

**МІНІСТЕРСТВО ОСВІТИ І НАУКИ УКРАЇНИ
ДЕРЖАВНИЙ ВИЩИЙ НАВЧАЛЬНИЙ ЗАКЛАД
«УЖГОРОДСЬКИЙ НАЦІОНАЛЬНИЙ УНІВЕРСИТЕТ»
ФАКУЛЬТЕТ МІЖНАРОДНИХ ЕКОНОМІЧНИХ ВІДНОСИН
КАФЕДРА ТЕОРІЇ ТА ПРАКТИКИ ПЕРЕКЛАДУ**

ПОПОВИЧ І.Є., СІДУН Л.Ю., ДРАБОВ Н.Ю., ЕСЕНОВА Е.Й.

**МЕТОДИЧНІ РЕКОМЕНДАЦІЇ
З ІНОЗЕМНОЇ МОВИ ЗА ПРОФЕСІЙНИМ
СПРЯМУВАННЯМ
для студентів
ОП «Міжнародна журналістика»**

УЖГОРОД 2025

Методичні рекомендації з іноземної мови за професійним спрямуванням:
*[методичний посібник] / Попович І.Є., Сідун Л.Ю., Драбов Н.Ю.,
Есенова Е.Й. Ужгород: 2025. 38 с.*

Укладачі:

*Попович І.Є. – к.п.н., доцент кафедри теорії та практики перекладу,
Сідун Л.Ю. – к.п.н., доцент кафедри теорії та практики перекладу,
Драбов Н.Ю. – старший викладач,
Есенова Е.Й. – старший викладач.*

Рецензенти:

*Стойка О.Я. – доктор педагогічних наук, професор кафедри іноземних мов,
Рогач Л.В. – кандидат філологічних наук, доцент кафедри англійської
філології ДВНЗ «УжНУ»*

Методичний посібник розроблений для студентів ОП «Міжнародна журналістика». Посібник містить структуру лекцій та практичних занять, що дозволяє раціонально розподіляти час між аналізом першоджерел та обговоренням дискусійних тем. Посібник допоможе ефективно підготуватися до професійної комунікації в англomовному медіасередовищі.

Рекомендовано до друку

*на засіданні кафедри теорії та практики перекладу
протокол № 9 від 24 вересня 2025 року*

Рекомендовано до друку

*на засіданні Вченої ради факультету
міжнародних економічних відносин УжНУ
протокол № 10 від 13 жовтня 2025 року*

Course: **«ІНОЗЕМНА МОВА ЗА ПРОФЕСІЙНИМ
СПРЯМУВАННЯМ»**

Complied by: Iryna Popovych, PhD in Pedagogy, Associate Professor;
Larysa Sidun, PhD in Pedagogy, Associate Professor;
Nataliia Drabov, Senior Lecturer; Erika
Yesenova, Senior Lecturer.

The Department of the Theory and Practice of Translation

LECTURE TITLE: THE EDITOR'S LENS: STRATEGIC SELF-EDITING AND STRUCTURAL INTEGRITY

1. Goal:

To cultivate a "proactive editing" mindset where students treat self-correction as an integral part of the reporting process, ensuring stories are structurally sound, audience-aligned, and rhetorically precise before submission.

2. Topical Tasks (Knowledge-Based):

1. **Workflow Differentiation:** Distinguish between "burst" editing for urgent breaking news and the "layered" editing process for non-urgent features.
2. **The Anatomy of Focus:** Understand the relationship between the **Lead**, the **Nut Graf**, and the **100-word summary**.
3. **Audience Analysis:** Identify how reader familiarity dictates the level of context and "hand-holding" required in a piece.
4. **Inclusivity Standards:** Apply a 2025-standard lens to text and visuals to ensure diverse perspectives and unbiased reporting.

3. Theoretical Value:

- **The "Cognitive Reset" Theory:** Explores the psychological necessity of "stepping back" and using "fresh eyes" to bypass the brain's tendency to overlook its own errors.
- **Syntactic Economy:** Reinforces the theory that "vigorous writing is concise" (Strunk & White), where every anecdote and scene-setter must justify its existence relative to the story's "So What?"
- **Rhetorical Alignment:** Examines how the tone of a headline creates a "contract" with the reader that the body of the story must fulfill.

4. Practical Value (Skill-Based):

- **The 100-Word Summary Drill:** A practical tool to force clarity and identify if the story's focus has drifted from its intended purpose.

Gap Identification: Learning to use self-editing to find "reporting holes" (missing facts, unanswered questions) early in the production cycle.

Headline Drafting: Developing the skill to distill complex narratives into high-impact, tone-appropriate titles.

Efficiency in Filing:

- Reducing the "back-and-forth" time with professional editors by delivering "cleaner" copy that addresses nuanced points from the start.

