24 Moral Panics:

Reconsidering Journalism's Responsibilities

Ann Luce

"I am deeply interested in the progress and elevation of journalism, having spent my life in that profession, regarding it as a noble profession and one of unequalled importance for its influence upon the minds and morals of the people."

Joseph Pulitzer

There is a fine line in journalism between reporting that enhances 'the minds and morals' of members of the public and reporting that causes fear and panic, intentional or otherwise. As a journalist, you shouldn't want to sensationalise news events, let alone cause fear or panic about any issue, yet it happens. Moral panics emerge when there is a misrepresentation of an important social issue. Moral panics, as Critcher (2003) states, have three dimensions:

- Moral panics have an identifiable process of definition and action;
- they mark the moral boundaries of society
- and they also create discourses of various kinds and at various levels (2003: 5).

What Critcher illustrates here is that the creation of a moral panic goes through a process. For instance, as you will see later in this chapter, moral panics tend to be ordinary issues that can serve as a warning to real danger. Moral panics tend to show underlying fears about issues that hit at the core of society such as the safety of children or the economic health and wellbeing of a nation. When a moral panic occurs, it highlights that the boundaries of society are being pushed past a comfortable level, and thus, various discourses need to emerge to try and stabilize the conversation. The media are important agents

for change. They help to reproduce and continue those different discourses, representations and misrepresentations. The media's role is to help maintain stability in a society. A moral panic then threatens the social order of a society.

This chapter will discuss how moral panics are formed, paying particular attention to historical examples – specifically, the 'Mods and Rockers', 'mugging,' 'sex and HIV/AIDS', and 'video nasties' – before turning to a more recent example, namely news reporting of suicide amongst young people. We will discuss the symbolic nature of moral panics, and the reasons why journalists need to think about their responsibilities when it comes to reporting controversial topics, despite the otherwise understandable urge to grab a headline. The challenge this chapter will address is how to be a proactive, responsible journalist while not creating a moral panic. By its conclusion, there will be several suggestions for you to consider about how best to incorporate responsible values into your everyday reporting life.

Responsible journalism is built upon the assumption that journalists understand that their actions affect those around them. Aldridge and Evetts (2003) see responsible journalism as a 'discourse of self-control, even self-belief, an occupational badge or marker which gives meaning to the work and enables workers to justify and emphasize the importance of their work to themselves' (2003: 555). While this is a good way to look at responsible journalism, Hodges' (1986) definition from the mid-1980s still holds true today:

> *"The roots of responsibility per se lie in the fact that we are both individual and social beings whose decisions and actions inevitably affect others. The very fact that we have the ability or power to affect each other deeply, either for good or for ill, requires that we act responsibly toward each other if society is to endure."* (Hodges, 1986: 16)

In short, as a journalist, you always need to think beyond the immediate limits of a story to consider its wider impact. Your personal moral code entails recognising that what you write or broadcast can shape people's lives, sometimes in profound ways. It is when journalists forget this moral code, or do not practice responsible journalism, that moral panics emerge in society.

The concept of moral panics stems from Stanley Cohen's work in the early 1970s around delinquency, youth cultures and subcultures, as well as football hooliganism. Cohen, a sociologist who is credited with coining the phrase moral panic, wrote one of most influential books in criminology, called Folk Devils and Moral Panics. In the course of his discussion, he outlines the role the media play in depicting public behaviors, particularly when they are perceived – by journalists and their selected sources – to be outside 'acceptable' norms in society. He explains his thesis here:

> *"...the attribution of the moral panic label means that the 'things' extent and significance has been exaggerated (a) in itself (compared with other more reliable, valid and objective sources) and/or (b) compared with other, more serious problems. This labeling derives from a willful refusal by liberals, radicals and leftists to take public anxieties seriously. Instead, they are furthering a politically correct agenda: to downgrade traditional values and moral concerns."* (2002: viii)

For a moral panic to occur, Cohen (2002) describes three steps in his discursive formula. The first is that the issue is either new or old, 'lying dormant perhaps, but hard to recognize; deceptively ordinary and routine, but invisibly creeping up the moral horizon' or that the issues are 'camouflaged versions of traditional and well known evils' (2002: viii). The second is that the issue is either damaging or a warning sign of the real danger. Most moral panics tend to be about an underlying fear around something fundamental on which the society depends, for example, the Internet or energy. Third, the issue is transparent and opaque, meaning anyone can see what is happening regarding the issue, but 'accredited experts must explain the perils hidden behind the superficially harmless' (2002: viii); the public must be told why they should fear what is going on.

