

COMM 7713: Political Communication Spring 2022	
	Dr. William "Chip" Eveland
Office:	3139 Derby Hall
Office hours:	via appointment
Phone:	(614) 247-6004
Email:	Eveland.6@osu.edu

Class Meeting Times: Wednesday and Friday 9:35am - 10:55am

Class Location: 3116 Derby Hall

Course Description

The purpose of this course is to provide an overview of the role of communication in politics. We will explore research from the fields of communication and political science concerning the content of a variety of "legacy" and "new" forms of political communication. We will discuss the role of traditional print and television news media, entertainment media forms with political relevance, online media, face-to-face interpersonal communication, and various forms of technologically mediated social interactions in politics (e.g., social media, discussion forums, news article comment spaces). Our emphasis will be considering the role these can play – good and bad – in democratic functioning. Although the primary emphasis of this course will be on American politics, we will take the time to consider where the U.S. stands from a broader perspective, and I welcome hearing from students with interests in other specific political systems.

This course will expose students to a breadth of scholarship on political communication from both communication and political science (and sometimes, other related fields). Students will become familiar with theoretical, methodological and pragmatic issues in political communication scholarship. Students will learn to evaluate original empirical research and how to chart future directions to advance theory and evidence.

Requirements & Grading

There will be no textbook for the course; instead, readings from a variety of sources have been assembled and are available via PDFs posted on the course Canvas site. The reading load for this course is reasonably heavy, and a primary function of the course will be to evaluate those readings and use them as specific examples of scholarship within the various topic domains covered in the course. Readings for each topic area typically include some sort of overview or theory paper as well as empirical papers focusing on specific topics. I have endeavored to include variety in methodological and theoretical approaches across weeks. Inclusion of a reading on the syllabus is not necessarily an endorsement; read everything with a healthy dose of skepticism, while also realizing that holding unrealistic standards for evidence inhibits advance as much as not recognizing limitations of evidence. There is for more to read than I can assign in this course, and I hope students will explore relevant literature on their own. I am happy to guide individual students to additional work within their areas of

interest.

Evaluations of student performance will be based on several criteria: in-class discussion leader duties, general in-class participation (on non-discussion leader days), and four integration/extension papers. The weighting of these evaluation criteria will be the following:

Discussion leading	15%
General in-class participation	25%
Integration/extension papers (4 @ 15% each)	60%
Total:	100%

When letter grades are given for an assignment, they will be converted into the following numeric values for final grade calculation:

A+, A, A- = 100, 95, 91
B+, B, B- = 88, 85, 81
C+, C, C- = 78, 75, 71
D+, D, D- = 68, 65, 61
E (F) = 0

I will use the standard OSU grade lettering scheme to convert numeric course grades back to a final course letter grade. Note that the OSU grade lettering scheme does not incorporate rounding. An “A+” grade on a given assignment would mean a flawless (or nearly so) product or performance, so standards for that are really high. “A” grades are much more likely.

How the Course Will Run

Across the semester, I’m treating “weeks” as the unit of course content. In general – possibly with some exceptions – my plan is to devote Wednesdays of each week to a combination of mini-lecture by me – summarizing the topic area, discussing matters that may not arise in assigned readings, and some discussion of the assigned readings themselves. So, students should have read all the assigned readings in advance of Wednesday’s class and come prepared for listening and some discussion. Fridays will be discussion-oriented, with one student discussion leader assigned each week. On Fridays, we’ll more closely examine details about the assigned readings, and the student discussion leader (and I) will bring additional information to help round out discussion. More detail on student discussion leading is presented below.

Discussion Leading

Each student will sign up to serve as a discussion leader for one week during the semester. In addition to reading the required readings, discussion leaders will read (and be prepared to discuss) additional work on the same general topic that builds upon, contradicts, or fills gaps in the assigned reading. To do so they must seek out this additional relevant material, probably in consultation with the instructor.

To structure the discussion in the class, discussion leaders should develop a number of questions – and for themselves, the answers to those questions – that will serve as the fodder for class discussion. Questions are likely to pertain to some combination of the theory, method, or connections across papers and topics in the assigned readings – including across topics/weeks when relevant. Discussion leaders should distribute their questions via email at least 24 hours before class (i.e., by Thursday AM) so that students can think about them in advance and bring copies to class. In addition to these questions, discussion leaders should include in the mailing the list of additional readings they did for the topic (for reference).