Lecture Outline (90 Minutes) Learning

Outcome:

By the end of this lecture, students will be able to perform a multi-layered audit of their own work, ensuring that every sentence serves the story's "So What?" and that the narrative is both ethically and structurally sound

1. The Self-Editing Workflow (20 min)

- *Theory:* Editing as an ongoing process rather than a final step.
- *Application:* Handling the "initial burst" of urgent news vs. the "slow burn" of long-form.

2. The Trinity of Focus: Summary, Lead, and Nut Graf (25 min)

- *Exercise:* Drafting a 100-word summary to test the "Absolute Need-to-Know" facts.
- *Alignment Check:* Does the lead invite the reader, and does the nut graf answer "Who cares?"

3. Audience and Inclusivity Audits (20 min)

- *The Persona Check*: Who is the reader? What is their "knowledge baseline"?
- *The Inclusivity Hard Look*: Assessing visual and textual representation for 2025 ethical standards.

4. Practicum: "Fresh Eyes" Workshop (20 min)

- Students take an existing draft and perform a "Gap Analysis"—identifying where more reporting (context, quotes, or data) is needed based on their 100word summary.

5. Closing: The Broadcast vs. Digital Distinction (5 min)

- Reviewing AP Stylebook Broadcast Guidelines for brevity and oral clarity.

LECTURE TITLE: **The Editor's "Fresh Eyes": Mastering Self-Editing for News**

Duration: 90 Minutes **Learning**

Objectives:

- **Synthesize** a complex story into a 100-word "Need-to-Know" summary.
- **Evaluate** leads and "nut grafs" for clarity, audience relevance, and the "So What?" factor.
- **Apply** urgency-based editing protocols for breaking vs. non-urgent news.

Materials Needed:

- Recent unedited student drafts or a local "raw" news release.
- Access to the [AP Stylebook Online](#).
- Digital timers.

1. Activity: The "Urgent Burst" Simulation (20 Mins)

- **Task:** Provide students with a "raw" set of facts (e.g., a major downtown fire with 10 conflicting details).
- **Constraint:** Students have **10 minutes** to file the "initial burst"—a 3paragraph update focusing only on the immediate "Who, What, Where."
- **Transition:** After 10 minutes, tell them the "urgent developments have eased." Now, they must apply the self-editing basics.

2. Analysis: The 100-Word Focus Test (20 Mins)

- **Individual Work:** Students must write a **100-word summary** of their "burst" story, focusing on the absolute "need-to-know" angles.
- **Peer Review:** Pair students up to swap summaries. Partners must answer:
 1. Are these key points in the lead?

2. Is there a clear **nut graf** explaining the "so what?".
3. Does the headline's tone match the subject matter?

3. Abstraction: The "So What?" Checklist (20 Mins)

- **Lecture/Discussion:** Review the five critical questions for every story:
 - *What is happening? What does it mean? So what? Who cares? Who is affected?*
- **Audience Mapping:** Discuss how familiar the target audience is with the topic and what context (backstory) is missing.
- **Inclusivity Audit:** Briefly discuss how to examine text and visuals for bias or lack of representation.

4. Application: The "Fresh Eye" Deep Edit (30 Mins)

- **Final Revision:** Students return to their initial "burst" story. Using the **AP self-editing list**, they must:
 - Rewrite the lead to remove "wasted words" and irrelevant scene-setters.
 - Ensure the story clearly answers "Who is affected, how, and why?"
 - Check for AP Style consistency (numerals, titles, and dates).
- **Submission:** Students submit their **100-word summary**, their **draft headline**, and the **final edited story**.

Assessment/Evaluation

- **Rubric Criteria:** Accuracy of the 100-word summary, presence of a "so what" nut graf, and adherence to AP Style.
- **Homework:** Select a professional news article and identify its nut graf and "so what" factor. Then, rewrite its headline to better match the story's tone.

LECTURE TITLE: **The Architecture of Clarity**

Theme: Deconstructing Syntactic Clutter and the Rhetoric of Conciseness.

Duration: 90 Minutes.

1. Introduction: The Psychology of Text Perception (15 min)

- 1) Cognitive Load Theory:** Explain why long, multi-clause sentences exhaust the reader. Discuss the concept of "working memory" and how a reader "drops the thread" when a sentence exceeds 25–30 words.
- 2) The Strunk & White Manifesto:** Analyze the thesis: "*Clarity, clarity, clarity.*" Why, in 2025, the ability to simplify is a high-value professional skill rather than a basic one.
- 3) The Clutter Demonstration:** Read the "Commonwealth Games" passage aloud without pausing. Ask students to identify the exact moment they stopped processing the information.

2. Anatomy of a "Cluttered" Sentence (25 min)

- 1) Clause Overload:** How an abundance of commas creates visual and mental "noise."
- 2) The Interruption Trap:** Analyzing how appositives (e.g., "*a runner who has had a storied past...*") and parenthetical information sever the vital link between Subject and Verb.
- 3) The "Academic Sophistication" Myth:** Debunking the idea that complexity equals intelligence. Discuss how "officialese" or "legalese" often hides a lack of precision.
- 4) The Breath Test:** A practical rule—if a sentence cannot be read comfortably in one breath, it requires "surgical intervention."

