

Mitchell Finnegan

Trudy Lewis

English 4995 – Honors Thesis Research Portion

13 August 2016

Parody and Media Literacy in *Nathan For You*

The premise of *Nathan For You* isn't very different from other television shows. It follows Nathan Fielder around the greater Los Angeles area as he searches for struggling businesses in need of his marketing expertise. The only problem is, Fielder doesn't exactly qualify as a marketing "expert." At least, not in the conventional sense. He relies on legal loopholes, logical fallacies and publicity stunts as the primary foundation for most of his ideas. Essentially, he starts by identifying an indisputable truth about a market segment (e.g. people share snacks when they go to the movies); then he makes a logical observation about that truth (e.g. movie theatres would make more money if customers didn't share snacks); and finally, he somehow convinces business owners to go along with an absurd scheme to exploit that truth in order to make money (e.g. install security cameras in theatres to enforce a no-sharing policy). To be clear, the no-sharing policy is an actual pitch Fielder brought to a movie theatre in one of his episodes. Some of his other ideas include "poo" flavored frozen yogurt, real-estate aimed at people who believe in ghosts and the sale of liquor to minors on a layaway plan that withholds the alcohol until they come of legal age.

In one episode from the Comedy Central series, Fielder opens with a speech explaining how some viewers criticize him for pushing businesses to take risks

without ever taking any risks himself. Nathan vehemently denies this claim and explains how tonight, in order to prove his critics wrong, he will take “a bigger risk than anyone on television has ever taken before.” In preparation for this event, Nathan explains, he has spent the last month practicing how to escape from police-grade handcuffs. Why? Because at the end of the episode, he will be handcuffed to a metal frame, where he will have ninety seconds to free himself before a robotic arm latches onto his pants and exposes him to an audience of children, officially making him a sex offender.

The craziest part about all this? It’s real. In fact, the majority of this episode follows Fielder as he prepares for the main event, calling attention to just how painfully real it is. He consults experts, from escape artists to judges – he even sits down with an ex-con to discuss what it’s like to be a sex offender in the prison system. All of this to ensure he’s designed a scenario that guarantees his conviction as a sex offender if he fails to free himself.

It would be easy to write off Fielder’s show as low-brow, to zero-in on the crass jokes and awkward moments (there are plenty) and pigeonhole it as another gross-out comedy. But this would be selling Fielder and all the other show’s creators short. While a lot of thrills from the show may seem cheap, there’s a deeper level of cultural reflection going on beneath the surface. *Nathan For You* is part of a new generation of television comedy, one steeped in digital media culture and post-modern reflexivity. In this paper, I plan to examine how contemporary television series like *Nathan For You* can use parody to help viewers better understand and navigate the rapidly shifting media landscape.

Before discussing the educational properties of poo-flavored frozen yogurt, it would help to have a basic understanding of media literacy. Media literacy deals with an individual's ability to interpret and understand different forms of media. The National Association for Media Literacy Education defines it as "the ability to encode and decode the symbols transmitted via media and the ability to synthesize, analyze and produce mediated messages," where "'Media' refers to all electronic or digital means and print or artistic visuals used to transmit messages," and "literacy" refers to "the ability to encode and decode symbols and to synthesize and analyze messages" ("Media Literacy Defined"). While that may sound tedious, it's a broad way of saying people learn to contextualize and assess all different forms of media – from smartphone ads to fashion blogs – in the same way they learn to read and interpret texts.

Many scholars and experts believe that, seeing as there are now more forms of media than ever before, the ability to decode and contextualize messages from different media is getting more and more important. The Center for Media Literacy, another organization dedicated to media literacy education, asserts that "media literacy builds an understanding of the role of media in society as well as essential skills of inquiry and self-expression necessary for citizens of a democracy," ("Media Literacy: a Definition"). It's important to note that this paper deals with media literacy in an American context and, as such, places considerable importance on the individual's ability to make well-informed decisions. In order to see how these concepts relate TV shows like *Nathan For You*, we'll need to first examine television and media scholar Jonathan Gray's book on *The Simpsons*.

In 2006, Jonathan Gray published *Watching with The Simpsons: Television, Parody, and Intertextuality*, a book that demonstrates how *The Simpsons* uses parody to incubate a sense of media literacy in audiences. In his analysis, Gray identifies advertising, news and the domesticom (domestic sitcom), as the three main areas in which *The Simpsons* uses parody to instill media literacy in the viewer. Gray positions parody as a vehicle of intertextuality that exploits general knowledge and conventions of other genres and texts in order to aid viewers' ability to contextualize and interpret them.

