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**Please read this guide and bring any questions with you to the lecture.**

#### Note: This course guide should be read in conjunction with the Blackboard website for the course and the Degree Handbook for your degree programme. Degree Handbooks for social science programmes are available here:

#### <https://www.southampton.ac.uk/studentservices/academic-life/faculty-handbooks.page>

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **1. ESSENTIAL INFORMATION** | | |
| **Contacts** | | |
| Lecturer(s): Justin Murphy |  | |
| Room: Building 58, Room 3049 |  | |
| Telephone: N/A |  | |
| Email(s): j.murphy@soton.ac.uk |  | |
| Office Hours: Wednesday 3pm-4pm, Friday 12pm-1pm | |  |
| Tutors: N/A |  | |
| Administrator: | Michelle Milton and Claudette Wilkins Politics.StudentOffice@soton.ac.UK | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Times and Dates** | |
| Lectures: | Thursdays 3-5pm in 29/1101 |
| Tutorials: | Fridays 10-11am in 02A/2077 in weeks 3, 5, 7 and 9 (attendance is compulsory). |
| Feedback half-day: | In addition to weekly office hours there will be a full afternoon available for discussing assignment feedback and the second assignment on November 29 from 1-5pm. |
| Assessed Coursework Submission: |  |

**Assignments and Assessments**

Assessment consists of two essays. These are to be submitted electronically, via Turnitin/Blackboard.

#### One maximum 1,500-word essay is due on Tuesday 7th November 11:59pm. It is worth 40% of your mark for the module. There is no assigned question, you must develop and defend a thesis of your own.

#### One maximum 3,000-word essay is due on Tuesday 16th January at 11:59pm. It is worth 60% of your mark for the module. There is no assigned question, you must develop and defend a thesis of your own.

* No overlap between essays.

#### 

**2. COURSE CONTENT**

**A. Aims & outcomes, general readings**

**Course Aims**

This module provides a theoretical and empirical overview of the role played by media, information, communication, and technology within the politics of the modern state. Students are introduced to canonical as well as marginal and emerging perspectives on media politics and asked to weigh them against the empirical record established by extant qualitative and quantitative scholarship. Students will gain an independent and critical command of the essential questions in media politics. They will learn to engage with historical texts, theoretical texts, contemporary academic research, as well as cutting-edge, contemporary web-based debates.

**Learning Outcomes**

• Gain a critical, developed, independent perspective on the role of media, information, communication, and technology in politics  
• Have a basic working knowledge of today’s incipient trends and questions in academic research on media, and their institutional landscape.  
• Gain a more reflexive awareness of how the politics of media shape your own perceptions and behaviors.

**General Course Readings**

Each week will have required readings, videos, or podcasts, which you are required to familiarize yourself with before we meet. All required content will be made available to you electronically. There is no particular book you have to buy, but you should buy at least a few of the books you find most interesting, because that is what educated people do. People who do not buy books are usually not very smart. What type of person are you, what type of person do you want to be? I think you should be or become the type of person who wants to buy books, but I am not going to force you.

**B. Summary of lecture topics**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **WEEK** | **WEEK COMMENCING** | **LECTURES** | **SEMINARS** |
| 1 | 2nd October | Introduction, overview of main themes |  |
| 2 | 9th October | Information, rationality, intelligence |  |
| 3 | 16th October | Modernity and Acceleration | Discussion (Oct. 20) |
| 4 | 23rd October | Ideology, Democracy, Capitalism |  |
| 5 | 30th October | The Information Revolution and its aftermath I | Discussion (Nov. 3) |
| 6 | 6th November | Early Science of the Media |  |
| 7 | 13th November | The Information Revolution and its aftermath II | Discussion (Nov. 17) |
| 8 | 20th November | Psychology and ideology |  |
| 9 | 27th November | Revolution, insurrection, liberation I | Discussion (Dec. 1) |
| 10 | 4th December | Revolution, insurrection, liberation II |  |
| 11 | 11th December | Reading Week |  |

**C. Tutorial Guide**

For every seminar, please prepare at least one interesting argument or question about the week’s topics and materials.

**D. Assignments & Assessments**

#### One maximum 1,500-word essay is due on Tuesday 7th November 11:59pm. It is worth 40% of your mark for the module. There is no assigned question, you must develop and defend a thesis of your own.