And, of course, discussion leaders will play a major role in moderating class discussion on Fridays. For now, by the end of the first week of class students should send to me a full ranking of the available dates (all weeks other than the first and last week). I will assign students to weeks to maximize the number of students getting topics ranked high on their lists.

Discussion leaders will be evaluated based on: (1) the quality of their questions; (2) the apparent depth of their reading, both of assigned and additional readings; and (3) their performance in leading the discussion. Discussion leading will be worth 15% of the course grade and will be given as a letter grade.

General In-Class Participation

Just as discussion leaders will be evaluated on their preparation and development of questions for the class, students not serving as a discussion leader for a given class session will be evaluated on their participation and ability to **intelligently** discuss the assigned readings. The first, minimum component of this is class attendance. I do expect students to attend all class sessions unless serious circumstances make it impossible, in which case I will expect notification in advance and documentation after the fact for the absence in order to avoid it impacting your participation grade.

Beyond attendance, ALL students will be expected to participate fully in the seminar by both asking questions and answering them during **each and every topic (i.e., week)**. While a reasonable quantity of verbal participation is a necessary condition for a positive evaluation, it is not sufficient. The quality of questions and answers will be considered when evaluating student participation and quality will be judged by how informed the questions are by the assigned readings and quality thinking. High quantity with low quality will be considered equivalent to not participating at all; it is essentially a distraction. **Students engaged in work unrelated to the course during class periods (e.g., emailing, Web surfing, texting, data analysis, etc., will be docked a full day's participation credit and will be asked to leave the class for the remainder of the session (and I'm really serious about this...).**

I seriously evaluate class participation and weight it accordingly. In-class participation will be worth 25% of the course grade and will be derived numerically based on a percentage of the maximum possible score across all class meetings in which values for a given class period will be zero, one, or two, with two indicating meeting expectations

for a graduate seminar (multiple meaningful contributions during 3-hours of class weekly) and zero indicating non-attendance or little to no participation during the class.

Integration/Extension Papers

For four weeks/topics over the course of the semester, students will write 5-7 page “integration/extension” papers. These papers will be focused on evaluating and integrating the evidence in the assigned readings for that topic, along with a modest amount of additional reading to be done beyond the assigned readings that allow the student to extend what they’ve learned from assigned readings. These papers should NOT be simple summaries of what the assigned (or new) articles have said or found. Rather, they should be original thoughts by students about how the ideas of the assigned (and additional) papers may be pulled together for greater understanding, and to offer directions for future scholarship.

Integration papers are due by the start of class on Wednesday mornings at the start of the given topic; that is, students should be writing these papers before class interactions on the topic rather than after, and using the ideas they have developed to help advance class discussion. Integration papers are each worth 15%. For now, by the end of the first week of class students should inform the instructor on which four weeks they intend to submit their integration papers.

Pro tip: You might want to consider choosing to do one of your papers on the same week you are serving as a discussion leader. Just sayin’. 😊

Office Hours

I will hold regular office hours during which I encourage you to come to see me to discuss course-related matters, particularly as they relate to the two papers for the course and discussion leading. If your schedule does not permit visiting me during formal office hours, please let me know and I will attempt to arrange an alternative time by appointment. Please do take advantage of this resource to ask questions or clarification, seek additional information, and so forth. It is my job to make sure that you have every opportunity to learn the course material, and I will make every effort to do so. But, it is also incumbent upon you to seek help when you think you need it, and to not delay in seeking that help until the last minute (especially with regard to papers and discussion leading), when it may be too late.

Etiquette

We want to build a classroom climate that is comfortable for all. It is *especially* important that we (1) display respect for all members of the classroom – including the instructor and students, (2) pay attention to and participate in all class sessions and activities; (3) avoid unnecessary disruption during class time; and (4) avoid racist, sexist, homophobic or other negative language that may unnecessarily exclude members of our campus / classroom. This is not an exhaustive list of behaviors; rather, they represent the minimum standards that help make the classroom a productive place for all concerned.

