Political Communication & Political Opinion

&

Nieuwsframes, Nieuwsimpact en Burgerschap

Lecturer & Coordinator: dr. Mariken van der Velden, Assistant Professor
Lecturer: dr. Andreu Casas Salleras, Assistant Professor
Tutorial Instructor: Puck Guldemond, PhD Candidate

Department of Communication Science, *Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam*
Online Office Hours: Fridays, 11:00 - 12:00 o'clock

Syllabus Seminar - Period 2 2021
01-11-2021 - 08-12-2021
ECTS points: 6.0.

This course syllabus combines the information for the two – strongly related – courses *Political Communication & Political Opinion* (S_PCPO) and *Nieuwsframes, Nieuwsimpact en Burgerschap* (L_NCMAJOU010) from the respective Master programs *Political Communication* and *Journalism*. The lectures, corresponding literature, and evaluation are identical for both programs. Due to the language abilities of the lecturers, all materials will be in English. Students are allowed to hand in their assignments in Dutch.

Passing this course yields you with 6 ECTS. Each credit stands for 28 hours work. Hence, 6 ECTS is the equivalent of 168 hours work. Divided over 7 weeks, you are expected to spend 24 hours per week on this course. In Section 6, you will find the course overview including the estimated hours per task.

1 Course Description

In almost no political systems do citizens have direct contact with their political representatives. One could say – and scholars of political communication have done so – that politicians operate in a highly mediatized environment, where media are citizens' principal source of political information. The field of political communication researches how politics is portrayed in media (i.e. by journalists), and subsequently how citizens process and use that mediatized information about politics. For example, how do people search for information about politics, and has this changed in the so-called digital era? How do people learn from political news, and when does political ideology interfere in this process: i.e. do media fuel polarization? Political Communication is a vast academic field and one period (i.e. six weeks) is not enough time to give even a tacit introduction to all of the content and issues within its purview. In this course, we therefore focus on the effect on public opinion – that is, what are the effects of political information on public opinion and behavior. The readings are a capita selecta. Many other articles could have been chosen. Because Political Communication is an inherently diverse and interdisciplinary field, this is reflected in the readings.

This course helps students to find answers to political communication questions with a combined theoretical and practical approach. Theoretically, students will study classic and recent literature on political communication – see Table 1 for an overview of the covered topics in this course.

Table 1: Overview of Topics Covered in Course

Week	Topics
1	Introduction to Political Communication: Theoretical Perspectives & New Developments
2	Learning from the News
3	Biases in Information Processing
4	Media and Polarization
5	Social Media and Democracy
6	Fake News
7	Oral Exam

During the meetings, then, we spend time to contextualize the readings assigned for each topic, as well as discuss the societal and pragmatic implications. Moreover, during the tutorials, students will work in groups on their weekly challenges, where they have to explain complex concepts to a variety of audiences. Thinking about literacy of various societal groups as well as the skill to judge the veracity of a study and the certainty with which claims can be made are indispensable for current days political communication advisors and journalists. Given that this is a political communication course, you are expected to follow news on politics pretty closely during this period. Make sure that you either read a daily newspaper (paper version or online), watch national television news, or listen to news analyses on the radio, podcasts or another communication medium every day.

2 Course Objectives

After completion of the course, the student is able to apply theories on political communication:

1. To critically analyze and give feedback on research literature about the news impact on citizens' attitudes and behavior;

2. To assess theoretical and empirical alternatives of how political information influences public opinion;

3. To evaluate your own work and the work by others on the real-world impact of political information;

4. To be able to apply the theoretical insights to foster and develop develop citizenship knowledge, citizenship skills and citizenship attitudes;

5. To orally present and discuss choices made by politicians, journalists and citizens in terms of democratic citizenship.

3 Organization & Structure of the Course Meetings

3.1 Academic Attitude

We expect an active academic participation, which means that you are prepared for every meeting, participate actively and positively in class. This includes both class discussions and (in)formal in-class assignments, including writing tasks. If we observe that your academic attitude is not at the level of a

Master student, the lecturer will set up a meeting to discuss how to improve your academic attitude. When you do not improve your attitude, we will maintain the right to give you an additional assignment or eventually remove you from the course.

3.2 Preparation

Students have to read all the literature before the first meeting of the week. Moreover, the lecturer might ask you to bring real-life examples or other small assignments such as writing tasks. These are not graded, but each student will have to prepare these. If you are unprepared, you cannot participate in the meeting.

