as a video card carrying the waveform and captions.

3. Chapters open for comment. Each episode will be divided into chapters, and listeners will be able to leave a timestamped comment on any chapter. Creators will be shown which chapters attract the most comments and where listeners stop.

4. Tidewater Plus. A paid tier removes advertising. The free tier keeps advertising and adds one extra mid-roll break to every episode.

Explain how these changes influence the ways Tidewater’s audience interacts and engages with media narratives.

In your response, refer to at least **two** of the changes.

Question 12 (5 marks)

Explain how technological development has influenced Australian media **industries and institutions**.

In your response, refer to one dated example from the last two years.

Question 13 (8 marks)

Discuss **one** social, ethical or legal issue in the media industry from the last two years, and the influence of the new media technology at the centre of that issue on society, audiences and the individual.

In your response:

- name the issue and **date** it, and name any law, code, body or company decision you rely on
- state what is contested, and who the parties are
- reach a position, and say what remains unresolved
- use a different example from the one you used in Question 12.

End of examination questions

Unit 2 Examination B — solutions

*Every model response below is one high-scoring answer, not the only one. Where a question requires your own studied narrative or your own production work, the model shows the **shape** of a full-mark answer — substitute your own material and keep the structure. Where a model names a real media product, law or company decision, the claim is public record and is sourced at the end of that solution.*

*Marks in this paper: Narrative, style and genre 3 + 4 + 5 + 8 = 20; Narratives in production 3 + 4 + 5 + 4 + 4 = 20; Media and change 3 + 4 + 5 + 8 = 20. **Total 60.***

Narrative, style and genre — solutions

Q1. *Command term — describe: give an account of the features of something. Three marks reward two named repeated choices, each with an account of what the choice does, and a sentence that ties them into one recognisable style.*

Model response (creator: Wes Anderson; narrative: The Grand Budapest Hotel, 2014):

Wes Anderson’s distinctive style is built on the deliberate flatness and order of the frame, and it is recognisable from a single still.

Repeated choice 1 — centred, symmetrical composition. Anderson repeatedly places the subject dead centre and balances the two halves of the frame against each other, so that the shot reads as a composed picture rather than as a snatched view of a world that happens to be there. In *The Grand Budapest Hotel* (2014) the hotel’s lobby, corridors and funicular are all shot down a central axis with the architecture receding symmetrically to either side.

Repeated choice 2 — planimetric staging. Anderson places the camera square-on to the back wall of the set, so that actors move horizontally or vertically across the frame rather than diagonally into depth. The effect is theatrical and storybook-like: the audience is positioned in front of the action, as at a stage or a page, rather than inside it.

Together these two choices produce the same result at every scale of his work — a narrative world that the audience is constantly reminded has been arranged for them. The same construction is visible nearly a decade later in *Asteroid City* (2023), which is why it counts as a style rather than as one film’s design.

Source: StudioBinder, “The Wes Anderson Style Explained: A Complete Visual Style Guide” — <https://www.studiobinder.com/blog/wes-anderson-style/>. Accurate as at July 2026.

Source: Britannica, “The Grand Budapest Hotel — film by Anderson [2014]” — <https://www.britannica.com/topic/The-Grand-Budapest-Hotel>. Accurate as at July 2026.

Common errors: describing the **story** of one product instead of the creator's repeated choices; offering adjectives ("quirky", "aesthetic", "unique") with no construction behind them; naming only one choice and padding it; naming a choice that appears once, which is a decision, not a style.

Q2. Command term — *explain: give a how/why chain. Four marks need at least one genre convention the film invokes, at least one it subverts, evidence from the stimulus for each, and a statement of the engagement effect.*

How *The Late Fee* invokes romantic comedy conventions. The catalogue entry declares the genre before a frame is seen. It is labelled "Romantic comedy", and every element of the paratext confirms the label. The cover image is the genre's standard two-hander: a pair framed close, symmetrically and in warm low light, separated by a single object that the composition promises they will resolve. The tagline puns — *Some things are overdue* — which is the genre's characteristic register. The opening montage supplies the rest of the furniture: an upbeat pop track, one charming location, and a parallel-lives structure in which two people repeatedly just miss each other. An audience that knows the genre reads all of this instantly and arrives with a single working expectation: these two will meet, and the film is the story of how. That expectation is the engagement mechanism — the audience commits because it already knows the shape of what it has started.

