



Department of Politics and International Studies

**Module Handbook
2013/14**

Media, Politics and Ethics

Module No: 30212

Level: 5

Semester: 1

Credit Value: 20

Module Leader: Professor Raphael Cohen-Almagor

Pre-requisites: None

Co-requisites: None

Post-requisites: None

Anti-requisites: None

Total Contact: 10 x 2 hour weekly seminars

Assessment: 1 presentation in class (30%)
3,000 word essay (70%)

Staff contact: (Tel) 01482 465024

(Email) R.Cohen-Almagor@hull.ac.uk

(Web) <http://ebridge.hull.ac.uk/>

This handbook is available in alternative formats on request from the Department

CONTENTS

1. **General Outline and Aims of the Module**
2. **Learning Outcomes**
3. **Method of Teaching**
4. **Module Assessment**
 - 4.1 Essay Plans and Draft Essays
 - 4.2 Essay Submission
 - 4.3 Essay Deadlines
 - 4.4 Essay Format
 - 4.5 Plagiarism
 - 4.6 Essay Length
 - 4.7 Examinations
 - 4.8 Class Presentations
5. **Your Right of Appeal**
6. **Marking Criteria**
7. **Essay Titles**
8. **Lectures**
9. **Tutorial 'Tips'**
10. **Reading List**
11. **Module Evaluation Questionnaires**

PLEASE NOTE: The Department of Politics and International Studies operate a policy of continuous quality enhancement, reflecting on the previous year's practice and specific feedback such as that gained through the Staff/Student Committee. This is intended to ensure that the Department provides the highest quality student experience possible. The Department is, on occasion, also required to amend its policies to ensure that they are fully compliant with University regulations and Faculty guidance. Consequently we review, and where necessary revise our policies on a yearly basis. Where this has resulted in a change in the Department's regulations this year this will be indicated by



a  in the margin of this handbook.

1. GENERAL OUTLINE AND AIMS OF THE MODULE

The seminar will address the following questions: (1) What is the relationship between ethics and media? (2) What are the guiding principles in the work of the media professional? (3) What should one do in the event of conflict between competing principles? (4) What are the ethical boundaries to media coverage? (5) What can be done to promote ethical standards in media?

2. LEARNING OUTCOMES

By the end of the module students should:

- be able to think critically about ethical dilemmas.
- understand relevant concepts: public right to know, privacy, fairness, truth telling, deception, objectivity, professionalism, accountability, confidentiality of sources, sensationalism, agenda setting, plagiarism, freebies, press councils, ombudsman.
- Be able to apply theory (e.g. Mill, Kant) to analyse pertinent case studies.
- be able to critically examine the relationships between ethics and the media.

PLEASE NOTE: the following sections should be read in conjunction with Departmental Undergraduate Handbook, the relevant University Programme Regulations and the University Student Handbooks.

For Programme Regulations see:
<http://www2.hull.ac.uk/administration/policyregister/qualityhandbook/sectionb.aspx>
The Student Handbook is available at: <http://www2.hull.ac.uk/student/studenthandbook.aspx>

It is your responsibility to ensure that you are fully acquainted with all of the requirements set out in this handbook and in the associated documentation.

3. METHOD OF TEACHING

Teaching will be by way of weekly seminars conducted of 2 hours by Professor R. Cohen-Almagor. Seminar papers, each of approximately 20 minutes duration, will be presented in each session. Presentation topics will be allocated at the beginning of the semester. All students will present at least one paper.

Attendance at ALL CLASSES (e.g. lectures, tutorials, seminars etc.) is compulsory and will be monitored accordingly. Students are also required to attend punctually. Students who arrive ten or more minutes after the scheduled start of a class will be marked as absent, though they will be permitted to remain in the class and to participate.

Those students who fail to satisfy the Department's attendance requirements for a module may be issued with formal written warnings and, under Paragraph 33(a) of the University's *Programmes Regulations – Chapter IV: Honours Degrees*, may be denied the right of re-assessment in the module. Persistent non-attendance may, in accordance with Paragraph 35(a), result in exclusion from assessment and/or termination of a student's programme of study.

4. MODULE ASSESSMENT

The regulations regarding module assessment set out in this handbook **must** be strictly adhered to. Failure to comply with the regulations, including failure to accurately provide information required by the regulations, may result in the award of a mark of zero. The right of reassessment may also be denied. All such cases will be considered by the Department's Academic Progress Committee (DAPC).

4.1 Essay plans and draft essays

In order to ensure equity, students may submit an essay plan, consisting of headings and sub-headings, of no more than one side of A4 paper. Alternatively students may discuss with tutors the broad plan of their essay. **Tutors will not comment on draft essays.** Please note that the purpose of submitting an essay plan or discussing an essay is to gain advice on *essay content*. Students concerned about essay preparation and writing skills (e.g. footnoting, bibliography, use of English etc.) should or seek advice from the University's Study Advice Service. (For further details see <http://www2.hull.ac.uk/student/studyadvice.aspx>). The Department will, as appropriate, also offer key skills events throughout the course of the academic year which students should attend.

4.2 Essay Submission

The submission of an essay, as defined in the Programme Handbook, constitutes part of the formal assessment of this module. If you do not submit an essay and fail the module the DAPC may, irrespective of whether failure was due to non-submission of the essay, recommend to the Module Board that you be denied the right of reassessment.

Essay submission is a two stage process, involving the submission of an electronic copy AND a hard copy of your essay. Until you have completed BOTH of these stages you will be deemed not to have satisfied the submission requirements. It is your responsibility to ensure that you leave yourself sufficient time to complete the whole submission process.

Firstly, you must **submit an electronic copy of your essay via TurnitinUK** (see section 4.5 for further details of *TurnitinUK*). Instructions on how to do this, including on how to acquire a *TurnitinUK* 'paper ID number' verifying your essay submission are provided below. You must follow them carefully. **You will not be able to submit the hard copy of your essay without the relevant TurnitinUK 'paper ID number'.**

- To submit the electronic copy of your essay you should proceed as follows:
 - Go to <http://www.submit.ac.uk>
 - Click <User Login>
 - Log in by entering your *university* email address and the *TurnitinUK* password which has been emailed to your *university* email account by *TurnitinUK*.
 - This will take you to your *TurnitinUK* homepage, on which are listed the modules for which you are registered this semester.