3. Methods of Restructuring (20 min)

1) **The "Start Fresh" Principle:** Based on *The Elements of Style*, teach students not to edit a broken sentence but to delete it and begin again.

2) **Fact Separation:** Techniques for isolating the "core action" from the "contextual baggage."

- *Core:* The Federation ruled.
- *Context:* The boycott, the athletes' histories, the location.

3) **Pruning Deadwood:** Identifying "empty" phrases (e.g., "*in an apparent effort to,*" "*the fact that,*" "*the object of a number of*") that add length without adding meaning.

4. Case Study & Workshop (20 min)

Provide students with the original Commonwealth Games text and a "cleaned" version.

1) **Comparative Analysis:** Which version communicates the political stakes of the boycott more effectively?

2) **The "Sieve" Exercise:** Provide students with a 60-word sentence from a 2025 legal brief or academic journal. Task them with "sieving" it into two sentences of 15–20 words without losing the nuance.

5. Conclusion: The Professional Voice (10 min)

1) **Punctuation as a Tool, Not an Ornament:** Use the period as a "rest stop" for the reader's brain.

2) **The Drafting vs. Editing Mindset:** Writing is about generating thought; editing is about engineering the reader's experience.

3) Assignment: Students must audit a paragraph from their current thesis or term paper, identify the most "cluttered" sentence, and rewrite it using the "Start Fresh" method.

Recommended Resources for Students:

- **Strunk, W., & White, E.B.** — *The Elements of Style*.
- **Williams, J. M.** — *Style: Lessons in Clarity and Grace*.
- **Purdue Online Writing Lab (OWL)** — Advanced Sentence Clarity Strategies.

WORKSHOP TITLE: **Precision and Pruning: Advanced Syntactic Clarity**

Objective: Students will analyze and deconstruct complex, multi-clause academic and journalistic sentences to improve readability and impact through strategic "pruning" and re-organization.

1. Introduction: The Burden of Complexity (10 Minutes)

- **The Hook:** Present a "cluttered" high-level academic or legal passage (like the Commonwealth Games Federation text).
- **Rhetorical Analysis:** Discuss why professional writers often fall into the trap of "over-writing." ◦ *Prompt:* Does the density of clauses lend authority, or does it obscure the primary argument?
- **Core Principle:** Review Strunk and White's **Rule 17: "Omit needless words"**. Emphasize that "vigorous writing is concise" and that every word must "tell".

2. Deep Dive: The Mechanics of Clarity (15 Minutes)

- **Deconstructing the Clause:** Identify how parenthetical expressions and appositives (e.g., "a runner who has had a storied past...") can dilute the subject-verb relationship.
- **The "Fresh Start" Technique:** Discuss the *Elements of Style* advice: when "hopelessly mired," do not fight the syntax—break it apart.
- **Identifying "Clutter Marks":** Focus on the overuse of commas as a red flag for a sentence that has become a "sea of clauses".

3. Collaborative Workshop: "Syntactic Surgery" (20 Minutes)

- **Group Activity:** Divide students into pairs and provide them with several high-density sentences from peer-reviewed journals or legal briefs.
- **The Task:**

1. **Isolate the Core:** Find the primary Subject-Verb-Object (SVO).
 2. **Evaluate the "Deadwood":** Identify which modifiers are essential and which are decorative.
 3. **Recast:** Rewrite the passage into 2–3 sentences that maintain the original nuance but prioritize the reader's "cognitive load".
- **Peer Review:** Groups swap their "clean" versions and evaluate if any vital information was lost during the pruning process.

4. Advanced Application: Writing with Confidence (10 Minutes)

- **Hedging vs. Precision:** Address "qualifiers" (e.g., *I think, it seems, arguably*) as a form of clutter that weakens professional voice.
- **Active Voice Mastery:** Practice converting passive, clause-heavy sentences into active, direct statements to increase energy and clarity.

5. Closing: The Clarity Audit (5 Minutes)

- **Exit Exercise:** Students take one paragraph from a draft of a current essay they are writing and perform a "Clarity Audit".
- **Assessment Goal:** They must identify at least one sentence that can be broken into two for better impact.

Materials & Resources:

- **The Text:** The Elements of Style (Strunk & White).
 - **Case Studies:** Cluttered excerpts from legal rulings or academic journals.
 - **Guidance:** Purdue OWL: Sentence Clarity for advanced revision strategies
- LECTURE TITLE: The Ethics of Digital Persona and Faithful Reporting Goal:** To establish a professional standard for social media conduct and ensure absolute fidelity in the representation of sources' words and actions.

