**MS-M18**

***Innovations in Journalism***

**Department of Media and Communication**

**Semester 2, 2024-25**

**Module coordinator: Dr Ceri Hughes, ceri.hughes**[**@swansea.ac.uk**](mailto:rhys.jones@swansea.ac.uk) **Office: Digital Technium, room 102**

**Office hours (TB2):**  
**Tuesdays 12-1pm and Thursday 2-3pm (Digital Technium 102/ Zoom)**

“Whatever may be the limitations which trammel inquiry elsewhere we believe the great state University of Wisconsin should ever encourage that continual and fearless sifting and winnowing by which alone the truth can be found.”

# Module Coordinator Availability

My student support hours (when I will be available in one form or another) are [**Tuesdays 12-1pm**](https://swanseauniversity.zoom.us/j/99353704513?pwd=T7gJLtNsGc6ehUzw1NdluWwCZobFPj.1) **and** [**Thursdays 2-3pm**](https://swanseauniversity.zoom.us/j/96793230275?pwd=TihzRboUab8kSY1eaRf5cbSWztXSxs.1)**. Zoom available on the hyperlinks. I may have to do some student support hours on Zoom.**

You’re welcome to send me email at [ceri.hughes@swansea.ac.uk](mailto:ceri.hughes@swansea.ac.uk). I try to answer all emails as soon as possible. University guidelines state that you should expect a reply to an email within two to three working days (my working day runs from 8:30am-4:30pm, Monday to Friday. I do not work weekends. I do fun stuff. That fun stuff does not usually include checking work emails.

**Contact Information**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Module Code/Name | MS-M18 | Level  Credits | 7  20 |
| Coordinator | Dr Ceri Hughes | Room Number | Digital Technium 102 |
| Lecturers | Dr Ceri Hughes |  | [Ceri.Hughes@swansea.ac.uk](mailto:Ceri.Hughes@swansea.ac.uk) |
| Teaching | Lectures | Assessment | Analytical Report (50%)  Fact-checking article and reflection (50%) |

**Teaching schedule for this module**

The face-to-face teaching for this module will usually be lectures on Thursday 3-5pm, DT207.

Alternative slots for teaching are Mondays 12-2, Glyndwr A and Wednesdays 9-11 DT103. Please note: there will only be one lecture each week. The alternative slots are there as backups should I not be able to make the Thursday one – this is due to medical treatment and appointments which may clash with class time.

I will update the times and venues on Canvas asap after I know but be sure to check regularly the details for each week.

**Learning and teaching information**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Course description and aims** | Journalism is changing. Journalists need to change. Journalists no longer need to just meet the deadline of the presses running but write, tweet, edit, film to multiple deadlines through the day. This module reflects on some of these recent developments to the practice of journalism and provides theoretical analysis of what these developments may mean for those practicing journalism and those consuming journalism.  Students will examine how developments such as social media impact on production and consumption of journalism, how newer forms of journalism such as advocacy journalism, citizen journalism and fact-checking journalism impacts society. And how new tech such as augmented and virtual reality and drones are being incorporated.  One recent innovation in journalism is fact-checking as seen on websites such as PolitiFact, Full Fact and BBC Reality Check. This form of journalism examines claims made by prominent members of society and often makes judgements as to the veracity of the claim. Students will spend the last weeks of the course producing journalism copy in the form of a fact-check.  This module aims to:  • Enable students to have critical awareness of newer innovations in journalism  • Enable students to critically evaluate theoretical concepts in relation to these developments  • Empower students to critically assess these newer forms of journalism which they may practice in future careers  • Teach students to undertake fact-checking journalism and evaluate this form  • Work in concert with practice-based courses teaching some of the new innovations in journalism |
| **Learning outcomes** | On completion of this module students should be able to:   * Critically analyse new innovations in the practice of journalism * Apply academic scholarship to understand the theoretical underpinnings of these developments * Critically assess the role of these developments on individuals and society * Demonstrate advanced practice in creating a newer form of journalism (fact-checking) and apply critical analysis to an interrogation of this practice |

**Teaching**

The teaching for this module during the first semester consists of the lectures noted below.

Please note that the days and time are subject to change.

**Timetable**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Wk** | **Date** | **Subject** |
| 1 – DT207 | **Jan 30th** | **What is journalism** – a recap. |
| 2 – Glyndwr A | **Feb 3rd – NOTE day/venue change** | **Alternative Journalism** - what role media such as The Canary, Another Angry Voice and Guido Fawkes play in the information ecology. |
| 3 – DT207 | **Feb 13th** | **Data Journalism** - how journalists incorporate data into stories and tell their stories using data and data visualization. |
| 4 – Glyndwr A | **Feb 17th**  **NOTE day/venue change** | **Solutions Journalism** - how can journalists do more than report on something like a war or famine? Can they play a part in stopping the war or famine? Or helping ensure another one does not happen. |
| 5 – DT207 | **Feb 27th** | **Drone Journalism –** how this technological development has enabled stories to be told from a new perspective and what this means. |
| 6 | **Mar 6th** | **Study Week** |
| 7 – DT207 | **Mar 13th** | **Social Media and Journalism –** how journalists use social media as a source, platform and engagement and performance metric. |
| 8 – DT207 | **Mar 20th** | **Advocacy and activism journalism –** how organisations use journalists and journalistic techniques to further their cause. |
| 9 – DT207 | **Mar 27th** | **Immersive Journalism –** what are the potential implications now, and future uses for this tech in relaying the news? |
| 10 – DT207 | **Apr 3rd** | **Fact-Checking Journalism –** how journalists can tell us who is lying and who is telling the truth, and whether they should be doing that. |
| 11 – DT207 | **Apr 10th** | **Fact-Checking Workshop** |

**Introduction**

In 1127, Galbert of Bruges wrote this:

“And it should be known that I, Galbert, a notary, though I had no suitable place for writing, set down on tablets a summary of events... and in the midst of so much danger by night and conflict by day. I had to wait for moments of peace during the night or day to set in order the present account of events as they happened, and in this way, though in great straits, I transcribed for the faithful what you see and read."