While an issue can be labeled a moral panic, Ben-Yehuda (2009) explains the characters that play a role in the story: 'Moral panics have to create, focus on, and sustain powerfully persuasive images of folk devils that can serve at the heart of moral fears' (1). A folk devil can be considered the enemy of a society; it can be a person, place or thing. It is a symbol of the

issue at hand. According to Goode and Ben-Yehuda, 'All moral panics, by their very nature, identify, denounce and attempt to root our folk devils' (1994: 29). Ben-Yehuda goes on to say:

> *"... moral panics are about representations, images and coercion: about which sector of a society has the power to represent and impose its images, world views and interests onto others as being both legitimate and valid."* (2009: 3)

There are several different participatory groups, or actors in the creation of moral panics: the media, the public, the police, politicians and action groups. However, in a British context, Critcher (2009) argues that it tends to be journalistic assumptions about the middle class that helps to intensify fears surrounding an issue:

> *"The anxiety of the middle class intensifies and finds expression in social movements whenever moral order seems to be collapsing in general or at particular sites where some specific social anxiety serves to mobilize an array of different issues and alliances of disparate social forces. Such anxieties are provoked by crises, real or imagined, in the political and social order."* (2009: 21)

These 'crises' can lead to the creation of moral panics by journalists. Cohen (2002) has identified seven clusters of social identity—which can also be understood as how a society labels certain socioeconomic groups within the culture—into which these moral panics tend to belong:

- Young, Working Class, Violent Males; these can be considered football hooligans, muggers, loiterers, or mobile-phone snatchers, the lowest of the low in society who are 'out to get' hard-working people in the society.
- School Violence: Bullying and Shootouts; violence has always been a backdrop in schools. Historically, teachers used corporal punishment against students to maintain order. Now, violence is perceived to be student-on-student, with bullying, physical assault and the shooting of classmates.
- Wrong Drugs: Used by wrong people at wrong places; drug use has always been perceived as an interaction be-

tween the 'evil' drug pusher and the poor, defenseless user, with the drug pusher forcing the user to move from 'soft' drugs to 'hard' drugs such as heroin or cocaine.

- Child Abuse, Satanic Rituals and Paedophile Registers; children have always been considered the innocents in society, and in need of protection. In the early 1980s, a controversy emerged over a group of children who evidently remembered being abused as part of satanic rituals that were occurring in families. The story seems quite absurd now, but the fear and horror of a child being violated and abused in such a manner brings about a sense of panicked vulnerability over the life stage of childhood.
- Sex, Violence and Blaming the Media; there is a long tradition of blaming the media for bringing about, or causing societal ills. A recent example you might remember is Marilyn Manson's music being blamed for the mass shooting at Columbine High School back in the late 1990s. While the media might have a small effect on vulnerable populations, it cannot be considered the sole perpetrator when violence such as the Columbine shooting occurs.
- Welfare Cheats and Single Mothers; these can be considered the people who try to take advantage of the welfare state, submitting bogus claims for financial assistance and trying to 'rip off' the country.
- Refugees and Asylum Seekers: Flooding our country, Swamping our services; immigration in the UK has long been a contentious issue. Similar to the welfare cheats and single mothers, this cluster is considered 'those from other countries who are trying to rip off the country'. Yes, there is some compassion for those who seek asylum or refuge from a war-torn country, however, the discourses that mostly emerge are about the bogus 'foreigners' who are trying to get a free handout and those that are 'lying' to get into the country.

