Fowler-Watt, K., and McDougall, J
Media Literacy versus Fake News: Critical Thinking, Resilience and Civic Engagement
WJEC, Paris. 2019

WJEC theme: Fact checking & verification in the era of fake news & post-truth

Media Literacy versus Fake News: Critical Thinking, Resilience and Civic Engagement.

ABSTRACT

This paper provides research findings to support the case for media literacy as an aid to journalists and journalism educators in a disruptive age through the fostering of resilient media engagement by young citizens. It posits that encouraging media literacy in news consuming publics facilitates a more critically engaged civic society. Focused on trust, it shares the outcomes of a project funded by the US Embassy in London, which brought together leading researchers from the United States and UK with a range of key stakeholders, including journalists. Their collective aim: to devise a practical strategy for harnessing media literacy to develop young people's understanding of and ability to withstand 'fake news'.

Introduction

'*Truth was fake, fake was true. And that's when the problem suddenly snapped into focus*'
(Rusbridger, 2018, p.x).

The essence of the disruptive age is summarised by the former editor of *The Guardian* newspaper, Alan Rusbridger in the opening pages of his recent treatise on the broken state of news and news consumption. Once again, journalists are presented as facing the challenge of restoring trust in themselves and their journalism. However, this time they are drinking in a different type of last - chance saloon - the problem is not self- inflicted but largely external: the media is 'the opposition', disinformation is rife, virtually everything is PR (Pomerantsev, 2015).

This paper will consider how media literacy can help journalists and journalism educators in tackling the age of disinformation through building resilience in young citizens. It posits that encouraging media literacy in news consuming publics, specifically young people, can facilitate a more engaged and critically aware civic society. It shares the findings of a project funded by the US Embassy in London, which brought together leading media literacy researchers from the United States and UK with educators, librarians, journalists, digital media producers and young people to devise a 'toolkit' for building resilience. In March 2019, these key stakeholders took part in a series of workshops in London in which they shared perspectives, working to a collective aim – a practical strategy for harnessing

media literacy to develop young people's understanding of and ability to withstand 'fake news', with a focus on case studies from both the UK and the US. Working collaboratively in this way, bringing together academic research, news providers and the new generation of media users, the project set out to listen to the voices of young citizens to help us to help them in the age of disinformation and disruption.

The research team captured the raw material for a toolkit for media literacy resilience which will be available online (July 2019) as an open access resource for use by journalists, journalism educators, media producers, teachers and academics, amongst others. The project team started out from our colleague Monica Bulger's research findings from her work in the US with the Data and Society Research Institute, arguing that media education needs to "develop a coherent understanding of the media environment, improve cross-disciplinary collaboration, leverage the current media crisis to consolidate stakeholders and develop curricula for addressing action in addition to interpretation" (Bulger and Davison, 2018, p.4). Clearly this project emanates from the leverage described and is concerned with such dialogue between both disciplines and professions.

In the UK, media literacy academics working with the Media Education Association, the professional association in the field, have called for a more 'joined up' approach to media literacy in the context of disinformation, saying that:

> Issues of bias, truth and falsehood in news are well-established topics for media education. However, fake news is largely a manifestation of much broader problems, which apply to 'real' news as well. We need a more systematic conceptual approach; and while media literacy may provide part of the solution, we should beware of oversimplifying the problem, and underestimating the difficulty of the task. (Buckingham, 2019).

In line with this, the project applied the key conceptual and pedagogical approaches of critical media literacy, through which we understand *all* media as representation[1], as well as

---

[1] See Buckingham, D., (2018) 'Teaching social media 3: representation. Retrieved from:
https://davidbuckingham.net/2018/03/26/teaching-social-media-3-representation/

involving other stakeholders in the media and in civil society. The project's objectives were tackled by:

1. using participative dialogic methods to develop new insights into the experiences of young UK citizens with regard to fake news and civic engagement with media,

2. applying the existing research findings from the academic experts to the insights from the young people,

3. working with teachers, trainers, librarians and young people to pilot and evaluate a toolkit for critical media literacy and resilience to disinformation,

4. leaving behind open access resources which can continue to be re-purposed beyond the life of the project,

5. enabling the voices of young citizens to inform policy planning and development with regard to media literacy and civic media.