I want to particularly address the role of laptops and other internet-connected devices in the classroom. Although I realize that these can be valuable tools for reviewing electronic copies of class readings, taking notes during class, and even (on occasion) looking up something online for class discussion purposes, they also serve as a major potential source of distraction – via email, Web surfing, and the ability to work surreptitiously on matters unrelated to class. Doing the latter can be very distracting, not only to the individual with the computer, but also to those around him/her. It is the equivalent of reading a newspaper, listening to music with headphones, or having a private conversation during class. So, please do not ever use your computing device to engage in activities that are not directly course related. Doing so will lead to a zero for class participation for that day plus me publicly asking the student doing so to leave class for the day. If this becomes an issue for multiple students, I may have to resort to banning the use of computers in class.

Some Words About Academic Honesty

It is your responsibility to complete your own work as best you can in the time provided. ***Cheating, plagiarism, and falsification of laboratory or other data are serious offenses, and it is my responsibility to make sure they do not occur.*** If you are unclear about definitions of plagiarism, read the Code of Student Conduct at http://studentaffairs.osu.edu/resource_csc.asp

Academic misconduct will be punished to the fullest extent possible. Anyone **suspected** of academic misconduct should expect to have a record of the matter forwarded to the Committee on Academic Misconduct as required by faculty rule. If a student is found guilty of academic misconduct, the most likely outcome will be failure of the course and loss of GA funding.

SPECIAL ACCOMODATIONS

This syllabus is available in alternative formats upon request. Students with disabilities are responsible for making their needs known to the instructor and seeking available assistance in a timely manner. If you need an accommodation based on the impact of a disability, you should contact me to arrange an appointment by the second week of classes. At the appointment we can discuss the course format, anticipate your needs and explore potential accommodations. If you have not previously contacted the Office for Disability Services (ODS) but believe you may need accommodations, I encourage you to do so. I rely on the Office for Disability Services at 614-292-3307 in Rm. 150 Pomerene Hall for assistance in verifying the need for accommodations and developing accommodation strategies.

TOPICS and READINGS

January 12-14: Course Introduction

- Jamieson, K. H., & Kenski, K. (2017). Political communication: Then, now and beyond. In K. Kenski & K. H. Jamieson (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of political communication* (pp. 3-12). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Jamieson, K. H. (2017). Creating the hybrid field of political communication: A five-decade-long evolution of the concept of effects. In K. Kenski & K. H. Jamieson (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of political communication* (pp. 15-46). New York: Oxford University Press.

January 19-21: Normative Foundations

- Althaus, S. L. (2012). What's good and bad in political communication research? In H. A. Semetko & M. Scammell (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of political communication* (pp. 96-111). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gurevitch, M., & Blumler, J. G. (1990). Political communication systems and democratic values. In J. Lichtenberg (Ed.) *Democracy and the mass media: A collection of essays* (pp. 269-289). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Norris, P. (2000). Evaluating media performance. In *A virtuous circle: Political communications in postindustrial societies* (pp. 22-35). Cambridge University Press.
- Conover, P. J., & Searing, D. D. (2005). Studying 'everyday political talk' in the deliberative system. *Acta Politica*, 40, 269-283.

January 26-28: Legacy News Media I: Content

- Benkler, Y. (2020). A political economy of the origins of asymmetric propaganda in American media. In W. L. Bennett & S. Livingston (eds.) *The disinformation age: Politics, technology, and disruptive communication in the United States* (pp. 43-66). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Soroka, S. N. (2012). The gatekeeping function: Distributions of information in media and the real world. *Journal of Politics*, 74, 514-528.
- Budak, C., Goel, S., & Rao, J. M. (2016). Fair and balanced? Quantifying media bias through crowdsourced content analysis. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 80(S1), 250-271.
- Berry, J. M., & Sobieraj, S. (2014). Outrage. In *The outrage industry: Political opinion media and the new incivility* (pp. 3-30). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Patterson, T. E. (2020). *A tale of two elections: CBS and Fox News' portrayal of the 2020 presidential campaign*. Shorenstein Center on Media, Politics and Public Policy.

February 2-4: Legacy News Media II: Exposure and Effects

- Stroud, N. J. (2017). Selective exposure theories. In K. Kenski & K. H. Jamieson (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of political communication* (pp. 531-547). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Eveland, W. P., Jr. & Garrett, R. K. (2017). Communication modalities and political knowledge. In K. Kenski & K. H. Jamieson (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of political communication* (pp. 517-530). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Garrett, R. K., & Stroud, N. J. (2014). Partisan paths to exposure diversity: Differences in pro- and counter-attitudinal news consumption. *Journal of Communication*, *64*, 680-701.
- Levendusky, M. S. (2013). Why do partisan media polarize viewers? *American Journal of Political Science*, *57*, 611-623.
- Hayes & Lawless, J. L. (2018). The decline of local news and its effects: New evidence from longitudinal data. *Journal of Politics*, *80*, 332-336.