#### One maximum 3,000-word essay is due on Tuesday 16th January at 11:59pm. It is worth 60% of your mark for the module. There is no assigned question, you must develop and defend a thesis of your own.

* No overlap between essays.

**Overlength work**

* There is no 10% leeway  (less or more)
* Please provide a total word count for your assignment on the front sheet
* All text above the limit will not be considered by markers

**Word limit** refers to the defined maximum length of a written assessment, expressed either as a single limit (e.g. “Maximum length 2,000 words”), or as the upper part of a range (e.g. “Between 1,800 and 2,000 words”).

**Word count** refers to the number of separate words submitted for assessment by a student. Note that:

The word count includes:

* Section headings and subheadings;
* Body of text (text that develops the substantive text or argument, wherever located);
* Quotes and citations that are integral to the body of text;
* Subtitles
* Bibliography/List of References;
* Footnotes (where they contain only citations);
* Captions to figures, tables or plates;

The word count excludes:

* Title;
* Acknowledgements (if relevant);
* Table of contents, list of figures, list of plates etc. (if relevant);
* Appendices if relevant (which may include supplementary quotes or transcripts for qualitative work);
* Abstract (if relevant)

**Penalties for late submission of coursework**

Work submitted after the deadline without an agreed extension will be marked as usual.  You will also receive feedback as you normally would for that module.  However, a penalty is imposed, as described below:

University working days Penalty mark

1 10% of final mark removed

2 20% of final mark removed

3 30% of final mark removed

4 40% of final mark removed

5 50% of final mark removed

More than 5 working days         Zero awarded

The penalty system deducts points from the mark you would have received if the assignment had been submitted on time.  For example, if your mark would have been 60, but the assignment is submitted one working day late, your assignment will be reduced by 10% of the final mark i.e. 6 marks, resulting in a mark of 54.

Working days are Monday to Friday throughout the calendar year, including student vacation periods (but excluding University staff closure dates at Easter and Christmas).

Work submitted after the published deadline may be accompanied by a completed Special Considerations application form should a valid reason exist for the late submission, but submitting the form does not guarantee that a penalty will be taken off.

These penalties do not apply when within the period of a formally granted extension to the original submission deadline.

**Extensions**

If you require an extension to an assignment, you must complete the Deadline Extension Request form, which you can download from the Form Store on the FSHMS Hub Blackboard site or via this link (http://www.southampton.ac.uk/quality/assessment/special\_considerations.page? ) and submit this to the Student Office (email in ‘essential information’ above). This will be considered by the appropriate Extensions Officer and you will receive a response via email. Extensions can only be granted up to the date of submission, so we recommend that you submit the form as soon as you are aware of any concerns.

**General Guidelines for Writing Assignments**

* Please put your student identity number, the title of your assignment and the module code on the front page of your assignment. Please do not put your name on your coursework.
* Please type/word process your assignment, use double line spacing and use a size of font (ideally 12 point) that is easy to read.
* Number the pages of your work and make sure they are in the correct order before you submit your work.
* Include a bibliography for essay assignments, listing all the sources you have used in your work. Remember to include references to these sources throughout the assignment. All Social Sciences subjects at Southampton use the Harvard system – for guidance, see: <http://library.soton.ac.uk/citing-and-referencing/harvard>
* Do not simply restate your lecture notes. By all means use those notes to introduce you to pertinent literature but read and reflect on that literature for yourself. Ground your assignments in module readings. Use only a limited number of well-chosen quotes. Lecture notes are NOT a suitable citable source for your essays or exams, they are to guide you to the sources, concepts and theories which will inform your essay.
* Always read your work through before submission – is it clearly written? Have you followed any instructions that have been given with the assignment titles? Have you referenced your sources?
* Please make sure that you keep a copy of your submitted work and that you can produce that copy if asked to do so.