- Click the title of the module for which you wish to submit an essay.
- Click the icon which appears in the submit column.
- Enter a submission title, attach the file which contains your essay and click submit.
Please note that *TurnitinUK* accepts the following formats: Microsoft Word, WordPerfect, RTF, PDF, Post-Script, plain text, and HTML)
- Check that you have submitted the correct essay for this module and then click <yes submit>.
- A digital receipt will now appear on screen. Directly below the title of the essay you have submitted you will see your '**paper ID**' number. **Write it down.** This number is unique to the particular essay you have submitted for the module. You must enter this number when you complete the cover sheet which accompanies the submission of the hard copy of your essay.

Secondly, you must **submit a hard copy of your essay. The hard copy submission must be an exact copy of the electronic copy.** You must not alter it in any way. Submission of non-identical copies of your essay may be deemed to constitute use of unfair means and will be dealt with accordingly.

- To submit the hard copy of your essay you should proceed as follows:
 - **Essays must be handed into the Politics Departmental Office.**
 - You must attach a completed Departmental essay receipt form to your essay. **It is your responsibility to ensure that the essay receipt form is completed in full and accurately.** Where you fail to do so acceptance of your essay may be denied or you may be penalised in accordance with the regulations set out in this handbook.
 - You must submit your essay by the deadline indicated in this module handbook. **The date/time at which you submit the hard copy of your essay will be deemed to be the formal point of submission.** Penalties for late submission will be calculated from this date/time

4.3 Submission Deadlines



The University has a standardised set of regulations regarding late submission of assessed coursework (see http://www2.hull.ac.uk/administration/policy_register/quality_handbook/section_f.aspx). The Department must apply these regulations and so, since they could seriously affect your academic progress, *it is essential that you are familiar with the following rules.*

In accordance with paragraph 32(iv) of the University Code of Practice on Assessment Procedures and the marking conventions adopted within the Department the following late submission penalties **must** be applied to coursework submitted after the published deadlines:

- Up to and including 24 hours after the deadline, a penalty of 10 marks
- More than 24 hours and up to and including 7 days after the deadline; either a penalty of 10 marks or the mark awarded is reduced to the pass mark, **whichever results in the lower mark**
- More than 7 days after the deadline, a mark of zero is awarded.

Explanatory note

Example applying the penalties for coursework submitted up to and including 24 hours after the deadline:

If a student submits the assessment 2 hours after the deadline, the student's mark will be reduced by 10 (so that a mark of 65 will be reduced to 55, a mark of 48 will be reduced to 38 and so on).

Examples applying the penalties for coursework submitted more than 24 hours and up to and including 7 days after the deadline:

Student	A	B	C	D	E
Pre-penalty mark	100	50	45	40	30
10 mark penalty	90	40	35	30	20
<i>Or</i>					
Mark awarded is reduced to the pass mark	40	40	40	40	40
Outcome (the lower mark)	40	40	35	30	20

The system of penalties outlined above is subject to the over-riding proviso that students will not be penalised if they have a genuine reason (called a 'mitigating circumstance') which prevents them from submitting work on time. In order to ensure that penalties are applied where appropriate but that students with mitigating circumstances are not penalised unfairly, the Department operates the following policies and procedures with regard to considering coursework submitted after the published deadline.

Within the Department (and subject to the final paragraph of this section) essay submission dates are generally standardised across each academic stage. This means that you will have several essays to submit on one day. It does not, of course, mean that you should start work on them all at the same time! Time management is an essential study skill and it is your responsibility to ensure that all stipulated deadlines are complied with.

Essay extensions will not be given under any circumstances. Students should always endeavour to submit work on time, but if you are unable to do so you should submit the work as soon as reasonably possible, accompanied by a mitigating circumstances form on which you must explain why your essay was late and supporting documentary evidence (e.g. a medical certificate). What is likely to be deemed to be 'reasonable' will vary depending on the circumstances and you are **strongly advised to contact your Head of Year** regarding this matter. Please note, however, that whilst **Heads of Year** are able to advise on appropriate timeframes for submission, they **cannot give extensions**.

Mitigating circumstances must be submitted within 7 days of the essay submission date if your mitigating circumstances are to be considered by the Department. If you fail to submit your mitigating circumstances within this 7 day limit they may only be considered by the Department with the permission of the University's Student Progress Committee. A mitigating circumstances form can be obtained from the Departmental Office, via the Department's *eBridge* site, or at <http://www2.hull.ac.uk/student/studenthandbook/academic/mitigatingcircumstances.aspx>

Please note that **computer problems** (e.g. printing problems, corrupted or unreadable discs, incompatible software, lost or stolen hardware etc.) **will not be accepted as grounds for late submission**. The Department will assume that you have taken all reasonable steps to protect your work. It is, therefore, strongly recommended that you backup your work on a regular basis and that you use the University shared drive. Alternatively, emailing your work to yourself will ensure that it is not lost.

Students should be aware that, under Paragraph 33(a) of the University's *Programmes Regulations - Honours Degrees*, a student who has not met the specified module requirements relating to submission of assessed work may be denied the right of re-assessment in that module. Persistent failure to comply with submission deadlines may, in accordance with Paragraph 35(a), result in exclusion from assessment and/or termination of a student's programme of study.

Students with a registered disability, officially recognised by the University's Disability Service should consult the Department's Disabilities Tutor regarding the submission schedule for their essays. As appropriate, the Disabilities Tutor will authorise staggered deadlines, but these must be formally applied for and agreed. Once agreed these deadlines must be strictly adhered to. Work submitted other than in accordance with this agreed schedule will be dealt with in accordance with the procedures outlined above.

4.4 Essay Format

Essays must be word-processed. Essays will be retained to allow for double marking and (where necessary) external verification. Students wishing to have a copy of their essay returned should submit work in duplicate.

Essays must be correctly referenced. Students are advised to use the system of annotation laid out in the Departmental Student Handbook. Quotations **MUST** be indicated either by the use of quotation marks or by indentation of the quoted text; use of a footnote is not, on its own, sufficient. Please also note that references are required not only when using a direct quotation. They must also be included when summarising, paraphrasing or interpreting arguments put forward by another scholar. Annotating essays is an integral part of essay writing and is, therefore, one of the many elements taken into account in marking work. Accordingly, essays which are not correctly referenced will be penalised. Failure to correctly reference may also give rise to an allegation of plagiarism (see Section 4.5 below).

A full **bibliography**, arranged alphabetically by author surname, should also be attached to the end of essays. The bibliography must contain all sources referred to, including sources of general use but not specifically cited in the footnotes.

You **MUST** relate in your answer to material we read and studied in class. Please feel free to consult with me.