How the film subverts them. The convention it breaks is the meet-cute, and with it the convergence the genre exists to deliver. A near-miss montage is normally a delay; here it is the film. Priya and Marco never appear in the same shot across the whole opening, and the notes confirm they share one ninety-second scene in the last ten minutes and are in frame together nowhere else. The genre's two obligatory payoffs are withheld outright: there is no declaration and no kiss. The ending then displaces the couple from their own resolution — the closing shot is the book back on the shelf, and the final card names four other borrowers, which reassigns the narrative from the two people to the object that passed between them.

The engagement effect. Because the used conventions promise convergence and the subverted ones refuse it, the audience spends the film wanting something the film has quietly decided not to give. The attention the genre bought is redirected — from *will they get together* to *what a shared object carries between strangers who never meet*. The subversion registers as a subversion only because the cover, the tagline and the pop-scored montage established the expectation first: an audience that did not recognise the genre would read the ending as merely inconclusive rather than as a refusal.

Common errors: listing conventions with no statement of what the audience does with them; treating "subversion" as "the film is unusual" rather than naming the specific convention that is broken; answering only half the question (uses **and** subverts are both required); inventing detail that is not in the stimulus.

Q3. Command term — *explain: a how/why chain. Five marks need the production context pinned to time and place, one specific moment of construction, and a clear line from the context to that construction choice. The context that matters is the context of **production**, not the period the narrative depicts.*

*Model response (studied narrative: *The Newsreader*, series 1, ABC, 2021):*

The production context. *The Newsreader* was created by Michael Lucas and produced by Werner Film Productions for the ABC, with series 1 premiering on 15 August 2021. Its production context is therefore Melbourne, 2020–21 — an Australian screen industry commissioning drama for a public broadcaster, at a moment when the conduct of workplaces towards women, and the way institutions had historically managed it, was a live public argument. The narrative it constructs, however, is set in a commercial television newsroom in **1986**. Those two dates are different, and the gap between them is where the analysis sits.

The construction that shows it. The series builds its 1986 newsroom around real broadcast events of that year — the *Challenger* explosion, Halley's Comet, Chernobyl — and reconstructs the technology of the period in its mise en scene: the studio desk, the analogue tape, the racks of monitors, the physical handling of a bulletin that has to be assembled before it goes to air at a fixed hour. The production context supplies the reason for that density. A 2021 audience consuming news on a phone has no working memory of a newsroom in which the whole institution's day is organised around one broadcast, so the narrative must construct that world in detail before its pressures can be felt.

Where the influence is clearest. The 1986 setting places Helen Norville, the station's star anchor, in a newsroom that treats her as difficult. A narrative made **in** 1986 would be far more likely to present that judgement as simply true of her. Made in 2021, the narrative constructs the judgement itself as the thing under examination — the audience is

positioned to see the label being applied and to weigh it, rather than to accept it. That is the production context doing the work: the events depicted belong to 1986, but the question the narrative asks about them belongs to 2021.

Source: ABC / Werner Film Productions via Wikipedia, “The Newsreader” — https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Newsreader. Accurate as at July 2026.

Source: ArtsHub, “The Newsreader — Creator Michael Lucas talks ambiguity, archives and the 80s” — <https://www.artshub.com.au/news/features/the-newsreader-michael-lucas-talks-ambiguity-archives-and-the-80s-2502264/>. Accurate as at July 2026.

Common errors: analysing the **depicted** era instead of the **production** context — the single most common fault on this question type; giving a decade with no place and no industry (“the 1980s”); listing historical events with no line drawn to a construction choice; retelling the narrative.

Q4. Command term — *analyse: break the narrative’s construction into parts and show how those parts work on the audience. Eight marks need at least two construction decisions, all three of engagement, consumption and reception treated separately, and a position.*

Model response (studied narrative: Bluey, Ludo Studio for the ABC, from 2018):

The three terms, kept apart. *Engagement* is how the narrative holds attention while it is being consumed; *consumption* is how, when, where and how much of it an audience takes; *reception* is what an audience makes of it afterwards. The construction of *Bluey* influences all three, and it does so through decisions that were taken before a frame was animated.