3.3 Presence

Participation is compulsory in all meetings. By exception, two classes may be missed. Yet, if you do not notify the coordinator before the start of the meeting by e-mail (m.a.c.g.vander.velden@vu.nl) you will be given an additional assignment that has to be completed before the next week starts. Missing more than two classes – for whatever reason – means the course cannot be completed.

3.4 Structure

Monday Lectures The theoretical understanding of each week's topic is central during the Monday lectures. To enhance students' theoretical understanding, students will make use of the Canvas integrated tool *FeedbackFruits* to study the literature – for more explanation, see Section 4.1. The first part of the lecture will be in a workshop format. The lecturer will first introduce the topic of the week within the broader literature in about 20-25 minutes. The theoretical investigation Course Objectives #1 and #2 (p.2) are central in the remainder of the lecture. To facilitate this, the second part of the Monday lectures have the structure of a podcast, where a group will interview the lecturer based on the reading assignments. During the lecture, we try to identify what parts of the theory are relevant to understand the cause, consequence or mechanism in the literature and what parts of the current state of the field could be improved, based on the reading questions you prepared. Based on our theoretical investigation, students work on a weekly challenge – for more information, see Section 4.1.

Wednesday Lectures Subsequently, in the Wednesday lectures, we pay attention to the empirical implications of the theories under study that week. In the first part of the lecture, students will be placed in so-called *jigsaw-groups* – that is, groups of 4 students that are different from their literature assignment groups – and discuss each weekly challenge with the aim to improve their weekly challenge. Thereby, students assess what is still unclear from the readings and discuss these matters in the light of the first weekly challenge (Course Objectives #3 and #5). Students will also receive peer-feedback on their written report for the weekly challenge. The jigsaw-groups will be published on Canvas – in Modules on the page for each Wednesday lecture. In the following 45 minutes, we will discuss the empirical implications of the literature in a group setting (Course Objectives #3 and #5) – often with a practitioner of the field (if possible).

Tutorials The tutorials are designed as mini-labs to work on the weekly challenge. Each week, students work in groups to apply the theoretical insights to foster and develop develop citizenship knowledge, citizenship skills and citizenship attitudes (i.e. see Course Objective #4). During the tutorial, students get time and support to develop the material for the weekly challenges (see Section Portfolio of Assignments: 50% of the Final Grade at p.4 for more information).

4 Grading

The final grade exist of (1) A Portfolio of Assignments; and (2) An Oral Exam. Both elements make up 50% of your final grade. The portfolio of assignments consists of three parts: (a) Literature Assignments in *FeedbackFruits* (peer-review based) for 20% of your portfolio grade (i.e. 10% of your final grade); and (b) Group Reports based on the Weekly Challenges for 80% of your portfolio grade (i.e. 40% of your final grade). There is no compensation possible between the portfolio of assignments and the oral exam. That is, both have to be higher than a 5.5. If a student has an insufficient grade for either the portfolio of assignments or the oral exam, the student takes a resit of the entire course by doing an individual assignment – this will be made available to Canvas. What is possible, however, is to compensate within the portfolio of assignments.

4.1 Portfolio of Assignments: 50% of the Final Grade

A.) Literature Assignments *FeedbackFruits* is an online tool, integrated in Canvas, that is designed to read and annotate the literature collectively. Students can annotate the readings and respond to each other in threads. This aids the understanding of the literature. Students will be assigned in groups of 4 for the literature assignments in which they:

1. Highlight the **Key Quote** from the assigned reading of that week that provides an apt summary of the article - note, this should only be a quote of one sentence and not a whole paragraph;

2. Use the annotations function to summarize in your own words the main theoretical **Argument** of the article - here you do not use any direct citations;

3. Use the annotations function to discuss the **Relationship** between the argument in the study and the theoretical arguments put forward in the other articles that you have read in that specific week;

4. Use the annotations to formulate two **Questions** you have after you have completed the required reading for that week - e.g., think about those issues that are not addressed in this particular literature or what should be a relevant future research question.

Annotations should be done by **Mondays 09:00 o'clock**.