**Categorical Marking Scheme**

Students studying modules within the Department of Politics and International Relations will be marked according to the following categorical marking scheme in order to avoid any ambiguity in the standard achieved.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **The Categorical Marking Scheme** | |
| **First (1st)** | |
| **Category** | **Numerical Grade** |
| Outstanding 1st | 100 |
| Excellent 1st | 90 |
| Very good 1st | 85 |
| Good 1st | 78 |
| Low 1st | 72 |
| **Upper Second (2:1)** | |
| **Category** | **Numerical Grade** |
| Good 2:1 | 68 |
| Mid 2:1 | 65 |
| Low 2:1 | 62 |
| **Lower Second (2:2)** | |
| **Category** | **Numerical Grade** |
| Good 2:2 | 58 |
| Mid 2:2 | 55 |
| Low 2:2 | 52 |
| **Third (3)** | |
| **Category** | **Numerical Grade** |
| Good 3rd | 48 |
| Mid 3rd | 45 |
| Low 3rd | 42 |
|  |  |
| **Fail (F)** | |
| **Category** | **Numerical Grade** |
| Bare Qualifying Fail | 38 |
| Low qualifying Fail | 30 |
| Unqualifying Fail | 18 |
| **Zero** | |
| **Category** | **Numerical Grade** |
| Absolute Fail | 0 |

**Fails and Zero Marks**

A mark of zero is applied to circumstances such as:

• No work is submitted (in the case of course work)

• The piece of work is submitted more than 5 university working days after deadline and without having been granted an extension (in the case of coursework)

* Or the work is wholly unsatisfactory. See below

**Past exam papers**

The university has a repository of past exam papers for students to consult, which can be accessed here: <https://www.adminservices.soton.ac.uk/adminweb/jsp/pastPapers/pastPapers.jsp>?

**3. CONTINUING ACADEMIC SUPPORT**

If you find yourself experiencing any study skills difficulties with your work please consult the following resources and then contact your personal academic tutor to discuss any issues:

For face to face help you should contact the Academic Skills Hub, level 2 in the Hartley Library, just past the IT Help desk: Monday - Friday: 10am - 12 noon, 2pm - 4pm, Lunchtime dropin and signup sessions as advertised.

<http://www.studyskills.soton.ac.uk/getstart.htm>

<http://www.southampton.ac.uk/edusupport/study_support/index.page>

If you experience any more specific difficulties with the content of the module, please contact your module convenor or seminar tutor.

**4. FEEDBACK**

All Politics and International Relations modules include both formative feedback – which lets you know how you’re getting on and what you could do to improve – and summative feedback – which gives you a mark for your assessed work. Formative and summative feedback are provided in the following ways:

* Informal verbal feedback will be given during lectures and tutorials for individual and group work. (You’ll need to contribute regularly to group discussions to make the best use of this.)

**Save Your Feedback!**

Feedback via TurnItIn on the Blackboard system is only accessible while you are studying that particular module. Download a pdf version of your feedback to refer to later by using the print icon in the bottom left corner of the feedback screen.



* Informal written and verbal feedback are often provided by email or during office hours when we respond to queries about assessments, for example.
* Written formative and summative feedback will be given on your assessed coursework, available via Blackboard. As per Faculty policy our aim is to get coursework back to students within 4 weeks of submission.
* Exam results are published only as a grade. If you wish to discuss your exam performance with your lecturer please book an office hour slot by email and let your lecturer know in advance that this is what you want to do.
* Feedback works two ways – we want to hear from you about any concerns you have and suggestions about how to improve modules. We do this through informal mid semester feedback, which can sometimes be used to make immediate improvements in module delivery, and through a formal questionnaire at the end of the module, which will benefit students taking it in subsequent years. In addition to these, informal feedback from you on how we are doing and what we could do better is welcome anytime.
* For further information about how your work is marked and moderated, university quality assurance processes etc, please visit the marking and feedback section in the University’s quality handbook: <https://www.southampton.ac.uk/quality/assessment/framework/marking_and_feedback.page>?

# Feedback Half Day will take place towards the end of the module to allow in-depth discussion of feedback on your first assessment and planning for the second assessment. Please register a timeslot via j.mp/schedule\_meeting.

**5. YOUR COMMITMENT**

**Study Schedule**

This module is classified as 15 CATS credit points (7.5 ECTS). In addition to the 24 hours of lectures and 5 hours of seminars you are expected to study independently for at least 130 hours over the entire module, split between wider reading (65 hours) and the completion of your assessment tasks (65 hours). While much of the latter will cluster around assessment periods, the former requires you to be reading key and additional texts from the reading list for approximately 5-6 hours per week. THE INFORMATION IN THIS PARAGRAPH SHOULD BE ADJUSTED TO YOUR MODULE ARRANGEMENTS – CURRICULUM MANAGER IS THE BEST PLACE TO LOOK FOR CATS/ECTS INFO.