Construction decision 1 — the seven-minute episode. *Bluey*, created by Joe Brumm and produced by Ludo Studio, premiered on ABC Kids on 1 October 2018 with a running time of seven minutes per episode. Seven minutes is not a scheduling accident; it is a narrative constraint that dictates structure. There is no room for a subplot, a second location or a slow open, so each episode is built on a single premise — one game, begun in the first thirty seconds and resolved by the end. The effect on **engagement** is that the narrative reaches its complication almost immediately and never asks a four-year-old to hold information across a gap. The effect on **consumption** is different and larger: seven minutes fits the units of time in which the audience actually watches — one episode before leaving the house, three in a waiting room — so the narrative is consumed in short, repeated, parent-controlled sessions rather than in a single sitting. A seventy-minute product placed in the same household would be consumed by a different mechanism entirely.

Construction decision 2 — dual address inside a single narrative. Each episode is constructed so that its surface — a game, played by dog characters, in and around a Queensland house — is complete for a child, while the situation underneath it is one an adult recognises: a parent trying to finish something, a negotiation about fairness, a small domestic failure. Nothing is signalled to the adult over the child’s head; the same scene simply reads twice. For **engagement**, this means the adult in the room is not merely supervising but following. For **reception**, it produces the response the series is best known for: adults discussing the episodes among themselves, in terms of what the episode said about parenting, long after the seven minutes ended. Reception here is not the child’s response alone — it is a second audience’s response to a narrative that was not, on its face, addressed to them.

Construction decision 3 — the release and distribution pattern. In Australia the series is distributed by the public broadcaster and is available free on ABC iView alongside broadcast on ABC Kids; internationally it was co-commissioned with the BBC, with BBC Studios holding global distribution, and it became the most-watched series globally on Disney+ in 2024. The construction decision that matters here is that the episodes are self-contained and unordered — no episode depends on a previous one — which makes the catalogue navigable by a viewer who cannot read. **Consumption** therefore includes a behaviour the narrative was built to allow: repeat viewing of a chosen episode, selected by the child, out of sequence, many times. A serialised construction would have made that impossible.

Position. The influence runs in one direction and it is worth stating plainly: *Bluey*’s reach is usually explained by its warmth, but warmth is not a construction decision. The seven-minute length, the single-premise structure, the dual address and the unordered self-contained catalogue are, and each of them determines a different part of the audience’s behaviour — how long attention is held, in what units the product is taken, and by whom it is talked about afterwards. Engagement was designed for the child; consumption was designed for the household’s clock; reception, in the end, came substantially from the adult who was only meant to be in the room.

Source: Wikipedia, “Bluey (2018 TV series)” — [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bluey_\(2018_TV_series\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bluey_(2018_TV_series)). Accurate as at July 2026.

Source: Ludo Studio, “Bluey” — <https://ludostudio.com.au/projects/bluey>. Accurate as at July 2026.

Source: Deadline, “‘Bluey’ To Bark On Big Screen: Movie In Works At Disney, BBC Studios”, December 2024 — <https://deadline.com/2024/12/bluey-movie-in-works-disney-bbc-studios-2027-1236205875/>. Accurate as at July 2026.

Band descriptors (out of 8):

- **High (7–8):** engagement, consumption and reception are **distinguished** and each is tied to a named construction decision; at least two construction decisions carried by specific evidence (duration, structure, code, release pattern), not by adjectives; the audience is identified; a clear position that goes beyond summary; media language precise throughout.
- **Mid (4–6):** the three terms are used but at least two are blurred together, or one is asserted without evidence; one construction decision genuinely analysed and a second mentioned; some specific evidence, some generalisation; a position present but thin.
- **Low (1–3):** the narrative is retold or praised rather than analysed; engagement, consumption and reception treated as synonyms for “people liked it”; no construction decision named; no audience identified.

Common errors: using engagement, consumption and reception as three words for the same idea — the single largest mark loss on this item; writing about the audience’s feelings with no construction attached; naming a code without saying what it does; re-using the Question 3 evidence, which the question explicitly forbids.

Narratives in production — solutions

Q5. Command term — outline: state the key features briefly. Three marks reward two distinct pre-production decisions, each paired with the intended audience understanding. Detail beyond that earns nothing here — the marks are for precision, not length.