Students will be graded based on the peer-assessed quality of the annotations and feedback using *FeedbackFruits* in Canvas (Pass/Fail). Each week's annotation graded with either a Pass (P) or Fail (F), converting to a final grade for the weekly challenge as follows:

- **5 P's** = 10
- **4 P's** = 8
- **3 P's** = 6
- **≤ 2 P's** = 4

B.) Weekly Challenges Students are presented with 5 weekly challenges in week 2 till week 6. During the Monday lecture, students have discussed the theoretical concepts of that week's theme. Their challenge is to develop material to increase citizenship knowledge on the concepts of that weeks literature and tie that to a real-world event – this is the group report, see below. To prepare for the group assignment, students will individually write a one-pager where they answer four questions:

1. In what ways does the target audience relate to the theme/theoretical concept?

2. What do you absolutely need to clarify in order to explain the theme/theoretical concept to the target audience?

3. What is the right form to convey the explanation of the theme/theoretical concept to the target audience?

4. Why would the target audience (better) understand the theme/theoretical concept this way?

Let's take the example of the third week's theme *Biases in Information Processing* here. Students could pick the concept of *negativity bias* to explain the current state of the debate on the Dutch COVID Green Pass – which is focusing on protests against this measure from both citizens as pub owners, instead of emphasizing how well the Green Pass works, or who are happy with it. Based on the article of Fournier et al. (2020), we know that citizens respond emotionally stronger to negative information than to positive information. Let's say your target audience is 16-18 year old MBO students for whom you would need to make a Instagram story on the topic. Your task is to first individually write a one-pager answering the four questions above. In the first hour of the Wednesday lecture, you will discuss the answers to your questions with a peer-group as a preparation for the final product of the weekly challenge. In the tutorials, students get time to further work on the challenge. Challenges can be done in English or Dutch. The individual reports need **upload the one-pager before the Wednesday lecture**, in which they receive peer-feedback. Second, using their peer-feedback, students finalize the weekly challenge in groups and hand in a final draft on **Friday 17:00 o'clock**. This allows students to ask their last questions during the online office hours on Friday between 11:00 and 12:00 o'clock. Each challenge is graded with either a High Pass (2 points), a Pass (1.4 points) or Fail (0 points). The final grade for this part of the portfolio is the sum of the points of the five assignments. For example, two times a High Pass and three times a Pass amounts to a 8.2: *Grade Weekly Challenges* $= (2*2)+(3*1.4) = 8.2$

All deadlines of the course can both be found in Section 6 as well as on the Canvas Calendar for this course. Late submissions for parts of the portfolio assignments will not be graded, i.e. automatically receive a fail for that submission.

4.2 Oral Exam: 50% of the Final Grade

In week 7, students will partake in an individual oral exam. During the exam, the first 7 minutes are given to the student to demonstrate that (s)he has reached the learning objectives (see Section 2). For Course Objectives #1(a) till #1(e) you can receive 2 points (Excellent), 1.67 points (Good), 1.33 (Sufficient), or 0 points (Fail). The final grade is the sum of the obtained points for each course objective. Students are allowed to make a presentation. After these 7 minutes, the lecturer will ask questions. This part will take a maximum of 8 minutes. The oral exams will be recorded. Your data will be processed according to GDPR rules.

4.3 Resit

If students do not pass the portfolio of exams or the oral exam – i.e. one or either have a grade <5.5 – students need to resit the entire course by writing an empirical research paper. The deadline for the resit will be decided in agreement with the coordinator – most likely due end of January.

5 Readings

All readings are accessible via Canvas. The recommended, yet optional, readings could help you to either deeper delve into the topic – e.g. for your weekly challenge. Or, additionally, it could help you when you

are starting to think about your master thesis topic, and would like to read more about a topic.

Week 1: Introduction to Political Communication: Theoretical Perspectives & New Developments (66 pages)

1. De Beus, J. (2011). Audience democracy: An emerging pattern in postmodern political communication. In *Political Communication in Postmodern Democracy* (pp. 19–38). Palgrave Macmillan, London.

2. Foos, F., Bischof, D. (2018). *Can the tabloid media create Eurosceptic attitudes? A quasi-experiment on media influence in England.* Available at: bit. ly/2xn78QU (last accessed 10/4/2018).

3. Salgado, S. (2019). Never Say Never... Or the Value of Context in Political Communication Research. *Political Communication*, 36(4), 671-675.

4. Van Aelst, P., Strömbäck, J., Aalberg, T., Esser, F., De Vreese, C., Matthes, J., ... Stanyer, J. (2017). Political communication in a high-choice media environment: a challenge for democracy?. *Annals of the International Communication Association*, 41(1), 3-27.

