

POLITICAL COMMUNICATION

Journalism and Mass Communication 829 – Spring 2015
(Cross-Listed with Political Science)
5013 Vilas Communication Hall
Monday 1:00 AM-3:00 PM

Dhavan Shah

Louis A. & Mary E. Maier-Bascom Professor
School of Journalism and Mass Communication
Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering (affiliated)
Department of Marketing (affiliated)
Department of Political Science (affiliated)

Office: 5162 Vilas Communication Hall
Telephone: 262-0388 (Office) or 513-4224 (Cell)
Email: dshah@wisc.edu
Office Hours: M/W 3:00-4:00 PM

Course Description:

This course examines the connection between mass media, citizens, and politics. We will start by taking a decidedly social-psychological perspective on these issues, placing the individual and their place in society at the center of our inquiry, and then move toward a more sociological approach to questions of media influence over the course of the term. The seminar will focus on the complex interrelationships between consumption of various types of media content and the thoughts, judgments, and behaviors of citizens. We will consider political communication outside the U.S. — in Europe, Latin America, and China — and explore emerging computational approaches to understanding “life in the network.” Still, we will mainly focus on media effects research at the intersection of communication and politics in Western democracies.

The encapsulated aim of this course: *To consider classics and controversies in the existing political communication literature and propose measurable concepts and testable theories that illuminate the relations between the consumption and content of the mass media in democratic societies and the political judgment, public opinion, and collective action of democratic citizens.*

Course Requirements:

Grades in the class will be based on your performance on the following requirements: (1) final research paper — 50%, (2) review reports as class discussant — 20%, (3) weekly comment papers — 20%, and (4) participation in seminar discussion — 10%.

Research Paper

The major requirement for this course is an original research paper written individually by each student and presented to other seminar participants. The paper should grow out of one of the topics or theories covered in the course and contain the following sections: (1) brief introduction, (2) literature review, (3) statement of hypothesis or research model, (4) actual or proposed methodology, (5) results or proposed analysis, (6) concluding discussion about what was or will be learned. The methodology may be quantitative or qualitative. The goal of the paper is to contribute, however modestly, to research in the area of political communication. The paper can present findings based on existing and available data sets (e.g., National Election Study, Annenberg National Election Survey, General Social Survey, DDB Life Style Archive, The Pew Internet and American Life Project, the National Annenberg Election Study, the Mass Communication Research Center Archive, etc.) or the collection of original data. Some of you may wish to extend projects you have developed elsewhere or to refine ideas toward completion of Master's or Doctoral theses; please consult with me if this is the case, and share your progress to date.

Your paper will be evaluated on whether it integrates the concepts encountered in class into coherent and testable propositions that have implications for theory in political communication. Your research paper should reflect an original extension of the ideas we have encountered in class, not a simple recapitulation of past work. A three-page prospectus for your seminar paper is due WEEK 10 (submit by email by Friday of that week). Seminar presentations will be held during the last two class periods. The final paper is due May 8th by 4:00 P.M. and should be between 20-25 pages of text, not including cover, bib, tables, and figures. **This paper will be worth 50 percent of your final grade.**

Review Reports

In addition, every student will be required to serve as a discussant for two class sessions. Discussants will write an 8 to 10 page **summary, synthesis and critique** of the week's readings and provide a brief list of questions to facilitate discussion. As a discussant, you will be responsible for spurring but not necessarily leading student discussion of the readings by pointing out what you believe are the strengths and weaknesses of the readings and encouraging debate about your reflections. Ideally, you will choose a week that coincides with your broader interests. That way, your review of the reading materials will be useful to you when preparing your paper. Review reports will be sent to the class listserv as an .doc or

.pdf at least 6 hours before class. These reports will be graded and **will be worth 20 percent of your grade, 10% each.**

Comment Papers:

Every week, with the exception of the weeks you prepare review reports, you will produce a brief set of written comments on the readings. You may miss 4 weekly comment papers (that is, you will complete six comment papers, omitting the two weeks you will be producing review reports). These comment papers should be 1-2 pages in length, though they may be shorter on weeks that are of less interest to you and longer on weeks that you feel inspired. Papers do not need to follow any particular format or necessarily cover all the readings, as long as they illustrate that you made an effort to process that week's reading and have reflected on the research you encountered. Some of you may use these comment papers to summarize the key points of each of the readings into notes for their own future use. Others may organize their comments into critical essays or critiques on the general themes of the week. Yet others may focus on detailed reviews of a few readings or even a single reading, digging deeply into a topic of particular interest. Bring your comment papers to class and turn them in to me at the end. If you do not complete your comment paper for a particular week, do not avoid class. Come to seminar, listen and learn, and comment when you can. **These six comment papers will be worth 20 percent of your final grade;** evaluation will be based on the number completed; I will not be evaluating the content of these papers.

Seminar Participation:

The final 10 percent of your class grade will be based on participation in seminar discussion. It is not enough that you just come to class. You must actively discuss the readings and engage in discussion with other seminar participants. Your weekly comment paper should be the starting point for ideas you want to share with the class. I am hopeful that the discussion that ensues will lead to the development of a classroom environment where ideas are discussed and debated in an open, maybe even heated, yet respectful way.

Recommended Texts:

Bimber, B., Flanagin, A., & Stohl, C. (2012). *Collective action in organizations: Interaction and engagement in an era of technological change*. Cambridge University Press.

Cappella, J. N. and Jamieson, K. H. (1997) *Spiral of cynicism: The press and the public good*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Delli Carpini, M. X. and Keeter, S. (1996) *What Americans know about politics and why it matters*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Gamson, W. A. (1992). *Talking politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Geer, J. (2006). *In defense of negativity: Attack advertising in presidential campaigns*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Iyengar, S. and Kinder, D. (1987). *News that matters: Television and American opinion*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

McLeod, D. M., and Shah, D. V. (2015). *News frames and national security: Covering Big Brother*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Mutz, D., (2006). *Hearing the other side: Deliberative versus participatory democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Neuman, W. R., Just, M. R., and Crigler, A. N. (1992). *Common knowledge: News and the construction of political meaning*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Noelle-Neumann, E. (1993). *The spiral of silence: Public opinion, our social skin*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Zaller, J. (1992): *The nature and origins of mass opinion*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Weekly Readings

Week 1, January 26: Introduction

Week 2, February 2: The nature of political communication and media effects

Discussants: Logan Vidal

- * Price, V., and Tewksbury, D. (1996). News values and public opinion: A theoretical account of media priming and framing. In G. Barnett and F. Boster (Eds.) *Progress in communication sciences*. Norwood, N.J., Ablex Pub. Corp.
- * McLeod, D. M., Kosicki, G. M., and McLeod, J. M. (2002). Resurveying the boundaries of political communication effects. In J. Bryant and D. Zillmann (Eds.). *Media effects: Advances in theory and research* (pp. 215-267). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- * Bennett, W. L. & Iyengar, S. (2008) A new era of minimal effects? The changing foundations of political communication, *Journal of Communication*, 58, 707-731
- * Stroud, N. J. (2008). Media use and political predispositions: Revisiting the concept of selective exposure. *Political Behavior*, 30(3), 341-366.
- * Boulianne, S. (2009). Does Internet use affect engagement? A meta-analysis of research. *Political Communication*, 26(2), 193-211.

Week 3, February 9: The construction and analysis of news discourse

Discussants: Emma Frankham

- * Edelman, M. J. (1993). Contestable categories and public opinion. *Political Communication*, 10, 231-242.
- * Patterson, T. (1998). Political roles of the journalist. In D. Graber, D. McQuail, and P. Norris (Eds.), *The politics of news, the news of politics* (pp. 17-32). Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly Press.
- * Iyengar, S., Norpoth, H., & Hahn, K. S. (2004) Consumer demand for election news: The horserace sells, *Journal Of Politics*, 66, 157-175.
- * Baum, M. A., & Groeling, T. (2008). New media and the polarization of American political discourse. *Political Communication*, 25(4), 345-365.
- * Young, D. G. (2013). Laughter, learning, or enlightenment? Viewing and avoidance motivations behind The Daily Show and The Colbert Report. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 57(2), 153-169.