The format of your essay should be the following:

- **cover page**
 - **table of contents**

 - **Introduction**
 - Context of the research project
 - Research Questions and Assumptions
 - Thesis/ Aims
 - Detailed Methodology
 - Time table of the subject of your research
 - Chapter outline, how do they connect, their logic and flow
 - Ethical concerns, if and when appropriate
-
- **Chapter 1. Title**
 - **Chapter 2. Title**
 - **Chapter 3. Title**
 - Etc.
 - **Conclusion**
 - **Bibliography**

In the chapters

Think carefully about the outline of your research, the chapter breakdown.

You need to describe the issues, and no less importantly **to analyse** them. Tools for analysis are the theories we studied.

Don't leave unclear points.

Don't make obscure statements.

Clarify terms and concepts.

Be consistent with the terminology that you are using.

Avoid declarations without explanation.

Avoid long summaries of what others are saying.

Be mindful of authors' biases. Always clarify for yourself who is the person you quote: a politician, journalist, academic, analyst, diplomat etc.

Make an effort to rely on primary sources, i.e., when you present J.S. Mill's theory, refer directly to Mill's writing, not to authors who refer to Mill.

Check data by relying on more than one source.

Avoid reliance on bogus Internet sites.

Always back your sources by providing references.

Better to quote from primary sources, i.e., John Stuart Mill, than interpretations of Mill.

If you are doing a **comparative work**, always analyse in accordance with identified themes; never analyse one author/approach after another.

The chapter titles should reflect the themes you explore in your essay.

You need to rely on the pertinent readings in your handbook, obviously the obligatory and preferably also the optional.

- **Conclusion**

Did you prove your thesis?

Did you substantiate your assumptions?

What did we learn from your research?; What conclusions can we reach?

You may make projections for the future, or suggest ideas for further research.

- **Bibliography**

Is written like the references in footnotes, with the only difference that here surname first, and then first name, listed in alphabetical order.

In English and other languages (English first, then others in alphabetical order)

Bibliography should include only sources mentioned in your essay.

Academic writing, with **footnotes** as written in syllabus. Do not refer in endnotes or in brackets.

Examples:

Article in a newspaper

Robert Fisk, "Mystery Surrounds Location of Hijack Passengers," *London Times* (18 June 1985), p. 1.

Book reference

Martha Nussbaum and Saul Levmore (eds.), *Privacy and Free Speech on the Internet* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2010).

Lee C. Bollinger, *The Tolerant Society* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), p. 127.

Article reference

Will Kymlicka, "Liberalism and the Politicization of Ethnicity", *Canadian Journal of Law and Jurisprudence*, Vol. IV, No. 2 (1991), pp 239-256.

C. Edwin Baker, "Autonomy and Informational Privacy, or Gossip: The Central Meaning of the First Amendment," *Social Philosophy and Policy*, Vol. 21, Issue 2 (July 2004): 215-268, esp. at 260-267.

Article in a book

David Sussman, "On the Supposed Duty of Truthfulness: Kant on Lying in Self-Defense", in Clancy Martin (ed.), *The Philosophy of Deception* (NY: Oxford University Press, 2009), pp. 225-243.

Ronald M. Dworkin, "Do We Have A Right to Pornography?", in Dworkin, *A Matter of Principle* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), pp 335-372.

Michael J. Beloff, "Politicians and the Press," in Jack Beatson and Yvonne Cripps (eds.), *Freedom of Expression and Freedom of Information* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), p. 76.

Court cases

Hellewell v. Chief Constable of South Yorkshire [1995] 1 WLR 804.

Village of Skokie v. The National Socialist Party of America 373 N.E. 2d 21 (1978).

Bartnicki et al v. Vopper, 532 U.S. 514 (2001).

Les Editions Vice-Versa Inc. v. Aubry [1998] 1 S.C.R. 591.

Government Papers

Home Office, *Report of the Committee on Privacy and Related Matters* (London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, June 1990), Cm 1102, at 73. Sir David Calcutt Report.

Website

Luciano Floridi, "The Information Society and Its Philosophy: Introduction to the Special Issue on 'The Philosophy of Information, its Nature and Future Developments'," *The Information Society*, Volume 25, Number 3 (May-June 2009), at <http://www.philosophyofinformation.net/publications/pdf/tisip.pdf> (accessed 4 September 2012).

If you refer to the same source more than once, provide full details in the first footnote and author, title and page no. in subsequent references.

Example for Bibliography references:

Bollinger, Lee C., *The Tolerant Society* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986). (no need to mention page numbers).

Dworkin, Ronald M., "Do We Have A Right to Pornography?", in Dworkin, *A Matter of Principle* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), pp 335-372. (for book chapters and articles you need to provide page nos.).

Floridi, Luciano, "The Information Society and Its Philosophy: Introduction to the Special Issue on 'The Philosophy of Information, its Nature and Future Developments'," *The Information Society*, Volume 25, Number 3 (May-June 2009), at <http://www.philosophyofinformation.net/publications/pdf/tisip.pdf> (accessed 4 September 2011).

Kymlicka, Will, "Liberalism and the Politicization of Ethnicity", *Canadian Journal of Law and Jurisprudence*, Vol. IV, No. 2 (1991), pp 239-256.

Village of Skokie v. The National Socialist Party of America 373 N.E. 2d 21 (1978).

4.5 Plagiarism and 'self-plagiarism'

As noted in section 4.2 all assessed coursework **must** be submitted via *TurnitinUK*. This is an anti-plagiarism software package. This software compares essays against a number of sources and produces a report indicating the extent to which the essay matches these sources. Markers are then required to consider the matches indicated to ensure that, where the work of others has been used, it has been appropriately referenced. Where references are not properly provided the work may be considered to be 'plagiarised'.

Plagiarism - passing off the work of others as your own - is a serious academic offence. It is considered to be a use of 'unfair means' and the University, Faculty and Department have clear policies to deal with it. 'Self-plagiarism' is also strictly prohibited. Self-plagiarism is the submission of a piece of work, in part or in whole, on more than one occasion and may be considered to be a form of unfair means.

All allegations of plagiarism (and all other matters relating to the use of unfair means) will be referred to the Dean of Faculty and will be dealt with in accordance with University regulations under the *Code of Practice on the Use of Unfair Means* available at <http://www2.hull.ac.uk/student/studenthandbook/academic/unfairmeans.aspx>. All students should fully apprise themselves of these documents.



TurnitinUK can be used as a developmental tool to support students in gaining a greater understanding of good academic practice. Under University regulations students must have access to the *TurnitinUK*'s 'Playpen' facility during the period for which they are eligible to receive a Caution under Unfair Means Regulations. Within the Department the caution period applies to any student who is undertaking the Certificate stage of an Undergraduate programme of study – this includes candidates who are repeating that stage or have transferred to it from another programme – and any

student who is undertaking the first semester of the Diploma, post Diploma or Honours stage of an Honours degree, having been admitted as a direct entrant to that stage. During the study skills session on plagiarism all eligible students will be shown how they may access and use the playpen facility.