1. Aim, Tasks, and Value

- **Aim:** To master the AP standards for social media neutrality, quote integrity, and the ethical "rewriting" of member and PR material.
- **Topical Tasks:**
 - Implement the "No-Altering" rule for quotes (even for grammar). ◦ Navigate the "Neutral Social Persona" (no political affiliations or "trash-talking").
 - Distinguish between "Plagiarism" and "Acceptable AP Boilerplate."
- **Theoretical Value: The "Mirror" Theory**—The journalist as a faithful reflector of speech and a neutral observer in public digital spaces.
- **Practical Value:** Developing the discipline to report first to the desk before posting on social media and ensuring "Right of Reply" protocols are met.

2. Lecture Outline (90 Minutes)

- **The Sanctity of the Quote (20 min):**
 - **Verbatim Integrity:** Why we do not fix grammar; the "Paraphrase or Omit" rule.
 - **Context & Affect:** The importance of describing body language and setting (e.g., "hallway conversation").
 - **Audio/Video Splicing:** The ban on "internal editing" of soundbites.
- **Social Media: The Professional Boundary (25 min):**
 - **The Neutrality Mandate:** Avoiding opinions on contentious issues even in "private" accounts.
 - **The "Desk First" Rule:** Exclusive news must hit the AP wire before a personal tweet.
 - **Social Diplomacy:** The ban on "trash-talking" in sports/entertainment and the "Dual-Following" rule for politicians.
- **Sourcing & Ownership (20 min):**

- **Plagiarism vs. Boilerplate:** When you can reuse previous AP background text vs. when you must attribute others.
- **PR & Press Releases:** Why we *never* publish them in original form.
The requirement to rewrite and augment with independent reporting.
- **Fairness & The Response Protocol (15 min):**
 - Defining "Reasonable Time" for a response.
 - The "Effort Disclosure": How to explain to the reader exactly how you tried to reach someone.
- **The Correction Cycle on Social Media (10 min):**
 - The "Delete and Substitute" protocol: Transparently acknowledging deletions on X, Instagram, or TikTok.

WORKSHOP TITLE: **The Newsroom Integration Lab**

Goal: To simulate the high-pressure environment of social media reporting, quote management, and response-gathering.

1. Practical Tasks

- **Task 1: The Quote Diagnostic:** Transforming a "broken" quote into a faithful paraphrase without losing meaning.
- **Task 2: The Social Media Audit:** Reviewing mock social media posts for "opinionated" violations.
- **Task 3: The Response Memo:** Documenting the "significant effort" to reach a subject.

2. Workshop Plan (90 Minutes)

Phase 1: The Quote Clinic (30 min)

- **Scenario:** A source provides a quote full of "umms," grammatical errors, and unclear slang.
- **Task:** Students must decide: 1. Keep it verbatim? 2. Paraphrase it? 3. Omit it?
- **Challenge:** Add a description of the source's "affect" (e.g., a smile or a shrug) to change the reader's understanding of the quote's tone.

Phase 2: The Social Media "Neutrality" Test (25 min)

- **Scenario:** A student is a sports reporter for the AP. A major athlete makes a controversial political statement.
- **Task:** Draft a tweet that "reports" the opinion without "endorsing" it.

- **Audit:** Check for "fawning praise" or "trash-talking." Ensure the student's profile identifies them as an AP journalist.

Phase 3: The Press Release Rewrite (25 min)

- **Scenario:** You receive a glowing press release from a tech company about a new "revolutionary" product.
- **Task:** 1. Identify two quotes to keep. 2. Identify three claims that need independent verification. 3. Rewrite the lead to be objective rather than promotional.

Phase 4: The "Right of Reply" Log (10 min)

- **Scenario:** You are publishing a story at 5:00 PM alleging a mayor misused funds. You called at 9:00 AM, 12:00 PM, and 4:00 PM.
- **Task:** Write the specific paragraph for the story that explains your efforts and the lack of response.

Professional Resources for Students:

- **Core Standards:** Associated Press News Values and Principles (Full Text).
- **Writing Guidance:** The AP Stylebook on Social Media Guidelines.
- **Legal/Ethical:** Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press (RCFP) Open Government Guide.

LECTURE TITLE: **The Data-Driven Storyteller**

Goal: To equip students with the analytical and ethical framework to acquire, vet, analyze, and present data as a core component of modern reporting.

1. Aim, Tasks, and Value

- **Aim:** To transform data analysis from a "specialist skill" into a standard reporting tool, ensuring students can converse in "the language of data."
- **Topical Tasks:**
 - Master the "**Electronic, Machine-Readable**" data request via FOIA.
 - Learn the protocol for handling **leaked/hacked** data (skepticism, legal review, verification).
 - Differentiate between **Mean, Median, and Mode** and apply them correctly.
- **Theoretical Value:** Understanding data transparency as the foundation of public trust and reproducible analysis as a core journalistic standard.
- **Practical Value:** Developing the ability to read government and business data critically, identify bias in collection methodology, and present complex numbers simply and accurately.