Of the most in/famous moral panics that have emerged from these clusters, several — 'Mods and Rockers,' 'mugging,' 'sex and HIV/AIDS,' and 'video nasties' —will be discussed in this chapter. The issue of suicide will also be examined, showing how one recent example of its reporting in South Wales resonated with several of Cohen's clustered identities.

The Mods and Rockers

What kicked off Cohen's (1972) original thesis on moral panics and folk devils was a highly contentious example of sensationalist news reporting about Britain's youth in the 1960s— 'The Mods and Rockers.' What created this moral panic was the media's attempt to exaggerate and distort what otherwise would have been described as a few rowdy drunk teenagers who got out of control in the seaside town of Clacton. The folk devils, as these teenagers had now become, were throwing rocks at each other, breaking windows, having scuffles, and wrecking a beach hut or two. Their escapades turned into headlines of exagerrated proportions: "'Day of Terror by Scooter Groups' (Daily Telegraph), 'Wild Ones Invade Seaside-97 arrests' (Daily Mirror)," amongst others (Thompson, 1998: 33). This 'panic' highlighed with an interesting change in post-war Britain, namely the ways in which economic factors contributed to the emergence of an increasingly commercialised youth culture, and with it public discourses about the country being transformed in a 'permissive society' (Cohen, 2002: 161). The rowdiness at the once-quiet seaside town of Clacton was an illustration that young people 'had it too good, too quickly'; they were openly 'flouting the work and leisure ethic' in the eyes of some media commentators. In short, the events at Clacton were depicted as signalling a dramatic change in moral and political values.

Mugging

By the early 1970s, the British public had moved its fear of rowdy teenagers, onto a new fear around crime, or more specifically, street muggings. Instead of studying mugging as a form of street crime, Stuart Hall et. al (1978), in their pivotal research in Policing the Crisis, wanted to look at mugging as a social phenomenon. They wanted to explore what it was about mugging that caused fear in the masses, but more specifically, what it was about this issue that made the country react in the way that it did. What caused this moral panic?! Hall et al. uncovered that the fear around mugging stemmed from a 'larger panic about the steadily rising rate of violent crime which [had] been growing through the 1960s.' But like the Mods and Rockers moral panic, the fear of muggings was not actually a panic around mugging,

but rather, as Hall et. al stated: 'The society [came] to perceive crime in general and mugging in particular, as an index of the disintegration of the social order, as a sign that the British way of life' [was] coming apart at the seams' (1978: viii).

> *"Periods of moral panic are expected in a society: A condition, episode, person, or group of persons emerges to become defined as a threat to societal values and interests; its nature is presented in a stylized and stereotypical fashion by the mass media; the moral barricades are manned by editors, bishops, politicians and other right-thinking people socially accredited experts pronounce their diagnoses and solutions; ways of coping are evolved or more often, resorted to; the condition then disappears, submerges or deteriorates and be comes more visible. Sometimes the object of the panic is quite novel and at other times it is something which has been in existence long enough, but suddenly appears in the limelight. Sometimes the panic is passed over and is forgotten, except in folklore and collective memory; at other times, it has more serious and long-lasting repercussions and might produce such changes as those in legal and social policy or even in the way society conceives itself."*
> (Hall et al., 1978: 16/17)

Moral panics then really point to the changes in morality within a society. Traditional societal values and interests change, and those who have been labeled as the 'moral watchers' of the society, such as editors, politicians, bishops and priests try to keep the society on track by telling the rest of us their solutions and why things are happening. In fact though, the society has already changed, thus creating new laws, new morals and, new societal values for all of us to embrace.

