

## Introduction to the candidate evidence

This candidate evidence was generated in response to the Role of Media question in the 2018 question paper. However, to illustrate the standard required for the revised course assessment for session 2019/20 onwards it has been marked in line with the new specimen marking instructions. The original question that candidates answered appears below but it has been laid out in the revised format.

### 2018 Role of Media question in session 2019/20 task layout

**MARKS**

#### The role of media

It could be argued that the production of media content is motivated by specific purposes such as profit. However, there can be other motivations such as promotion and/or public service.

Discuss this with reference to media content you have studied.

In your response you must discuss the point of view referenced above by:

- giving detailed information or ideas about the role(s) of media referenced above
- giving specific examples from media content which illustrate the information/ideas and your discussion
- commenting on these examples and relating these to your discussion
- drawing at least one conclusion which provides judgement in relation to the question.

**20**

## Candidate A evidence

2	<p>There are grounds for an argument that ^ media content is often created with a specific purpose. Dove's advert 'one caught' and Always advert 'like a girl' could claim that they intend to perform a public service by informing audiences on the dangers of the beauty industry and its affects on girls, and the affects of sexism in language. However, <del>this</del> their true purpose is to make a <del>product</del> profit by selling their products, and promoting their brand. This can be argued as they're companies in a capitalise society and doing a public service is really a side affect of their marketing scheme.</p>	
	<p>Always could claim that their advert 'like a girl's' purpose is to perform a public service by informing audiences on the negative</p>	

effects of using sexist language, such as "like a girl." In the advert, adults are asked to do tasks 'like a girl,' such as 'running like a girl'; they act as though falling over and generally fail at their tasks. Little girls are asked the same questions, they wholeheartedly try at their tasks as they're clearly not aware of the implications of the phrase. The adults are shown the little girls' <sup>reactions</sup> ~~reactions~~ and asked if they'd like to try again - they do, performing the tasks to the best of their ability. This advert performs a public service as in seeing the difference in reactions adults, and by extension the watching audience are forced to question why they believe "like a girl = negative." They are ignorant about sexism in their language which they may not have known.

The advert informs the audience as clearly  
 the phrase means something negative to  
 the adults, as they're clearly experienced  
 in sexism. However, these little girls haven't  
 had such experiences and still believe  
 in themselves. This shames and informs  
 audiences as it's clear that using  
 phrases like 'like a girl' can turn  
 girls into women who no longer believe  
 in themselves and see themselves  
 as weak. This educates viewers not  
 to use the phrase due to its  
 demeaning effects. <sup>As it can take away girls confidence</sup> Always could  
 claim that intent to help stem  
 from being a puberty related  
 conspiracy, a time when girls lose  
 their confidence.

However, arguably, the true purpose

of Always ad is to create a profit,  
partly by promoting the brand.  
The advert ~~say~~ does this by creating  
a positive and inspirational mood  
as they use an ending message  
of girls succeeding at their tasks to  
suggest that 'girls can do anything'.  
They appear like a positive brand  
and truly believe in women and  
want to help fight sexism, such as  
they have a link on their  
website for a fund to do this.  
This suggests to female audiences  
that Always are better than  
other brands as they're feminist  
and allies of women, and  
inspirational. Women will look  
favorably on the company  
and therefore buy their products.

as an act of solidarity. This generates a profit, which is their intended purpose. 'Public service' is a side effect of their feminist marketing scheme.

Dove could claim that the purpose of their advert 'Onslaught' is to perform a public service by informing audiences of the dangerous effects of the beauty industry on young girls. They do this through creation of a <sup>narrative</sup> ~~story~~ suggesting a dangerous cycle.

In the advert a little innocent looking girl starts off at the audience - the lyrics 'Here it comes' repeat suggesting something bad is about to start.

In stage one there are adverts featuring skinny women in revealing clothes that appear to glamorise and idealise a 'thin' look. In stage 2, products for slimming are shown in ads - it's suggested people buy into this to achieve the 'thin' look. Stage 3 is a time lapse of a woman on a scale, as she diets her weight goes up and down - she's shown vomiting, to suggest she has developed an eating disorder in a progression of her attempt to be thin. Then in stage 4 women are shown having plastic surgery their faces drastically change - this is the final and most extreme stage.