2. Lecture Outline (90 Minutes)

- **The New Staple: Data as Source Material (15 min):**
 - Data journalism is everywhere; government and business communicate in stats. The imperative for journalists to be conversant.
 - Data evaluation: Treat a dataset as you would any human source (reliability, bias, scope).
- **Acquisition: FOIA and the "Scraping" Ethics (25 min):**
 - **Government Data:** Using the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) (and state equivalents) for access.

- **The Format Fight:** Always request "electronic, machine-readable" format.
- **Web Scraping as a Last Resort:** Ethical precautions (terms of service, not crashing servers, identifying yourself).
- **Expert Insight:** The need to speak to both "technical experts" (data managers) and "domain experts" (policy context).
- **Vetting: The Sourcing Audit (20 min):**
 - The "Skepticism Mandate": Extreme caution with leaked/hacked data (privacy risks, malware, authenticity).
 - The Data Dictionary/Record Layout: What to request (codes, missing data indicators, frequency of updates).
 - Cross-Referencing: Comparing data against a parallel source for discrepancies.
- **Analysis: Numbers in Context (20 min):**
 - **Comparison is Key:** A number alone signifies nothing. Using "per capita" and adjusting for inflation.
 - **Averages Explained:** The sensitivity of the **Mean** to outliers; why the **Median** is often a better central point.
 - **The Cardinal Sin:** Do not average averages.
- **Conclusion: Transparency and Correlation (10 min):**
 - **Reproducibility:** A "road map" for editors/public to replicate your analysis.
 - **Correlation \neq Causation:** The fundamental difference.

WORKSHOP TITLE: **The Data Desk Lab**

Goal: To apply analytical skills to raw data scenarios and practice transparent reporting methods.

1. Practical Tasks

- **Task 1: The FOIA Request:** Drafting a legally sound data request.
- **Task 2: The Data Vetting Log:** Creating documentation for a suspect dataset.
- **Task 3: The Presentation Challenge:** Explaining Mean vs. Median to a lay audience.

2. Workshop Plan (90 Minutes)

Phase 1: The FOIA Challenge (20 min)

- **Scenario:** Students want data on local police response times.
- **Task:** Draft a formal FOIA request. The key phrase to include: Requesting the data in "electronic, machine-readable" format (e.g., a CSV or spreadsheet file).

Phase 2: The Data Audit & Vetting (30 min)

- **Scenario:** Students are given a sample "data dictionary" and a small dataset provided by an advocacy group.
- **Task:** Identify the data source's potential bias. Look for "anomalies" (blank values, outliers, weird codes). Document the methodology used for collection. **Phase 3: The Presentation Challenge (30 min)**

- **Scenario:** A town's average income is presented as \$100,000 (mean). But one billionaire lives there, skewing the numbers. The median income is \$45,000.
- **Task A:** Calculate both the mean and median.

- **Task B:** Write a two-sentence "Methodology Statement" explaining why the median is the more accurate representation for the story.
- **Task C:** Explain the difference between "percent change" (e.g., 10% to 13% is 3 percentage points) and "percentage points."

Phase 4: Reflection & Transparency (10 min)

- **Discussion:** Why is maintaining a rigorous "data log" of all steps crucial? How does sharing results with sources before publication improve accuracy without giving up editorial control?

Professional Resources for Students:

- **Legal Guidance:** The National Freedom of Information Coalition (NFOIC) State Laws Resource.
- **Data Vetting:** Data Journalism Handbook on Methodology.
- **Tools:** Standard spreadsheet or database software for analysis.

LECTURE TITLE: **Beyond the "Standard": Mastering Inclusive Storytelling**

Duration: 60–90 minutes **Learning**

Objectives:

1. Define **inclusive storytelling** and its importance to accuracy.
2. Identify **unconscious bias** and "traditional narratives" in current media.
3. Apply strategies for **diverse sourcing** and ethical framing.

Phase 1: Hook & Discussion (15 mins)

- **The "Standard" Norm:** Write the following terms on the board: *White, Male, Straight, Non-disabled*. Ask students: "When we see these as the 'default' in news or history, who is missing?"
- **Reading:** Distribute the article. Have students highlight the sentence: "*The inaccuracies and misrepresentations grow ever greater as the diversity of our audiences increases.*"
- **Discussion:** Why is inclusive storytelling considered "essential to accuracy" rather than just a nice-to-have "topic"?

Phase 2: Analysis Activity – "The Missing Perspective" (25 mins)

- **Exercise:** Provide students with a short, "traditional" news clip or historical text (e.g., a standard account of a local event).
- **Activity:** In small groups, use a **Think, Pair, Share** strategy to evaluate the story.
 - **The Perspective:** From whose viewpoint is this told?
 - **The Sources:** Who was interviewed? Who was *not* asked for their opinion?
 - **The Language:** Are there words that imply a certain "norm" or "standard"?

- **Goal:** Students must suggest three specific "diverse voices" or "missing details" that would make the story more accurate.