Optional readings:

- Bartels, L. M. (1993). Messages received: The political impact of media exposure. *American Political Science Review,* 87 (2), 267–285.

- Brants, K., & Voltmer, K. (2011). *Political communication in postmodern democracy. Challenging the primacy of politics.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Hallin, D., & Mancini, P. (2004). *Comparing media systems. Three models of media and politics.* Cambridge: CUP.

- Iyengar, S., & Simon, A. F. (2000). New perspectives and evidence on political communication and campaign effects. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 51, 149–159.

- Jamieson, K. H. (2017). Creating the Hybrid Field of Political Communication. In *The Oxford Handbook of Political Communication.* Oxford University Press.

- Kenski, K., Jamieson, K. H. (2017). The Power of Political Communication *The Oxford Handbook of Political Communication.* Oxford University Press.

- Norris, P. (2000). *A virtuous circle: Political communications in postindustrial societies.* Cambridge: CUP.

- Rojas, H., Valenzuela, S. (2019). A call to contextualize public opinion-based research in political communication. *Political Communication*, 36(4), 652-659.

- Schudson, M. (2002). The news media as political institutions. *Annual review of political science*, 5(1), 249–269.

- Simon, A. F., & Jerit, J. (2007). Toward a theory relating political discourse, media, and public opinion. *Journal of communication*, 57(2), 254–271.

- Vavreck, L. (2009). *The message matters. The economy and presidential campaigns.* Princeton: PUP.

Week 2: Learning from the News (74 pages)

1. Carlson, T. N. (2019). Through the grapevine: Informational consequences of interpersonal political communication. *American Political Science Review*, 113(2), 325-339.

2. Feezell, J. T., Ortiz, B. (2021). 'I saw it on Facebook': an experimental analysis of political learning through social media. *Information, Communication Society*, 24(9), 1283-1302.

3. Kruikemeier, S., Lecheler, S., Boyer, M. M. (2018). Learning from news on different media platforms: An eye-tracking experiment. *Political Communication*, 35(1), 75–96.

4. Prior, M. (2014). Visual political knowledge: A different road to competence?. *The Journal of Politics*, 76(1), 41–57.

Optional readings:

- Barabas, J., & Jerit, J. (2009). Estimating the causal effects of media coverage on policy?specific knowledge. *American Journal of Political Science*, 53(1), 73–89.

- Baum, M. A. (2002). Sex, lies, and war: How soft news brings foreign policy to the inattentive public. *American Political Science Review*, 96(1), 91–109.

- Baum, M. A. (2003). Soft news and political knowledge: Evidence of absence or absence of evidence?. *Political communication*, 20(2), 173–190.

- Cichocka, A., Bilewicz, M., Jost, J.T., Marrouch, N., & Witkowska, M. (2016). On the grammar of politics? or why conservatives prefer nouns. *Political Psychology* 37(6), 799–815.

- Gilens, M., Vavreck, L., & Cohen, M. (2007). The mass media and the public's assessments of presidential candidates, 1952?2000. *The Journal of Politics*, 69(4), 1160–1175.

- Iyengar, Shanto and Donald R. Kinder. 1987. *News That Matters: Television and American Public Opinion*. Chicago: University of Chicago.

- Kim, Y.M., & Garret, K. (2012). On-line and memory-based: Revisiting the relationship between candidate evaluation processing models. *Political Behavior*, 34(2), 345–369.

- Knight, B., & Tribin, A. (2019). *Opposition Media, State Censorship, and Political Accountability: Evidence from Chavez's Venezuela* (No. w25916). National Bureau of Economic Research.

- Lyons, J., & Sokhey, A. (2014). Emotion, motivation, and social information seeking about politics. *Political Communication*, 31(2), 237–258.

- Mutz, D. C., & Reeves, B. (2005). The new videomalaise: Effects of televised incivility on political trust. *American Political Science Review*, 99(1), 1–15.

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

- Prior, M. (2003). Any good news in soft news? The impact of soft news preference on political knowledge. *Political communication*, 20(2), 149–171.

- Ryan, T. J. (2012). What makes us click? Demonstrating incentives for angry discourse with digital-age field experiments. *The Journal of Politics*, 74(4), 1138–1152.

- Soroka, S., et al. (2013). Auntie knows best? Public broadcasters and current affairs knowledge. *British Journal of Political Science*, 43(4), 719–739.

- Tsfati, Y.; & Capella, J. (2003). Do people watch what they not trust? Exploring the association between news media skepticism and exposure. *Communication Research*, 30 (5), 504–529.