**Tutorial Preparation**

Tutorials are a central part of the course module structure. They provide you with an opportunity to discuss, apply and enhance your knowledge, and to build confidence in your skills of analysis, comprehension and presentation. What you will gain from tutorials is dependent upon your preparation and willingness to participate. It is thus essential that you familiarise yourself with the Tutorial Guide for each course, undertake the required tutorial preparation, and bring all relevant materials (hardcopies of the Key Reading, notes on the Key Reading, preparation exercises etc.) to every tutorial. Students should complete any preparatory work prior to a tutorial.

**Attendance**

You are expected to attend all lectures, tutorials, and workshops that are part of your programme. Absences are recorded on your University record, and inappropriate amounts of absence without extenuating circumstances will be treated seriously and may result in exclusion from the course. In addition, you should be aware that prospective employers almost always ask for information about attendance and punctuality, as well as matters such as your record on completing work to deadlines.

**Absences**

If you are unable to attend a tutorial because of illness or other good reason you should notify the course lecturer/tutor and your Programme Administrator in advance if possible (see contact details in ‘essential information’ above). This is especially important if you are due to make a presentation to the class. Absences of more than a few days should be backed up by medical or other evidence.

All absences will be reported to the relevant Tutor, who will then monitor your performance. A record of indifferent attendance will be held against you if your examination results are marginal; you should not expect to be shown sympathy by the Board of Examiners in such circumstances.

If you have missed a class, you should be sure to catch up on what you have missed by further independent reading of materials on the reading list and/or consulting any available lecture notes or PowerPoint slides if these are provided or asking other students whether they might allow you to consult theirs.

**Email and Blackboard**

Your commitment is also to **check your University email and Blackboard at least every other day** in order to make sure that you are informed of any communications from tutors or administrative staff. These might, for example, concern important meetings with staff, changes of room, or course-relevant information from your lecturer. Being unaware of arrangements because you have not checked your email or Blackboard is not an acceptable excuse.

**6. MARKING CRITERIA AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS**

Most written work by students – essays, reviews, dissertations, exams – is assessed into different class categories by using the following **marking criteria**:

* **RELEVANCE** – the ability to focus your work on the question at hand, gathering literature and data that relate clearly to the subject
* **STRUCTURE** – the ability to achieve a coherent structure in your work so that it flows logically and fluently, using good paragraphing and signposting, with a clear introduction and conclusion.
* **ACCURACY** – describing empirical phenomena and key ideas and theories accurately and clearly.
* **EVIDENCE** – using relevant, appropriate, authoritative sources to back up your claims and arguments, indicating strong knowledge of the literature
* **ANALYSIS** – the ability to move beyond a descriptive approach to key ideas and information towards harnessing these in the construction of an insightful response to the question
* **CRITICAL JUDGEMENT** – the ability to engage critically with the sources you use, reflecting on their strengths and limitations and using such reflections to develop your own argument.
* **COMMUNICATION** – writing carefully with good grammar, spelling and word choice, to communicate your arguments and analysis effectively.
* **REFERENCING** – correctly citing and attributing the sources you use in written work through an identified referencing system. All Social Sciences subjects at Southampton use the Harvard system: <http://library.soton.ac.uk/citing-and-referencing/harvard>

These criteria provide a detailed description of the characteristics expected of honours degree written work at all stages from Year 1 to Year 3. However, as you progress through your degree programme, emphasis will be placed on different criteria. At **Year 1** a particular emphasis is placed on students ' ability to develop their study skills and an accurate understanding of assessment tasks, to demonstrate their grasp of basic concepts, and to demonstrate their capacity for reading widely around the subject. In Years **2 and 3**, greater emphasis is placed on the development of independent research skills, alongside a continuing emphasis on the ability to critically evaluate supporting evidence in appropriate depth, alongside theoretical material where appropriate.

In all cases marking criteria are intended to provide guidance to markers and students, rather than to provide a rigid checklist. Examination answers and assessed essays may display these characteristics in varying degrees, and these variations may not correlate precisely with one another. Assessment therefore necessarily involves a judgment on the part of markers of the extent to which relative strengths and weaknesses balance against one another, but always includes a baseline assessment of the student's ability to answer the question that has been set.