Phase 3: Application – The Storyteller’s Pitch (20 mins)

- **Task:** Students choose a "regular, go-to topic" (e.g., local sports, a school policy change, or a historical event) and re-frame it using the article’s principles.
- **Pitch Requirements:**
 - **Sourcing:** List three sources that represent different races, ages, or classes.
 - **Self-Interrogation:** Write one "unconscious bias" they had to overcome when thinking about this story.
 - **Framing:** Explain how they will avoid making one group the "default" norm.

Phase 4: Reflection & Wrap-up (10 mins)

- **Exit Slip:** Ask students to answer: "How does changing the *who* and *how* of a story change its *truth*?"
- **Takeaway:** Emphasize that inclusive storytelling is a daily "mindset shift," not a one-time project.

Practical Resources:

- For identifying media bias, use the Ad Fontes Interactive Media Bias Chart.
- Explore diverse digital storytelling tools via Common Sense Education's Digital Literacy Resources.
- For historical perspectives, consult [Facing History & Ourselves](#) for curriculum on identity and narrative.

Exercise 1: "The Source Detective" (Expanding Perspectives)

Goal: To move beyond "usual sources" and identify missing voices.

- **The Scenario:** A local city council decides to close a community youth center to build a luxury apartment complex.
- **The Task:** Students are given a list of "traditional" sources (The Mayor, the Developer, the Police Chief). They must brainstorm **5 non-traditional sources** who would make the story more accurate and fair.
 - *Examples:* A teenager who uses the center, a local street artist, a single parent who relies on the center's after-school care, or a disability advocate (to discuss accessibility in the new building).
- **Discussion Question:** How does the "truth" of the story change when we add these voices versus only talking to the Mayor?

Exercise 2: "The Language Audit" (Identifying Norms)

Goal: To recognize when language implies a "standard" or "norm" (e.g., white, male, non-disabled).

- **The Task:** Provide students with sentences that contain subtle biases. Ask them to rewrite the sentences to be more inclusive.
 - *Sentence A:* "Despite being in a wheelchair, Sarah lives a normal life." (**Edit:** Remove "despite" and define what "normal" implies).
 - *Sentence B:* "The police questioned both ordinary citizens and members of the minority community." (**Edit:** Discuss why "ordinary" creates a "us vs. them" narrative).
 - *Sentence C:* "The new policy helps working mothers balance their lives." (**Edit:** Change to "working parents" to avoid gendered assumptions).

Exercise 3: "Framing the Frame" (Visual Analysis)

Goal: To understand how images can reinforce or challenge traditional narratives.

- **The Task:** Show students two different photographs for an article about "Global Leadership."
 - **Photo 1:** A group of older men in suits shaking hands in a boardroom.
 - **Photo 2:** A diverse group (different ages, ethnicities, and physical abilities) collaborating in a community space.
- **Activity:** Use a VTS (Visual Thinking Strategy) approach. Ask:
 1. What is going on in these pictures?
 2. Who is being presented as the "expert" or "leader" in each?
 3. If you were from an underrepresented group, which story would you trust more?

Exercise 4: "Interrogating My Assumptions" (Self-Reflection)

Goal: To practice "stretching beyond accustomed ways of thinking."

- **The Task:** Students pick a news story they recently disagreed with or felt "didn't apply to them."
- **Reflective Journaling Questions:**
 1. What was my initial reaction to this headline?
 2. Did I make an assumption about the people in the story based on their race, age, or class?
 3. How would this story look if it were told by someone from a completely different background than mine?

Exercise 5: "The Collaborative Pitch" (Teamwork)

Goal: To use teamwork to overcome individual unconscious bias.

- **The Task:** In small groups, students must pitch a story about a "routine" school event (e.g., The School Prom or a Football Game).

- **The Constraint:** Every member of the group must represent a different "stakeholder" perspective (e.g., a student on a low income, an international exchange student, a student with social anxiety, a teacher).
- **The Outcome:** The group must present a "storyboard" that includes diverse faces and perspectives, ensuring no single group is treated as the "default."

Actionable Resources for Teachers:

- **Bias Check:** Use the Harvard Implicit Association Test (IAT) as a starting point for discussing unconscious bias.
- **Media Literacy:** Refer to the News Literacy Project for tools on how to teach students to identify fair and accurate reporting.
- **Diversity Style Guide:** Encourage students to use The Diversity Style Guide to find the most respectful and accurate terms for their assignments.

LECTURE TITLE: “Navigating the “Bonanza of Opportunity”

Duration: 2 x 90-minute sessions **Learning**

Objectives:

By the end of this lesson, students will be able to:

1. **Evaluate** the newsworthiness of scientific claims using the “Dinner Table Test.”
2. **Analyze** sources for potential bias, distinguishing between peer-reviewed journals and industry-led advocacy reports.
3. **Translate** complex scientific jargon into clear, narrative-driven prose for a general audience.
4. **Apply** AP Style guidelines specific to health and science reporting.