Model response (production: a four-minute short-form drama, moving image):

Decision 1 — the opening image was fixed in the storyboard as a static wide of an empty kitchen holding for six seconds before any character enters. I intended the audience to understand, before anyone spoke, that the space was ordinarily occupied and was not occupied now, so that the character’s entrance would read as a return rather than as a beginning.

Decision 2 — the script was written so that the first line of dialogue is a reply, not an opening. The character answers a question the audience never heard. I intended the audience to understand that the narrative had begun before they arrived, which places them in the position of working out what they have walked into.

Common errors: describing what was filmed rather than what was **decided** at pre-production; giving two versions of the same decision; stating the decision and then forgetting to state the intended audience understanding, which is half the mark allocation; writing at four-mark length for a three-mark outline.

Q6. Command term — describe: give an account of the features. Four marks need the role named, two responsibilities specific to the **production** stage, and one handover with its recipient identified.

Model response (role: director of photography on a four-minute short-form drama):

The role. I was director of photography. On a four-person crew the role covers everything the camera and the lighting do, and on this production it also covered the shot list, because I had built it during pre-production.

Responsibility 1 — delivering the planned coverage. At the production stage my responsibility was to come away from each location with every shot the edit would need, in the sizes the storyboard specified and with enough overlapping action to cut between them. I ran the shot list as a checklist on set and marked each set-up off as it was captured, because a missing shot cannot be recovered once the location is returned.

Responsibility 2 — keeping the look consistent across a shoot that spanned two days. Because the kitchen scenes were shot across a Saturday and the following Wednesday, I recorded the lamp positions, the white balance and the

exposure settings in a continuity note at the end of the first day and matched them on the second, so that the two halves of one scene would cut together without the audience seeing the join.

The handover. At the end of the production stage I handed the editor a labelled card of footage with a shot log listing every take, its slate, and a one-word note on which takes were usable. The log was the handover: without it the editor's first task at post-production would have been to re-watch two days of material to find out what existed, which was time the schedule did not have.

Common errors: describing the role across the whole production process when the question names the **production** stage; giving responsibilities that belong to pre-production (planning, casting) or post-production (grading, mixing); listing responsibilities with no account of what they involved; omitting the handover, which carries a mark of its own.

Q7. Command term — explain: a how/why chain. Five marks need the technology named, the technical skill named, a specific moment identified, and — the part most often missing — the meaning that the skill constructed at that moment.

Model response (production: a six-minute narrative podcast):

The technology. A digital audio workstation, used with a cardioid condenser microphone and a portable recorder.

The technical skill. Controlling the perceived distance of a voice from the listener by combining microphone placement at the recording stage with reverb and level automation at the mixing stage.

The moment. The narrative's turning point, at 3:40, is a phone call in which the protagonist is told that the building she has been cleaning for nine years is being sold. Before the call she is present in a large, hard room; during the call the room disappears.

How the skill constructed meaning. For the pre-call material I recorded the protagonist at roughly 40 cm from the microphone in a stairwell, which gave a natural early reflection and placed her audibly inside a big, echoing space — the building itself is a character, and the audience needed to hear its size. For the call itself I re-recorded her at about 10 cm, off-axis, with a pop filter, in a soft-furnished room, then in the workstation I removed the reverb send entirely, rolled off everything below 200 Hz to imitate a phone line, and automated her level up by 3 dB. The listener is pulled from a room they can hear the walls of to a voice with no room around it at all.

The meaning is carried by that contrast rather than by any line of dialogue. The building has been the constant acoustic backdrop of the narrative; at the instant she learns she will lose it, the audience loses it too, and the character is left with nothing behind her voice. Applying the skill at that specific moment — rather than treating reverb as a general atmosphere across the whole piece — is what turned a technical operation into a narrative one.

Common errors: naming a technology and a skill and then never reaching a specific moment; describing what a button does rather than what the audience understands as a result; choosing a skill so general ("I used editing") that no meaning can be attached to it; explaining an effect the piece has overall instead of at the named moment.

Q8. Command term — explain: a how/why chain. Four marks need all three constraint types identified against evidence in the stimulus, and one concrete, correct pre-publication change. The mark scheme rewards naming which constraint each problem belongs to.

Four problems sit in this diary entry, and they belong to different constraint types.