It is hoped that the online toolkit will make a small but important contribution to tackling this complex problem, by supporting the development of curricula to help build resilience.

The question of trust constituted one of the key themes of the project and provides a focus for this paper. Journalists like Alan Rusbridger are bemused as to why journalism is not *the* answer to fake news, since journalism is historically seen as an effective means to distinguish the true from the untrue. Yet, he argues, journalism was ill-prepared to cope because it is not itself trusted: 'If only people trusted journalism more, society would have a system in place for dealing with fake news' (Rusbridger, 2018, p.373). Atmospherics that have intensified since 2016 and the election of Donald Trump as US President and the Brexit debacle in the UK (even though there were many differences between the two events) have enabled fear narratives to hold sway: The outcome? A decline in trust and a rise in scepticism. This is not to say that a healthy dose of scepticism is a bad thing – indeed, critical evaluation of all information is crucial to robust discourse in a democratic society

(Buckingham, 2019), but many observers now see truth (and reason) as an endangered species (Kakutani, 2018). In this 'post – truth' context, trust levels spiral, indifference and lack of awareness hold sway (Sopel, 2017).

Fake news

> *We have always experienced propaganda and politically-aligned bias, which purports to be news, but this activity has taken on new forms and has been hugely magnified by information technology and the ubiquity of social media. In this environment, people are able to accept and give credence to information that reinforces their views, no matter how distorted or inaccurate, while dismissing content with which they do not agree as 'fake news'*

- Disinformation and 'Fake News' Final Report, House of Commons Digital, Culture Media and Sport Committee, 18 February 2019

In its analysis of disinformation and the 'fake news' phenomenon, the UK government – commissioned report published in February 2019 concluded that the polarising effect of fake news was unlikely to recede and placed responsibility for moves towards greater transparency with the big tech companies. It emphasised the importance of a plurality of voices and human agency, concluding 'we must make sure that people stay in charge of the machines' (p.6). Questions of agency threaded through the workshop conversations for the Media Literacy vs Fake News project.

The status of 'fake news' is always discursively framed for the purposes of its articulation. These examples from 2018 provide further useful illustration:

i.   The European Commission's assessment of news organisations' engagement with verification and trust-enhancing techniques published in a report from a high-level policy forum: "Print press organisations and broadcasters are in the process of intensifying their efforts to enforce certain trust enhancing practices". This involves working with academia, amongst others, to develop media literacy approaches and investing in verification tools to ensure ethical compliance and trustworthiness (European Commission, 2018, p. 41).

ii)   Insider narratives from journalists ruminating on the place of journalism in society that conclude "on both sides of an increasingly scratchy debate about media, politics, and democracy, there is a hesitancy about whether there is any

longer a common idea of what journalism is and why it matters" (Rusbridger, 2018, p. 360).

iii)   A searing critique from the academy that places journalism itself and its elitist tendencies at the heart of the 'post truth' problem - a "journalism self-appointed with a false respectability, a 'liberal' journalism that claims to challenge corporate state power but, in reality, courts and protects it" (Edwards and Cromwell, 2018, p. xii).

'Fake news' is a problematic term, used often as a 'catch all' or as a disclaimer, but its distinction from 'real news' is characterised by the *intention* to mislead, for political reasons, to undermine stability or for economic purpose, for example as 'clickbait' for financial return from advertising or through the monetisation of data, most notoriously through Facebook. A challenge for media literacy's response is the confusion, at the level of legislation, over the status of search engines and social media platforms – are they providers (of media content) or merely technology companies offering services for other parties to share media? For this reason, regulatory discussions impact on both the political / legal reaction – as attempted by the House of Commons committee – and the academy.