Sex and HIV/AIDS

One such example of a policy shift due to a moral panic revolved around the emergence of HIV/,AIDS in the early-mid 1980s. The condition was first discovered amongst gay men in San Francisco, California, and soon after in other vulnerable groups, such as intravenous drug users and haemophiliacs, before appearing in the population at large. It was a crisis that spread geographically, leaving fear and angst in its wake. In much of the media

reporting, one of the most contentious dimensions to surface concerned a perceived linked with the 'immorality' of homosexuality (Critcher, 2003). At the time, stereotypes and sigma associated with being gay were much stronger than they are today. All too often, those afflicted by the condition were deemed by the press to be leading hedonistic lifestyles, or going against God. Some newspapers went so far as to invoke distinctions between those who 'caught AIDS' by 'being irresponsible' – such as by having casual sexual relations or by sharing a needle – and those who were 'innocent victims' who caught it from blood transfusions, or by other accidental means. Headlines ranged from, 'AIDS is the wrath of God, says Vicar' (Daily Telegraph, 3 May, 1983), to 'AIDS: Why must the innocent suffer?' (Daily Express, 25 September, 1985). In fact, it was not until 1984, when the National Union of Journalists issued guidelines on how to report AIDS that the disease was no longer called the 'gay plague' (Thompson, 1998: 74).

Some journalists got into the unfortunate habit of reporting exaggerated numbers of those affected, and consequently, ended up creating a moral panic around homosexuality. In response, public policy campaigners put forth the message that all people in the society 'should practice safe sex and harm minimization', helping to quash pernicious arguments in the press for a gay quarantine and related types of anti-gay propaganda (Thompson, 1978: 74). An overarching fear permeating much of the news coverage was the threat to social cohesion; relationships between same-sex partners were not the norm, thus 'allowing' homosexuality to happen could throw the balance of society off kilter, and thus change Christian cultures' beliefs around marriage Watney (1987) explains here:

> *"It is the central ideological business of the communications industry to retail ready-made pictures of 'human' identity, and thus recruit individual consumers to identify with them in a fantasy of collective mutual complementarity. Whole sections of society, however, cannot be contained within this project, since they refuse to dissolve into the larger mutualities required of them. Hence the position, in particular, though in different ways, of both blacks and gay men, who are made to stand outside the 'general public', inevitably appearing as threats to its internal cohesion. This cohesion is not 'natural',*

> *but the result of the media industry's modes of address—white and heterosexual. … We are not, in fact, living through a distinct, coherent and progressing 'moral panic' about AIDS. Rather, we are witnessing the latest variation in the spectacle of the defensive ideological rearguard action, which has been mounted on behalf of 'the family' for more than a century."* (Watney, 1987: 43)

What Watney highlights here is the media's role in replicating the discourse that relationships should exist between men and women. By putting forth an alternative discourse about sexuality and relationships, the fear is that the notion of family and family life would disintegrate.

Up until now, moral panics around the 'Mods and Rockers,' 'mugging,' and 'sex and HIV/AIDS' have indicated societal apprehensions about a perceived decline of social order in Britain, unwelcome changes in moral and political values, and fears that social cohesion was breaking apart, particularly where identities associated with youth, ethnicity, sexuality and crime were concerned.

Video Nasties

In February, 1993, three-year-old James Bulger was abducted and murdered by two ten-year-old boys, Jon Venables and Robert Thompson. Bulger disappeared from the New Strand Shopping Centre in Bootle, near Liverpool, where he had been shopping with his mother. In the search for Bulger, he was seen on CCTV cameras leaving the shopping centre hand-in-hand with the two boys. Two days after his murder, his mutilated body was found on a railway line several miles away from the shopping centre. Accounts say that Bulger was battered to death with an iron bar and rocks, his body left on the track to be run over by a train. The two ten-year-olds were found guilty in November 1993 and at the time, were the youngest convicted murderers in modern English history.

It wasn't so much the child-on-child violence that caused a moral panic in this issue, but rather what emerged during the trial about video nasties. A video nasty was an overly violent film; they tended to be low-budget horror films. The video nasty that was highlighted during the Bulger murder case was

the film, Child's Play 3.