Journalism has been around for a long time.

It has always had to change form, change focus and change purpose. Paradoxically it has also always remained consistent. Its job is to inform. Its job is to entertain. Its job is to help people navigate society. All of these are true and false in different ways.

In this module we will be looking at the latest sets of innovations which journalists which journalists have recently adopted and/or developed.

To start we will have a recap about what journalism is – something very obvious and well known to some of you reading this, but perhaps a little less clear to others.

We will take a look at Alternative Online Political Media, examining what outlets such as *Guido Fawkes, The Canary* and *Conservative Woman* have to say.

Next, we look at the use of data within journalism, and yes sorry we’re going to do a (very brief and simple) bit of maths.

We will have a look at how journalism can do more than report on what is wrong with the world but can report on what is being done to fix what is wrong. It does not have to be “if it bleeds it leads”, it can include looking for ways of stemming or stopping the cut from happening.

We will enjoy a guest lecture from my colleague Nick Ridd who will be giving us his expertise on how drones are used in journalism (insert gag here about droning on)

You’ll probably need a breather by this point, so we’ll call it reading week/student week/ study week / definitely not just a week off though…

Social media –I guess we have to talk about that as it might just catch on. We will look at how journalists use it, how it informs and shapes reporting and the downsides of this.

Time for another guest lecture I think. We will be joined this week by Dr Jeff Tischauser who is a Senior Researcher with the Southern Poverty Law Center. He writes about the far-right and his work in exposing those in positions of power with far-right views – essentially, he is a Nazi hunter.

We have a nice new and shiny Virtual Reality lab if it is free, we’ll head there to experience some immersive journalism using the Meta Quest headsets.

For the last two weeks we will just be chilling out with the free pizza provided and playing with puppies in the lecture hall. But you may want to fact-check that last sentence. Luckily, you will be able to do that as we will spend these two weeks looking at fact-checking, with week two being a workshop to help with the fact-checking assignment.

Come with an open enquiring mind. Ask questions. Often. Let’s talk through some of the things we are covering. Honestly, it’s more fun that way. I get bored of my own voice, so I want to hear from you all. Some of you probably work (or have worked) as journalists and have experience with some of the things we are discussing. Share with the class. I can learn from you too. I want to learn from you, and I want the class to learn from each other.

And let’s enjoy it. 😊

**The Module Week by Week**

**All the readings are uploaded to the relevant weeks on Canvas. Check the details below for which readings are key, and which recommended. There are also some additional useful URLs below.**

**Week 1: Introduction to the module and what is journalism – a recap.**

**Key reading**

Philips, A. (2015) Journalism in Context: Practice and theory for the Digital Age. London: Routledge. Chapter 1 ‘News Defined’.

Kulkarni, S. Thomas, R. Komowski, M. Lewis, J. (2022) ‘Innovating Online Journalism: New Ways of Storytelling’ *Journalism Practice.* <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/17512786.2021.2020675?needAccess=true>

Harcup, T, (2015) *Journalism Principles and Practice.* London: Sage. Chapter 9 ‘Writing the News’.

**Background reading**

Curran, J. Seaton, J. (2014) Power Without Responsibility: Press, Broadcasting and the Internet in Britain. London: Routledge

Dahlgren, P. Sparks, C. (1993) Communication and Citizenship: Journalism and the Public Sphere. Hoboken: Routledge.

Wahl-Jorgensen, K & Hanitzsch, T. (eds) The handbook of journalism studies.

**Week 2: Alternative Online Political Media**

**Key reading:**

Cushion, S., McDowell-Naylor, D., & Thomas, R. (2021). Why national media systems matter: A longitudinal analysis of how UK left-wing and right-wing alternative media critique mainstream media (2015–2018). *Journalism Studies*, *22*(5), 633-652.

McDowell-Naylor, D., Cushion, S., & Thomas, R. (2023). A typology of alternative online political media in the United Kingdom: A longitudinal content analysis (2015–2018). *Journalism*, *24*(1), 41–61. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14648849211059585>

Strömbäck, J. (2023). Political Alternative Media as a Democratic Challenge. *Digital Journalism*, 1-8.

**Background reading: (a bit of history)**

Winston, B., & Winston, M. (2020). “‘Strange newes’ – printed news”. *The roots of fake news: Objecting to objective journalism*. Routledge. pp. 17-32

Winston, B., & Winston, M. (2020). “Newes’ – the coming of newspapers” *The roots of fake news: Objecting to objective journalism*. Routledge. pp. 33-49.

And if you are really interested in this topic, this special issue of *Digital Journalism* is all about alternative media <https://www.tandfonline.com/toc/rdij20/11/5?nav=tocList>

**Week 3: Data Journalism**

**Key Reading:**

Felle, T. (2016). Digital watchdogs? Data reporting and the news media’s traditional ‘fourth estate’ function. *Journalism*, 17(1), 85-96.

Nguyen, A., & Lugo-Ocando, J. (2016). The state of data and statistics in journalism and journalism education: Issues and debates. *Journalism*, 17(1), 3-17.

**Background Reading:**

There was a special issue of *Journalism* in 2016 specifically about Data Journalism. Available here: <https://journals.sagepub.com/toc/joua/17/1>

Livingston C & Voakes P.S. (2005) *Working with Numbers and Statistics: A Handbook for Journalists*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates Publishers.