February 9-11: Political Advertising

- Fowler, E. F., Franz, M. M., Martin, G. J., Peskowitz, Z., & Ridout, T. N. (2021). Political advertising online and offline. *American Political Science Review*, *115*(1), 130-149.
- Geer, J. G. (2012). The news media and the rise of negativity in presidential campaigns. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, *45*, 422-427.
- Parry-Giles, S. J. (2016). *A report on presidential advertising and the 2016 general election: A referendum on character*. Center for Political Communication and Civic Leadership.
- Coppock, A., Hill, S. J., & Vavreck, L. (2020). The small effects of political advertising are small regardless of context, message, sender, or receiver: Evidence from 59 real-time randomized experiments. *Science Advances*, *6*(36), eabc4046.
- Kim, Y. M., Hsu, J., Neiman, D., Kou, C., Bankston, L., Kim, S. Y., Heinrich, R., Baragwanath, R., & Raskutti, G. (2018). The stealth media? Groups and targets behind divisive issues campaigns on Facebook. *Political Communication*, *35*, 515-541.

February 16-18: Entertainment Media

- Delli Carpini, M. X. (2017). The political effects of entertainment media. In K. Kenski & K. H. Jamieson (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of political communication* (pp. 851-870). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Young, D. G. (2017). Theories and effects of political humor: Discounting cues, gateways, and the impact of incongruities. In K. Kenski & K. H. Jamieson (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of political communication* (pp. 871-884). New York: Oxford University Press.
- 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.
- Mutz, D. C. (2016). Harry Potter and the Deathly Donald. *Political Science & Politics*, *49*, 722-729.
- Coronel, J. C., O'Donnell, M. B., Pandey, P., Delli Carpini, M. X., & Falk, E. B. (2021). Political humor, sharing, and remembering: Insights from neuroimaging. *Journal of Communication*, *71*, 129-161.

February 23-25: Political Networks, Conversation and Deliberation I: Selection and Content

- Eveland, W. P., Morey, A. C., & Hutchens, M. J. (2011). Beyond deliberation: New directions for the study of informal political conversation from a communication perspective. *Journal of Communication*, *61*, 1082-1103.
- Cowan, S. K., & Baldassarri, D. (2018). "It could turn ugly": Selective disclosure of attitudes in political discussion networks. *Social Networks*, *52*, 1-17.
- Druckman, J. N., Levendusky, M. S., & McLain, A. (2018). No need to watch: How the effects of partisan media can spread via interpersonal discussions. *American Journal of Political Science*.
- Settle, J. E., & Carlson, T. N. (2019). Opting out of political discussions. *Political Communication*, *36*, 476-496.
- Wolak & Sokhey (in press). Enraged and engaged? Emotions and motives for discussing politics. *American Politics Research*.

March 2-4: Political Networks, Conversation and Deliberation II: Effects

- Rolfe, M., & Chan, S. (2018). Voting and political participation. In J. N. Victor, A. H. Montgomery, & M. Lubell (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of political networks* (pp. 357-382). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bello, J. (2012). The dark side of disagreement? Revisiting the effect of disagreement on political participation. *Electoral Studies*, *31*, 782-795.
- Wojcieszak, M., & Warner, B. R. (2020). Can interparty contact reduce affective polarization? A systematic test of different forms of intergroup contact. *Political Communication*, *37*(6), 789-811.
- Eveland, W. P., Jr., & Schmitt, J. B. (2015). Communication content and knowledge content matters: Integrating manipulation and observation in studying news and discussion learning effects. *Journal of Communication*, *65*, 170-191.
- Carlson, T. N. (2019). Through the grapevine: Informational consequences of interpersonal political communication. *American Political Science Review*, *113*, 325-339.