4.6 Essay Length



The University has a standardised set of regulations regarding over length assessments (see http://www2.hull.ac.uk/administration/policy_register/quality_handbook/section_f.aspx). The Department must apply these regulations and so, since they could seriously affect your academic progress, *it is essential that you are familiar with the following rules.*

This module handbook clearly specifies the maximum length of the essay which you must submit. **Your essay should not exceed this limit. Essays which exceed the stipulated maximum word length will be penalised** as set out below. There are two reasons for this: firstly, being able to produce work of a specified length is an important skill and an integral part of essay writing; secondly, ensuring that students' work does not exceed a stipulated word length makes essay based assessment more equitable.

Amount over word limit	Consequence
Up to 10%	No marks deducted
10-20%	10 marks deducted
More than 20%	Mark of zero awarded

You must declare the word length of your essay on the cover sheet. In accordance with paragraph 30(v) of the University Code of Practice on Assessment Procedures an erroneous word count declaration **must** be dealt with as suspected use of unfair means and the matter must then be followed up according to the Regulations on the Use of Unfair Means. If no word count has been declared, or no coversheet submitted, students will be subsequently asked to declare a word count/submit a coversheet. If, within a period of 7 days, the word count is subsequently not declared/coversheet not submitted, the work must be awarded a mark of zero.

Please note that the **essay title, citation footnotes/references and your bibliography must not be included as part of the declared word count. However, textual footnotes must be included in the word count.** A citation footnote is one which simply shows the source(s) you have used e.g. J. Goldstein, *International Relations* (4th Edition) (New York: Longman, 2000) A textual footnote is one which is composed of prose and which is intended to provide the reader with information additional to that contained within the main body of text.

The following **is** included in the word count:

- Contents page (if included);
- All text, including section headings and sub-headings;
- Textual footnotes (as defined above); and
- Appendices, figures and tables which are annotated with prose that is intended to provide information additional to the main body of text.

The following **is not** included in the word count:

- Citation footnotes (for definition, see above);
- Bibliography (and/or List of sources); and
- Appendices, figures and tables which are not annotated with prose that is intended to provide information additional to the main body of text. This includes Time-plans, as well as tables that collate evidence from the material being analysed. Appendices, figures and tables in this category are aimed to complement and illustrate the main text and not to develop the argument being presented.

4.7 Examinations

Students must attend examinations as scheduled by the University's Examinations Office. Exam timetables will be published prior to each examination period. You may access this via the Student Portal. Exam timetables will also be posted on Departmental notice boards.

If you are unable to attend an exam at the scheduled time (e.g. because of ill health) you should inform the Department as soon as possible. If you miss an exam **you must submit a mitigating circumstances form** on which you must explain why you failed to attend. **You must also provide supporting documentary evidence**, e.g. a medical certificate. **You must do this within 7 days of the date of the exam** if your mitigating circumstances are to be considered by the Department. If you fail to submit your mitigating circumstances within this 7 day limit they may only be considered by the Department with the permission of the University's Student Progress Committee.

Mitigating circumstances are considered by the DAPC which determines whether a student should be deemed to have been 'absent with good cause'. If you are found not to have had good cause you will be deemed to have failed to comply with the attendance requirements of the module and you may, therefore, under Paragraph 33(a) of the University's *Programmes Regulations - Honours Degrees*, be denied the right of re-assessment in the module. Failure to attend exams as scheduled may also adversely affect your chance of being referred in a module should you fail to pass it. Where the Department does not refer a student in a failed module the student will be unable to graduate with honours within the prescribed period of study.

A mitigating circumstances form can be obtained from the Departmental Office, via the Department's *eBridge* site, or at:

<http://www2.hull.ac.uk/student/studenthandbook/academic/mitigatingcircumstances.aspx>

4.8 Class Presentations

Each student must make at least one assessed tutorial presentation. Presentation topics are indicated in Section 12 of this module handbook and will be decided upon during the first tutorial session.

Each tutorial presentation should be **20 minutes long** and must be accompanied by a **one-page summary** to be prepared before the session. Copies of the summary must be handed out to the tutor and all students present at the beginning of the tutorial.

Assessment of the work shall be based on content as well as presentation of the work (oral as well as written summary). **Presentation dates and topics can only be changed with the explicit agreement of the tutor.** In such circumstances the student is responsible for finding another student willing to switch with them. Failure to present your agreed tutorial paper (without valid excuse) at the appointed date and time will result in a mark of zero for the assessment. It should also be noted that failure to meet the specified module requirements relating to assessed tutorial presentations may result in denial of the right of reassessment for the module.

Instructions for class presentations

PowerPoint is preferred but not obligatory. Creative ways for presentation are encouraged.

Do NOT simply read from your papers.

Try to combine with a video clip. Ask me if I happen to have a relevant clip.

Presentation – 20 minutes.

Video clips are encouraged. They should be max. 5 minutes long, in addition to the 20 minutes allotted time. The clip can be at the start, finish or any other time of your presentation.

Please **email your presentation directly to me** R.Cohen-Almagor@hull.ac.uk two-days prior to your presentation.

I will post all presentations on ebridge.

Please come to class room sometime BEFORE we start to install your PowerPoint on the class PC and to verify that it runs smoothly.

Please always bring your presentation on your disk-on-key.

Please prepare summary of your presentation, **1-2 pages**, and circulate to class.

Assume that students read the material; therefore, there is no need to provide a detailed description of the readings.

The presentation should address the questions and themes outlined in your handbook for the particular week under discussion.

It must relate to **all** obligatory readings for the particular class and preferably relate to at least some of the optional reading as well.

Optional readings are for you to strengthen some points and ideas.

Do **NOT** present the issues by articles (Author A said...; Author B said...; Author C said...). This is boring. Show your ability to provide a comprehensive analysis of the readings together. Instead, you need to cover the main points made, and to provide an analysis according to **common themes**.

Relate your presentation to my points for discussion, provided in the module handbook.

You are required to relate to ALL points for discussion.

After covering the shared themes, discuss the important themes of articles that are not shared by all authors.

Almost half of your presentation (8 to 10 minutes) should be your Critique of the readings. I will alert you when you reach half way of your presentation so you will now that at this point you need to provide your OWN Critique of ALL readings together.

Rehearse your presentation before you do it in class. See that your presentation is 20 minutes long.

A shorter presentation usually means that you failed to cover all points of the readings and/or failed to provide adequate Critique.

Also make sure that you do not go beyond the allotted time.