Porter, T. M. (1996). *Trust in numbers*. Princeton University Press. (pp.3-48 & pp. 191-216)

British Polling Council (2022) *A Quick Guide for Journalists to the Use and Reporting of Opinion Polls*. Available at: <https://www.britishpollingcouncil.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/bpc-guide-for-journalists-2022.pdf>

**Week 4: Solutions Journalism**

**Key reading:**

Curry, A. L., & Hammonds, K. H. (2014). The power of solutions journalism. *Solutions Journalism Network*, *7*, 1-14.

McIntyre, K. E., & Lough, K. (2021). Toward a clearer conceptualization and operationalization of solutions journalism. *Journalism*, *22*(6), 1558-1573.

Solutions Journalism (2017). Medium.com (Sep 25, 2017). Available at: <https://thewholestory.solutionsjournalism.org/the-ten-noble-questions-f7b97d137135>

**Background Reading:**

Lough, K., & McIntyre, K. (2023). A systematic review of constructive and solutions journalism research. *Journalism*, *24*(5), 1069-1088.

**Week 5: Drone Journalism**

**Key reading:**

Holton, A. E., Lawson, S., & Love, C. (2015). Unmanned Aerial Vehicles: Opportunities, barriers, and the future of “drone journalism”. *Journalism practice*, *9*(5), 634-650.

Adams, C. (2020). Dual control: Investigating the role of drone (UAV) operators in TV and online journalism. *Media and Communication*, *8*(3), 93-100.

**Background reading:**

Uskali, T., Manninen, V., Ikonen, P., & Hokkanen, J. (2020). Diffusion of drone journalism: The case of Finland, 2011–2020. *Media and Communication*, *8*.

Okocha, D. O., Agaku, T., & Ola-Akuma, R. O. (2021). Drone journalism: The empirical arguments for its utilization in investigative journalism in Nigeria. *Human Discourse*, *1*(4).

**Week 6: Individual Consultations/ Chats**

Instead of a lecture this week, please use the sign-up on Canvas to arrange a 1-2-1 meeting with Ceri. How you use the slot is entirely up to you. You can talk about the assignment(s) which are due, about aspects of the course you are interested in, future career or study ideas. Or we can chat about rugby, the intricacies of the LBW rules in cricket, the environment, your pet, my pet, how I got a big scar on my thigh (cool story), the political situation in Kazakhstan, thoughts on Marmite (it’s great) or olives (gross)…

**Week 7: Social Media and Journalism**

**Key reading**

Lukito, J., Suk, J., Zhang, Y., Doroshenko, L., Kim, S. J., Su, M. H., ... & Wells, C. (2020). The wolves in sheep’s clothing: How Russia’s Internet Research Agency tweets appeared in US news as vox populi. *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, *25*(2), 196-216.

Lewis, S. C., & Molyneux, L. (2018). A decade of research on social media and journalism: Assumptions, blind spots, and a way forward. *Media and Communication*, *6*(4), 11-23.

**Background reading**

Charitidis, P., Doropoulos, S., Vologiannidis, S., Papastergiou, I., & Karakeva, S. (2020). Towards countering hate speech against journalists on social media. *Online Social Networks and Media, 17*, 100071

Harlow, S., Wallace, R., & Cueva Chacón, L. (2022). Digital (In) Security in Latin America: The Dimensions of Social Media Violence against the Press and Journalists’ Coping Strategies. *Digital Journalism, 1*-19.

Sbaraini Fontes, G., & Marques, F. P. J. (2022). Defending democracy or amplifying populism? Journalistic coverage, Twitter, and users’ engagement in Bolsonaro’s Brazil. *Journalism 24*(8) 1634-1656

Wells, C., Shah, D. V., Pevehouse, J. C., Yang, J., Pelled, A., Boehm, F., ... & Schmidt, J. L. (2016). How Trump drove coverage to the nomination: Hybrid media campaigning. *Political communication*, *33*(4), 669-676.

Wells, C., Shah, D., Lukito, J., Pelled, A., Pevehouse, J. C., & Yang, J. (2020). Trump, Twitter, and news media responsiveness: A media systems approach. *New Media & Society, 22*(4), 659–682. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444819893987

**Week 8: Advocacy Journalism**

**Key reading**

Tischauser, J. (2023) Patriot Front timeline. April 11, 2023. *SPLC.* <https://www.splcenter.org/patriot-front-timeline>

Wilson, J. & Tischauser, J. (2022). Patriot front leader involved in fatal Utah car crash. *SPLC.* March 25, 2022. <https://www.splcenter.org/hatewatch/2022/03/25/patriot-front-leader-involved-fatal-utah-car-crash>

Waisbord, S. (2009). Advocacy journalism in a global context. In: Wahl-Jorgensen, K. and Hanitzsch, T. (eds). *The handbook of journalism studies*, 391-405.

**Background reading**

Gilbert, R. (2023) ‘I’m an actual literal Nazi’: Lewis Country Store owner responds to Southern Poverty Law Center report finding the business hosted hate groups. WPLN.org. “6 June, 2023. <https://wpln.org/post/im-an-actual-literal-nazi-lewis-country-store-owner-responds-to-southern-poverty-law-center-report-finding-the-business-hosted-hate-groups/>

McKenzie, R. (2022). ‘A white nationalist pyramid scheme’: how Patriot Front recruits young members. *The Guardian. Sep 2, 2022.* <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2022/sep/02/patriot-front-recruits-members-young-pyramid-scheme?CMP=Share_iOSApp_Other&fbclid=IwAR2V0A4qoKJ-lb7YC5KAypeM2h7cKdSQSiPF1WwBakPG5wqcxyry9bBxw7U>

Good example here from Channel 4 / Hope Not Hate - [Watch Undercover: Exposing the Far Right | Stream free on Channel 4](https://www.channel4.com/programmes/undercover-exposing-the-far-right)

**Week 9: Immersive Journalism**

**N.B. we will be experiencing some VR journalism this week using VR headsets, so the location may change to the VR lab. This will be confirmed closer to the date.**

**Key Reading:**

de Bruin, K., de Haan, Y., Kruikemeier, S., Lecheler, S., & Goutier, N. (2022). A first-person promise? A content-analysis of immersive journalistic productions. *Journalism*, 23(2), 479-498.