Throughout Britain, there was massive outcry regarding the brutal murder of such a young child. The murder was widely discussed and heavily reported in all forms of media. The language used by some journalists reporting the murder and the subsequent trial was ideologically charged. By way of example, in contrast with the use of the affable 'Jamie' to name the victim, the two young murderers were described in newspapers as: 'street urchins' (so-called, Morrison (1997) argues, because they were of a lower social class); 'evil' (according to the lead policeman on the case) and 'freaks who just found each other' (according to a reporter who interviewed Thompson) (Morrison, 1997: 230-231). The two were also referred to by their last names, Thompson and Venables, which arguably made them sound much older, possibly encouraging in the public mind the belief that they were as answerable for their actions as adults would be. In fact, because of such emotive terminology in the lead up to the trial, it almost did not happen:

> *"Matters of opinion had been canvassed on page after page and, while the criminal investigation was proceeding, the nature of reporting went way beyond what was normally done by the media before defendants are charged and the trial begins. It was not a case where the publicity had been merely local. There had been widespread comment and articles containing alleged information about the case and the background of the defendants... editors had expressed opinion and comment and suggested innuendo that the defendants were guilty. Publicity had been misleading, prejudicial and, in a number of cases, highly sensational."* (Smith, 1994: 198)

During the course of the trial, the judge said, 'it is not up for me to pass judgment on their upbringing, but I suspect violent video films may in part be an explanation.' The film Child's Play 3 was singled out, with the judge adding it 'had some striking similarities to the manner of the attack on James Bulger' (cited Critcher, 2003: 67). These statements ignited further controversty. Franklin and Petley (1996) summed it up best: 'the "normal" requirements of reporting were abandoned in favour of undiluted, vitriolic editorialising' (1996: 134). According to Critcher (2003), 'the press wanted to lay the blame for moral decline on

liberal permissiveness, the collapse of family life and the failings of schools'; (2003: 68), but ultimately, it was video nasties and the effects of media that came to be the focus of the story.

Too many journalists took a campaigning stand with the Bulger case, calling the two boys 'monsters,' 'bastards', and the like, day-in and day-out over the 30 days of the trial. Readers were told what they should think about what had happened, and why it represented a moral issue. The coverage indicated that the impact of video nasties such as Child's Play 3 needed to be censored in an effort to prevent moral decline. The underlying threat, however, was the fear of new technology, something that we will see still resonates today.

Suicide: A Newer Moral Panic

It is clear from the examples we have already looked at—'Mods and Rockers', 'mugging,' 'sex and HIV/AIDS,' and 'video nasties'—that serious issues regarding stigmatization warrant close and careful attention. A more recent example further illustrates how these concerns continue to reverberate.

In January 2008, the South Wales borough of Bridgend became the focus of local, national and eventually international media attention due to a spate of suicides in the region. Suicide, once believed to be a social issue that should be kept under wraps because of the stigma associated with it, became much more openly discussed as the former mining town made national headlines over the first six months of 2008 for having had 20 suicides amongst people aged 15-29. Unfortunately, several journalists failed to live up to their social responsibilities.

The Bridgend suicide story was sensationalized to the point that a moral panic around the issue of suicide began to emerge, thereby making it difficult for the citizenry to have a reasonable debate about its complexities. Several facets featured in the ensuing coverage, including the fear of the Internet. All of those who died were members of social networking sites, such as Facebook, Bebo and MySpace. Because many of them were 'friends' with each other on these sites, journalists jumped to the conclusion that the deaths must have been linked, despite evidence to the contrary. This misreporting was compounded by a degree of demonization regarding those who took their own lives, leading to simplistic (normal versus abnormal) dis-

tinctions reproduced as fact on news pages for more than six months. There is little doubt such insensitivity caused further anguish for those bereaved by suicide, as well as complicating the efforts of those working in suicide prevention amongst people coping with mental health issues. (Luce, 2012).

Here it is revealing to note how news reporting of the Bridgend suicides may be read in relation to Cohen's seven clusters of identity, as mentioned earlier in this chapter. Specifically, the suicides touched upon young, working class people in South Wales, who had few job prospects. Bullying was suggested by some sources as a reason for why the deaths were occurring. Time and again, it was suggested in news reports that many of those who had died had participated in ilicit drug activity prior to their deaths (this was never confirmed by coroners).An overarching fear that found wide expression was that those who died belonged to an internet suicide cult, which corresponds to Cohen's cluster regarding child abuse, satanic rituals and paedophile registers. At the height of the coverage of the Bridgend suicides, the media was blamed as the main cause for the continuation of the suicides, even though this too was never proven. And, lastly, the Bridgend suicides brought to light familiar prejudices about welfare cheats, single mothers, refugees and asylum seekers, together with stereotypical views about Welsh identity.