Legal. Two items in the entry are legal problems, not matters of taste. The busker's performance of a **well-known chart song** is a recording of someone else's copyright material; using it as the bed under the opening and closing is publication of that material, and a school podcast feed is public distribution. The crew has no licence for it. The child's forty seconds is the second: a nine-year-old cannot give consent for himself, and the crew holds no signed release from a parent or guardian, so the material has been gathered without the authority the crew's own release process is designed to establish. Mrs Petrakis's signed release covers Mrs Petrakis and nobody else.

Ethical. The plant seller asked, after recording, that his name not be used. The crew has technically complied — the script says "the plant seller" — while defeating the purpose of the request, because he is the only person at the market who sells plants and the market's own community will identify him immediately. Worse, the material is an allegation against a third party and the council. Honouring the letter of a request while breaking its substance is an ethical failure

even where nothing unlawful has occurred, and the fact that the request came after the tape was rolling does not weaken it.

Community. The crew is making a narrative *about* a community and publishing it *into* that same community — the link is going into the market’s own Facebook group. The people in the piece will read it, be recognised by their neighbours, and still be at their stalls the following Saturday. That is a constraint on construction, not merely on distribution: a piece that leaves one stallholder identifiable as the source of an allegation about another damages relationships the crew will not be there to repair.

One change the crew must make before publication. Replace the music bed. The busker’s chart song must be removed from the opening and closing and replaced either with original music the crew has made or commissioned, with a track the crew is licensed to use, or with market ambience recorded away from the busker. This is the change that is not negotiable, because publishing without a licence is unlawful regardless of how good the recording is.

Other fully creditable changes: obtain a written parent or guardian release for the grandson’s forty seconds, or cut it; and re-record or restructure the plant seller’s contribution so that he is neither named nor identifiable, or seek his agreement to be used with attribution.

Common errors: labelling every problem “unethical” without separating the legal ones; missing the child’s consent because Mrs Petrakis signed a form; accepting “the plant seller” as adequate anonymisation; naming a change that is optional (adding a disclaimer) rather than one that is required; treating community constraint as a synonym for audience.

Q9. Command term — evaluate: judge the decision against a stated intention, using evidence, and reach a verdict. Four marks require the intention, the actual effect and a judgement — a description of what was done is not an evaluation.

Model response (production: a four-minute short-form drama):

The decision. In post-production I cut the film’s final shot — a nine-second hold on the empty kitchen after the character leaves — down to two seconds.

The intention it was meant to serve. The intention set at pre-production was that the audience should be left sitting with the space rather than with the character, so that the ending read as the room outlasting her. The nine-second hold was designed to do exactly that. I shortened it because two people at the rough-cut screening said the ending “dragged”.

What it actually achieved. The shorter ending removed the drag, and the film now finished cleanly on its running time. But it also removed the effect the shot existed for. At two seconds the empty kitchen reads as a cutaway on the way to the credits; at nine it read as a held image the audience had to occupy. Three viewers of the final version described the ending as “abrupt”, and none of them mentioned the room — which is the evidence that the intention was no longer being met.

Judgement. The decision was wrong, and it was wrong in an instructive way. It solved a symptom correctly identified by the rough-cut audience — the ending felt slow — but it treated the length of the shot as the cause when the actual cause was that nothing changed inside the shot to justify its duration. A better decision, against the same feedback, would have kept the duration and given the shot an internal event: a fridge cycling off, or the light shifting. I traded the film’s stated intention for a comfort that could have been bought without it. The general lesson is that feedback is reliable about the **problem** and unreliable about the **remedy**, and that an intention set in pre-production is the thing a post-production decision has to be judged against.

Common errors: describing the decision without judging it; judging it only as “it worked well”; inventing an intention after the fact so that the decision passes; giving audience feedback with no statement of what it shows; evaluating the whole product instead of the one named decision.

Media and change — solutions

Q10. Command term — describe: give an account of the features. Three marks reward the technology named plus a genuine account of a change in consumption — where, when, how much, in what order, or alongside what else.