- Zaller, J. R. (1992). *The nature and origins of mass opinion*. Cambridge university press.

Week 3: Biases in Information Processing (77 pages)

1. Ahn, T. K., Huckfeldt, R., Mayer, A. K., & Ryan, J. B. (2013). Expertise and bias in political communication networks. *American Journal of Political Science*, 57(2), 357–373.

2. Bakker, B. N., Schumacher, G., Rooduijn, M. (2021). Hot politics? Affective responses to political rhetoric. *American Political Science Review*, 115(1), 150–164.

3. Fournier, P., Soroka, S., Nir, L. (2020). Negativity Biases and Political Ideology: A Comparative Test across 17 Countries. *American Political Science Review*, 114(3), 775–791.

4. Soontjens, K., Van Remoortere, A., Walgrave, S. (2020). The hostile media: politiciansâ perceptions of coverage bias. *West European Politics*, 1–12.

Optional readings:

- Althaus, S. L. (2003). When news norms collide, follow the lead: New evidence for press independence. *Political Communication*, 20(4), 381–414.

- Bail, C. A. (2012). The fringe effect: Civil society organizations and the evolution of media discourse about Islam since the September 11th attacks. *American Sociological Review*, 77(6), 855–879.

- Baum, M. A., & Gussin, P. (2007). In the eye of the beholder: How information shortcuts shape individual perceptions of bias in the media. *Quarterly Journal of political science*, 3(1), 1–31.

- Farrell, H., & Drezner, D. W. (2008). The power and politics of blogs. *Public choice*, 134(1–2), 15.

- Fridkin, K., Kenney, P. J., & Wintersieck, A. (2015). Liar, liar, pants on fire: How fact-checking influences citizens? reactions to negative advertising. *Political Communication*, 32(1), 127–151.

- Gentzkow, M., & Shapiro, J. M. (2006). Media bias and reputation. *Journal of political Economy*, 114(2), 280–316.

- Gilens, M., & Hertzman, C. (2000). Corporate ownership and news bias: Newspaper coverage of the 1996 Telecommunications Act. *The Journal of Politics*, 62(2), 369–386.

- Groseclose, T., & Milyo, J. (2005). A measure of media bias. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 120(4), 1191–1237.

- Hayes, D., & Guardino, M. (2010). Whose views made the news? Media coverage and the march to war in Iraq. *Political Communication*, 27(1), 59–87.

- Krupnikov, Y. (2011). When does negativity demobilize? Tracing the conditional effect of negative campaigning on voter turnout. *American Journal of Political Science*, 55(4), 797-813.

- Kuklinski, J. H., & Sigelman, L. (1992). When Objectivity is Not Objective: Network Television News Coverage of US Senators and the "Paradox of Objectivity". *The Journal of Politics*, 54(3), 810–833.

- Lau, R. R., Sigelman, L., & Rovner, I. B. (2007). The effects of negative political campaigns: a meta?analytic reassessment. *The Journal of Politics*, 69(4), 1176–1209.

Week 4: Media and Polarization (58 pages)

1. Prior, M. (2013). Media and political polarization. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 16, 101–127.

2. Eady, G., Nagler, J., Guess, A., Zilinsky, J., & Tucker, J. A. (2019). How many people live in political bubbles on social media? Evidence from linked survey and Twitter data. *Sage Open*, 9(1).

3. Levendusky, M. S. (2013). Why do partisan media polarize viewers?. *American Journal of Political Science*, 57(3), 611-623.

4. Bail, C. A., Argyle, L. P., Brown, T. W., Bumpus, J. P., Chen, H., Hunzaker, M. F., ... & Volfovsky, A. (2018). Exposure to opposing views on social media can increase political polarization. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(37), 9216-9221.

Optional readings:

- Arceneaux, K., Johnson, M., & Murphy, C. (2012). Polarized political communication, oppositional media hostility, and selective exposure. *The Journal of Politics*, 74(1), 174–186.

- Bartels, L. M. (2014). Remembering to forget: A note on the duration of campaign advertising effects. *Political Communication*, 31(4), 532–544.

- Boxell, L., Gentzkow, M., & Shapiro, J. M. (2020). Cross-country trends in affective polarization (No. w26669). *National Bureau of Economic Research*. [*15 pages*]

- Caprara, G.V., & Zimbardo, P.G. (2004). Personalizing politics. A congruency model of political preference. *The American Psychologist*, 59(7), 581–594.