For example, the *Simpsons* often critiques the domesticom's cyclical story arc by having episodes climb to an impossibly zany climax only to resolve back into the quiet order that prevailed at the beginning. Oftentimes one of the characters will break the fourth wall with a remark about the inorganic absurdity of this return to normalcy as a way of calling attention to the artificiality of this generic convention, undermining much of the verisimilitude of the domesticom and similar shows. Gray argues that this is how *The Simpsons* uses parody to let viewers engage with other texts and genres and critique them at the same time. These moments instill media literacy by making audiences aware of formal boundaries, motivations and limitations in such a way that teaches them how to recognize, or read, these constructions in other media (Gray 2).

While Gray certainly wasn't the first, or last, person to write about how parody can perform these tasks, he was one of the first to argue, with considerable success, for the importance of television shows (particularly cartoons and comedy) as literary and critical texts, and to establish a clear connection between television

parody and media literacy. This paper is not written in response to so much as in conjunction with Gray's original text as an attempt to expand upon his original arguments and use them as a lens through which we may evaluate contemporary television's use of parody to instill literacy for newer, post-digital forms of media that were far less developed in 2006. In other words, this paper will use a contemporary television show, *Nathan For You*, to examine the ways television parody has responded to recent technological developments in the media landscape using a modified version of *The Simpsons'* three main targets – advertising, news media and reality television – as focal points.

While Gray's arguments still hold true, a lot has changed over the past decade in terms of the media landscape. In the last ten years, Americans have witnessed the invention of the smartphone, the rise of online streaming services and, consequently, the sudden yet steady decline of traditional media such as newspaper, magazines, radio and broadcast television. Each year, fewer and fewer Americans watch television in a traditional format while streaming and on-demand services continue to grow (Luckerson). The coming of the digital age has started to change the way we experience all media, including television. So, if television itself has changed so drastically as a medium, the ways in which its shows engage with other texts and media must have changed as well. I chose to examine *Nathan For You* because of the way its unique format allows it to critique the conventions of advertising, news media and reality television at the same time it capitalizes off of them. For the remainder of this paper, I will examine how various moments in

*Nathan For You* facilitate a process of media literacy education through a parody of common practices in these three areas.

Technically speaking, *Nathan For You* isn't just a comedy show; it's a reality show with comedic tendencies. In this way, the show is quite post-modern. It is essentially a caricature of itself – delegitimizing reality television at the same time it epitomizes it. While a lot of planning and preparation goes into each episode, Fielder and his crew can only work with what their subjects give them. In an interview with *The A.V. Club*, Fielder said “Personally, I tend to enjoy the [episodes] where something happened that I wasn't expecting and [it] threw off the story a bit, and we have to cobble it around that stuff,” (Fielder Interview). But Fielder goes to great lengths to let viewers know just how distorted this show's reality is.

In “Claw of Shame,” for instance, Nathan calls attention to the ridiculousness of the episode's premise by repeatedly reminding viewers of its artificiality. By inserting elements like an interview with an ex-con, sportscasters who announce the stunt and a video call with Fielder's parents immediately before he takes the stage, the show's creators expose many of the manufactured qualities typical to reality-television: the lack of context, the artificially heightened stakes and the arbitrarily yet clearly defined risk. He claims this stunt as proof of his personal stake in the show, but he remains painfully unaware of his argument's self-fulfilling logic. Fielder does have a lot at stake in the TV show, and he often puts himself in legally compromising situations. In fact, just a week before “Claw of Shame” aired, *Nathan For You* ran an episode where Nathan uses his own money to back a struggling burger joint's claim to have the best burger in L.A. He offers a hundred dollars to

anyone who tries a burger and says it's not the best in the city, and by the end of the episode he's given out \$6,000. While Fielder could have leveraged that moment as proof of his own stake in the show, he instead devises a stunt that takes him 90 seconds to perform and dedicates a half-hour of television to this self-centered spectacle with only a loose connection to the show's usual premise. He places the genre in a modified context that exaggerates its conventions as a way of breaking it apart.