David Buckingham pinpoints these contextual risks for our project in his blog (2017), fashioning fake news as symptomatic of a broader trend: "People (and not just children) may be inclined to believe it for quite complex reasons. And we can't stop them believing it just by encouraging them to check the facts or think rationally about the issues" (Buckingham, 2017). As he points out, this poses significant pedagogical questions – rather than working on the assumption that we are involved in a rational process it is vital, as educators to ask why people might believe 'fake news', since "by no means all media use is rational. Where we decide to place our trust is as much to do with fantasy, emotion and desire, as with rational calculation" (ibid, 2017).

According to Paul Bradshaw (2018), fake news must be considered in the context of 'mobile-first' publishing and he offers three key sites of conflict – commercial, political and cultural. Fake news has clearly disrupted the optimism for mobile media to increase diversity and plurality, but the mobile consumption of news has taken traditional news organisations into a commercial battle that is forcing them to 'adapt to survive'. The political battle occurs

around a growing consensus that alleged Russian activity relating to other nations' elections constitutes a new form of international conflict in which, according to research findings from New Knowledge (RiResta et al, 2018), the giant technology corporations were slow in response, even complicit, with Russia's influence spanning across platforms from YouTube, to Instagram and Twitter to Google and Facebook. This, according to Bradshaw (2018), makes verification the concern of everyone, not just journalists. The cultural battleground hosts the war for attention and professional journalism's stake in news agendas in the era of 'Post-Truth'. This is where media literacy (and journalism education) has a role to play. Following this thread, Fowler-Watt (2019) calls for a radical rethink to consider whether "re-imagining journalism education [could] provide a starting point for a re-imagined journalism practice that prioritises the human aspect of journalism as a craft?" (forthcoming, 2019).

In December 2018, a panel convened in Oxford by the Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism debated a newly-published European Commission action plan on disinformation. The Institute's Director, Rasmus Kleis Nielsen underlined the challenge of positioning 'real' journalism as the solution to the problems of political disinformation and 'bottom up' dissemination of false 'facts' when the industry itself is in crisis: "There's nothing less than a war on journalism taking place across the world." The panel agreed that "fighting back is mission central", in the form of a robust re- booting of professional and ethical values and practices within the industry, putting its faith in media literacy education in schools to teach young people how to distinguish between fake news and false facts, to understand and to value the concept of 'verifiable information in the public interest'.[2]

Wider contexts

> *Fake has become an omnipresent feature of both our daily lives and a globalized, ultra-connected culture: it is in the way we dwell and break free from spaces and ideas.* (*Excursions* journal 9.1, call for articles, 2018).

Bolstered by the sense that 'Media and Information Literacy' (MIL) could assume an important role in damage limitation, whilst avoiding solutionism, the project team were

---

[2] See also: Nielsen, R. and Graves, L. (2017) *"News You Don't Believe": Audience Perspectives on Fake News.* Oxford: Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism.

acutely aware of wider contexts, of a sense of helplessness in the face of omnipresent fakery. Douglas Rushkoff (2018) laments the loss of "our ability to think constructively, connect meaningfully, or act purposefully. It feels as if civilization itself were on the brink, and that we lack the collective willpower and coordination necessary to address issues of vital importance to the very survival of our species" (Rushkoff, 2018, p. 3). To combat the sense of powerlessness McIntyre (2018) calls for a deep-rooted study of the conditions for 'post-truth' - "If our tools are being used as weapons, let's take them back" (McIntyre, 2018, p.122). Reflecting on his experience of editing a print newspaper, as the digital age dawned, Rusbridger (2018) was also alarmed, not only by "information chaos" but by the realisation that "the chaos was enabled, shaped and distributed by a handful of gargantuan corporations, which – in that same blink of an eye – had become the most powerful organisations the world had ever seen" (Rusbridger, 2018, pp. xviii- xix).