~~This program is public service  
informing the~~

This performs a public service by educating the public on how what at first might seem like harmless beauty advertising can change into extreme problems like plastic surgery and eating disorders which threaten hair and eyes. The girl is shown at the end looking scared in a group - this suggests audiences should be wary as this may happen to her; and girls everywhere. The advert is easily memorable due to its negative style and song, they'll likely remember to warn their daughters of the dangers as the ad intends.

However, arguably, the true purpose of this is Dove's advert



is to generate a profit (partly done through promoting the brand.)

They further carry audiences of the objects / of the beauty industry - "here it comes" suggests that the dangers are inescapable. They then immediately act like they, Dior, are the solution.

Their logo appears and a link to their self-esteem fund and they 'campaign for real beauty'. This causes them to appear like a positive, feminist brand, who hope to help women ~~beating~~ promoting their brand. They act as though they are going to help fight the evils of the other beauty companies who don't champion the rights of women.

They hope to appear like the better, feminist alternative so that women vote on them favourably and therefore buy their products in an attempt to fight the bad beauty companies. By using a feminist message they therefore generate a profit, their true purpose - this is clear as they've continued such advertising for this day.

In conclusion, the true intended purpose of these adverts was to generate a profit - they were not motivated by the need to do a public service as they are brands / companies in a capitalist society which surely must intend to

to sell their products and make a profit. They do perform a public service - yet this is all part of their "jargonist" marketing scheme to educate and seem like allies in the fight against bad capitalist sexist businesses, in the hopes of generating a profit. This is clear as it's a popular marketing scheme that they've continued to use to this day therefore it must generate a profit - such as 'Always' 'pads for all shapes'. However, I feel that if they thought they could make more profit from using another method, I don't doubt they would do so.

## Candidate B evidence

QUESTION	70
2. a) b)	<p>The 2017 Superbowl was home to many adverts with political undertones to go against the travel ban imposed by President Trump earlier that year. It can cost a company \$5million for a 30 ad slot and they are aware that over 100 million viewers watch it each year. Ads with these said undertones were Coca-Cola's "It's Beautiful", Airbnb's "We Accept" &amp; Budweiser's "Born the Hard Way" which can be argued that their sole purpose was to meet a profit or promote their company's values.</p> <p>* This banned Muslims from 7 <del>countries</del> muslim countries entering the USA and banned Christians entering.</p> <p>Coca-Cola's "It's Beautiful" is an ad that tried to profit off of their advertisement. They did this by encouraging brand loyalty and showing their drink is for everyone by showing the many cultures within America enjoying their drink like people who are Jewish, Asian, Caucasian and even cowboys. They also use product placement by using shots where the logo for Cola is in clear view to show who made the drink as well as <del>the</del> made sure the bottles looked enticing by having</p>

them be ice cold and frosted. By doing this they could attract people to the product as well as show that the drink they produce is for everyone in the USA, not just white Americans who support Trump. People will then feel as if they can trust Cola and will buy the product to support their views hence turning a profit.

The ad also promotes the idea that America is beautiful by having the various ~~scenic~~ stunning views of landscapes in the country. This was also edited with shots of other cultures in America to show the company's support for the multiculturalism in the USA as it also makes the country beautiful. This is further anchored by the use of the patriotic song "America the Beautiful" sung in 8 different languages by various voices to show that America is a melting pot of cultures and they also add to the beauty of the USA. Therefore, a political statement is made

about Trump's policies as they are showing everything he is against ~~as~~ he banned Muslims entering the USA for 90 days from 7 predominantly Muslim countries. They are against this and it can be argued they raised the ad with the price tag of \$10 million to get across their values, which they later denied to be a political statement.