With the genre stripped down to its parts, Fielder and his crew allow audiences to see the secret ingredient that gives reality television its addictive quality: unpredictability. As I mentioned earlier, Fielder spends a large portion of "Claw of Shame" calling attention to just how manufactured the episode is. But despite its constructed nature, the risk is still real. No matter how much Nathan prepares for the claw, the only way to find out if he'll actually succeed is to keep watching. We see this in the scene that reveals that the robotic arm they've programmed to remove Nathan's pants runs on Windows '94, calling into question the machine's reliability. By exploring all of the ways this scenario could go wrong, Fielder artificially ratchets up the tension as the show progresses and distracts us from the fact that it's all manufactured to begin with. This is how he convinces viewers to stick with him through the twenty-something minutes leading up to the actual stunt. Through all of this, Fielder educates audiences on the generic conventions of reality television, allowing them to better understand their relationships with similar shows and interpret their meanings. Pointing to the artificiality of the genre and revealing its formula informs viewers on how other

texts of the same form use the same gimmicky plot points and flashy production values to draw in their attention.

While the commentaries are myriad and complex, in a broad sense *Nathan For You* gives insight on the paradox of reality television's calculated unpredictability. Like Fielder, the show never breaks character. It never sheds the lens of reality TV and is therefore constantly engaging with the genre on a formal level. In the same way the show embeds itself in the genre it parodies, *Nathan For You* has advertising and news media woven into its core. A comedy at its heart, the series dresses itself up as a show about commerce, placing advertising and marketing culture squarely in its line of fire. But just as television shows saw a shift in form with the digital revolution, so did marketing and journalism. Where there once was a clear line between advertising and news media now lies a murky gray area full of sponsored content and product placement.

There are plenty of notable examples of the show using its unconventional structure to take jabs at traditional targets in advertising. In "Toy Company / Movie Theatre," for instance, Fielder condemns predatory marketing by directing a commercial for a toy company in which a sinister spokesman smokes a cigarette while he warns children of the president's new declaration that owning a toy called a 'Doink-It' is the only way to prove you're not a baby. While moments like this certainly deserve some consideration, this paper is more interested in the show's portrayal of contemporary advertising in conjunction with news media and how it illuminates the now-permeable boundary between the two.

Seeing as most of Nathan's ideas are designed to generate publicity for a business, it's only natural that the press should pick up on a few of his more outlandish schemes. There have been a few notable instances, though, where Nathan manipulates and exploits broadcast news media in such a way as to criticize it. In "Santa / Petting Zoo," the second episode of the series, Nathan approaches the owner of a petting zoo with the idea of creating a viral video to get free publicity for the business. To be clear, Nathan means "viral" in its correct sense; he wants to fake a scenario in which a pig swims out into a pond to save a baby goat and post a video of it to YouTube, in hopes that it will catch the attention of millions of Americans, giving the zoo a chance to insert itself into a national conversation. In order to capture this on video, Fielder has two scuba divers hold a baby goat in place as a trained pig swims toward it on a narrow path made by two sheets of clear plastic. As if this idea weren't already crazy enough, it seems even crazier when everything goes exactly according plan. Less than 24 hours after posting the video, it has already received over a million views on YouTube, and it eventually makes its way into NBC's "Today" and "Nightly News" programs, FOX News, Gawker, Time – it even makes an appearance in a Korean news broadcast.

While this isn't parody in its usual sense, *Nathan For You's* infiltration of the news cycle allows it to offer a harsh critique of 21<sup>st</sup> century news media by painting them as sensational and lazy. When asked about this incident by the *New York Times*, Kelly McBride, senior faculty for ethics, reporting and writing at the Poynter Institute, said, "It really is embarrassing for the journalists who stumbled upon this and decided to promote it or share it with their audience. It's almost a form of

malpractice,” (Itzkoff). While the creators of the show don’t have any control over how the news media responds to their video, they do have editorial control over how to depict them in the episode. So, when they assemble a montage of the video’s coverage in the press, they lay bare the ironic foolishness of pseudo-journalistic statements from people like Brian Kilmeade of “Fox & Friends,” who said, “You couldn’t do this at Warner Brothers as a cartoon and make it seem more realistic.” Simply by changing the context in which we view the newscasts and read the headlines, *Nathan For You* reveals the corruptibility of the news-cycle by exposing it as easily-manipulated, predictable and formulaic. Given the video’s initial purpose as a marketing tool, these critiques bleed over into the world of advertising as well.