Model response (technology: the on-demand podcast feed on a smartphone):

The subscribable audio feed, delivered to and stored on a phone, changed the consumption of audio narrative in three connected ways. First, it detached consumption from a schedule: an episode is downloaded when it is released and played whenever the listener chooses, so the narrative no longer competes for a fixed hour. Second, it made audio narrative a **secondary-task** medium — it is consumed while commuting, walking, working or cooking, which no seated media form allows — and this in turn shapes what producers construct, because a listener whose hands and eyes are elsewhere cannot be asked to follow a visual cue or a complicated cast. Third, because the whole back catalogue sits behind the newest episode, a listener who arrives at episode 14 can begin at episode 1 and consume a serialised narrative in a compressed run, in an order and at a pace the release schedule did not set.

Common errors: naming a technology and then describing its features rather than the audience's changed behaviour; writing "people can watch anything anytime" with no mechanism; describing a change in **production** when the question asks about consumption.

Q11. *Command term — explain: a how/why chain. Four marks need at least two of the four listed changes, each with a stated consequence for how the audience interacts and engages, and — for full marks — recognition that the changes cut both ways.*

Change 2 — clip and share. Allowing a listener to take thirty seconds out of an episode and post it elsewhere as a captioned video card turns an audience member into a distributor. The interaction is no longer just with the narrative but *about* it, and it happens on platforms Tidewater does not own. Two consequences follow. For engagement, the narrative now reaches people through a fragment chosen by a listener rather than through a trailer chosen by the producer, so the audience collectively decides which thirty seconds represents the work. For construction, producers who know this will begin to build clippable moments — a self-contained thirty seconds that makes sense with no context — which changes the narrative itself, not only its promotion.

Change 3 — timestamped chapter comments. This converts a private, linear listen into a marked-up shared text. Listeners interact with each other at specific points in the narrative rather than in a general comment field at the end, so discussion attaches to the moment that caused it. The engagement is more participatory, and it is also more visible: because creators are shown which chapters attract comments and **where listeners stop**, every listener's ordinary behaviour is converted into data. The audience is simultaneously participating in the narrative and being measured by it — and the drop-off figure in particular will shape what the next episode does in its first ninety seconds.

Change 1 — synthetic-voice translation. Automatic translated versions in five languages widen who can engage at all, and because the synthetic voice is matched to the original narrator, the translated listener engages with something presented as the narrator's own performance. The "translated audio" label is doing significant work: it is the only signal distinguishing a performance from a generated reconstruction of one, and an audience that stops noticing a small label loses the ability to tell those apart.

Change 4 — Tidewater Plus. Adding a mid-roll break to the free tier while removing advertising from the paid tier makes the free listener's engagement measurably worse in order to price the upgrade. It splits one audience into two, consuming the same narrative under different conditions — one uninterrupted, one interrupted more than before.

The pattern. Each change gives the audience a new capability and takes something in return: sharing gives reach and gives away editorial control of the excerpt; commenting gives community and gives away listening data; translation gives access and blurs the line between a performance and a generated imitation of one. That trade is the characteristic shape of new media interaction, and a full answer names it.

Common errors: summarising the four changes instead of explaining their influence on interaction and engagement; treating every change as straightforwardly good for the audience; ignoring the requirement to refer to at least two changes; discussing the platform's business model with no audience behaviour attached.

Q12. *Command term — explain: a how/why chain. Five marks need a technological development, a named Australian industry or institution, a **dated** example from the last two years, and a mechanism — how the technology produced the effect.*

The development. The migration of audience attention and advertising expenditure to a small number of global digital platforms, and the platforms' consequent control over how Australian journalism reaches readers.

The industry effect, dated. On 1 March 2024 Meta announced that it would shut down the Facebook News tab in Australia and the United States and would not enter into new commercial deals for traditional news content, saying it would honour existing agreements — agreements which were largely due to expire during 2024. Those deals had been struck under the News Media Bargaining Code inserted into the *Competition and Consumer Act 2010* (Cth) in 2021. The mechanism matters: the Code works by threatening designation, which forces a platform to bargain; it cannot easily compel a platform that has withdrawn from carrying news at all. A technological development — a platform’s ability to simply de-prioritise an entire content category across a national market — therefore undid a regulatory settlement without any change in the law.

The institutional effect, dated. The response came from the Commonwealth. On 12 December 2024 the Government announced a **News Bargaining Incentive**, under which large digital platforms operating in Australia would face a charge that could be offset by entering into or renewing commercial agreements with Australian news publishers — designed so that the charge would apply even to a platform that removed news entirely, closing the exit Meta had used. That is an institution — the Commonwealth Parliament and Treasury — redesigning its instrument because a technological and commercial development had made the previous one avoidable.