- Iyengar, S., Lelkes, Y., Levendusky, M., Malhotra, N., & Westwood, S. J. (2019). The origins and consequences of affective polarization in the United States. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 22, 129-146.

- Laustsen, L. & Petersen, M.B. (2016). Winning faces vary by ideology: How nonverbal source cues influence election and communication success in politics. *Political Communication* 33(2), 188–211.

- Farrell, D. M., & Schmitt-Beck, R. (2002), *Do political campaigns matter? Campaign effects in elections and referendums.* London: Routledge.

- Kam, C. D. (2006). Political campaigns and open-minded thinking. *The Journal of Politics*, 68(4), 931–945.

- Lilleker, D. G., & Negrine, R. (2002). Professionalization of what? Since when? By whom?. *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, 7(4), 98–103.

- Mazzoleni, G., & Shulz, W. (1999). Mediatization of politics: A challenge for democracy. *Political Communication*, 16, 247–261.

- Meffert, M. F., Chung, S., Joiner, A. J., Waks, L., & Garst, J. (2006). The effects of negativity and motivated information processing during a political campaign. *Journal of Communication*, 56(1), 27–51.

- Minozzi, W. (2013). Endogenous beliefs in models of politics. *American Journal of Political Science*, 57(3), 566-581.

- Neiheisel, J. R., & Niebler, S. (2015). On the limits of persuasion: Campaign ads and the structure of voters? interpersonal discussion networks. *Political Communication*, 32(3), 434–452.

- Sides, J. (2006). The origins of campaign agendas. *British Journal of Political Science*, 36(3), 407–436.

- Stasavage, D. (2007). Polarization and publicity: rethinking the benefits of deliberative democracy. The Journal of Politics, 69(1), 59-72.

- Strömbäck, J. (2008). Four phases of mediatization: An analysis of the mediatization of politics. *The International Journal of Press/Politic*s, 13 (3), 228–246.

Week 5: Social Media and Democracy   (68 pages)

1. Bennett, W. L., & Segerberg, A. (2012). The logic of connective action: Digital media and the personalization of contentious politics. *Information, Communication Society*, 15(5), 739-768

2. Tucker, J. A., Theocharis, Y., Roberts, M. E., & BarberÃ¡, P. (2017). From liberation to turmoil: Social media and democracy. *Journal of Democracy*, 28(4), 46-59.

3. King, G., Pan, J., & Roberts, M. E. (2013). How censorship in China allows government criticism but silences collective expression. *American Political Science Review*, 107(2), 326-343.

4. Hobbs, W. R., & Roberts, M. E. (2018). How sudden censorship can increase access to information. *American Political Science Review*, 112(3), 621–636

Optional readings:

- Lewis, S. C., & Molyneux, L. (2018). A decade of research on social media and journalism: Assumptions, blind spots, and a way forward. *Media and Communication*, 6(4), 11–23.

- Silva, B., & Proksch, S. (2020). Fake It 'Til You Make It: A Natural Experiment to Identify European Politicians' Benefit from Twitter Bots. *American Political Science Review*, 1-7.

- DiMaggio, P., Hargittai, E., Neuman, W. R., & Robinson, J. P. (2001). Social implications of the Internet. *Annual review of sociology*, 27(1), 307–336.

- Farrell, H. (2012). The consequences of the internet for politics. *Annual review of political science*, 15.

- Hassid, J. (2012). Safety valve or pressure cooker? Blogs in Chinese political life. *Journal of Communication*, 62(2), 212–230.

- Huang, V. G. (2016). Speaking out: Testimonial narratives of Chinese cyberpetitioners under networked authoritarianism. *Discourse, Context & Media*, 14, 18–27.

- Vaidhyanathan, S. (2018). Antisocial media: How Facebook disconnects us and undermines democracy. Oxford University Press. Introduction.

- Zhuravskaya, E., Petrova, M., & Enikolopov, R. (2019). Political Effects of the Internet and Social Media. Forthcoming, *Annual Review of Economics*. DOI/10.1146/annurev-economics-081919-050239.

Week 6: Fake News   (56 pages)

1. Grinberg, N., Joseph, K., Friedland, L., Swire-Thompson, B., & Lazer, D. (2019). Fake news on Twitter during the 2016 US presidential election. *Science*, 363(6425), 374-378.