**Grade Descriptors mapped to Categorical Marking Scheme**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| First class | Description | First class qualities include relevance (a high degree of focus on the question), accuracy of interpretation, originality and insightfulness of analysis, critical reflection, wide reading, coherence of structure, and clarity of expression. These factors will be present to varying degrees in a first class answer. |
| **100** | **Outstanding 1st** | **An assessment that could not be bettered within the time available.** |
| **90** | **Excellent 1st** | **Distinguished by substantial scholarship and, in some cases, originality.** |
| **85** | **Very good 1st** | **An answer that includes almost all the first class qualities.** |
| **78** | **Good 1st** | **An answer showing a great deal of insight into the question, and one which indicates wide reading beyond the reference lists provided in course handouts.** |
| **72** | **Low 1st** | **An answer showing substantial evidence of most of the first class qualities, demonstrating a comprehensive coverage of the subject matter and relevant literature, a very strong analysis, and no major inaccuracies of interpretation.** |
| Upper second class |  | Upper second class qualities include a good degree of focus on the question and accuracy of interpretation, evidence of reading of the core literature and some insightful analysis. Although not necessarily original, the answer will articulate a clear and well-supported viewpoint on the key issues being discussed. The work will be well-structured and relatively clearly expressed. |
| **68** | **High 2:1 – Very good** | **Displays all upper second qualities, but narrowly misses first class, most commonly in areas of insight or breadth of additional reading.** |
| **65** | **Mid 2:1 – Good** | **An answer that displays most of the upper second class qualities. There will be clear evidence of reading of relevant literature and key issues will be interpreted accurately, although the answer may not be entirely comprehensive, or may be let down by one or two weaker components such as coherency of structure.** |
| **62** | **Low 2:1 – Capable** | **An answer which displays some of the upper second class qualities. There will be evidence of reading of relevant literature and key issues will be interpreted mostly accurately, although the answer may be let down by one or two weaker components such as coherency of structure, coverage of key issues and readings.** |
| Lower second class |  | Lower second class qualities include a good degree of relevance, coverage of the topic and accuracy of interpretation. There is evidence of reading, but it is limited in extent. Coherence of structure, clarity of analysis and degree of insight and critical reflection are also limited. |
| **58** | **High 2:2 – Competent** | **Displays all of the lower second class qualities, but fails to demonstrate much reading. Structure is present, but may not be the most suitable. Typically, such an answer may cover the course material and be correct, but display a lower level of clarity in comprehension and analysis than a low 2:1.** |
| **55** | **Mid 2:2 – Satisfactory** | **An answer that displays most of the lower second class qualities, largely relevant and accurate and covering the topic, but with limited coverage of the literature and limited insight.** |
| **52** | **Low 2:2 – Adequate** | **Some of the required qualities are significantly lacking. The structure may be weak, or there may be little evidence of reading. An answer at this level may be let down by significant sections which are not relevant to the question, or by some inaccuracy of interpretation.** |
| Third class |  | Work with severe shortcomings in presentation, relevance, analysis and structure. Though there may be some evidence of basic knowledge of the literature, it is likely to be superficial and/or inaccurate. |
| **48** | **High 3rd – Rudimentary** | **An answer that is relevant to the question and demonstrates some of the key points, but with little or no evidence of reading, and possibly large segments of inappropriate material. The answer demonstrates little or no insight and is weakly structured.** |
| **45** | **Mid 3rd – Weak** | **An answer that is only partly relevant to the question and covers only some of the key issues, with little or no evidence of reading, and possibly large segments of inappropriate material. The answer demonstrates little or no insight and is weakly structured.** |
| **42** | **Low 3rd – Very weak** | **An answer that demonstrates only a rudimentary understanding of the key issues, with little focus on the question, little or no evidence of reading, and possibly large segments of inappropriate material. The answer demonstrates little or no insight and is weakly structured.** |
| Fail |  | Poor answers with serious omissions or errors. A distinction is made between answers at the higher end of this range, which typically demonstrate a serious weakness in argument and/or a lack of knowledge and understanding, and answers at the lower end, which are simply deemed inadequate. |
| **38** | **Bare qualifying fail – Poor** | **Answers with serious omissions or errors, but with some material relevant to the question. There is evidence that the question has been understood in part, but that there is only a fragmented and shallow acquaintance with the subject. Work at this level will demonstrate serious weakness in argument, and/or a serious lack of knowledge and understanding.** |
| **30** | **Low qualifying fail – Inadequate** | **Little substance or understanding, but with a vague knowledge of the correct answer.** |
| **18** | **Unqualifying fail – Unsatisfactory** | **Some relevant facts but an inadequate structure and approach leading to a jumble of disorganised material. This grade is also appropriate for an answer which is wholly tangential to the question, or to a very short answer (less than one side), without promise of being better had it been longer.** |
| **0** | **Wholly unsatisfactory** | **Virtually nothing of relevance to the answer, lacking any real structure.** |