The shattering impact of the economic crash in 2008 is a significant context, if not a direct cause of the 'fake news' phenomenon. The failed response of neoliberal politics to economic meltdown and the simultaneous dismantling of traditional notions of the 'public sphere' arguably provided ripe conditions for 'post truth' to grow and flourish. One important aspect of all this is that we no longer have a shared view, however contested it might have been, of the role of journalism, the concept of 'public interest', 'holding power to account', 'power and responsibility'. According to Bridle (2018), whether analysing Brexit or Trump "it is ultimately impossible to tell who is doing what, or what their motives and intentions are," this means that "it's futile to attempt to discern between what's algorithmically generated nonsense or carefully crafted fake news" (Bridle, 2018: ch. 9, para 51).

Media Literacy

International research has led to the development of a number of frameworks for media literacy, most notably provided by UNESCO and the European Union (see McDougall *et al,* 2018), with the following shared key competences:

- **Access:** the ability to find and use media skilfully and to share suitable and valuable information with others (including browsing, searching, filtering and managing data, information and digital content).

- **Analysis and evaluation**: the capacity to comprehend messages and use critical thinking and understanding to analyse their quality, veracity, credibility and point of view, while considering their potential effects or consequences.

- **Creation:** the capacity to create media content and confidently express oneself with an awareness of purpose, audience and composition techniques.

- **Reflection:** the capacity to apply social responsibility and ethical principles to one's own identity, communication and conduct, to develop an awareness of and to manage one's media life.

- **Action/agency:** the capacity to act and engage in citizenship through media, to become political agents in a democratic society.

In the US context, another of the project team, Paul Mihailidis (2018) observes a more optimistic 'state of the art' for an activist, participatory, civic form of media literacy, so that a project such as this should help to "....re-imagine media literacies as guided by a set of value constructs that support being in the world with others, and that advocates for social reform, change, and justice" (Mihailidis, 2018, p.xi).

Media literacy is not understood here merely as educational resilience building but instead, there is a competing, less visible and more agentive / dynamic use of media literacy (Potter and McDougall, 2017) by young people that can be potentially harnessed by education, or – if we are to re-imagine educational approaches - that education can learn from these forms of engagement.

Media Literacy vs Fake News:

The event:

The project team[3] hosted 2 days of activities in London at the Olympic Park to bring together the various stakeholders in a public event (Day 1) with presentations and a panel comprised of the US and UK academics involved in the funded project and invite-only workshops with librarians, journalists, media educators and students (Day 2). The participants were invited through our networks, so represent a purposive sample, rotating through 3 workshops each of 45' duration in mixed groups: *Testing the Wheel'* gathered

---

[3] The project team members are: Julian McDougall (P-I), Karen Fowler-Watt, Paul Mihailidis, Monica Bulger, David Buckingham, Roman Gerodimos, Anna Feigenbaum.

views on online resources for media literacy that are already available, *Fake news and issues around disinformation* sought to assess why fake news matters and *A Question of Trust* asked, 'what is trust?' 'What is its function in society?' 'How can trust be developed and maintained?' The event concluded with reflections from each group of stakeholders. The theme of trust ran as a red thread through our conversations and due to the limited space available for a conference paper, only the findings from the workshop on trust are shared here.

It is important to note that trust is a key discursive marker in the societal challenge around media literacy – a loaded term that is fraught with assumptions (LSE, 2019; Buckingham, 2019b). On this topic, media educators, mainly, presented arguments for combining new resources for deconstructing media to locate its biases and / or its distorting properties, but also a cautious approach to both putting 'trust' at the centre of this debate. Their concern: that this constituted an opportunity for self-validation, placing media literacy in a solutionist discourse with its attendant neoliberal impulse to position citizens as responsible entirely for their own 'uses of media literacy'. Journalists talk about trust in a different way and – in the workshops - shared clear definitions of terms, notions of building trust with audiences through transparency and verification. The tension around engaging with questions of trust was clearly articulated at the public event on day 1, so this mood music infused the workshop environment. As co-authors of this paper, one a media literacy specialist (Julian), the other a former journalist (Karen), we are situated at the intersection between media education and journalism practice, seeking to present a balanced assessment of the workshop outcomes as we take a deep dive into the question of trust.