The chain, stated plainly. Digital distribution moved the audience; the platforms captured the advertising that had funded newsrooms; a regulatory institution built a bargaining mechanism to redirect some of that money back; the platform withdrew from the category rather than bargain; and the institution responded by designing an instrument that does not depend on the platform’s willingness to carry news. The industry consequence sits with the publishers in between, whose revenue from those deals was not replaced during 2024.

Source: CNBC, “Facebook is getting rid of the News tab in the U.S. and Australia”, 1 March 2024 — <https://www.cnbc.com/2024/03/01/facebook-is-getting-rid-of-the-news-tab-in-the-us-and-australia.html>. Accurate as at July 2026.

Source: The New Daily, “Australia’s news bargaining incentive: the latest move against Meta”, 12 December 2024 — <https://www.thenewdaily.com.au/life/media/2024/12/12/news-bargaining-meta>. Accurate as at July 2026.

Source: Wikipedia, “News Media Bargaining Code” — https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/News_Media_Bargaining_Code. Accurate as at July 2026.

Common errors: naming a technology and then describing audience behaviour instead of industry or institutional effects; giving an undated example, or one older than the two-year window; confusing the **industry** (publishers, platforms, broadcasters) with an **institution** (a parliament, a regulator, a public broadcaster) — the question asks for both; asserting that a proposal is law when it is a proposal.

Q13. *Command term — discuss: develop the argument with evidence and reach a position. Eight marks need the issue named and dated, the instrument identified, conflicting parties, the technology’s influence traced separately to society, audiences and the individual, and an explicit position with an acknowledged remainder.*

Model response (issue: Australia’s social media minimum age):

The issue, named and dated. Since **10 December 2025**, Australians under 16 have not been permitted to hold accounts on age-restricted social media platforms. The obligation comes from the *Online Safety Amendment (Social Media Minimum Age) Act 2024* (Cth), which received Royal Assent on 10 December 2024 and commenced exactly one year later, amending the *Online Safety Act 2021* (Cth). It requires age-restricted platforms to take **reasonable steps** to prevent under-16 Australians holding accounts, with civil penalties for a corporate breach of the minimum-age obligation running to 150,000 penalty units. On 5 November 2025 the Minister for Communications identified the services to which it would apply from commencement, including Facebook, Instagram, Snapchat, TikTok, YouTube, X, Threads, Reddit and Kick. The eSafety Commissioner has not mandated a single verification technology.

The new media technology at the centre of it. Two, working against each other. The first is the social platform itself — an always-on, personalised, participatory distribution system that a young person carries in a pocket. The second is **age assurance**: the set of techniques by which a platform estimates or verifies a user’s age, whether by facial age estimation, document checking, inference from behaviour, or a third-party attestation. The Act regulates the first by mandating the second, which is why the argument is not only about children.

What is contested, and by whom. The parties do not disagree about the facts; they disagree about the trade.

Party	Interest
Young people	Connection, information, identity and community — including for those whose support networks are online rather than local
Parents and carers	A rule with force behind it, rather than a negotiation renewed at home every night
Platforms	Compliance cost, the loss of a growth audience, and a genuine reluctance to hold more identity data than they must
Every other user	The privacy cost of age assurance, which falls on adults as well, since a platform cannot verify who is under 16 without assessing everybody
Government and the eSafety Commissioner	A demonstrable reduction in harm, and a scheme that survives circumvention

Influence on society. The scheme reverses the default of the previous fifteen years. It is the first Australian law to treat access to a communication platform as something a person becomes eligible for at an age, in the way that driving and drinking are, and it shifts the burden of enforcement from parents to companies. Socially, that is a claim that the harms of these platforms to a developing person are sufficiently established to justify a blanket rule rather than a case-by-case judgement — a claim that was contested in the Senate and remains contested in the research.

Influence on audiences. For the audience as a whole, the consequence is architectural rather than symbolic. A platform cannot exclude one age band without assessing the age of every account holder, so age assurance becomes a permanent layer between all Australian users and the services they use. Audiences that were previously anonymous by default become audiences that are, to some degree, identified by default — and the data generated by that identification sits with companies that already hold a great deal of it.