Make sure that the PowerPoint is readable and clear. Do not use faint colours or small fonts.

Avoid overloading your presentations with too many details. On the other hand, do not merely resort to one or two words.

The PowerPoint should provide the audience with a clear idea about your topics. It should NOT be your talk. You are required to elaborate on the PowerPoint verbally.

Please relate to your audience. Look at them from time to time if you read. See that you do not lose touch with your audience.

I will stop you after 20 minutes.

After the presentation, open a forum for questions and discussion.

In case of two presenters:

Prepare your presentation together.

Each should speak 10 minutes.

Please do NOT arrange your time so that the first speaks for 10 minutes, and then the second speak for another 10 minutes. Instead, I expect you to have a ping-pong discussion, when you argue the points. One should present the “pro” side, the other the “con” side, like **a ping-pong**, in the form of debate. For instance, one of you will take a pro-speech stance with regard to the issue at hand, while the other will take a prohibitive stance on freedom of speech. I want to have a lively argument in class, and see which of the stances wins the hearts of your fellow students.

Then, together you voice your critique of the reading.

I expect you to relate also to the **optional readings**.

After the presentation, there will be a Q&A session. Usually, I let your peers to ask first, and later I come in with my own questions/remarks/clarifications.

You are most welcome to come to see me to discuss any question/difficulty that you may have in preparation of your presentation. I am always happy to help.

Do NOT postpone things to the last moment. Make sure that you have read **all** the relevant readings in advance, and that you met me well before the presentation, when I am still able to help.

5. YOUR RIGHT OF APPEAL

You have the right to appeal against decisions taken regarding your academic progress, including the award of a qualification. You may not, however, appeal against academic judgement. For further information see:

<http://www2.hull.ac.uk/student/studenthandbook/academic/academicappeals.aspx> .

Impartial advice on appeals is available from the Students' Union Advice Centre (details available at <http://www2.hull.ac.uk/student/studenthandbook/support/advicecentre.aspx>) or from the Senior Tutor responsible for students within the Department of Politics and International Studies, Mrs Christine Murphy, who can be contacted on C.Murphy@hull.ac.uk.

6. MARKING CRITERIA



In response to feedback from students and its External examiners, the Department has developed a series of marking criteria for different types of assessment (e.g. essays, exams, presentations etc.). These are designed to enhance the transparency of the marking process. Marking criteria provide guidance in the application of academic judgement. The Department's various sets of marking criteria are available via *eBridge*. Students are strongly advised to consult the relevant set of criteria prior to starting work on an assessment task.

7. ESSAY TITLES

Choose one of the following titles:

1. Should there be an external organization to monitor and sanction the British media?
2. How should the problem of cyberbullying be addressed?
3. Do the British media resort to freebies to get their stories?
4. How effective is the work of the *Guardian* Readers' Representative?

Essay Deadline: 12.00pm (noon), Monday 3rd December 2012.

8. LECTURES

Week 1: Administrative matters.

Week 2: Between ethics and morality; what is ethics?; Kant; Virtue ethics; Utilitarianism.

READING WEEK.

Week 3: Values in Communication.

Week 4: The Public Right to Know v. The Right to Privacy.

Week 5: Trustworthy Reporting.

Week 6: Responsibility in Communication.

Week 7: Communication and Racism.

Week 8: Violence in Communication.

9. TUTORIAL 'TIPS'

In preparing for tutorials you should note the following points:

- The reading material in this reading list is split into two basic categories. Firstly, a number of **core texts** are listed. These **should be referred to throughout the module, prior to the reading listed for each tutorial**. Rather than single out a particular text for purchase, it is recommended that you coordinate your purchases with friends/other students in your tutorial group or with whom you otherwise study. This way, in preparing for tutorials, you will have immediate access to a wider range of material.
- In addition to core texts, **specific texts** are listed for each tutorial topic. The literature listed here **does not constitute an exhaustive reading list**. Students should use their initiative in preparing for classes; use the library's computer system to search out material and in particular refer to the extensive range of journals available.
- When referring to books **use your common sense**. For guidance this reading list often cites specific book chapters, but many of the books referred to will have been published in a number of editions and in each edition chapters may have changed. For this reason it is important that you use the chapter references for guide purposes only.
- **Consider your fellow students**. Inevitably library resources are not infinite; we don't have a copy of every book for every student. Do not take books out of the library and have them sitting, unused, in your room while others strive to get hold of them. Photocopying requisite chapters and returning the book immediately to the shelf maximises access for others. This method also allows you to write on or highlight the photocopied text without damaging the original copy.
- **When using electronic resources you must be discerning**. Many recognised, refereed journals are now available on-line and these are an invaluable resource. At the other end of the scale is a vast array of material posted by people who know little if anything about the topic on which they have chosen to write. So it is crucial that you remember that anyone can post anything; see, for example, my guide to open-heart surgery!
- **Some of the material you are asked to read is difficult**. The language used and arguments forwarded are often complex. **Don't be afraid!** You won't understand everything that you read, but then, if it were that simple, people wouldn't be able to build careers arguing about the issues raised.
- Finally, remember that the key in preparing for tutorials is that you should be able to make a worthwhile contribution to the topic of debate. You may find it advantageous to work in groups in preparing for tutorials (though work on essays should be yours and yours alone!) as discussing matters in this way can often help clarify them. Group working also allows for the division of labour, hence maximising the amount of material you can cover, and the sharing of books etc. Whichever working practice you adopt, it is not necessarily expected that you read everything listed, but it is expected that you **read something!**

10 READING LIST

The most important readings are:

Barendt, E. (ed.), *Freedom of the Press* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2009).

Cohen-Almagor, R., *Speech, Media, and Ethics: The Limits of Free Expression* (New York and Houndmills: Palgrave, 2005).

Cohen-Almagor, R., *The Scope of Tolerance* (London and NY: Routledge, 2006).

Hare, I. and J. Weinstein (eds.), *Extreme Speech and Democracy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).

Knowlton, S.R. and B. Reader, *Moral Reasoning for Journalists* (Westport, CT: Praeger Publishing, 2009).

Steel, J., *Journalism and Free Speech* (London: Routledge, 2012).

Items in **BOLD** *infra* are compulsory. The rest are optional but it is expected that class presenters will relate to the optional readings in their respective presentations. The optional material is designed to help you in the writing of your essays.

Schedule of Sessions

Each session will be opened with a short introduction by Prof. Cohen-Almagor. Each week one or two students will then deliver a 20 minutes' presentation summarising the week's reading and relating to issues and questions outlined below. Further details will be distributed and a schedule drawn up in the first session.