***IF MODULE HAS NON-STANDARD ASSESSMENTS SUCH AS PRESENTATIONS, BLOGS ETC, PLEASE INSERT RELEVANT MARKING CRITERIA AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS HERE***

**7. REFERENCING AND ACADEMIC INTEGRITY**

**Referencing**

The lack of appropriate referencing in assessed essays will potentially greatly affect the mark for the work and may be considered plagiarism, which, as outlined below, is a serious offence.

All essays must employ the scholarly apparatus of references and a bibliography, or references list. There are different acceptable referencing styles. In all Social Sciences subjects we use the Harvard system of referencing, which is described in detail here: <http://library.soton.ac.uk/citing-and-referencing/harvard>

In short, Harvard referencing means that you refer to the author and date of publication in brackets within the text, wherever you are referring to the ideas of another writer. Where you quote an author you must always include quotation marks and a page number in the reference.

All essays must include a References List, which lists your sources in alphabetical order by author's surname. This should include all (and only) the sources you have directly referenced in the text. Whatever your source is, you need to provide a full set of publication details as described in the guide linked above.

**Academic integrity**

Fundamentally, Academic Integrity (AI) is about following **academic standards and honesty** in your work.  According to the University [regulations](http://www.calendar.soton.ac.uk/sectionIV/academic-integrity-regs.html), the main breaches of AI include: *plagiarism* (using someone else’s words or ideas without proper acknowledgement), *cheating* (getting unfair advantage in assessment, for example during exams), *falsification* (fabricating or distorting data or results), *recycling* (submitting the same piece of work for another piece of assessment without explicit permission), *breaching ethical standards*, or other types of *misconduct in research*.

Of those breaches, the most common type is plagiarism, which in many cases is a result of poor academic practice.  To learn how to avoid it, there are several excellent resources available to you, including the very comprehensive Academic Skills library guide, available at <http://library.soton.ac.uk/sash/ai>.  It provides links to many **interactive teaching materials**, such as those prepared at the University of Leeds, where you can learn how to [maintain AI](https://library.leeds.ac.uk/tutorials/integrity/generic/) in your work, [recognize plagiarism](https://library.leeds.ac.uk/tutorials/activities/plagiarism/recognising-plagiarism/), or judge various [real-life situations](https://library.leeds.ac.uk/tutorials/activities/plagiarism/you-be-the-judge/) according to AI principles. Worth trying!

The Academic Skills guide and other AI resources are also listed on the Faculty Blackboard resource site FSHMS-Hub, on which you should be automatically enrolled (click on Programme Related > Academic Integrity).

Unfortunately, AI breaches sometimes occur.  For those of you who are new to the University, the [regulations](http://www.calendar.soton.ac.uk/sectionIV/academic-integrity-regs.html) distinguish between two types of breaches of academic integrity: minor (first-time offences, "committed through inexperience or lack of understanding and ... limited in scope or their effect"), and major.  The minor breaches are dealt with by individual markers, through the regular feedback process.  However, everything that is not a minor breach, including all repeated cases, is a major one.

The major breaches are dealt with either by the Academic Integrity Officer – currently Professor Jakub Bijak for Social Sciences – or by an AI panel, depending on the severity of the alleged breach.  The process is definitely unpleasant and can lead to severe consequences. The maximum penalty that can be given by an AI panel is the termination of the programme – **so please treat AI really seriously**.

For those of you embarking on or continuing to write your theses or dissertations, please additionally bear in mind the requirements of the University Ethics Policy.  Unless your study is exempt from this requirement, please do not attempt an analysis without having secured clearance from the Ethics Committee via the ERGO system, as this would be a breach of academic integrity.  You will receive further guidance on that from your dissertation coordinators and/or supervisors.

The full text of the academic integrity regulations is available in the [University Calendar](http://www.calendar.soton.ac.uk/sectionIV/academic-integrity-regs.html).  Please spare a few moments to have a look. More detailed information and additional guidance are in the [Quality Handbook](http://www.southampton.ac.uk/quality/assessment/academic_integrity.page).