Workshop: A Question of Trust

- *Trust refers to a relationship*
- *Trust is an action (in a process)*
- *Trust needs preconditions*
- *Trust is limited (to a subject, specific matter)*

(Blobaum, 2014)

Working with this definition of trust, the participants in each of the 3 rotations engaged with the following format:

Case study discussion: The Migrant Caravan https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/blogs-trending-45951102

This example of the Migrant Caravan[4] – and the BBC's report deconstructing the various ways in which the story was framed in the winter of 2018 - was used to illustrate how media reporting can encourage us to be distrustful, how 'fear narratives' can be propagated and the dangers of stereotype and stigma. These atmospherics lead to a decline in trust and rising scepticism. The case study also provided an illustration of an 'explainer', created by a publicly funded news organisation to 'debunk' fakery and offered a point of reference to ground the discussion.

The **workshop aims** were threefold:

- to draw up a checklist of factors that contribute to building trust
- to devise an overarching statement on trust and news
- to make an innovative contribution to the toolkit as a group

The participants engaged with these aims through:

- **defining** trust/distrust in relation to news sources – what is a trusted/distrusted source for news?
- asking **why** we trust/distrust these sources?
- questioning **how** we can trust/distrust them?
- engaging in **critical evaluation of news values** in relation to trust in news e.g. impartiality

The workshop concluded with each group devising **an overarching statement on trust** to add to their checklist, for example: "*in order to trust news media we need ….*" OR "*Trust in news means …*". These would help the project team in designing the online 'toolkit'.

Contributions:

> *There is an inherent tendency for people to believe things that aren't true, so can we change human nature?* (media educator)

As our field review had indicated, drawing up a checklist of factors that contribute to building trust was going to be challenging – even with an engaged group of key stakeholders,

---

[4] The migrant caravan that moved through Central America in 2018 was an unofficial gathering of around 7000 people who travelled from 4000km from the Guatemala – Mexico border to the Mexico-US border. Many of them said they were fleeing violence and persecution in Honduras, Guatemala and El Salvador and their goal was to settle in the US, despite threats that they would face prosecution or deportation. See: https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-latin-america-45951782

the climate of 'ennui' and helplessness permeated our discussions. '*Where does that leave you*?' asked David Buckingham '*It's a really difficult question if you don't trust anybody or anything.*' One student offered a counterpoint, that *being young means being powerless* so there is *no choice but to listen* and that *is a good thing* because *it's good to consume diverse opinions on social media.* Trust in the media required validation – whether from media itself or from a personal approach (echo chamber).

   i.   *Sources of news and trustworthiness*

   The checklist shaped around sources that have *no hidden agenda,* where stories have *documented sources, quotes.* A *range of sources* inspired trust, because '*You can piece together your own trust from different perspectives on Twitter*' (media educator); '*you can piece together trust from different sources*' (student). One student saw social media as a trustworthy source, but another disagreed saying that '*people only trust it more because they use it more*' and '*social media sensationalises*' (media educator); '*social media keeps everyone in their own echo chamber*' (media educator). There was more of a consensus around trust being based on personal relationships – the participants were inclined to trust a news source that was recommended by a close friend or relative: Likewise, journalists who they 'knew' were more likely to be trusted, even if their views differed: '*when I know where that person is coming from, I can engage with it*' (media educator); '*I think less about the organisation and more about who is doing the writing*', (media educator)*.* They were also more likely to trust individuals who were '*verifiable as a primary source*' (student). However, one student sought to avoid reading the tabloids, that his parents read, '*because I know they are trying to influence my belief*'. A librarian said *I don't think I trust anything*'. She would form her own opinion from looking at all angles, but '*I would only do that for something I was interested in*' and felt that she was more sceptical now than ever before. Another librarian reads '*extreme views from both sides and the truth is somewhere in the middle*'. Confirmation - bias was generally acknowledged: One student goes with his own instincts and beliefs, a media educator noted that '*I normally read things that align with my opinions*' and, consequently, avoids TV news. Another media educator agreed, noting that he tries to '*maintain a critical faculty. Something that I need to do perhaps more than 10 years*' *ago*'. The journalists in the groups, the producers of news underlined the importance of trust between journalist and source(s), a freelance journalist emphasised the imperative of going to the primary source, as '*people will re-write other people's reports and not correctly source. So, find the original and cross-verify*'. One journalist highlighted the importance of

transparency and acknowledging mistakes to build a relationship of trust between news producers and news consumers. But that can lead to '*over validation and over-emphasising – like a pushy teacher at the beginning of class!*' (student). Another journalist felt that '*I want to know how they* [the news organisation] *got to that point'*.