Airbnb's "We Accept" is a similar ad, they also tried to turn a profit by also encouraging brand loyalty as they don't discriminate against their guests. They show a montage of various people of all races, genders, ages, religions etc. to show they accept any of the above to stay with them, unlike Trump who banned people from "his" country. At the end of the ad their logo is displayed with #weaccept to generate interest online so people will talk about them and may even book a holiday with them which was the goal. They want people to stay

with them and they cleverly did this by meeting the need to be entertained as they know people don't share the same mindset as the president so they'll want to support a brand by having seemingly the same mindset as them. This way they feel included and turn a profit.

Airbnb also promotes the idea that everyone should be accepted regardless of "who [they] are or where [they're] from" and promote the idea their brand is a strong community full of acceptance. They do this by using personal pronouns like "you" and "we" as a direct mode of address to make it feel like the ad is specifically targeted to the person watching. They also create the sense that they're honest as the montage ~~includes~~ <sup>is made</sup> of solely close-ups to show the blank facial expressions on the employees in the ad and this connotes honesty as their faces aren't displaying

any harsh emotion; we get a sense of the truth behind their words. It can be argued that they are making a political statement as any one can stay with them globally unlike Trump and the CEO came out and said they felt passionately about the issues. They gave rooms out to those who needed them if they were effected by the ban and stranded unable to get on their flight. However, Airbnb had a scandal a while before which shows included their hosts not allowing people of races, religions or sexualities they were against stay with them which goes against the company's policy. This ad aired at the Super Bowl was one that was a repurposed version of the ad they put out to dispell the rumours and scandal. Doing this makes their honesty now seem false alongwith their purpose and begs the question, are they really any better than Trump? It seems as if they were trying to



make up for their own mistakes by placing the focus on their President, even though they did also discriminate like he is.

In conclusion, these advertisements were promoting ideas but ultimately were trying to turn a profit just like all pieces of media try to. They were using these values to get the audience to trust in them to then ~~use~~ adapt the behaviour to go out and buy their product which would then turn them a profit. All companies want to profit off of what they release and the \$5million 30second ad slot at the Superbowl isn't cheap, they clearly wanted to make back what they earned and then some. This way they can continue to make more ads and further profit off of those. Therefore, media content is produced with the motivation to seek the purpose of profit.

## Candidate C evidence

I, Daniel Blake is a film that is primarily motivated by informing and by public service. With secondary purpose of entertainment and profit. The profit motive is put aside in general as the director Ken Loach and writer Paul Laverty tend to make socially conscious and politically charged films that don't generally appeal to a mainstream audience, therefore they could potentially make more profit if they did, this shows that this is not their main motive.

A role of the media is to entertain. This is done by engaging the audience emotionally and attempting to fulfil the preferred reading of a particular emotion they are trying to portray in a particular scene or throughout the whole film. This can be done through the representation of a

character as likable and interesting, it is hard to maintain an entertaining piece of media with a one dimensional character. Producers often put in several different characters of different demographics in order to entertain a wider TA. However, this can also be done in order to profit as a wider TA will of course mean more people will come and see the film.

Daniel Blake is a character that entertains people with his sense of humour and caring attitude. This humour is prevalent right from the start when he is speaking to the 'healthcare professional', for example, when asked if he has uncontrollable bowel movements when she is asking about a heart attack he responds – 'me arse works a dream now can we talk about my heart' using a deadpan and mocking delivery. This immediately cements him as a likable character even before you can see his face, as this scene is just a blank screen with credits and audio. The introduction of the characters China bring in a younger and ethnically diverse TA and also entertain the audience by giving an alternative to Dan's personality, for example with China's playful attitude, shown when he pretended to throw the bin bag at Dan and when he got very excited about the new shoes in his flat. It could be argued that these characters are brought in with a profit motive simply to expand the TA. However, given Loach and Laverty's track record, it is more feasible that these characters are brought in to entertain a different TA with the ultimate purpose of informing about the different groups of people affected by poverty.

A profit motive a media production can have is by trying to gain maximum exposure. This can be in a number of ways. One is by creating a controversial film which is likely to get analysed politically. This can be done by exposing things done by a government, or going far left or right of centre on the political spectrum. This will make more people watch it, whether agreeing or not, just out of curiosity. Another way is releasing a film right before a film festival or event, this means it has the chance to win awards which means more people will notice and watch it. Albeit, this could also feed into the purpose of public service if the producers believe their content does that. If this is the case, the producers will want to gain as much publicity as possible.