Shin, D., & Biocca, F. (2018). Exploring immersive experience in journalism. *New Media & Society*, *20*(8), 2800-2823.

**Background Reading:**

Sánchez Laws, A. L. (2020). Can immersive journalism enhance empathy? *Digital Journalism*, *8*(2), 213-228.

Harris, J. and Taylor, J. 2021. Narrative in VR journalism: research into practice. *Media Practice and Education 22*(3), pp. 211-224. (10.1080/25741136.2021.1904615)

**Week 10: Fact-checking**

**Key Reading**

Graves, L. (2016) Anatomy of a Fact Check: Objective Practice and the Contested Epistemology of Fact Checking. *Communication, Culture & Critique 10* 518–537

Nyhan, B., & Reifler, J. (2010). When corrections fail: The persistence of political misperceptions. *Political Behavior, 32*(2), 303–330. doi: 10.1007/s11109-010-9112-2

**Background reading**

Duncan, M. & Hughes, C. (working paper). Fact-checking by the people for what people? The relationship between audience support for anti-elite populism and the effectiveness of crowdsourced fact-checking journalism

Walter, N., & Murphy, S. T. (2018). How to unring the bell: A meta-analytic approach to correction of misinformation. *Communication Monographs, 85*(3), 423-441.

**Week 11: Fact-checking workshop**

**Key Reading**

Graves, L. (2011, February 15). Glenn Beck says Muslim Brotherhood wants to declare war on Israel. PolitiFact. Retrieved from <http://www.politifact.com/truth-o-meter/statements/2011/feb/15/glenn-beck/glenn-beck-says-muslim-brotherhood-wants-declare-w/>

Schulman, M. (2018). Daniel Radcliffe and the art of the fact-check. *The New Yorker* (October 8, 2018). <https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2018/10/15/daniel-radcliffe-and-the-art-of-the-fact-check>

**Have a look through a few of these fact-checking sites.** [BBC Reality Check](https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/reality_check), [Channel 4 FactCheck](https://www.channel4.com/news/factcheck)[, Full Fact](https://fullfact.org/latest/), [Washington Post Fact Checker](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/fact-checker/), [FactCheck.org](https://www.factcheck.org/), [Reuters Fact Check](https://www.reuters.com/fact-check), [Politifact.com](https://www.politifact.com/)

Reading List

Read widely, read deeply in certain areas. The resources below are pointers for some places to start your reading exploration. Many of the books are available through the library in hard copy and/or e-version. Journals are available online through the library using your student login.

And read/watch/listen to some news! This is a course about news, so it makes sense to consume it.

**Recommended resources for wider reading:**

Allan, S (Ed) (2005) Journalism: Critical Issues. London: Open University Press

Allan, S. (2006), *Online News*. Maidenhead: OUP.

Baleria, G. (2021) *The Journalism Behind Journalism: Going Beyond the Basic to Train Effective Journalists in a Shifting Landscape*. London: Routledge.

Beaman, J. (2011) *Interviewing for Radio (Media Skills),* Oxford: Routledge.

Blaine, M. (2014), *The digital reporter’s notebook.* London: Routledge

Bradshaw, P. (2015) ‘Data Journalism and the 2015 UK General Election’. In *UK Election Analysis 2015: Media, Voters and the Campaign. https://www.psa.ac.uk/sites/default/files/pagefiles/UK%20Election%20Analysis%202015%20-%20Jackson%20and%20Thorsen%20v1.pdf*

Bradshaw, P. and Rohumaa, L. (2013 & 2011) *The Online Journalism Handbook: Skills to Survive in the Digital Age.* Harlow: Pearson.

Briggs, M. (2015) *Journalism next : a practical guide to digital reporting and publishing* (3rd edn). Thousand Oaks, CA: CQ Press

Bull, A. (2010) *Multimedia journalism: a practical guide* London: Routledge

Burns, L.S. (2002) *Understanding journalism*. London: Sage

Burum, I. Quinn, S. (2015) *MOJO: the mobile journalism handbook: how to make broadcast videos with an iPhone or Ipad.* London: Taylor & Francis.

Calver, B. Kemp, D. Ryder, M. (2017) *Everybody In: A Journalist’s Guide to Inclusive Reporting for Journalism Students*. <https://www.media-diversity.org/additional-files/Everybody_In_Book.pdf>

Carter, C. Steiner, L. Allan, S. (2019) Journalism, gender and power. Oxon: Routledge.

Carlson, M. Franklin, B. (2011) Journalists, Sources & Credibility: New Perspectives. New York: Routledge.

Conboy, M. (2013) Journalism Studies: the basics. London: Taylor & Francis.

Cushion, S. (2015) *News and politics: the rise of live and interpretive journalism*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Cushion, S. Thomas, R. (2018) Reporting Elections: rethinking the logic of campaign coverage. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Davies, N (2008) Flat Earth News London. Chatto and Windus.

Dick, M. (2013) *Search: Theory and Practice in Journalism Online*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Emm, A. (2014) *Researching for the media: television, radio and journalism,* London: New York: Routledge

Eastwood, L. (2017) chapter 8, ‘Your Smartphone as your best reporting tool’ in *Entrepreneurial journalism: how to go it alone and launch your dream digital project*, Abingdon, Oxon: RouEllis,

Fenton, N. (2009) New Media, Old News: Journalism and democracy in the digital age. London: Sage

Filak, V. (ed) (2015), *Convergent Journalism: An Introduction* (2nd edn). Oxford: Focal Press.