Trust in media is highly personal, this may be partially because verification – or '*finding the kernel of truth*' as one librarian described the fact-checking process - is hard work. This sense was clearly evident in all 3 iterations of the trust workshop, and – as a result - individuals are generally inclined to engage in careful source and fact-checking on an *ad hoc* basis, since '*no one really has the time to check multiple sources*' (media educator). Ultimately even cross-checking leads to an assessment based on personal opinion '*and whether you believe it yourself*' (media educator).

ii.   *Media literacy education*

Media education was critiqued by some participants for failing to prepare students adequately for the disruptive age, '*for the realities that [they] are going to face*' (librarian). There was general agreement on this point and some of the students felt that teaching was constrained by the curriculum, with the scope for critical debate being limited as a result: '*No, we aren't discussing that, it's not for the exam*' (student). This was seen as an obstacle to building a wider understanding of news sources in relation to trustworthiness and a constraint on developing critical thinking. One media educator felt that the quality of her own teaching was constrained by questions around the veracity of news sources stemming from an abundance of poor journalism '*I cannot stand up in front of my class and say, 'it's quality journalism'*'.

iii.   *Does impartiality help or hinder building trust?*

A brief critical evaluation of news values, notably impartiality and whether these can bolster trustworthy journalism elicited mixed views. Journalists largely took an organisational view: *understanding ownership helps us understand news values* (e.g. RT, Fox). Impartiality means different things to different people: '*Every news source I go to has a bias or agenda. Cross-referencing is crucial to get different viewpoints*' (media educator); '*They can have their own biases as long as what they have reported is factual*' (student); '*if we have a*

concern with objectivity, then I choose a balanced mix of views rather than, just [for example] *The Guardian'* (librarian).

Building a checklist:

A drive to engage with a *multiplicity of sources* in order to trust news, *transparency* and *accountability* from news organisations and journalists, individual, *personalised* approaches to *verification* and a frustration with the current provision and focus of *media education* that fails to prioritise *critical thinking* characterised the checklist that shaped the final over-arching statements produced by each group:

'In order to trust news media, we need…'

- o Education that looks for the fuller picture as a creator as well as an observer. You need to first trust yourself and equip yourself to get as close to the truth as possible (i.e. develop critical awareness). (Rotation 3)
- o Access to multiple sources. Transparency so that we know where the information is coming from and who owns it. To be our own verifiers, we need critical thinking and self-reflexivity to be informed by a wider range of sources. (Rotation 1)
- o Transparency and critical education in tandem. It is a matter of balance and a dual responsibility' (Rotation 2)

Reflections:

Finally, each stakeholder group convened to discuss 'take – aways'. For the purposes of this paper, we have focused on the journalists' reflections on the workshops. They noticed that there was *little agreement between media professionals and media educators* pointing to the tension that was apparent at the outset. The journalists felt that they can define and decipher fake news. The closest other group were library professionals, described more in terms of information literacy as checking sources. Students and teachers were generally either more sceptical about the term 'fake news' or less inclined to see a distinction between fake and real.

When asked what educators need to do in order to train media makers of the future with the requisite tools, the journalists responded:

- *To equip them with skills such as critical thinking and build on that foundation This basis appears to be missing.*

- *Appreciate good journalism: Make students understand good journalism is expensive and valuing it leads to more being done. Don't just criticize. The knowledge surrounding journalism architecture and values are missing.*

Conclusions

Trust in media is seen as the lifeblood of journalism's role in and contribution to people's sense making. Most of us cannot be everywhere, account for ourselves or understand the complexities of society (Brants, 2013, p.17).