Influence on the individual. For an individual under 16 the effect is not uniform. A young person with local friendships and a supportive household loses a distraction. A young person whose community is geographically dispersed — a rural teenager, a young person with a rare illness, a young person whose identity is not accepted at home — may lose the network that carried it, and the law offers no substitute. For an individual adult, the effect is a small, permanent addition of friction and a disclosure of identity to sign in.

Position. The Act is justified in its aim and unproven in its method, and both halves of that sentence should be said. The aim is defensible: the platforms were designed to maximise the attention of an audience they knew to include children, and self-regulation had a decade to address it and did not. But “reasonable steps” is defined after the fact, no verification technology has been mandated, the obligation falls on platforms rather than on users so a minor who circumvents a check breaks no law, and the privacy cost of age assurance is imposed on the entire adult population to reach a minority of it. The strongest argument on the other side — that this is the most significant privacy expansion in Australian consumer technology and that it was enacted as a child-safety measure — is not answered by the Act’s aim being good.

What remains unresolved. Three things, as at July 2026: whether the scheme measurably reduces harm rather than relocating young users to services outside the designated list; what standard of “reasonable steps” enforcement will actually settle on; and whether the identity data generated by age assurance is retained, and by whom. Those are empirical questions, and they will be answerable before they are answered.

Other fully creditable issues: the statutory cause of action for **serious invasions of privacy**, which commenced on 10 June 2025 under the *Privacy and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2024* (Cth), with exemptions including for journalism; the withdrawal in November 2024 of the *Communications Legislation Amendment (Combating Misinformation and Disinformation) Bill 2024*, which had passed the House of Representatives on 7 November 2024 but had no pathway through the Senate; or generative tools and creators’ work under the *Copyright Act 1968* (Cth).

Source: Federal Register of Legislation, Online Safety Amendment (Social Media Minimum Age) Act 2024 (Cth) — <https://www.legislation.gov.au/C2024A00127/asmade>. Accurate as at July 2026.

Source: MinterEllison, “The age of reason(able steps): Australia’s impending Social Media Minimum Age obligations” — <https://www.minterellison.com/articles/australias-impending-social-media-minimum-age-obligations>. Accurate as at July 2026.

Source: DLA Piper Privacy Matters, “Australia’s Social Media ‘Ban’ and the eSafety Commissioner’s Social Media Minimum Age Regulatory Guidance”, February 2026 — <https://privacymatters.dlapiper.com/2026/02/australias-social-media-ban-and-the-esafety-commissioners-social-media-minimum-age-regulatory-guidance/>. Accurate as at July 2026.

Source: OAIC, “Statutory tort for serious invasions of privacy” — <https://www.oaic.gov.au/privacy/your-privacy-rights/more-privacy-rights/statutory-tort-for-serious-invasions-of-privacy>. Accurate as at July 2026.

Source: JURIST, “Australia government abandons legislation requiring social media companies to regulate misinformation”, November 2024 — <https://www.jurist.org/news/2024/11/australia-government-abandons-legislation-requiring-social-media-companies-to-regulate-misinformation/>. Accurate as at July 2026.

Band descriptors (out of 8):

- **High (7–8):** the issue is named and **dated**, and the instrument (Act, code, body or company decision) is named correctly with its commencement or announcement date; the new media technology at the centre is identified precisely; society, audiences and the individual are treated **separately**, each with its own consequence; parties with genuinely conflicting interests are mapped; a position is reached that states the strongest opposing argument and concedes something to it; unresolved elements are named.
- **Mid (4–6):** a real issue from the window is identified but dated loosely (“recently”, “last year”); the instrument named without a date, or a proposal treated as law; two of society, audiences and the individual are treated and the third collapsed into another; some stakeholder awareness but no genuine conflict; a position asserted rather than argued.
- **Low (1–3):** an issue outside the two-year window, or a fact rather than a contested issue; no law, code, body or decision named; the three targets treated as one; opinion in place of evidence; no position, or a position that concedes nothing.

Common errors: choosing something that is not contested — a fact or a constraint is not an issue; using an example older than the two-year window, however well analysed; treating a **bill** as though it were a law; naming no instrument and no date; collapsing society, audiences and the individual into a single paragraph about “people”; re-using the Question 12 example, which the question forbids; reaching a position that acknowledges no cost on its own side.

End of Unit 2 Examination B solutions