Technically speaking, this isn’t so much a parody of advertising as it is a slap in its face. In terms of internet and social-media marketing, Fielder’s video does the impossible. There are textbooks upon textbooks that list his approach as among the worst when it comes to viral marketing. And again, technically speaking, they’re right. There’s no exact way to ensure a video will go viral, there are too many factors to account for. It’s just too hard to tell what will cut through all the other noise in the media environment and capture the attention of so many people. But Nathan Fielder seems to think a video of a pig rescuing a goat would have a pretty good shot, and he’s developed a pretty good track record of making headlines ever since.

While he didn’t set out with the intention of going viral, Nathan made global news again with Dumb Starbucks, a coffee shop that hijacked the Starbucks brand and added a small “dumb” to the logo in an attempt to bring in more business. Even though he says – on camera – that he hopes people will mistake Dumb Starbucks for

a real Starbucks, Fielder's primary legal protection for his shop is his claim that it's all a work of parody art. He explains that he can accept money from a customer in the same way an artist can collect donations from displaying their work at a gallery. Moreover, since the establishment is legally classified as an art gallery and not a restaurant, he doesn't have to abide by the same regulations as a real Starbucks. When asked about this by a concerned customer, Nathan explains "we don't want any of our customers to get sick, but if they do, technically that's part of the artistic experience."

Schemes like this may paint Fielder as conniving and insensitive, as a man who values the dollar above all else, or even as someone who would rather laugh at people than actually offer them assistance. But he insists there's more to it than doing something just to see if he can get away with it. In his interview with *The A.V. Club*, Nathan explains the reasoning behind a lot of his ideas:

It's a mentality. When you're thinking about things just in terms of, "If it's legal and it makes money, let's do it"—in a lot of the culture now, or from what I gauge is the culture on Wall Street these days, [the mentality] is, the only way to make money is to find a loophole that's technically legal but one step ahead of anything anyone else has thought about. They don't really think about how it's affecting the world or the moral or ethical issues with it—if it's legal and it can make money.

To be clear, Nathan said this in reference to the entire series, not just the "Dumb Starbucks" episode. While he said the show tries not to be overtly political, the creators do have a few broad notions of what it is they want to convey about society (Fielder Interview). Fielder and his teammates build the show around what they think will be funny, but they often tap into a humor that reveals a truth about

consumer culture and corporate practices, like that they may only be worried about your health to the extent they're legally responsible for it. While the example of Dumb Starbucks may not deal explicitly with the concept of media literacy, it still helps educate consumers by making them aware of the commercial impulses that govern much of the media landscape.

While Dumb Starbucks and The Petting Zoo made fools of the media, they didn't necessarily set out to do so. It wasn't long, though, before Fielder devised a plan in which he deliberately tries to exploit the news media in order to gain publicity. In "The Movement," Nathan aims to help a moving company by repositioning it as a gym that collects membership fees from people who want to move furniture as a form of alternative exercise. If an idea like this is going to get any steam behind it, Fielder believes he'll need a charismatic personality to help make his program more marketable. Enter Jack Gabarino, an unnaturally muscular man whom one critic described as "a bodybuilder who continues Nathan's track record for finding people who look like the walking embodiment of post-traumatic stress," (Alston). After one quick interview with Gabarino, Fielder signs him up as the new spokesperson for the program and uses a morbidly obese "look-alike" (who looks nothing like Gabarino) to forge before-and-after photos that support his claims of losing over 100 pounds from moving boxes and furniture.

Fielder's use of a spokesperson parodies a classic advertising approach that dates back to the 1940s, when tobacco companies started using movie stars to endorse their cigarettes (Creswell). When Nathan leverages the constructed personality and appearance of a stranger to support his ludicrous claims, he

essentially parodies the celebrity spokesperson. More specifically, though, Gabarino's personal obscurity places him in a category more alongside personalities like Billy Mays (OxiClean) and Jared Fogle (Subway), who paradoxically become famous only through the products they endorse. But it's not what Fielder says about advertising in this episode that's so brilliant; it's how he says it.