Trust is problematic. Brants' (2013) 'top down' view of journalism as soothsayer is no longer viable: Journalism cannot provide the solution to the fake news crisis because it has lost trust and is in crisis itself (Rusbridger, 2018); media literacy education is not providing the critical thinking skills that we need to verify, and fact check for ourselves. Yet both journalism and education are crucial to sense making in the crowded, noisy digital world, where everyone has a voice, but nobody is listening and/or feels overwhelmed by the 'information chaos' discerned by Rusbridger (2018). The resilience toolkit devised as an output from our Media Literacy vs Fake News project does not seek to offer solutions but mines a path through the – albeit often healthy – scepticism to provide resources that can be drawn on to develop critical thinking through engagement and so build resilience. Its design was informed by an emerging new manifesto for media literacy education (McDougall, 2019):

- Rather than producing competence frameworks for media literacy, as though it is a neutral set of skills for citizens, media education needs to enable students to apply the *critical* legacies of …media literacy education on the contemporary media ecosystem.

- Educators need to adopt a dynamic approach to media literacy and increase the experiential, reflexive aspects of media *practice* in the curriculum. Resilience *to* representation is enhanced by expertise *in* representing.

- The critical exploration of social media, algorithms and big data form crucial aspects of the curriculum, accompanied by applied practical learning in the uses of them for social justice, as opposed to training the next generation in the use of these for even further commercial and political exploitation of one another.

At the outset, we stated that we hope the online toolkit[5] will make a small but important contribution to tackling the complex problem of 'fake news', by supporting the development of curricula to help build resilience. This should, in turn equip the next generation of journalists and media consumers to engage in a dynamic way with the challenges of fake news, whilst helping those journalists (and journalism educators) currently immersed in the quest to re-imagine journalism practice and actively re-engage news consumers.

References

Blobaum, B. (2014) 'Trust and Journalism in a Digital Environment' (working paper), Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism

Bradshaw, P. (2018) 'Journalism's 3 conflicts — and the promise it almost forgot' in Hill, S and Bradshaw, P. (2018) *Mobile First Journalism*. London: Routledge.

Brants, K. (2013) 'Trust, cynicism and responsiveness' in Peters, C. and Broersma, M. (eds). *Rethinking Journalism – Trust and participation in a transformed news landscape* (2013) Oxon: Routledge

Bridle, J. (2018) *New Dark Age: Technology and the End of the Future*. London: Verso.

Buckingham, D. (2017) *The Strangulation of Media Studies*:
https://davidbuckingham.net/2017/07/16/the-strangulation-of-media-studies/

Buckingham, D. (2019) 'Teaching media in a 'post-truth' age: fake news, media bias and the challenge for media/digital literacy education / La enseñanza mediática en la era de la posverdad: fake news, sesgo mediático y el reto para la educación en materia de alfabetización mediática y digital, Cultura y
Educación, DOI: 10.1080/11356405.2019.1603814

Buckingham, D. (2019) *Beyond Fake News*:
https://davidbuckingham.net/2019/02/27/beyond-fake-news-disinformation-and-digital-literacy/

---

[5] The is the link to work in progress, the **Media Literacy versus Fake News: Critical Thinking, Resilience and Civic Engagement** project and final toolkit will go live at the end of July 2019. https://www.cemp.ac.uk/projects/US-Embassy.php

Buckingham, D. (2019) *How much trust in media do we need?*:
https://davidbuckingham.net/2019/03/12/how-much-trust-in-media-do-we-need/

Bulger, M. and Davison, P. (2018) *The Promises, Challenges and Futures of Media Literacy.*
New York: Data and Society Research Institute.

Council of Europe. (2019) *Democracy at Risk: Threats and Attacks Against Media Freedom
in Europe.* Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Edwards, D and Cromwell, D. (2018) *Propaganda Blitz: How the Corporate Media Distort
Reality*. London. Pluto Press.