All in all, then, it is regrettable to observe the extent to which news reporting of the Bridgend suicides stressed a perceived breakdown in moral and political values, particularly where young people are concerned. Lost in the swirls of panic were insights into the actual life experiences of those involved, the issues confronting their communities, and the lack of a suicide prevention strategy in Wales.

How to be a responsible journalist

This chapter has introduced the notion of moral panics, providing critical examples of instances where news reporting blew events out of proportion. How to improve this state of affairs may seem obvious, but there are obstacles in our path. Given that so many otherwise well-intentioned journalists (and their editors) become complicit in irresponsible reporting, we need to think through issues such as these ones:

- Creating a moral panic shows you lack solid reporting skills. If you need to embellish information, or make 'facts' up to grab a headline, then you are showing your readership that you do not have the skills to dig deeper and investigate the subject of your story in greater depth. Despite the fast-paced newsrooms that you are faced with today, always strive for excellence in your reporting. Stand for something; have principles.
- Creating a moral panic enhances stigma in society. As a journalist, it is your responsibility to understand how your reporting will affect those that are participating in your story, their families, and also those who are reading. This is particularly so where vulnerable people are conerned. Being a responsible reporter is not about you and your byline; it means being concerned for the greater good. Be an informed, socially alert and conscientious journalist. Remember, you have a duty of care to members of the public.
- Creating a moral panic inflicts pain. Following on from stigma, your reporting can have an impact, especially if you are reporting about poverty, sexuality, ethnicity, illness or death. Recognize that if your reporting has a tinge of hysteria to it, your readers will pick up on that, as will your competitors. Also be aware that what you do matters, and you can inflict pain. Imagine if you were the brother or sister of a person struggling with HIV/AIDS in the 1980s. Would you like to read that your loved one 'deserved' to be suffering from the 'gay plague'? Think before you write. And then think again.
- Creating a moral panic is unethical. Every journalist wants that one big break, that story that will put them on the map, that will make their editor or producer sit up and take notice. You don't have to create a moral panic to do it! Make sure you have standards when you are a journalist. Know what your limits are, and know what lines you will not cross. Discuss ethics with your colleagues, your family, your lecturers, your editors and producers. Ask yourself, what would you do if you were covering the James Bulger murder? How would you write the story? Know your own ethics, know what you stand for, and don't be morally compromised by

anyone.

- Creating a moral panic prevents public understanding and compassion. If you find yourself in the midst of the reporting of a moral panic, recognize that instead of facilitating public discussion, you are closing it down. Moral panic, as we have seen throughout this chapter, prevents citizens from having meaningful, solution-focused conversations about particular issues. As a journalist, it is your responsibility, as protector of the Fourth Estate, to put into the public domain accurate information. When conversation occurs, a society becomes more open. When it is stifled by prejudice, which happens in the case of a moral panic, fear and panic rear their ugly heads instead.

Concluding thoughts

This chapter has shown what can happen when journalists fail in their responsibilities to you and me. Since the coining of the phrase 'moral panic' by Stanley Cohen back in the 1970s, we have become increasingly aware how sloppy, shoddy and sensationalistic news reporting can cause fear and panic. As a journalist, you will strive to hold your profession to high standards, and yourself to even higher ones. As Joseph Pulitzer said, you have the power to influence 'the minds and morals of the people.' And with that comes great responsibility.

There are several challenges facing the journalism of tomorrow, as this book clearly outlines. However, if you are aware of how moral panics can develop, and take to heart the lessons learned from the above examples, then you will make a rewarding career by participating in new forms of reporting that are smarter, ethical and compassionate.