In the scene where Nathan interviews Jack for the position, viewers get to see the actual process of creating a brand ambassador, not a simulation of it. After Gabarino enters the room and shows a peculiar standoffishness, Nathan's parody begins with his tongue-in-cheek remark that "Jack said all the right things, but what I really cared about was his body," followed by a 30-second shot of the man silently flexing for his interviewer. Without getting too insulting, Gabarino doesn't possess many conventionally attractive attributes; his veiny skin looks leathery and dry, and his hairlessness lends him a vaguely reptilian quality. But the man has a ridiculous amount of muscle, so he makes the perfect candidate for Fielder's purposes. This tunnel vision on one aspect of his physical appearance not only reflects the artificiality of advertisers, it reveals how haphazardly marketers will stake a brand's reputation on the reputation of an individual. For example, while Subway executives probably couldn't have predicted Jared's pedophilic tendencies, they should have known the risk of building such a large part of their brand around an individual who they know very little about. Instead, they saw an opportunity to make money, and they took it.

The most interesting moment in the interview, however, is when Nathan walks Gabarino through the contract he'll have to sign if he wants to become their

spokesperson. When Fielder points to a clause that specifies in the event of his death, the moving company would have rights to Gabarino's name, "likeness, photographs, voice and DNA (For cloning purposes)," Jack nods his way through the whole thing, readily forfeiting all of these rights. In this sense, Fielder engages in one of the most bizarre and complex critiques of advertising's commodification of human lives. He goes out of his way to draw up one of the most transparently dehumanizing contracts imaginable and he still has no trouble finding someone to sign it. While the reflexive argument for this would be to say the scenario is clearly an exaggeration, that this kind of thing would never go on in an actual business meeting, that would ignore the complicating detail that this *is* an actual business meeting. We've already discussed how the show blurs the line between parody and self-deprecating performance art, but this is how its unique form actually lends credibility to its parody. Here, Fielder proves the existence of this absurd scenario at the same time he imagines it, preemptively defeating one of the primary arguments that could discredit him. Everything that goes on in the interview, no matter how outrageous, is the truth.

Obviously, though, the critique of advertising culture here isn't that companies want to clone you so that you live forever as a real-life brand mascot, but it does raise questions about the ethics of appropriating an individual's identity for the purposes of a brand. It acts as a cautionary sign to viewers of the dehumanizing qualities of contractual relationships, delegitimizing the image advertisers try to convey of the endorser's relationship to the product as symbiotic and organic. Furthermore, it speaks to the recent trend in advertising toward investing in "brand

ambassadors,” or popular online personalities on sites like Instagram, YouTube and Twitter who get paid to include certain products in their social media posts without having to disclose any involvement with the brand to their followers. This approach attempts to leverage respected and/or unique persons in a similar way as the celebrity spokesman approach, but with the added benefit of internet advertising’s lack of regulation.

Interestingly enough, though, Fielder steers away from the digital approach of previous schemes in favor of a more traditional one. In order to get the word out about the program, he hires a questionable ghostwriter off Craig’s List to fictionalize a book called *The Movement*, which tells the story of Gabarino’s miraculous weight loss. He plans to use the book as a promotional tool, assembling media packets and sending out press releases to local news media informing them of Jack’s unconventional exercise methods. The book ends up full of bizarre stories about “jungle children,” Jack’s childhood friendship with Steve Jobs and countless other incoherent narratives that do more to harm the credibility of the book’s claims than back them up. But that doesn’t stop one of the most popular morning talk shows in the state from booking Gabarino on their show to talk about *The Movement*.

This is where the main target of the episode’s parody shifts away from advertising and more toward news media. As Jack makes his way around the daytime television circuit, squatting boxes full of books and lugging couches alongside news anchors and talk-show hosts, it becomes more and more clear that Nathan Fielder has, once again, proved himself a mad genius and exposed the news media as incompetent sensationalists. . Virtually none of the journalists who talk

with Jack shows any sign of having read his book, and each one seems more willing than the last to accept his fantastic anecdotes as fact. In doing this, they're providing a platform for Nathan's business to trick viewers into paying a moving company to let them work. But more importantly, they reveal a lack of concern for their own audiences, failing to recognize not only the incredibility of Gabarino and his book, but also the ethical dilemma of suggesting manual labor as a quick fix for obesity.