Week 4, February 16: Agenda-setting and priming: Effects on social evaluations

Discussants: Logan Vidal

- * Kosicki, G. M. (1993). Problems and opportunities in agenda-setting research. *Journal of Communication, 43*, 100-127.
- * Althaus, S, & Tewksbury, D. (2002) Agenda setting and the “new” news: Patterns of issue importance among readers of the paper and online versions of the New York Times. *Communication Research, 29*, 180-207.
- * McCombs, M. (2004). *Setting the agenda: The mass media and public opinion*. Chapter 3. John Wiley & Sons.
- * Malhotra, N., & Krosnick, J. A. (2007). Retrospective and prospective performance assessments during the 2004 election campaign: Tests of mediation and news media priming. *Political Behavior, 29*(2), 249-278.
- * Lenz, G. S. (2009). Learning and opinion change, not priming: Reconsidering the priming hypothesis. *American Journal of Political Science, 53*(4), 821-837.

Week 5, February 23: Information and knowledge: Learning from the news

Discussant: Kristen Bialik

- * Huckfeldt, R. & Sprague, J. (1987). Networks in context: The social flow of political information. *American Political Science Review, 81*, 1197-1215
- * Eveland W. (2001) The cognitive mediation model of learning from the news: Evidence from non-election, off-year election, and presidential election contexts. *Communication Research, 28*, 571-601.
- * Baum, M. (2002) Sex, lies, and war: How soft news brings foreign policy to the inattentive public, *American Political Science Review, 96*, 91-109
- * Prior, M. (2003). Any good news in soft news? The impact of soft news preference on political knowledge. *Political Communication, 20*, 149-172.
- * Kim, S. H. (2008). Testing the knowledge gap hypothesis in South Korea: Traditional news media, the Internet, and political learning. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research, 20*(2), 193-210.

Week 6, March 2: News framing and political judgment

Discussants: Ceri Hughes

- * Cappella, J. N. & Jamieson K. H. (1996) News frames, political cynicism, and media cynicism, *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 546*, 71-84

- * Nelson, T. E., Clawson, R. A., & Oxley, Z. M. (1997). Media framing of a civil liberties conflict and its effect on tolerance. *American Political Science Review*, 91, 567-583.
- * Chong, D. & Druckman, J. N. (2008). The Influence of democratic competition on public opinion, *American Political Science Review*, 101, 637-655
- * Lecheler, S., & de Vreese, C. H. (2011). Getting real: The duration of framing effects. *Journal of Communication*, 61(5), 959-983.
- * McLeod, D. M., & Shah, D. V. (2014). *News Frames and National Security: Covering Big Brother*. Chapter 1. Cambridge University Press.

Week 7, March 9: Media cues and public opinion expression

Discussants: Emma Frankham

- * Zaller, J., & Feldman, S. (1992). A simple theory of the survey response: Answering questions versus revealing preferences. *American journal of political science*, 579-616.
- * Shah, D. V., Watts, M. D., Domke, D. & Fan, D. P. (2002). News framing and cueing of issue regimes: Explaining Clinton's public approval in spite of scandal, *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 339-370.
- * Valentino, N. A. Hutchings, V. L., and White I. K. (2002). Cues that matter: How political ads prime racial attitudes during campaigns, *American Political Science Review*, 96, 75-90.
- * Bennett, W. L., Lawrence, R. G., & Steven Livingston (2006). None dare call it torture: Indexing and the limits of press independence in the Abe Gharib Scandal. *Journal of Communication*, 56, 467-485.
- * Zaller, J. (2012). What Nature and Origins Leaves Out. *Critical Review*, 24(4), 569-642.