The topics for the following sessions are as follows:

Week 2. What is Ethics?

Between ethics and morality;
 The essence of professionalism;
 Utilitarian ethics v. other forms of ethics – compare and contrast;
 Journalism as art, as a profession, as a vocation;
 Critique of readings.

Knowlton, Steven R. and Bill Reader, *Moral Reasoning for Journalists* (Westport, CT: Praeger Publishing, 2009), pp. 3-16, 44-65.

Plaisance, Patrick Lee, *Media Ethics: Key Principles for Responsible Practice* (Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications, 2009), chap. 1.

LOCATION	SHELVED AT	STATUS
<u>BJL 6th Floor</u>	<u>P 94 P6</u>	

Further Reading:

James Watson, *Dictionary of Media and Communication Studies* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2010).

LOCATION	SHELVED AT	LOAN TYPE	STATUS
<u>BJL 6th Floor Reference</u>	<u>P 87.5 W3</u>	NOT FOR LOAN	LIB USE ONLY

Matthew Kieran, *Media Ethics: a philosophical approach* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1997).

LOCATION	SHELVED AT	LOAN TYPE	STATUS
<u>BJL 6th Floor</u>	<u>P 94 K4</u>	NORMAL LOAN	

David Sussman, "On the Supposed Duty of Truthfulness: Kant on Lying in Self-Defense", in Clancy Martin (ed.), *The Philosophy of Deception* (NY: Oxford University Press, 2009), pp. 225-243.

Dale Jacquette, *Journalistic Ethics: moral responsibility in the media* (Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice-Hall/Pearson, 2007), pp. 1-11.

LOCATION	SHELVED AT	LOAN TYPE	STATUS
<u>BJL 5th Floor</u>	<u>PN 4756 J1</u>		

Week 3. Values in Communication

If still teach Jacquette, add embedding into the army.

Media values;
Credibility;
The relationships between communication, government and democracy;
Objectivity and neutrality;
The public right to know;
Critique of readings.

Cohen-Almagor, R., "Objective Reporting in the Media: Phantom Rather than Panacea", in *Speech, Media, and Ethics: The Limits of Free Expression* (London: Macmillan, 2005), chap. 4
Or
"The Limits of Objective Reporting", *Journal of Language and Politics*, Vol. 7, No. 1 (2008), pp. 138-157.

Jacquette, Dale, *Journalistic Ethics: moral responsibility in the media* (Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice-Hall/Pearson, 2007), pp. 208-243.

Further Reading:

BBC Guidelines, <http://www.bbc.co.uk/guidelines/editorialguidelines/guidelines/>

Patrick Lee Plaisance, *Media Ethics: Key Principles for Responsible Practice* (Thousand Oaks, Calif. : Sage Publications, 2009), chap. 2.

LOCATION	SHELVED AT	STATUS
<u>BJL 6th Floor</u>	<u>P 94 P6</u>	

Robert A. Hackett, and Yuezhi Zhao, *Sustaining Democracy? Journalism and the Politics of Objectivity* (Toronto: Garamond Press, 1998), Chapter 2.

R. Cohen-Almagor and I. Yanovitzky, "The Conduct of the Media in the Eye of the Jewish Public in Israel: 'Is' versus 'Ought'", in R. Cohen-Almagor, *Speech, Media, and Ethics: The Limits of Free Expression* (London: Macmillan, 2005), Appendix.

Erik Ugland and Jennifer Henderson, "Who Is a Journalist and Why Does it Matter? Disentangling the Legal and Ethical Arguments," *JMME*, Vol. 22, No. 4 (2007), pp. 256-258.

Bill Kovach and Tom Rosenstiel, *The Elements of Journalism: what newspeople should know and the public should expect* (NY: Random House, 2007).

Jeffrey Scheuer, *The Big Picture: why democracies need journalistic excellence* (Routledge/Taylor & Francis Inc., 2008), pp. 61-82.

LOCATION	SHELVED AT	LOAN TYPE	STATUS
<u>BJL 5th Floor</u>	<u>PN 4751 S3</u>		

Rita Watson and Menahem Blondheim (eds.), *The Toronto School of Communication Theory: Interpretations, Extensions and Applications* (Toronto and Jerusalem: University of Toronto Press and Magnes Press, 2007).

LOCATION	SHELVED AT	LOAN TYPE	STATUS
<u>BJL 6th Floor</u>	<u>P 90 T6</u>		

Week 4. The Public Right to Know v. The Right to Privacy

The Princess Diana Affair in England;
The Aubry affair;
Limits of intrusion into one's privacy;
Public figures v. ordinary people and other helpful distinctions;
Legal precedents;
Was the decision of the **CANADIAN BROADCAST STANDARDS COUNCIL** justified?;

Critique of readings.

Cohen-Almagor, R., *The Scope of Tolerance* (London and NY: Routledge, 2006), chapters 2, 3.

CANADIAN BROADCAST STANDARDS COUNCIL, QUEBEC REGIONAL PANEL, *Privacy of convicted and released pedophile, CKYK-FM re broadcast of a civic address, (CBSC Decision 05/06-0710) Decided June 30, 2006.*

BBC Video: Ethics in the British Communication.

Further Reading:

BBC Guidelines, section 7, <http://www.bbc.co.uk/guidelines/editorialguidelines/guidelines/>

James Stanyer, *Intimate Politics* (Cambridge: Polity, 2013), pp. 101-129.

Steven J. Heyman, *Free Speech and Human Dignity* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), pp. 149-163.

Les Editions Vice Versa Inc. v. Pascale Claude Aubry, 1 S.C.R. [1998].

Daniel J. Solove, and Paul M. Schwartz, *Privacy and the Media* (Aspen Publishing Co. 2009). ISBN: 9780735582576

LOCATION	SHELVED AT	STATUS
<u>BJL 2nd Floor</u>	<u>KT 199 S6</u>	

Daniel J. Solove, *Understanding Privacy* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2008).

Eric Barendt, "Privacy and the Press", in Eric Barendt (ed.), *Freedom of the Press* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2009), pp. 361-379. ISBN 9780754627821

Martha Nussbaum and Saul Levmore (eds.), *Privacy and Free Speech on the Internet* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2010).

Dario Milo, *Freedom of Speech and Defamation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008).

Whitfield Diffie and Susan Landau, *Privacy on the Line: the politics of wiretapping and encryption* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2007).

LOCATION	SHELVED AT	STATUS
<u>BJL 4th Floor</u>	<u>UB 256 U5 D5</u>	

Week 5. Trustworthy Reporting

When, if at all, is it possible to use deception?;
The Janet Cooke, *Washington Post*, affair;
The Food Lion affair;
What lessons should be learned from the Cooke and Food Lion affairs?
Critique of readings.