Franklin, B et al (2005) Key Concepts in Journalism Studies. London: Sage

Franklin, B. (2016) *The Routledge Companion on Digital Journalism Studies*. London: Routledge.

Frost, C. (2002) *Reporting for Journalists.* Sage

Gardner, S. & Birley, S. (2008), *Blogging for Dummies*. Hoboken: Wiley Publishing.

Gray, J. et al. (2012) *The Data Journalism Handbook.* O’Reilly Media.

Harcup, T. (2007) *The ethical journalist*, Sage

Harcup, T. (2009) *Journalism: principles and practice* (2nd edition). Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage

Harcup, T. and Cole, P. (2009) *Newspaper journalism*. London: Sage

Hemmingway, E., et al. (2007) *Introduction to Journalism*. Sage

Hennessy, B. (2006) *Writing feature articles* (4th Edition). Oxford: Focal Press

Hicks, W. & Holmes T. (2002), *Subediting for Journalists*. London: Routledge.

Hill, S. Bradshaw, P. (2019) *Mobile-First Journalism: producing news for social and interactive media.* London: Taylor & Francis.

Hill, J.E. and Schwartz, V. (2015) *Getting the picture: the visual culture of the news*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Hill, S. and Lashmar, P. (2014) *Online Journalism: The Essential Guide*. London: Sage.

Holmes, T., Hadwin, S. and Mottershead, G. (2013) *The 21st Century Journalism Handbook: Essential Skills for the Modern Journalist.* Harlow: Pearson.

Itule, B. and Anderson, A. (1999) *Newswriting and Reporting for Today’s Media*. McGraw Hill

Jenkins, H. (2008), *Convergence Culture*. New York: New York University Press. (2006 edition available as an e-book on campus).

Keeble, R. (2001) *Ethics for Journalists.* London: Routledge

Keeble, R. (2005) *Print journalism: a critical introduction*. London, New York: Routledge

Keeble, R. (2006) *The newspapers handbook* (4th Edition). Routledge

Keeble, R. (ed.) (2005), *Print Journalism: A Critical Introduction*. London: Routledge.

Kobre, K. (2012) *Video journalism: multimedia storytelling*, Waltham, Mass: Focal Press.

Lancaster, K. (2013) *Video journalism for the web: a practical introduction to documentary storytelling*, New York: Routledge.

Lasky, M.J. (2000) *The language of journalism*. New Brunswick, N.J., London: Transaction

Llinares, D. et al. (ed.) (2018) *Podcasting: New Aural Cultures and Digital Media,* Palgrave Macmillan.

Marsden, P. (2017) *Entrepreneurial journalism: how to go it alone and launch your dream digital project*. Oxon: Routledge.

McChesney, R. 2000. Rich Media, Poor Democracy. Chicago, University of Illinois, Press.

McKay, J. (2006) *The magazines handbook* (2nd Edition). Routledge

McNair, B. (2012) Journalism and Democracy: An Evaluation of the Political Public Sphere. London: Taylor and Francis.

Mencher, M. (2003) *News reporting and writing* (9th ed.) Boston: McGraw-Hill

Nieman Foundation. (2001) Essays about ‘The Elements of Journalism’. [WWW]

https://niemanreports.org/issues/special-issue-2001/

Perruchet, M. (2016) *One Perfect Pitch: How to Sell Your Idea, Your Product, Your Business—or Yourself* (2016). McGraw-Hill.

Pape, S. and Featherstone, S. (2005) *Newspaper journalism: a practical introduction*. London: Sage

Pape, S. and Featherstone, S. (2006) *Feature writing: a practical introduction*. London: Sage

Phillips, A. (2015) *Journalism in Context: Practice and Theory for the Digital Age.* Abingdon: Routledge.

Quinn, S. & Lamble, S. (2008), *Online Newsgathering*. Oxford: Focal Press.

Randall, D. (2007) *The universal journalist* (3rd Edition). Pluto Press

Rettberger, J. Walker, (2008), *Blogging*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Rich, C. (2010) *Writing and reporting news: a coaching method*. Boston, Mass.: Wadsworth

Sanders, K. (2002) *Ethics & journalism*. London: Sage

Sissons, H. (2006), *Practical Journalism: How to Write News.* London: Sage

Ward, M. (2002), *Journalism Online*. Oxford: Focal Press.

Wahl Jorgensen, K. and Hanitzsch, T. (2008) Handbook of Journalism Studies. ICA Handbook Series

Wheeler, S. (2009) *Feature writing for journalists.* London: Routledge

Whittaker, J. (2002), *Web Production for Writers and Journalists*. London: Routledge.

Williams, K (2009) Get Me A Murder A Day: A history of media and communication in Britain. London: Bloomsbury.

Williams, K (2009) *Read All About it: A history of the British Newspaper*. London: Routledge

Wulfemeyer, K. (2006), *Online Newswriting*. Oxford: Blackwell.

**Academic Journal Reading**

These journals are really useful if you want to explore the academic debates within journalism.