Session 1: The Gatekeeper’s Skepticism

1. Introduction (15 mins)

- **Discussion:** Why is science reporting “high stakes”?
- **Concept:** Introduce the “Bonanza of Opportunity” vs. “Unique Responsibility.” Discuss how a misleading story about a “breakthrough” can lead to public harm.

2. The Credibility Checklist (35 mins)

- **Lecture:** Understanding the hierarchy of evidence.
 - **The Gold Standard:** Peer-reviewed journals (e.g., *Nature*, *The Lancet*).
 - **The Red Flags:** Science by press release, industry-funded “studies,” and non-peer-reviewed preprints.

- **Activity: "Audit the Source"**

- Provide three press releases: one from a major university (peerreviewed), one from a pharmaceutical lobby, and one from a niche blog.

Students must rank them by credibility using the AP Stylebook

criteria. **3. Case Study: "Breakthrough" vs. Incrementalism (40 mins)**

- **Analysis:** Examine a "sensationalized" headline (e.g., "Cure for Cancer Found!") versus the actual research paper (e.g., "Targeted Protein Inhibitor Shows Promise in Phase 1 Murine Trials").
- **Discussion:** How do we report on the *fifth* treatment for a disease vs. the *first*?
How do we quantify temperature rises without alarmism?

Session 2: From Lab to Living Room

1. The "Dinner Table" Test (20 mins)

- **Lecture:** Relevance and human interest. Why does heart disease often trump a rare genetic disorder in general news?
- **Quick-fire Pitches:** Students are given five scientific abstracts. They have 30 seconds to pitch why it matters to someone's grandmother.

2. Translation Workshop: Killing the Jargon (40 mins)

- **The Challenge:** Give students a paragraph of dense scientific jargon (e.g., "The CRISPR-Cas9 mechanism facilitates double-stranded breaks in the genomic sequence...").
- **Exercise:** Rewrite the paragraph for a general news site without losing accuracy. Focus on Clear Language and AP Style (e.g., proper naming of diseases like Alzheimer's or COVID-19).

3. Role-Play: The Expert Interview (30 mins)

- **Scenario:** One student plays a researcher eager to promote their "breakthrough." The other is a reporter asking critical questions:
 - "Is this the first study of its kind?"
 - "Who funded this research?"
 - "How does this change our current understanding?"

Homework: Identify a recent scientific study from an academic repository (like PubMed or AAAS). Write a 400-word news story that:

- Passes the "Dinner Table Test."
- Provides context (is it the 1st or 5th treatment?).
- Adheres to AP Stylebook Health and Science guidelines.
- Includes a "Source Disclosure" paragraph explaining why this source is credible.

Recommended Resources:

- Association of Health Care Journalists (AHCJ) for ethical toolkits.
- **The Open Notebook** for "story behind the story" examples in science writing.
- **Science Media Centre** for expert reactions to breaking science news.

LECTURE TITLE: “Ethics and Accountability in Criminal Justice Reporting”

Duration: 3-Hour Workshop (or two 90-minute sessions)

Learning Objectives: By the end of this lesson, students will be able to:

- Apply the "**Follow-Through**" **Test** to decide when to name a suspect .
- Recognize and neutralize **unconscious bias** in criminal justice descriptors.
- Construct a story that balances law enforcement claims with defense perspectives.

Session 1: The Principle of Fairness (90 Minutes) Learning

Objectives:

By the end of the lesson, students will be able to:

1. Explain the **principle of fairness** in journalism using appropriate B2-level language.
2. Identify **fair and unfair reporting practices**.
3. Analyze news stories for bias and imbalance.
4. Apply fairness when writing and editing short journalistic texts.

Key Vocabulary (Pre-teach): fairness, bias, balance, objectivity, source, representation, misquotation, omission, ethical journalism.

1. Warm-Up: Media Reflection (10 minutes)

Think–Pair–Share (To Encourage justification using example) Ask

students:

- *“Do journalists always report the truth fairly?”*
- *“Can a news story be factually correct but still unfair?”*

Students discuss in pairs, then share ideas with the class.

Input: Fairness in Journalism (15 minutes)

Mini-Lecture + Board Work Explain:

- **Fairness in journalism** means:
 - Giving all relevant sides a chance to be heard
 - Avoiding misleading language
 - Providing accurate context
 - Not misrepresenting people or events

Contrast:

- **Fairness vs. neutrality**
- **Fairness vs. opinion Journalism Example:**
- Reporting a protest:

Fair: includes voices from protesters, authorities, and experts; Unfair:

focuses only on violence and ignores the cause.

2. Case Study Analysis (15 minutes) Activity: Fair or Unfair Reporting?

Provide a short news extract (real or adapted) that shows:

- loaded language
- missing viewpoints
- selective facts

In groups, students answer:

1. What makes the report fair or unfair?
2. Which voices are missing?

3. How could the journalist improve fairness?

Provide the following sentence starters:

- *The article seems biased because...*
- *One important voice that is missing is...*

3. Listening or Video Analysis (10 minutes) Show a short news clip or interview.

Tasks:

- Identify the main sources used
- Decide whether the coverage is fair
- Justify opinions with evidence

4. Practical Activity: Edit for Fairness (20 minutes)

Journalism Workshop

Give students a **biased or one-sided news paragraph**.