Cooke, Janet, "Jimmy's World", *Washington Post* (September 28, 1980), Page A1.

Larisa Brown and Chris Brooke, "Culture of cruelty': 11 care home workers sentenced for shocking abuse of vulnerable residents exposed by Panorama probe", *Mail Online* (27 October 2012), <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2223514/Winterbourne-View-11-care-home-workers-sentenced-abuse-exposed-BBC-Panorama.html>

Poynter Institute Guidelines on deception, <http://www.poynter.org/uncategorized/744/deceptionhidden-cameras-checklist/>

Videos: **Panorama Winterbourne home care abuse,**
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=U8RmNQVHIDI>

Food Lion, <http://www.mrctv.org/videos/worst-business-myths-no-9-food-lion-under-fire>

Further Reading:

Bill Green, "Janet's World", *The Washington Post* (19 April 1981).

Food Lion, Inc. v. Capital Cities/ABC, Inc., 194 F.3d 505, 15 IER Cases 1065, 27 Media L. Rep. 2409 (4th Cir. 10/20/1999).

Ron F. Smith, *Ethics in Journalism* (Ames: Blackwell Publishing, 2008), pp. 191-210.

LOCATION	SHELVED AT	LOAN TYPE	STATUS
BJL 5th Floor	PN 4888 E8 S6	NORMAL LOAN	

Tom Goldstein, *Journalism and Truth: strange bedfellows* (Northwestern University Press, 2007), pp. 25-45.

LOCATION	SHELVED AT	LOAN TYPE	STATUS
BJL 5th Floor	PN 4888 E8 S6		

Clancy Martin (ed.), *The Philosophy of Deception* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).

Randall P. Bezanson, "Means and Ends and Food Lion: The Tension between Exemption and Independence in Newsgathering by the Press", *Emory Law Journal*, Vol. 47 (Summer 1998): 895.

Jeffrey Scheuer, *The Big Picture: why democracies need journalistic excellence* (Routledge/Taylor & Francis Inc., 2008).

0415976170. 9780415976176. R6682634 US. 2008. USD 95.00

LOCATION	SHELVED AT	LOAN TYPE	STATUS
BJL 5th Floor	PN 4751 S3		

Steven R. Knowlton, and Bill Reader, *Moral Reasoning for Journalists* (Westport, CT: Praeger Publishing, 2009), pp. 192-215.

Bill Kovach and Tom Rosenstiel, *The Elements of Journalism: what newspeople should know and the public should expect* (Random House, 2007), pp. 226-244.

Andrew Belsey and Ruth Chadwick (eds.), *Ethical Issues in Journalism and the Media* (London: Routledge, 1992).

LOCATION	SHELVED AT	LOAN TYPE	STATUS
BJL 5th Floor	PN 4756 E8	NORMAL LOAN	

Week 6. Responsibility in Communication

The notion of responsibility;
How to cover events?;
Protection of sources;
Bribes and 'Free meals';
BBC responsible guidelines;
Critique of readings.

Frost, Chris, *Journalism Ethics and Regulation* (Harlow, England; New York: Pearson, 2011), chap. 7 "Gathering the News".

Cohen-Almagor, R., "Ethical Boundaries of Media Coverage", in *Speech, Media, and Ethics: The Limits of Free Expression* (London: Macmillan, 2005), chap. 5.

BBC Guidelines, <http://www.bbc.co.uk/guidelines/editorialguidelines/guidelines/>

Further Reading:

Clifford Christians, et al., *Good News* (Oxford University Press, 1993), chap. 5.

LOCATION	SHELVED AT	LOAN TYPE	STATUS
<u>BJL 5th Floor</u>	<u>PN 4888 E8 C5</u>		

Dale Jacquette, *Journalistic Ethics: moral responsibility in the media* (Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice-Hall/Pearson, 2007), pp. 36-55.

R. Cohen-Almagor, "Media Coverage of Suicide in Canada, with Reflections on Great Britain and Israel", in *Speech, Media, and Ethics: The Limits of Free Expression*, chap. 6.

R. Cohen-Almagor, "Responsibility of Net Users", in Mark Fackler and Robert S. Fortner (eds.), *The Handbook of Global Communication and Media Ethics*, Vol. I (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011), pp. 415-433.

Clifford G. Christians and John C. Merrill (eds.) *Ethical Communication: Five Moral Stances in Human Dialogue* (Columbia, MO.: University of Missouri Press, 2009).

LOCATION	SHELVED AT	STATUS
<u>BJL 5th Floor</u>	<u>BJ 1521 E8</u>	

R. G. Frey, *Liability and Responsibility* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).

BJL Short Loan	<u>K 230 F74 L6</u>	24 HOURS	AVAILABLE
BJL Short Loan	<u>K 230 F74 L6</u>		

William James Willis, *The Media Effect: how the news influences politics and government* (Praeger, 2007).

LOCATION	SHELVED AT	STATUS
<u>BJL 5th Floor</u>	<u>PN 4738 W7</u>	

Week 7. Communication and Racism

Sensitive terminology;
 Should racism be excluded from media coverage?;
 Is hate speech protected speech?;
 The David Duke affair in the United States;
 Media coverage of the Unabomber;
 Media coverage of militias;
 The Skokie controversy;
 Critique of readings.

Boeyink, David E., "Reporting on Political Extremists in the United States: The Ku Klux Klan, the Unabomber, and the Militias", in R. Cohen-Almagor (ed.), *Liberal Democracy and the Limits of Tolerance* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2000), pp. 215-231.

Heyman, Steven J., "Hate Speech, Public Discourse, and the First Amendment", In Ivan Hare and James Weinstein (eds.), *Extreme Speech and Democracy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), pp. 158-181.

LOCATION	SHELVED AT	STATUS
<u>BJL 2nd Floor</u>	<u>K 3254 E9</u>	

Further Reading:

Raphael Cohen-Almagor, *The Boundaries of Liberty and Tolerance* (Gainesville, FL.: University Press of Florida, 1994), chapter 12.

R. Cohen-Almagor, "Ethical Considerations in Media Coverage of Hate Speech in Canada", *Review of Constitutional Studies*, Vol. 6, No. 1 (2001), pp. 79-100.

Raphael Cohen-Almagor, "Hate Speech in Canada", *The Scope of Tolerance* (London and NY: Routledge, 2006), chap. 7.

Raphael Cohen-Almagor, "Freedom of Expression v. Social Responsibility: Holocaust Denial in Canada" (forthcoming).

Jeremy Waldron, *The Harm in Hate Speech* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2012), pp. 105-143.