*Digital Journalism*

*Journalism Studies*

*Journalism Practice*

*Journalism*

*Mass Communication and Society*

*International Journal of Communication*

*European Journal of Communication*

*Political Communication*

**Online Resources**

http://www.guardian.co.uk/media For media related news

http://onlinejournalismblog.com/ Publishes comment and analysis on covering online

journalism

https://theconversation.com/uk You can find academic analysis of contemporary journalism stories and practice here

https://www.nuj.org.uk/ You can find news, advice and guidance on carrying out practical journalism work.

http://www.ojr.org/ Online resource that focuses on the future of digital journalism

https://www.journalism.co.uk/ Journalism tools and resources, plus jobs and links to courses

https://www.thenewsmanual.net/ A professional resource for journalism and guidance on skills and technique

https://www.media-diversity.org/additional-files/Everybody\_In\_Book.pdf - Important resource on inclusivity when producing journalistic work

https://firstdraftnews.org/ Offers a wide range of resources and training focused on

disinformation

https://www.bbc.co.uk/academy/en Great resources for smart phone journalism

https://www.apple.com/uk/iphone/photography-how-to/: Useful guidelines on taking photographs and videos on i-phone

https://support.apple.com/en-au/HT207587 Editing on i-phone

**ASSESSMENT**

**Please note:** You must use academic referencing and a bibliography in all assignments. You are expected to use the APA style of referencing. Ensure that you structure your essays to make an effective argument and include a critical analysis. Careful attention to layout (double/1½ spacing) and using an appropriate, legible, font are both important parts of the academic requirements. See the rubric tables below for specific grading requirements.

**Assignments for MS-M18 2024/25**

**Assignment 1 (50%): Deadline, April 2nd, 2025. 2,000-word analytical essay**

For assignment 1, choose one of the innovations in journalism we examined in the first nine weeks of the semester—VR, drone, data, AOPM, advocacy etcetera—and compare how this journalism compares to a “traditional” (newspaper/broadcast) form of journalism. If, for example, you choose to examine drone journalism, you can choose an example of drone journalism covering event(s) X/Y to compare with a newspaper or broadcast piece covering the same event(s). Alternatively, you can choose an example of traditional journalism and argue what affordances drone journalism might provide to improve the journalism. You MUST include literature from this course and literature discussing more general journalism theory (things you covered in previous journalism modules and/or available in the wider reading list in this module).

**Assignment 2 (50%): Deadline, May 16th, 2025. 1,000-word fact-checking article, plus 1,500-word critical reflection of writing the article.**

For assignment 2, choose a recent speech by a politician and write a fact-checking article about it. You should emulate the style of one of the fact-checking organisations we looked at and present it as a fact-check from that organisation. You can rate facts you examine as four Pinocchios, Pants on Fire, etcetera , or use a more measured style which concludes something like “this isn’t entirely accurate”. You cannot choose to examine facts which have been previously fact-checked by a fact-checking organisation, but you can examine the same speech as may have been examined.

You must also write a critical reflection on your writing of the fact-check article. You must include the following:

• A general introduction about how you identified stated facts and stated opinions in the speech. Why you chose to write about the “facts” you chose for your fact-check article.

• An examination of how you reached the conclusion for each fact/opinion you checked and wrote up in the article.

• Challenges faced to find out truth from fiction.

• The sources you used to reach a conclusion about each stated fact/opinion. Reflect on why you believe these sources.

• State which fact-checking organisation style you have adopted and reflect on why you chose that style. Reflect on why you wrote in a blunt “pants on fire” style or a more nuanced, measured manner.

You must include reference to academic literature related to fact-checking (and journalism/communication more generally) throughout the critical reflection.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grading criteria for Assessment 1.** | | | | | |
|  | **Weight** | **70%+** | **60%-69%** | **50%-59%** | **49% and under / Fail** |
| **Strength of argument** | **40** | The essay makes very well-argued claims, whilst acknowledging weaknesses and competing arguments. There is a clear thread of argument running through the essay. | The essay generally makes well-argued claims, and you refer to competing arguments. For the vast majority of the essay, the direction of argument is clear. | You make some solid arguments but need to refer more frequently to other competing perspectives. Your argument can be hazy in places. | Very limited and undeveloped use of argument. Competing arguments are hardly acknowledged or referred to. |
| **Breadth of analysis and research** | **40** | You have clearly done a great deal of research and analysis into the arguments surrounding your topic, both from the reading list and beyond. You draw sophisticated connections between the different texts in the analysis. | You have evidently done a significant amount of research and analysis into your essay topic, both from the reading list and beyond. In places, you could compare and contrast texts in more detail. | There is evidence of some solid research and analysis into the arguments surrounding your topic, but more is needed, particularly texts that aren’t on the main module reading list or the link between these and the analysis. | Little evidence of research or analysis. Too few sources are used in order for you to successfully analyse the topic. |
| **Adherence to academic conventions** | **10** | Very good use of quotations consistently referenced using APA system. Comprehensive and well-presented bibliography. | Accurate use of quotations, with only a few very minor errors in APA referencing and bibliography. | Fairly good use of quotations with some errors in APA referencing. Bibliography is generally solid. | Inadequate use of quotations with substantial errors of APA referencing. Bibliography poorly presented. |
| **Essay structure and use of English** | **10** | Excellent command of English. Immaculate spelling and grammar. Excellent essay structure. | A well-written essay. One or two small spelling/grammatical mistakes. Good essay structure. | There are a number of spelling/grammatical errors. Remember to check your work carefully before submission. Generally good essay structure. | There are spelling/grammatical mistakes throughout your essay. You must check your work before you hand it in. Essay structure is rather disjointed. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grading criteria for Assessment 2.** | | | | | |
|  | **Weight** | **70%+** | **60%-69%** | **50%-59%** | **49% and under / Fail** |
| **Quality of journalism in the fact-check article** | **40** | Excellent standard of fact-checking journalism. It adheres to fact-checking style throughout and is written in a very good style of journalism. Of or close to publishable quality. | Very good standard of fact-checking journalism. Good adherence to fact-checking practices and style. | Reasonable standard of journalism with general adherence to fact-checking style and | Poor adherence to conventions of fact-checking journalism |
| **Quality of reflection** | **40** | Excellent completion of requirements of reflection. You explain fully, with reference to literature, how you wrote the article and why the article appears as it does. | Very good completion of requirements of reflection. You generally explain how the article was written and, with reference to some literature, give an understanding of why the article appears as it does. | Generally good completion of requirements of reflection. You explain the mechanics of writing the article and reference some literature to support your choices. | Poor completion of requirements of reflection |
| **Range and depth of sources** | **10** | A wide range of excellent and extremely relevant sources are considered. | A range of good and very relevant sources are considered. | Some good and very relevant sources are considered but there are also one or two less reliable sources included. | The sources are mostly unreliable, irrelevant, or unsuitable for the topic at hand. |
| **Appropriate use of academic literature including referencing** | **10** | Excellent use of literature. Faultless referencing with attention paid to the finer details of style and presentation. | Very good use of literature. Good and unproblematic referencing. | Good use of literature. No major problems with referencing. A reasonable attempt has been made to adhere to conventions. | Poor use of literature. Dissatisfactory referencing that contains many errors and/or missing information. |