Week 8, March 16: Conversation, deliberation, and disagreement

Discussants: Margarita Orozco

- * Sotirovic, M. & McLeod, J. (2001) Values, communication behavior, and political participation. *Political Communication*, 18, 273-300.
- * Mutz, D. C. (2002). The consequences of cross-cutting networks for political participation. *American Journal of Political Science*, 838-855.
- * Mutz, D. C. & Reeves, B. (2005) The new videomalaise: Effects of televised incivility on political trust, *American Political Science Review*, 99, 621-635.
- * Wojcieszak, M. E., & Mutz, D. C. (2009). Online groups and political discourse: Do online discussion spaces facilitate exposure to political disagreement? *Journal of Communication*, 59(1), 40-56.

- * Shah, D. V., Hanna, A., Bucy, E. P., Wells, C., & Quevedo, V. (2015) The power of television images in a social media age: Linking biobehavioral and computational approaches via the second screen, *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*.

Week 9, March 23: “Old” and “new” media, social capital, and civic engagement

Discussants: Ceri Hughes

- * Prior, M. (2005) News vs. entertainment: How increasing media choice widens gaps in political knowledge and turnout. *American Journal of Political Science*, 49, 577-592.
- * Shah, D. V. Cho, J. Eveland, W. P. Jr. and Kwak, N. (2005). Information and expression in a digital age: Modeling Internet effects on civic participation,” *Communication Research*, 32, 1-35.
- * Xenos, M., & Moy, P. (2007). Direct and differential effects of the Internet on political and civic engagement. *Journal of Communication*, 57(4), 704-718.
- * Sander, T. H., & Putnam, R. D. (2010). Still bowling alone?: The post-9/11 split. *Journal of Democracy*, 21(1), 9-16.
- * Valenzuela, S., Park, N., & Kee, K. F. (2009). Is there social capital in a social network site?: Facebook use and college students' life satisfaction, trust, and participation. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 14(4), 875-901.

SPRING BREAK

Week 10, April 6: Digital media, socialization, and participation

Discussants: Kristen Bialik

- * Bimber, B. (1998). The Internet and political transformation: Populism, community, and accelerated pluralism. *Polity*, 31, 133-60.
- * Delli Carpini, M. X. (2000). Gen.com: Youth, civic engagement, and the new information environment, *Political Communication*, 17:341–349.
- * Pacheco, J. S. (2008). Political socialization in context: The effect of political competition on youth voter turnout. *Political Behavior*, 30(4), 415-436.
- * Lee, N. J., Shah, D. V., & McLeod, J. M. (2012). Processes of political socialization: A communication mediation approach to youth civic engagement. *Communication Research*.
- * Thorson, K., Driscoll, K., Ekdale, B., Edgerly, S., Thompson, L. G., Schrock, A., ... & Wells, C. (2013). YouTube, Twitter and the Occupy Movement: Connecting content and circulation practices. *Information, Communication & Society*, 16(3), 421-451.

Week 11, April 13: Political campaigns and their consequences

Discussant:

- * Ansolabehere, S., Iyengar, S., Simon, A., and Valentino, N. (1995). Does attack advertising demobilize the electorate? *American Political Science Review*, 88, 829-838.
- * Freedman, P. and Goldstein, K. (1999) Measuring Media Exposure and the Effects of Negative Campaign Ads, *American Journal of Political Science*. 43, 1189-1208.
- * Schenck-Hamlin, W.J., Procter, D.E., & Rumsey, D.J. (2000). The influence of negative advertising on political cynicism and politician accountability. *Human Communication Research*, 26, 53-74.
- * Shah, D. V., Cho, J., Nah, S., Gotlieb, M. R., Hwang, H., Lee, N-J., Scholl, R. M., and McLeod, D. M., (2007) Campaign ads, online messaging, and participation: Extending the communication mediation model,” *Journal of Communication*.
- * Franz, M. M., & Ridout, T. N. (2010). Political advertising and persuasion in the 2004 and 2008 presidential elections. *American Politics Research*, 38(2), 303-329.