This sheds light on the current media environment for *Nathan For You's* viewers. It reveals how, especially now that there are so many other media outlets to compete with, broadcast journalism has taken a turn toward the sensational as a means of audience retention. Important to note here, Nathan did surprisingly little to get the ball rolling on this idea. While he does openly push the lie that moving furniture promotes rapid weight loss and muscle gain, he's not very deceitful in this episode; The book makes no sense, the before-and-after photos are clear forgeries – even the fundamental idea of the campaign is so absurd that he can't expect anyone to actually believe it. Somehow, though, they do. And, once again, everything goes according to Fielder's plan.

The takeaway from moments like these isn't that they often occur exactly in the same way in the business world as they do in the show, but rather that these types of things could happen, that some people really do only care about money and that consumers should be wary of even the most elaborate of hoaxes and schemes in a when people can be convinced to pay money to work for a moving company. Through all of this, *Nathan for You* lets audiences see just how destabilized their media environment has become in the post-digital era. Fielder's show gets a lot of

laughs, but it also raises a lot of valuable questions – in a world where advertising permeates a vast media landscape, where reality television is anything but real and not even the neighborhood news station does its homework anymore, how does someone make sense of it all? By taking audiences with him on these borderline surreal conquests, Nathan taps into a critical form of comedy that not only informs viewers on how to interpret different media, but exposes some truths about human nature as well. In his interview with the *A.V. Club*, Fielder said:

“I do think there is this sense for people in this situation—if you’re putting yourself in that mindset of someone who’s just out there to make money and doesn’t care about [ethics], at the end of the day they’re probably doing it because they have some vague idea that it’s going to bring them closer to people, or give them the life they want. In the show, I try to [convey] that general sense that yes, you’re talking business with people, but there’s this need for connection that goes beyond what people are saying.

Over three decades after *The Simpsons* broke onto the primetime scene, *Nathan For You* harnesses a brand new form of comedy that makes similar use of parody as a means of instilling media literacy in audiences. While *The Simpsons* offered a disruptively humorous take on news media, advertising and generic television in its earlier run, *Nathan For You* serves as a more current example of how a television show can distort the boundaries of genre and use parody to reveal valuable truths about the construction of contemporary media. The show’s unconventional form allows it to explore the murky ties between commercial and journalistic media as it constantly lampoons the paradoxes of reality television, offering valuable insights on how to better contextualize the institutions it mocks. While it may seem opportunistic and crass on its surface, *Nathan for You* demonstrates how comedy, particularly television comedy and parody, can engage

with other media and texts on a critical level and help modern audiences develop  
media literacy

## Works Cited

- Alston, Joshua. "In "The Movement," Nathan Fielder Continues His Journey down the Left-hand Path." *The A.V. Club*. Onion Inc., 30 Oct. 2015. Web. 12 May 2016.
- Creswell, Julie. "Nothing Sells Like Celebrity." *The New York Times*. The New York Times, 21 June 2008. Web. 12 May 2016.
- Fielder, Nathan. "The Claw of Shame." *Nathan For You*. Comedy Central. New York, New York, 11 Apr. 2013. Television.
- Fielder, Nathan. "Dumb Starbucks." *Nathan For You*. Comedy Central. New York, New York, 29 July 2014. Television.
- Fielder, Nathan. Interview by John Teti and Bonney Teti. *The A.V. Club*. Onion Inc., 15 Oct. 2015. Web. 12 May 2016.
- Fielder, Nathan. "The Movement." *Nathan For You*. Comedy Central. New York, New York, 29 Oct. 2015. Television.
- Fielder, Nathan. "Santa / Petting Zoo." *Nathan For You*. Comedy Central. New York, New York, 7 Mar. 2013. Television.
- Fielder, Nathan. "Toy Company / Movie Theatre." *Nathan For You*. Comedy Central. New York, New York, 19 Aug. 2014. Television.
- Gray, Jonathan. *Watching with the Simpsons: Television, Parody, and Intertextuality*. New York: Routledge, 2006. Print.
- Itzkoff, Dave. "Really Cute, but Totally Faked." *The New York Times*. The New York Times, 26 Feb. 2013. Web. 12 May 2016.
- Luckerson, Victor. "Here's Proof Television Is Slowly Dying." *Time*. Time Inc., 3 Dec. 2014. Web. 12 May 2016.

"Media Literacy: A Definition and More." *Center for Media Literacy*. Center for Media Literacy, n.d. Web. 12 May 2016.

"Media Literacy Defined." *National Association for Media Literacy Education*. National Association for Media Literacy, 06 Apr. 2010. Web. 12 May 2016.