Challenging Questions

- Pick a social issue in the news that proved to be controversial and trace whether or not it became a moral panic. If it was a moral panic, why did this occur? If it was not a moral panic, why did it not reach that status?
- How do we encourage journalists to be more responsible in their reporting?
- Explain the steps you think journalists can take to avoid the creation of a moral panic. What are the biggest problems to overcome?
- What is your personal code of ethics?

Recommended reading

Barker, M. and Petley, J. (2001). *Ill Effects: the media/violence debate*. London: Routledge.

Ben-Yehuda, N. (2009). Moral Panics—36 Years On. *British Journal of Criminology* 49, pp. 1-3.

Cohen, S. (2002). *Folk Devils and Moral Panics: The Creation of the Mods and Rockers*. London: Routledge.

Critcher, C. (2003). *Moral Panics and the Media*. Berkshire: McGraw Hill.

Hall, S., Critcher, C., Jefferson, T., Clarke, J., and Roberts, B. (1978). *Policing the Crisis: Mugging, the State and Law and Order*. London: The MacMillan Press Ltd.

References

Aldridge, M. and Evetts, J. (2003). Rethinking the Concept of Professionalism: the case of journalism. *British Journal of Sociology* 54, pp. 547-564.

Ben-Yehuda, N. (2009). Moral Panics—36 Years On. *British Journal of Criminology* 49, pp. 1-3.

Cohen, S. (2002). *Folk Devils and Moral Panics: The Creation of the Mods and Rockers*. London: Routledge.
Cohen, E.D. (ed) (1992). *Philosophical Issues in Journalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Cohen, E.D. (1992). What makes a story newsworthy? In Cohen, E.D. (ed). *Philosophical Issues in Journalism* (pp. 156-160). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Cohen, E.D. (1992). Objectivity and News Reporting. In Cohen, E.D. (ed). *Philosophical Issues in Journalism*. (pp. 8-11) Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Critcher, C. (2009). Widening the Focus: Moral Panics as Moral Regulation. *British Journal of Criminology* 49, pp. 17-34.
Critcher, C. (2003). *Moral Panics and the Media*. Berkshire: McGraw Hill.
Davis, H. and Bourhill, M (1997). 'Crisis': The Demonization of Children and Young People. In Scraton, P. (ed). *Childhood in 'Crisis'* (pp. 28-57). London: UCL Press Limited.
Franklin, B. and Petley, J. (1996). Killing the Age of Innocence: newspaper reporting of the death of James Bulger. In Pilcher, J. and Wagg, S. (eds). *Thatcher's Children? Politics, Childhood and Society in the 1980s and 1990s*. London: Falmer Press.
Goode, E. and Ben-Yehuda, N. (1994). *Moral Panics: The Social Construction of Deviance*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Halberstam, J. (1992). A Prolegomenon for a Theory of News. In Cohen, E.D. (ed). *Philosophical Issues in Journalism* (pp. 11-21). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Hall, S., Critcher, C., Jefferson, T., Clarke, J., and Roberts, B. (1978). *Policing the Crisis: Mugging, the State and Law and Order*. London: The MacMillan Press Ltd.
Hodges, L.W. (1986). Defining Press Responsibility. In Elliott, D. (ed). *Responsible Journalism* (pp. 13-31). London: Sage Publications Ltd.
Jenks, C. (1996). *Childhood*. London: Routledge.
Koch, R. and Smith, C. (2006). *Suicide of the West*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.
Luce, A. (2012). The Bridgend Suicides: How the Story Unfolded. *Cyfrwng: Media Wales Journal*. 12, pp. 41-55.
Morrison, B. (1997). *As If*. London: Granta Publications.
Smith, D.J. (1994). *The Sleep of Reason*. London: Century.
Watney, S. (1987). *Policing Desire: Pornography, Aids and the Media*. London: Methuen.

Journalism: New Challenges
Edited by: Karen Fowler-Watt and Stuart Allan
Published by: Centre for Journalism & Communication Research
Bournemouth University

ISBN: 978-1-910042-01-4 [paperback]
ISBN: 978-1-910042-00-7 [ebook-PDF]
ISBN: 978-1-910042-02-1 [ebook-epub]

http://microsites.bournemouth.ac.uk/cjcr/