Week 12, April 20: Hostile media, third-person effects, and corrective actions

Discussant: Margarita Orozco

- * Perloff, R. (1999) The third-person effect: A critical review and synthesis. *Media Psychology*. 1, 353-378.
- * Gunther, A. (2003). The influence of presumed influence. *Journal of Communication*, 35, 199–215.
- * Tsfati, Y. & Cohen, J., (2005) Democratic consequences of hostile media perceptions: The case of Gaza Settlers, *The Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics*, 10, 28-51.
- * Rojas, H. (2010). “Corrective” Actions in the Public Sphere: How Perceptions of Media and Media Effects Shape Political Behaviors. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 22(3), 343-363.
- * Arceneaux, K., Johnson, M., & Murphy, C. (2012). Polarized political communication, oppositional media hostility, and selective exposure. *The Journal of Politics*, 74(1), 174-186.

Week 13, April 27: Research presentations

Week 14, May 5: Research presentations/end of term party

Supplemental Readings

Week 2 Supplemental

- † McQuail, D. (1987) *Mass communication theory: An introduction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage (Chapter 6, pp 135 – 174; Chapter 9, pp. 250 – 295)
- † Blumler, J. (1999). The third age of political communication. *Political Communication*, 16, 209-230.
- † Bennett, W. L. (2000) Toward a theory of press-state relations in the U.S. *Journal of Communication*, 40, 103-125.
- † Lazer, D., Pentland, A. S., Adamic, L., Aral, S., Barabasi, A. L., Brewer, D., ... & Van Alstyne, M. (2009). Life in the network: The coming age of computational social science. *Science (New York, NY)*, 323(5915), 721.

Week 3 Supplemental

- † McQuail, D. (1987). *Mass communication theory: An introduction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage (Chapter 7, pp. 175 - 212).
- † Pan, Z. & Kosicki, G. M. (1993). Framing analysis: An approach to news discourse. *Political Communication*, 10, 55-75.
- † Shoemaker, P. and Reese, S. (1996) *Mediating the message: Theories of influence on mass media content*. White Plains, NY: Longman. (Chapters 1-4, pp. 1 – 62)
- † Miller, J. M. & Krosnick, J. A. (2000) News media impact on the ingredients of presidential evaluations: Politically knowledgeable citizens are guided by a trusted source. *American Journal of Political Science*, 44, 301-315.

Week 4 Supplemental

- ◆ Iyengar, S. and Kinder, D. (1987): *News that matters: Television and American opinion*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- † McCombs, M. E. & Shaw, D. L. (1993). The evolution of agenda-setting research: Twenty-five years in the marketplace of ideas. *Journal of Communication*, 43, 58-67.
- † Boyle, T. P. (2001) Intermedia agenda setting in the 1996 presidential election, *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*; 78, 26-44.
- † Tedesco, J. C. (2005) Intercandidate agenda setting in the 2004 Democratic presidential primary, *American Behavioral Scientist*, 49, 92-113.
- † Althaus, S. & Kim, Y-M (2006). Priming effects in complex information environments: Reassessing the impact of news discourse on presidential approval, *Journal of Politics*, 68, 960–976.
- † Boomgaarden, H. G., & Vliegenthart, R. (2007). Explaining the rise of anti-immigrant

parties: The role of news media content. *Electoral studies*, 26(2), 404-417.

Week 5 Supplemental

- ◆ Delli Carpini, M. X. and Keeter, S. (1996) *What Americans know about politics and why it matters*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- ◆ Neuman, W. R., Just, M. R., and Crigler, A. N. (1992). *Common knowledge: News and the construction of political meaning*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- † Price, V. and Zaller, J. (1993). Who gets the news: Alternative measures of news reception and their implications for research. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 57, 133-164.
- † Zhao, X. and Chaffee S. H. (1995). Campaign advertisements versus television news as sources of political issue information. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 59, 41-65.
- † Althaus, S. (1998) Information effects on collective preferences. *American Political Science Review*. 92, 545-558.
- † Eveland, W. P. & Scheufele, D. A. (2000) Connecting news media use with gaps in knowledge and participation.