**Disclaimer**

This Handbook should be read in conjunction with the definitive information about your programme available online. Information regarding assessment and other formal course requirements is published in the ***Student Handbook*** and available online.

Only this information is authoritative. Do not rely solely on tutors’ information about assessment modes and timing or other formal course requirements as such information is not authoritative and occasionally may be mistaken.

This wider Swansea University handbook is a comprehensive and detailed one-stop-shop for everything you will need to know as an undergraduate student at Swansea:

<https://myuni.swansea.ac.uk/media/Academic_Handbook_Undergraduate_UG.pdf>

Finally, despite the challenges of the last year or two for all students and staff in Higher Education, as you can see from the infographic below, Media in Swansea remains among the leaders in the sector.

Please take confidence from this and be assured that teaching and professional services staff will continue to work really hard to ensure that your learning experience is as good as we can possibly make it.

A close-up of a poster
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**Academic Good Practice and Avoiding Academic Misconduct**

Every piece of work submitted to the Department is examined for evidence of “unfair practice”, both

electronically, and by the marker. Some students will be unfamiliar with an educational system that assesses you via coursework. Many of you will be more familiar with the final exam system, but you will by now know that we do not hold exams in Media at Swansea.

Students are expected to have familiarized themselves with the definition of “unfair practice” given in the University Regulations. Plagiarism is an example of unfair practice and is defined in the Regulations as “using without acknowledgement another person’s work and submitting it for assessment, as though it were one’s own work, for instance, through copying or unacknowledged phrasing”.

This definition applies to intentional or unintentional plagiarism. Examples of plagiarism, as per the regulations include:

* **Use of any quotation(s) from the work of others which have not been clearly identified as such by being placed in quotation marks and acknowledged**
* **Summarising another person’s ideas, judgments, figures, software or diagrams without reference to that person in the text and the source in the bibliography**
* **Misrepresenting any data in order to mislead**
* **Use of unacknowledged material downloaded from the internet**
* **Submission of another student’s work as your own**

Other forms of misconduct include:

### **Unfairly colluding with another student in the completion of an assignment**

### **Using the services (paid or unpaid) of ‘ghost-writing’ agencies or so-called “essay mills” in the preparation of assessed work**

### **Using translation software to convert your work into English or Welsh from a different language**.

* **Unauthorized use of Artificial Intelligence (see later section)**

Please note that some modules incorporate practical assignments. These might involve writing news stories, developing portfolios, building websites, creating PR campaigns and so on. It is important to remember therefore, that offences that might be considered as academic misconduct will also include fabrication, misquoting and misrepresenting in a journalistic sense. This means that when asked to write a news story for example, you must not make the story up, or pretend that an event, incident or interviewee are real when they are not. What you write and report about should always be real. Similarly, you should not falsify any element of your work experience or internship.

Please note that while self-plagiarism is not deemed misconduct, nonetheless, is bad practice that must be avoided. If you recycle work previously submitted, it is fully possible – and perhaps even likely – that your mark will suffer as a consequence.

The prescribed penalties for proven cases of unfair practice can be severe. These range from reduced marks, marks being cancelled for an assessment, a whole module or even a whole level of study. In extreme cases, students are sometimes withdrawn from the university. Students worried about any aspect of this warning are advised to discuss their work with their lecturers and mentors. See the Student handbook for more information.

**The GOLDEN RULES are to write your work in English or Welsh, not to use translation software, and to ensure that everything is your own work, and that you reference and acknowledge accurately, and that you take an honest and responsible approach to your studies and assessments.**

**Academic culture in the UK**

### In the UK, there is a well-established process for marking student work. Those marking your work will be experienced experts who have done so many times before. They will work to specified and transparent marking criteria.

### Once work has been marked, it is moderated by a colleague from outside of the module who will scrutinize it for fairness, accuracy and consistency. At this stage, the mark is still provisional and is not final.

### Prior to the exam board sitting, an external examiner from a different university will further scrutinize the work to again check for fairness, accuracy and consistency. Once this process has been completed, **MARKS ARE FINAL AND WILL NOT CHANGE.**

### So the only possible adjustments to marks will be made during this process as described above, and by experts who are qualified to do so. Students lobbying their lecturers or the subject lead **WILL NOT RESULT IN ANY MARKS BEING CHANGED**. Your final mark is the considered opinion of a respected academic expert and has been checked by other respected academic experts. Your mark is not the opening bid in some process of negotiation. This does not happen in the UK, and we suggest that reading the feedback you have received and responding positively to it is a much better approach to take.

**Artificial Intelligence**

Artificial Intelligence – in the form of language models such as ChatGPT or Claude - is changing the way we operate as scholars. We are living through a revolution in the way university academics and students work. This is having profound effects on how we learn about our world. There is no doubt then when you graduate you will use artificial intelligence in your work – so from this point we are going to explore with you and develop ways it can be used skilfully and ethically.  In the meantime, it is important that we recognize the short-term future as a period of learning and transition for everyone as we adapt to these new programmes.