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to ask your Personal Academic Tutors, module coordinators, programme teams, or Faculty AI Officer Jakub Bijak.

**Lecture guide and reading lists**

**Week 1 – Introduction and overview of main themes**

Heidegger, Martin. 1977. “The Question Concerning Technology.” In *The Question Concerning Technology, and Other Essays*, New York: Garland. Page 3-36.

**Week 2 – Information, rationality, intelligence**

Khan Academy Labs. 2014. *What Is Information Theory?*

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=d9alWZRzBWk.

Harris, Sam. 2016. “Complexity & Stupidity: A Conversation with David Krakauer.” *Waking Up (Podcast)*. https://www.samharris.org/podcast/item/complexity-stupidity/ (October 2, 2017).

**Week 3 – Modernity and Acceleration**

Land, Nick. “Teleoplexy: Notes on Acceleration.” In Mackay, Robin, and Armen Avanessian, eds. 2014. *Accelerate: The Accelerationist Reader*. Falmouth, United Kingdom: Urbanomic. Pages 511-520.

Bostrom, Nick. 2014. “Past developments and present capabilities.” In *Superintelligence: Paths, Dangers, Strategies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Pages 1-19.

**Week 4 – Ideology, Democracy, Capitalism**

Chomsky, Noam. 1991. *Media Control: The Spectacular Achievements of Propaganda*. New York: Seven Stories Press. Pages 1-30 (of the PDF).

Bernays, Edward L. 1928/2004. *Propaganda*. Ig Publishing. Pages 1-40 (of the PDF).

**Week 5 – The Information Revolution and its Aftermath (I)**

Gleick, James. 2011. *The Information: A History, a Theory, a Flood*. London: Harper Collins. Chapter 7.

Card, David, and John E DiNardo. 2002. “Skill Biased Technological Change and Rising Wage Inequality: Some Problems and Puzzles.” <http://www.nber.org/papers/w8769.pdf>.

**Week 6 – Early Science of the Media**

Gleick, James. 2011. *The Information: A History, a Theory, a Flood*. London: Harper Collins. Chapter 8.

Wiener, Norbert. 1950/1989. *The Human Use of Human Beings: Cybernetics and Society*. London: Free Association Books. Read the introduction (pp. 11-28 of the PDF, xi- xxiii of the book).

**Week 7 - The Information Revolution and its Aftermath (II)**

Prior, Markus. 2005. “News vs. Entertainment: How Increasing Media Choice Widens Gaps in Political Knowledge and Turnout.” *American Journal of Political Science* 49(3): 577–92.

“The Big Sort.” 2008. *The Economist*. <http://www.economist.com/node/11581447>.

Hall, Stuart. 2011. *Institutional Racism on Television: A British Example (1984)*. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JsqTXylw-Uo

“'The Shallows': This Is Your Brain Online.” June 2, 2010. NPR (Podcast). Interview with author Nicholas Carr.

**Week 8 – Psychology and Ideology**

Kahneman, Daniel. 2012. “Of 2 Minds: How Fast and Slow Thinking Shape Perception and Choice [Excerpt].” *Scientific American*. (October 5, 2017).

Haidt, Jonathan. 2013. *The Righteous Mind: Why Good People Are Divided by Politics and Religion*. London: Penguin. Pages 20-151.

**Week 9 – Revolution, Insurrection, Liberation (I)**

Ehrenreich, Barbara. 2007. *Dancing in the Streets: A History of Collective Joy*. New York: Metropolitan Books. Chapters 1-3.

PowerfulJRE. 2015. *Joe Rogan Experience #702 - Milo Yiannopoulos*. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dGL5eRw7rXU>.

Laboria Cuboniks. *Xenofeminism: A Politics for Alienation*. http://www.laboriacuboniks.net/

**Week 10 – Revolution, Insurrection, Liberation (II)**

Csikszentmihalyi, Mihaley. 1988. *Optimal Experience: Psychological Studies of Flow in Consciousness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 1, 2, and “The Autotelic Experience,” in 3.

Peterson, Jordan B. *Biblical Series I: Introduction to the Idea of God*. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=f-wWBGo6a2w>.

Fontaine, Claire. 2013. “Human Strike Has Already Begun,” in *Human Strike Has Already Begun & Other Writings*. London: Mute & Post-Media Lab.