Week 6 Supplemental

- ◆ Cappella, J. N. and Jamieson, K. H. (1997) *Spiral of cynicism: The press and the public good*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- ◆ McLeod, D. M., and Shah, D. V. (2015). *News frames and national security: Covering Big Brother*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- † Shah, D., Domke, D., and Wackman, D. (1996). "To thine own self be true": Values, framing, and voter decision-making strategies. *Communication Research*, 23, 509-560.
- † Druckman, J. N. and Nelson, K. R. (2003). Framing and deliberation: How citizen conversation limits elite influence. *American Journal of Political Science*, 47, 729-745
- † Druckman, J. N (2004). On the limits of framing effects: Who can frame? *Journal of Politics*, 63, 1041-1066.
- † Shah, D. V., Kwak, N., Schmierbach, M. & Zubric, J. (2004). The interplay of news frames on cognitive complexity, *Human Communication Research*, 30, 102-128.

Week 7 Supplemental

- ◆ Zaller, J. (1992): *The nature and origins of mass opinion*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- † Conover, P. J., & Feldman, S. (1989) Candidate perception in an ambiguous world: Campaigns, cues, and inference processes. *American Political Science Review*. 33, 912-940.
- † Kuklinski, J. H., and Hurley, N. L. (1994). On hearing and interpreting political messages: A cautionary tale of citizen cue-taking. *Journal of Politics*, 56, 729-751.

- † Mondak, J. (1993). Source cues and policy approval: The cognitive dynamics of public support for the Reagan agenda. *American Journal of Political Science*, 37, 186-212.
- † Domke, D. (2001) Racial cues and political ideology: An examination of associative priming. *Communication Research*, 28, 772-801.
- † Cho, J., Gil de Zuniga, H., Shah, D. V., & McLeod, D. M. (2006) Cue convergence: Associative effects on social intolerance. *Communication Research*, 33, 136-154.
- † Bailenson, J. N., Garland, P., Iyengar, S. & Yee, N. (2006) Transformed facial similarity as a political cue: A preliminary investigation, *Political Psychology*, 27, 373-385.
- † Ceron, A., Curini, L., Iacus, S. M., and Porro, G. (2013). Every tweet counts? How sentiment analysis of social media can improve our knowledge of citizens' political preferences with an application to Italy and France, *New Media and Society*. 1-19.

Week 8 Supplemental

- ◆ Gamson, W. A. (1992). *Talking politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- ◆ Mutz, D., (2006). *Hearing the other side: Deliberative versus participatory democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- † Gastil, J. & Dillard, J. P. (1999). Increasing political sophistication through public deliberation. *Political Communication*.16: 3-23.
- † McLeod, J. M., Scheufele, D. A., & Moy, P. (1999) Community, communication, & participation: The role of mass media and interpersonal discussion in local political participation. *Political Communication*, 16, 315-336.
- † Mutz, D. C. & Martin, P. S. (2001) Facilitating communication across lines of political difference: The Role of Mass Media. *American Political Science Review*, 95, 97-114.
- † Mutz, D. C. (2007) Effects of “In-Your-Face” Television Discourse on Perceptions of a Legitimate Opposition, *American Political Science Review*, 101, 621-635.
- † Rojas, H. (2008) Strategy versus understanding: How orientations toward political conversation influence political engagement, *Communication Research*, 35, 452-480.
- † Walsh, K. C. (2012). Putting inequality in its place: Rural consciousness and the power of perspective. *American Political Science Review*, 1(1), 1-16.

Week 9 Supplemental

- ◆ Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- † Kraut, R., Patterson, M., Lundmark, V., Kiesler, S., Mukopadhyay, T., and Scherlis, W. (1998). Internet paradox: A social technology that reduces social involvement and psychological well-being? *American Psychologist*, 53, 1017-1031.

- † Uslaner, E. (1998). Social capital, television, and the mean world: Trust, optimism and civic participation. *Political Psychology*, 19, 441-67.
- † Bimber, B. (2001) Information and political engagement in America: The search for effects of information technology at the individual level, *Political Research Quarterly*, 54, 53-67
- † Stolle, D. Hooghe, M., & Micheletti, M. (2005). Politics in the supermarket: Political consumerism as a form of political participation. *International Political Science Review*, 26 (3): 245-69.
- † Schudson, M. (2007) Citizens, consumers, and the good society." *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. 611, 236-249.
- † Gil de Zúñiga, H., & Valenzuela, S. (2011). The mediating path to a stronger citizenship: Online and offline networks, weak ties, and civic engagement. *Communication Research*, 38(3), 397-421.
- † Putnam, R. D. (2007). E pluribus unum: Diversity and community in the twenty-first century the 2006 Johan Skytte Prize Lecture. *Scandinavian political studies*, 30(2), 137-174.
- † Conover, M., Ratkiewicz, J., Francisco, M., Gonçalves, B., Menczer, F., & Flammini, A. (2011, May). Political Polarization on Twitter. In Proceedings of the Fifth International AAAI Conference on Weblogs and Social Media.