AI cannot teach you critical thinking or show you how to add the more human, intuitive and creative elements to your work and, sometimes it’s just plain wrong. Moreover, the standard of analysis offered by AI is simply not good enough for university-level scholarship; it is too superficial.

At various times, and where appropriate to do so, your lecturers might incorporate AI into your studies. But you should not assume that you can use it for everything. Using AI too prominently within your work and without the express permission of your tutors represents poor academic practice and will be dealt with according to University guidance. So please don't use AI in anything beyond an approved manner.

Your Tutors will work with you on how to avoid problems, and it’s important you listen to them, and accept their guidance. **The golden rule is – if in doubt, then ask**. If you talk openly about AI to your Module leaders and lecturers, then this should enable grown up and transparent discussions about AI that will help you stay very much on the safe, ethical side of things.

**Writing emails**

The lines between professional emails and more informal modes of writing have become blurred, and many students find the conventions of professional emails murky. In the age of social media, many students approach emailing similar to texting and other forms of digital communication, where the crucial conventions are brevity and informality. **However, most lecturers consider emails closer to letters than to social media messages**. This style of writing therefore calls for more formality.

These different ways of writing are just that - different ways of writing. The letter approach to emails is not always and forever better (or worse) than the texting approach. Knowing how and when to use one or the other - based on why you are writing and whom you are writing to - makes all the difference. So, if you use emojis, acronyms, abbreviations, etc., when messaging your friends, you are actually demonstrating legitimate, useful writing skills. However, you *aren’t* if you do the same thing when emailing lecturers who view emails as letters. Effective writing requires shaping your words according to your audience, purpose and genre (or type of writing, e.g., an academic email). Some of the key conventions for the rhetorical situation of emailing academic or professional service staff are as follows:

1. **Use a clear subject line.** The subject “Rhetorical Analysis Essay” would work a bit better than “heeeeelp!” (and much better than the unforgivable blank subject line).
2. **Use a salutation and signature.** Instead of jumping right into your message or saying “hey,” begin with a greeting like “Hello” or “Good afternoon,” and then address your lecturer by first name or by appropriate title and last name, such as “Dr Evans”. Please do not address your lecturer by last name alone i.e. “Dear Evans” – that is just weird. Similarly, to end your email, use “Best wishes” or “Sincerely,” followed by your name.
3. **Use our names** – This is the polite way to do things. “Dear Dr Evans” confirms to Dr Evans that message is for him, and that you know who you want to respond. Emails starting with “Hello” and sent to a group will often be ignored as everyone will assume that someone else will answer it.
4. **Use standard punctuation, capitalization, spelling and grammar.** Instead of writing “idk what 2 rite about in my paper can you help??” try something more like, “I am writing to ask about the topics you suggested in class yesterday.”
5. **Do your part in solving what you need to solve.** If you email to ask something you could look up yourself, you risk presenting yourself as less resourceful than you ought to be. However, if you mention that you’ve already checked the handbook, asked classmates and looked through lecture notes then you present yourself as responsible and taking initiative. So, instead of asking, “What’s our essay?” you might write, “I looked through the syllabus and course website for the assessment title, but unfortunately I am unable to locate it.”
6. **Add a touch of humanity.** Being polite and friendly creates a very positive impression and will get you much further than being rude or aggressive. Sugar works better than salt in this context.

**Don’t forget that your lecturers receive many, many emails. Make yourself stand out by sticking to these rules. In return, you can expect a reply to your email no later than 2-3 working days after your email. Please remember that weekends, bank holidays and periods of annual leave are not working days, and that the working day is from 9am-5pm. Some colleagues may work part time hours.**

**Proofreading policy**

Students are encouraged to always proofread their own work.

**The** [**Centre for Academic Success**](https://www.swansea.ac.uk/academic-success/) **offers help with this and many other aspects of academic work. If English is not your first language, they can offer you lots of assistance across all elements of academic writing and referencing.**

Some students will have completed the assignment to the best of their ability and want another person or a commercial service to proof-read their work, but in such a case, they need to be aware of the correct procedure before asking someone to proof-read their work.

Proof-readers are allowed to identify, **BUT NOT CORRECT** …

* spelling errors
* punctuation and capitalization errors
* grammatical errors (e.g. subject-verb agreement, articles)
* inconsistencies in the formatting, layout, font, etc.
* repetitions or omissions of words or phrases
* format and structure of paragraphs
* errors in the labelling of tables and figures
* inconsistent referencing

Proof-readers **ARE NOT ALLOWED TO** …

* directly correct any errors, incl. inconsistent style
* add content
* rephrase or reorganize sentences or paragraphs
* shorten the text (to come within the word limit)
* translate into English, or edit machine-translated text

There are exceptions to these restrictions on proofreading, i.e. supervision of dissertations, some disabilities, creative writing workshops (where students are expected to comment on and/or proofread each other’s work).

Where writing and grammar are part of the assessment criteria, proofreading may not be allowed at all. (Where applicable, this restriction will be made clear in the assessment description.)

Students who intend to use a proof-reader, including those who undertake this without pay, must ask their proof-reader to comply with the guidelines and sign the declaration (see below) before undertaking this work and agreeing to any proof-reading being done.

Students must keep an electronic copy of the work before proof-reading, including work that was drafted in languages other than English or Welsh. All correspondence with the proof-reader must be kept, including the original request and any evidence of payment. Students must declare the use of proof-readers on the cover sheet that is submitted with their work.

Upon request they must provide the documentation and correspondence concerning the proof-reading work. This request might happen at any stage, especially within any the process that follows any official allegation of Academic Misconduct.

Students must take overall ownership and responsibility for the work submitted by accepting or rejecting suggestions made by the proof-reader. The use of proof-readers will not be accepted in mitigation of any deficiencies in the work.