European Commission. (2018) *A multi-dimensional approach to disinformation: Report of
the independent High-level Group on fake news and online disinformation.* Luxembourg:
Publications Office of the European Union.

Excursions journal 9.1: Faking It. (2018) Call for articles: Available at:
http://www.excursions-
journal.org.uk/index.php?journal=excursions&page=pages&op=view&path[]=cfp

Fowler-Watt, K. (2019, forthcoming) 'New journalisms, new pedagogies.' In: Fowler-Watt,
K. and Jukes, S. (2019) *New Journalisms: Rethinking Practice, Theory and Pedagogy*.
London: Routledge Research in Media Literacy and Education.

House of Commons, *Disinformation and 'fake news'*: Final report of the House of Commons
Digital Media, Culture and Sport Committee. Published 18 February 2019. Available at:

https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201719/cmselect/cmcumeds/1791/1791.pdf

Kakutani, M. (2018) *The Death of Truth* London: William Collins.

London School of Economics. (2019) *Trust, Truth and Technology*. London; LSE
Publications.

McDougall, J., Zezulková, M., van Driel, B., Sternadel, D. (2018), 'Teaching media literacy
in Europe: evidence of effective school practices in primary and secondary education',
NESET II report. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

McDougall, J; José Brites, M; Couto, M and Lucas, C (eds) (forthcoming, 2018) *Cultura y
Educación*: 'Digital Literacy, Fake News and Education'. Special Issue, in press.

McIntyre, L. (2018) *Post-Truth*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Mihailidis, P. (2018) *Civic Media Literacies: Re-Imagining Human Connection in an Age of Digital Abundance.* New York: Routledge.

Pomerantsev, P. (2015). *Nothing is true, and everything is possible.* London: Faber & Faber.

Potter, J., and McDougall, J. (2017) *Digital Media, Education and Culture: Theorising Third Space Literacy.* London: Palgrave MacMillan.

RiResta, R. et al. (2018) *The Tactics & Tropes of the Internet Research Agency.* New Knowledge.

Rusbridger, A. (2018) *Breaking News: The Remaking of Journalism and Why it Matters Now.* London: Canongate.

Rushkoff, D. (2018) *Team Human.* New York: W.W. Norton.

Sopel, J., (2017) *If only they didn't speak English: Notes from Trump's America* London: BBC Books

UNESCO, (2016). *Riga Recommendations on Media and Information Literacy*: Available at:http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/CI/CI/pdf/Events/riga_recommendations_on_media_and_information_literacy.pdf

Author biographies:

Dr Karen Fowler-Watt is research theme lead for journalism education in the Centre for Excellence in Media Practice at Bournemouth University, UK. As a BBC journalist, she worked in the Middle East, Northern Ireland, and the United States. Her research focuses on questions of empathy and voice with specific interest in journalism education, trauma awareness, and conflict reporting. She works with the Salzburg Academy on Media & Global Change and is engaged in a pedagogy project with Global Voices. Her new book (co-edited with Stephen Jukes), *New Journalisms: Rethinking practice, theory and pedagogy* is published by Routledge in August 2019.

Julian McDougall is Professor in Media and Education and Head of the Centre for Excellence in Media Practice at Bournemouth University, UK. He is editor of *Media Practice and Education* and leads a doctoral programme for media educators. He has published a wide range of books, journal articles, chapters and reports and conducted research projects for research councils, charities, governments, the European Commission, NGOs and industry in the fields of media, literacy and education. His new book, *Fake News vs Media Studies: Travels in a False Binary* is published by Palgrave MacMillan in September 2019.

Fowler-Watt, K., and McDougall, J
Media Literacy versus Fake News: Critical Thinking, Resilience and Civic Engagement
WJEC, Paris. 2019

Fowler-Watt, K., and McDougall, J
Media Literacy versus Fake News: Critical Thinking, Resilience and Civic Engagement
WJEC, Paris. 2019

Fowler-Watt, K., and McDougall, J
Media Literacy versus Fake News: Critical Thinking, Resilience and Civic Engagement
WJEC, Paris. 2019