IDB was very politically explosive as it showed the dire effects that Tory cuts on the benefit system have on people. An example being when Katie was in the food bank and opened up the can of beans and ate it straight. This shows the desperation of poverty in the UK. This was also shown with the shot outside the foodbank, which had a huge line. Shots like this caused a political debate with much criticism from the right wing about how it is unrealistic. Toby Young, a daily mail columnist, called the film 'a romance of benefit street', a show which depicts people on benefits as lazy scroungers. The film was also brought up in parliament with many Tories claiming it was an exaggeration. It can be argued that the political controversy was a marketing technique by Loach and Laverty, albeit, this is very unlikely as it was based on true stories Laverty researched. For example, the beans in the foodbank scene was inspired by a woman Laverty met in a foodbank in Glasgow. The story of Daniels character was from research Laverty did into a man in Edinburgh who had cancer and was made to look for work in order to receive benefits, as he was deemed 'fit for work' by a decision maker. He died of the cancer. This research shows that the political controversy does not come from the film but from Tories trying to cover up their system of murder. The films publicity did a public service as it informed people about the brutal reality people face on the breadline in Britain. However, the film was released just before the Cannes Film Festival and subsequently won an award, this may have had a profit motive due to the prestige and publicity this brings.

Another purpose can be to persuade, this can be done by breaking down stereotypes. This can be done by representing characters in a film differently than they would be usually in the media. For example, the media often shows people who are on benefits as lazy scroungers and as thieves from the state. Despite this, only 0.6% of benefits are fraudulently claimed, a figure dwarfed by the

number of unclaimed benefits. A film that does not represent people on benefits like this would be breaking down a stereotype. This links into the purpose of informing as well as it does lets people know that the media narrative of benefit seekers is a false one.

IDB completely breaks down the stereotype of benefit seekers as lazy scroungers. This is shown in the shot when Daniel is at the doctors and asks when he can go back to work, he seems upset when told it won't be for a while. There are several shots of him working as a carpenter at home for leisure, showing his genuine want for work. Katie is also a more realistic benefit claimant than that that is shown in most media. She reveals in a shot in her house with Dan that she intends to go back to Open University and gain an education. The reason this is primarily a purpose to persuade is because the media narrative many people already have engrained in their heads. After this, it can continue to inform more that the benefit scrounger narrative is fake.

Overall, it is clear that Loach and Laverty did not have a primary intention of profiting with their main motive being to inform about the struggles of poverty and the benefit system and to provide a public service which is to show the unsympathetic nature of the beaurcartic class.

## Candidate D evidence

2a) b)	<p>IN the newspaper article "Never mind Brexit, who won legs-it?" It is clear that this was written to promote both Sarah Vine and The Daily Mail. The article was written by Sarah Vine and talks about how Theresa May is better than Nicola Sturgeon politically but based on their looks. Vine has written this to promote her own name. She knew that creating an outrageous article it would strike up controversy and get people talking about her no matter if what they were saying was bad, they were still learning about who she is. If people read this and disagreed with what she was saying it could lead them to bad mouthing her to others.</p>	
-----------	---	--

which might intrigue people to see what she has written. However if they agreed then it could influence them to read other articles of news in the future therefore gaining her viewership in the future.

- She also used this as a way to promote The Daily Mail. Lord Rothermere, owner of the Daily Mail, allowed me to ~~rig~~ write this as he is bias towards May but also because it would get them more readers. The article caused so much commotion that people who perhaps don't usually buy their newspaper were buying it to see what everyone was talking about. But because people had made a purchase on the paper it