Task:

- Rewrite the text to make it fairer by:
 - Removing emotional language
 - Adding balance or missing context
 - Clarifying facts

Students work in pairs and then compare versions.

5. Ethical Discussion: Difficult Choices (10 minutes) Whole-Class Discussion

Ask:

- Is it always possible to be fair?
- What happens when sources refuse to comment?
- Should fairness slow down breaking news?

Encourage students to defend opinions professionally.

- “Do you trust the news media? Why or why not?”
- “What should journalists do when they make mistakes?”

Students share short opinions in pairs, then with the class.

2. Concept Input: Accountability & Bias (15 Minutes)

Teacher-Led Input Explain:

Accountability in journalism

- Journalists are responsible for:
 - Accuracy of information
 - Explaining their decisions
 - Correcting errors publicly
 - Being transparent with audiences

Bias Mitigation

- Bias is often **unconscious**
- Mitigation means:
 - Actively reducing bias, not denying it

Using professional checks and standards **Types of**

Bias (with examples):

- Confirmation bias
- Political or ideological bias
- Cultural bias
- Source bias
- Headline bias

3. Case Study: When Accountability Fails (15 Minutes)

Group Activity

Provide a short case (real or adapted), e.g.:

- A journalist publishes incorrect information
- The outlet delays or hides the correction
- Public criticism follows **Group Questions:**

1. What went wrong?
2. How should the journalist or newsroom respond?

3. How could bias have influenced the mistake?

Use the following phrases:

- *The journalist should have...*
- *A more accountable response would be...*

4. Bias Detection Workshop (15 Minutes)

Activity: Spot the Bias Give

students:

- Headlines
- Short news leads
- Photo captions **Task:**

Students work in pairs to:

- Identify possible bias
- Explain how it affects audience perception
- Suggest a more neutral alternative

5. Practical Task: Bias Mitigation in Action (20 Minutes)

Editing & Reporting Exercise Students

receive:

- A short news story on a controversial topic
- Limited sources and emotionally charged language

Task:

Students must:

1. Identify biased elements
2. Add accountability measures (attribution, clarification, transparency)
3. Rewrite the text to reduce bias

Students compare before/after versions in small groups

6. Ethical Debate: Real-World Pressure (10 Minutes)

Discussion

Prompt

Ask:

- Can journalists be accountable under political or commercial pressure?
- Is complete objectivity possible?
- Should journalists explain how they select sources?

Encourage structured responses using:

- *In my opinion...*
- *From an ethical point of view...*

7. Reflection & Wrap-Up (5–10 Minutes)

Exit Task (Written) Students

complete:

“One way journalists can reduce bias and remain accountable is...”

(60–80 words)

Teacher gives brief feedback on content and language.

Assessment:

- Participation and quality of discussion
 - Bias identification accuracy
 - Clarity and balance in rewritten text
 - Exit reflection **Hometask:**
1. Find a news article and identify at least **three accountability measures** used (or missing).
 2. Write a short newsroom policy paragraph on bias mitigation.

Assignment for Students

The "Full Arc" Report: Assign each student one local arrest from this week.

They must:

1. Verify the information with a non-police source.
2. Provide a specific "Status Check" calendar for the next 6 months to ensure they follow the case to its end.

3. Write two versions of the lead: one focusing on the "act" and one focusing on the "public policy/safety trend".

Recommended Resources:

- [The Poynter Institute: Transforming Local Crime Reporting](#)
- [The Marshall Project: Language Guide](#)
- [AP Stylebook: Criminal Justice Section](#)

РЕКОМЕНДОВАНІ ДЖЕРЕЛА ІНФОРМАЦІЇ

1. Froke, P. (Ed.) (2022). *The Associated Press Stylebook: 2-22-2024, 55th Edition*.
<http://www.apstylebook.com/>
2. Moor Ch., Dooley, J., (2022). *Career Paths: Journalism*. Express Publishing.
3. Strunk W., White E. B. *The Elements of Style*. 4th ed. Boston : Allyn and Bacon, 1999. 105 p.
4. Williams J. M. *Style: Lessons in Clarity and Grace*. 12th ed. Boston : Pearson, 2017. 256 p.

ІНФОРМАЦІЙНІ РЕСУРСИ В МЕРЕЖІ ІНТЕРНЕТ

1. VOA Learning English – Voice of America.
<http://Learningenglish.voanews.com/>
2. <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/>
3. <https://www.rcfp.org/open-government-guide/>
4. <https://www.nfoic.org/organizations/>
5. <https://healthjournalism.org/freelancers/>
6. Advanced Sentence Clarity // Purdue Online Writing Lab (OWL). URL:
owl.purdue.edu (дата звернення: 14.01.2026).