2. Guess, A., Nagler, J., & Tucker, J. (2019). Less than you think: Prevalence and predictors of fake news dissemination on Facebook. *Science advances*, 5(1), eaau4586.

3. Nyhan, B., & Reifler, J. (2010). When corrections fail: The persistence of political misperceptions. *Political Behavior*, 32(2), 303-330.

4. Pennycook, G., Bear, A., Collins, E. T., & Rand, D. G. (2020). The implied truth effect: Attaching warnings to a subset of fake news headlines increases perceived accuracy of headlines without warnings. *Management Science*, 66(11), 4944-4957.

5. Pennycook, G., & Rand, D. G. (2019). Fighting misinformation on social media using crowdsourced judgments of news source quality. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(7), 2521-2526.

Optional readings:

- Egelhofer, J. L., & Lecheler, S. (2019). Fake news as a two-dimensional phenomenon: A framework and research agenda. *Annals of the International Communication Association*, 43(2), 97-116.

- Pennycook, G., & Rand, D. G. (2020). Who falls for fake news? The roles of bullshit receptivity, overclaiming, familiarity, and analytic thinking. *Journal of Personality*, 88(2), 185-200.

- Vosoughi, S., Roy, D., & Aral, S. (2018). The spread of true and false news online. *Science*, 359(6380), 1146-1151.

- Weeks, B. E., Menchen-Trevino, E., Calabrese, C., Casas, A., & Wojcieszak, M. (2021). Partisan media, untrustworthy news sites, and political misperceptions. *New Media & Society*, 14614448211033300.

- Allcott, H., & Gentzkow, M. (2017). Social media and fake news in the 2016 election. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 31(2), 211-36.

- Pennycook, G., & Rand, D. G. (2021). The psychology of fake news. *Trends in cognitive sciences*.

6 Schedule

Date	Theme	Readings & Assignments	Prep.
		Week 1	
01/11	L: Introduction to the course		
03/11	L: Introduction to Political Communication	De Beus (2011), Foos (2018), Salgado (2019) & van Aelst et al (2017)	4h.
03/11	T: NO TUTORIAL		
		Week 2	
08/11	L: Learning from the News	Carlson (2019), Feezell & Ortiz (2021); Kruike-meier et al. (2018), & Prior (2014) **Reading Assignment 1**	6h.
10/11	L: Learning from the News Guest Lecture	**1st draft Weekly Challenge 1**	5h.
10/11	T: Weekly Challenge 1		
12/11	Online Office Hours	**Hand-in Weekly Challenge 1**	3h.
		Week 3	
15/11.	L: Biases in Information Processing	Ahn et al. (2013), Bakker et al. (2021), Fournier et al. (2020) & Soontjes & Van Remoortere (2020) **Reading Assignment 2**	3h.
17/11	L: Biases in Information Processing Guest Lecture	**1st draft Weekly Challenge 2**	5h.
17/11	T: Weekly Challenge 2		
19/11	Online Office Hours	**Hand-in Weekly Challenge 2**	3h.
		Week 4	
22/11.	L: Media and Polarization	Bail et al. (2018), Eady et al. (2013), Levendusky (2013) & Prior (2013) **Reading Assignment 3**	6h.
24/11	L: Media and Polarizatio Guest Lecture	**1st draft Weekly Challenge 3**	4h.
17/11	T: Weekly Challenge 3		
26/11	Online Office Hours	**Hand-in Weekly Challenge 3**	3h.
		Week 5	
29/11.	L: Social Media and Democracy	Bennett & Segerberg (2012), Tucker et al. (2017), King et al. (2013), Hobbs & Roberts (2018) **Reading Assignment 4**	6h.
01/12	L: Social Media and Democracy Guest Lecture	**1st draft Weekly Challenge 4**	4h.
17/11	T: Weekly Challenge 4		
03/12	Online Office Hours	**Hand-in Weekly Challenge 4**	3h.
		Week 6	
06/12.	L: Fake News	Grinberg et al. (2019),Guess et al. (2019), Ny-han & Reifler (2010), Pennycook et al. (2020) & Pennycook & Rand (2019) **Reading Assignment 5**	6h.
08/12	L: Fake News Guest Lecture	**1st draft Weekly Challenge 5**	5h.

17/11	T: Weekly Challenge 5		
10/12	Online Office Hours	**Hand-in Weekly Challenge 5**	3h.
	Week 7		
13/12		Oral Exams	10h.
15/12		Oral Exams	10h.