Week 10 Supplemental

- ◆ Bimber, B., Flanagin, A., & Stohl, C. (2012). *Collective action in organizations: Interaction and engagement in an era of technological change*. Cambridge University Press.
- † Bonfadelli, H (2002) The Internet and knowledge gaps: A theoretical and empirical investigation, *European Journal of Communication*, 17, 65–84.
- † Cappella, J. N., Price, V., & Nir, L. (2002). Argument repertoire as a reliable and valid measure of opinion quality: Electronic dialogue during campaign 2000, *Political Communication*, 19:73–93.
- † Stromer-Galley, J. (2000) On-Line Interaction and why candidates avoid it, *Journal of Communication*. 50:111-132.
- † Katz, J., Rice, R. and Aspden, P. (2001). The Internet, 1995-2000 Access, civic involvement, and social interaction. *American Behavioral Scientist* 45: 405-419.
- † Norris, P. (2002). The bridging and bonding of online communities. *Press-Politics* 7(3).
- † Valenzuela, S., Arriagada, A., & Scherman, A. (2012). The social media basis of youth protest behavior: The case of Chile. *Journal of Communication*, 62(2), 299-314.

Week 11 Supplemental

- ◆ Geer, J. (2006). *In defense of negativity: Attack advertising in presidential campaigns*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- † Finkel, S. E. & Geer, J. G. (1998). A spot check: Casting doubt on the demobilizing effect of attack advertising. *American Journal of Political Science*, 42, 573-595.
- † Lau, R. R., Sigelman, L., Heldman, C., and Babbitt, P. (1999) The effects of negative political advertisements: A meta-analytic assessment. *American Political Science Review*, 93, 851-875.
- † Kahn, K. F. and Kennedy, P. J. (1999) Do negative campaigns mobilize or suppress turnout? Clarifying the relationship between negativity and participation. *American Political Science Review*, 93, 877-889.
- † Iyengar, S. and Simon A. F. (2000). New perspectives and evidence on political communication and campaign effects, *Annual Review of Psychology*, 51, 149-169.
- † Franz, M. M., & Ridout, T. N. (2007). Does political advertising persuade?. *Political Behavior*, 29(4), 465-491.
- † Livne, A., Simmons, M. P., Adar, E., & Adamic, L. A. (2011, May). The Party Is Over Here: Structure and Content in the 2010 Election. In Proceedings of the Fifth International AAI Conference on Weblogs and Social Media.

Week 12 Supplemental

- ◆ Noelle-Neumann, E. (1993). *The spiral of silence: Public opinion, our social skin*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- ◆ Mutz, D. (1998) *Impersonal influence: How perceptions of mass collectives affect political attitudes*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- † Gunther, A. (1992). Biased press or biased public? Attitudes toward media coverage of social groups. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 56, 147-167.
- † Salwen, M. B. (1998). Perceptions of media influence and support for censorship: The third-person effect in the 1996 presidential election. *Communication Research*, 25, 259-285.
- † Eveland, W., Nathanson, A., Detenber, B. & McLeod, D. (1999) Rethinking the social distance corollary: Perceived likelihood of exposure and the third-person perception, *Communication Research*, 26, 275-302.
- † McLeod, D, Detenber, B, and Eveland, W. (2001). Behind the third-person effects: Differentiating perceptual processes underlying self and other. *Journal of Communication*, 51, 678 – 695.
- † King, G., Pan, J., & Roberts, M. (2013). How censorship in China allows government criticism but silences collective expression. *American Political Science Review*, 107 (2): 1-18.