Irwin Cotler, "Holocaust Denial, Equality and Harm: Boundaries of Liberty and Tolerance in a Liberal Democracy", in R. Cohen-Almagor (ed.), *Liberal Democracy and the Limits of Tolerance* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2000).

David Kretzmer, "Freedom of Speech and Racism", *Cardozo Law Review* (1987), pp. 445-513.

John Solomos, *Race and Racism in Britain* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2003).

L. W. Sumner, *The Hateful and the Obscene* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004).

LOCATION	SHELVED AT	STATUS
<u>BJL 2nd Floor</u>	<u>KU 199 S9</u>	

Mark Fackler and Robert S. Fortner (eds.), *Ethics and Evil in the Public Sphere: Media, Universal Values & Global Development* (Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, 2010).

Video: Ernst Zundel website of hate.

Week 8. Violence in Communication

Violence in communication and its influence on children;
Should we bully the bullies?;
What is bullying? What is cyberbullying?
How should we address bullying and cyberbullying?;
Should we employ censorship in television?
Critique of readings.

Canadian Broadcast Standards Council, MTV Canada re *Bully Beatdown*, CBSC Decision 08/09-1667 (Decided April 1, 2010), <http://www.cbsc.ca/english/decisions/2010/100721.php>

Strasburger, Victor C. And Barbara J. Wilson, "Television Violence", in Douglas A. Gentile (ed.), *Media Violence and Children: a complete guide for parents and professionals* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2003), chapter 4, pp. 57-86.

**Video: Violence in the Media: Effects on Children,
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Dj0ybgDDIpg>**

Further Reading:

BBC Guidelines, section 9, <http://www.bbc.co.uk/guidelines/editorialguidelines/guidelines/>

Mark Fackler and Robert S. Fortner (eds.), *Ethics, Global Communication and Media* (Blackwell, 2011).

Canadian Broadcast Standards Council, Ontario Regional Council, *Decision Concerning 'Mighty Morphin Power Rangers' on CIII-TV* (April-May 1994), files 9394-270; 9394-277).

John Vernon Pavlik, *Media in the Digital Age* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2008), pp. 266-282.

Video: Violence on TV.

Week 9. Political and Commercial Constraints

Economy, politics and communication;
Conflict of interests;
Herman and Chomsky's criticism of the media;
Commercial speech;
What is the present ownership situation in Britain?;
Cross ownership and excessive ownership;
Critique of readings.

Herman, Edward S. and Noam Chomsky, *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media* (London: Bodley Head, 2008), chapter 1.

KDL Main	302.23 CHO
----------	------------

Steel, John, *Journalism and Free Speech* (London: Routledge, 2012), pp. 154-168.

Douglas, Torin, "Analysis: Murdoch and media ownership in UK", *BBC News* (22 December 2010), <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-12062176>

Further Reading:

Michael Schudson, *Why Democracies Need an Unlovable Press* (Cambridge: Polity, 2008), chap. 5.

BJL 6th Floor	P 95.8 S3
---------------	-----------

Maude Barlow, and James Winter, *The Big Black Book* (Toronto: Stoddart, 1997), chapter 1.

James Winter, *Democracy's Oxygen: How Corporations Control the News* (Montreal: Black Rose Books, 1997), Introduction, pp. xxiii-xxix.

R. Cohen-Almagor, "Responsibility and Ethics in the Canadian Media: Some Basic Concerns", *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*, Vol. 17, No. 1 (2002), pp. 35-52.

Thomas Gibbons (ed.), *Free Speech in the New Media* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2009).
978-0-7546-2791-3

Colin B. Grant, *Uncertainty and Communication: new theoretical investigations* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007).
0230517625.
9780230517622. L7615248 UK. 2007. GBP 45.00

Ron F. Smith, *Ethics in Journalism* (Ames: Blackwell Publishing, 2008).
US. 1405159340. 9781405159340. 6th L7757700 UK. 2008. GBP 24.99

LOCATION	SHELVED AT	LOAN TYPE	STATUS
BJL 5th Floor	PN 4888 E8 S6		

R. Cohen-Almagor, with Stefan Seiterle, "Excessive Media Ownership and Its Potential Threats to Democracy: A Comparative Analysis", *Annual Review of Law and Ethics*, Vol. 12 (2004), pp. 437-463.

Week 10. The Work of the Ombudsman and Press Councils

Is there a need for ethical codes and press councils?;
The authority of the Press Council;
Should the Press Complaints Committee be equipped with more powers or be dissolved?;
Why there are so few ombudsmen and how can their work become more effective?;

Critique of readings.

Kenney Rick, and Kerem Ozkan, "The Ethics Examiner and Media Councils: Improving Ombudsmanship and News Councils for True Citizen Journalism", *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*, Vol. 26, No. 1 (2011): 38-55.

Ritter, John A., and Matthew Leibowitz, "Press Councils: The Answer to Our First Amendment Dilemma", in Eric Barendt (ed.), *Freedom of the Press* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2009), pp. 141-166.

Lord Hunt, "Towards a new system of self-regulation", http://www.pcc.org.uk/assets/0/Draft_proposal.pdf

Further Reading:

Sir Louis Bloom-Cooper and Lisa R. Pruitt, "Privacy Jurisprudence of the Press Complaints Commission", in Eric Barendt (ed.), *Freedom of the Press* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2009), pp. 167-194.

LOCATION	SHELVED AT	LOAN TYPE	STATUS
<u>BJL 2nd Floor</u>	<u>K 3255 F8</u>		

R. Cohen-Almagor, "The Work of the Press Councils in Great Britain, Canada, and Israel: Comparative Appraisal", in *Speech, Media, and Ethics: The Limits of Free Expression* (London: Macmillan, 2005), chap. 7.

Lucy Kueng, Robert G. Picard and Ruth Towse (eds.), *The Internet and the Mass Media* (Thousand Oaks: Sage, 2008), Chapter 6 (pp. 102-124) and Conclusions (pp. 170-177).

<u>KDL Main</u>	<u>302.231 KUN</u>
-----------------	--------------------

Roy L. Moore, *Media, Law and Ethics* (NY: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2008).

Chris Frost, *Journalism Ethics and Regulation* (Harlow, Essex: Pearson, 2011), pp. 205-220, 273-292.

11. MODULE EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRES

At the end of each module students have the opportunity to fill in a Module Evaluation Questionnaire, through which they feedback on the respective module. This provides staff with valuable information to consider when reviewing their modules. Below you will find a summary of the feedback received for this module last year, accompanied by the module coordinator's response.

BOX FROM EACH MEQ REPORT TO GO HERE.