March 9-11: Politics Online I: Selectivity and News

- Bakshy, E., Messing, S., & Adamic, L. A. (2015). Exposure to ideologically diverse news and opinion on Facebook. *Science*, *348*, 1130-1132.
- Bond, R. M., & Sweitzer, M. D. (2022). Political homophily in a large-scale online communication network. *Communication Research*, *49*, 93-115.
- Cinelli, M., Morales, G. D. F., Galeazzi, A., Quattrociocchi, W., & Starnini, M. (2021). The echo chamber effect on social media. *PNAS*, *118*(9), e2023301118
- Beam, M. A., Hutchens, M. J., & Hmielowski, J. D. (2018). Facebook news and (de)polarization: Reinforcing spirals in the 2016 US election. *Information, Communication & Society*, *21*, 940-958.
- Lu, Y., & Lee, J. K. (2019). Stumbling upon the other side: Incidental learning of counter-attitudinal political information on Facebook. *New Media & Society*, *21*, 248-265.

March 16-18: Spring Break

March 23-25: Politics Online II: Forums for Sharing and Talk

- Settle, J. E. (2018). The END framework of political interaction on social media. In *Frenemies: How social media polarizes America* (pp. 50-77). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Neubaum, G., & Krämer, N. C. (2017). Opinion climates in social media: Blending mass and interpersonal communication. *Human Communication Research*, *43*, 464-476.
- Graham, T., Jackson, D., & Wright, S. (2016). 'We need to get together and make ourselves heard': Everyday online spaces as incubators of political action. *Information, Communication & Society*, *19*, 1373-1389.
- Su et al. (2018). Uncivil and personal? Comparing patterns of incivility in comments on the Facebook pages of news outlets. *New Media & Society*, *20*, 3678-3699.
- Brady, W. J., Wills, J. A., Jost, J. T., Tucker, J. A., & van Bavel, J. J. (2017). Emotion shapes the diffusion of moralized content in social networks. *PNAS*, *114* (28), 7313-7318.

March 30- April 1: Misinformation and Disinformation

- 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.
- Allen, J., Howland, B., Mobius, M., Rothschild, D., & Watts, D. J. (2020). Evaluating the fake news problem at the scale of the information ecosystem. *Science Advances*, *6*(14), eaay3539.
- Guess, A. M., Nyhan, B., & Reifler, J. (2020). Exposure to untrustworthy websites in the 2016 US election. *Nature Human Behavior*, *4*, 472-480.
- Connors, E. C., Pietryka, M. T., & Ryan, J. B. (in press). Motivating information seeking & sharing. In *Examining motivations in interpersonal communication experiments* (pp. 18-37). Cambridge University Press.
- Garrett, R. K., & Bond, R. M. (2021). Conservatives' susceptibility to political misperceptions. *Sciences Advances*, *7*, eabf1234

April 6-8: Political Socialization

- McDevitt, M. (2016). Political socialization. In C. R. Berger, & M. E. Roloff (Eds.) *The international encyclopedia of interpersonal communication* (Vol. 1). John Wiley & Sons.
- Lee, N. J., Shah, D. V., & McLeod, J. M. (2012). Processes of political socialization: A communication mediation approach to youth civic engagement. *Communication Research, 40*, 669-697.
- Eggerly, S., Thorson, K., Thorson, E., Vraga, E. K., & Bode, L. (2017). Do parents still model news consumption? Socializing news use among adolescents in a multi-device world. *New Media & Society*.
- Iyengar, S., Konitzer, T., & Tedin, K. (2018). The home as a political fortress: Family agreement in an era of polarization. *Journal of Politics, 80*, 1326-1338.

April 13-15: Comparative Political Communication

- Rojas, H., & Valenzuela, S. (2019). A call to contextualize public opinion-based research in political communication. *Political Communication, 36*, 652-659.
- de Vreese, C. H. (2017). Comparative political communication research. In K. Kenski & K. H. Jamieson (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of political communication*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Nir, L. (2012). Cross-national differences in political discussion: Can political systems narrow deliberation gaps? *Journal of Communication, 62*, 553-570.
- Mattoni, A., & Ceccobelli, D. (2018). Comparing hybrid media systems in the digital age: A theoretical framework for analysis. *European Journal of Communication, 33*, 540-557.
- Yang, J. et al. (2016). Why are "others" so polarized? Perceived political polarization and media use in 10 countries. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 21*, 349-367.

April 20-22: Wrapping Up

Readings, if any, TBA