QUESTION	ANSWER
	<p>made them flick through the rest of the newspapers. If someone found an article that really interested them then it might cause them to make a repeat purchase to read more of their articles.</p> <p>- The article is also used as a method of promoting Theresa May.</p> <p>Sarah Vine states that May is "Reliable, measured, considerate and cautious." whereas if you support Sturgeon it is "a dangerous leap into the unknown... could all too easily lead to a lifetime of regrets."</p> <p>May insinuates that if you choose to support Sturgeon that you will regret it for the rest of your life.</p> <p>put <del>it</del> <sup>siding</sup> <del>you</del> <del>sideing</del> with May is the obvious choice because she looks</p>

better here. Vine picks out everything that could ever be possibly wrong in the picture of ~~the~~ Sturgeon and May and carefully lifts useless things that will promote May in a good light but will start to make you doubt Sturgeon as she has all of these 'flaws'. For example, Vine talks about Mays fingers being "Elegant with their classic red." yet Sturgeon's "right thumb is at an awkward angle." All of these qualities ~~are~~ are things no reader will have noticed if Vine hadn't written about them. However, Vines method could potentially have failed ~~as~~ as The Limited Effects Theory, created

by Paul Laserfeld states that only a small minority of people are ~~affected~~ ~~psychology~~ manipulated by the media and that <sup>it is</sup> those who are socially isolated or most ~~of~~ adults already have their own opinions about politics without the media's help as most people are affected through friends and family.

- One motivation of the articles is to provide a public service.

If the article had been just stuffed full with facts and figures about politics then people might have found it dull and those who don't have an opinion on politics wouldn't have read it but this article,



QUESTION	M
<p>provides readers with enjoyment and debate. It gives people someone to discuss in depth and even perhaps argue about. It gives them <del>the</del> an audience. Something different from the stereotypical article that states the news or what was <del>being</del> discussed at the meeting.</p>	
<p>- <del>crossed out text</del> vine has assumed that the majority of her audience are not only right wing but are English. She says "her smile as warm and welcoming as Loch Lomond on a winters days". Here she not only insults <del>the</del> Nicola Sturgeon but the whole of Scotland. She intended on providing those in English <sup>and</sup> with some comedy which shows that Scotland</p>	

QUESTION	MARKS
<p>and England are not the best of friends. The meeting <sup>informs</sup> <del>the</del> the public that they need to co-operate more.</p>	
<p>- Class dominant theory suggests that the media is controlled by a certain group within society who decide what is written and what is not presented which actually dictates what the readers see and hear. In this article Lord Rothemere decides what is written and that is why he let Vnie write this because he knew she'd add her own twist to it. Rothemere backs May and is extremely right <del>ing</del> wing and that is why he has let an article be written that</p>	

only shows ~~the~~ May in a good light.

- Sarah Vine has been allowed to base the entire article off of appearance rather than political views which would never have happened if it was an article about two men. Vine ~~says~~ calls Sturgeons outfit "a natty blue suit" yet May is wearing "a stylish navy jacket" that makes her look "statemwomen like" Both women are dressed similar so ~~they~~ Sarah Vine really has no leg to stand on here yet somehow manages to compare ~~the~~ <sup>h</sup> both women and is ~~is~~ psychologically imbedding doubt into the minds of the reader without them knowing. They will just see a list of negative

ESTION

Comments such as "her undeniably more shapely shanks, were all together more flirty." and begin to question whether or not she is right.

- Culturalist theory suggests that only a small elite group have the ability to chose what to ~~write~~ write. The tones get to force their own opinions onto the reader because Lord Rothermere himself is a Tory. Vine has written about Sturgeons high heel and ~~talks~~ <sup>talks</sup> ~~is~~ about it as if the shoe can manipulate people and mean anything else other than support for her feet.

"Her Stiletto not quite dangling off her foot, but could be 'come succumb to my revolution any

QUESTION	MARKS
<p>allure:" Here vine tries to say that Sturgeon is trying to manipulate people into taking her side by not quite having her shoe on properly which makes her look flirtacious, and unprofessional. It is insinuating that Sturgeon is a tease and is playing people to get their attention which makes it seem as if that's what her political stand point will be like as well.</p> <p>Vine uses this article as a way of informing the public about what vine is up to, where she is at and that this meeting between May and Sturgeon took place. It provides this public service by <del>keeping</del> keeping us up to date on her activity and</p>	

Whereabouts so people don't need
to watch the news or hunt for
this information on their own.