

**Political Communication**  
POLI 7903  
1:30-4:30 pm Wednesdays  
210 Stubbs (Political Science Conference Room)

Professor Johanna Dunaway  
Office: 213 Stubbs Hall  
Hours: MW 4:30-6:00pm, and by 1pt.

E-mail: [jdunaway@lsu.edu](mailto:jdunaway@lsu.edu)  
Web: [www.johannadunaway.com](http://www.johannadunaway.com)  
Phone: (225) 578-2553

### **Overview**

This course is an advanced introduction to theory and research in the field of political communication. Its goal is to acquaint students with the field's history, research questions, theoretical approaches, empirical accomplishments, and likely future directions.

No course can be fully comprehensive, and in order to best serve students taking this one, the instructor has limited the range of topics to a manageable few. Four omissions are notable. First, students should be aware that most of the course readings apply mainly to political communication systems in the United States, with a few exceptions. This course mostly ignores a broader range of important work done by political communication scholars that addresses the interaction between news media, audiences, and politicians in within and across other countries. Cross-national political communication research is a thriving area of scholarship that deserves a course of its own, and interested students are encouraged to follow up on this course by examining political communication research directed at systems outside the United States.

Second, this course covers the social-scientific study of political communication that is being conducted primarily by political scientists and communication scholars. Neglected almost entirely is a much broader range of humanistic and qualitative research on political communication that traces back to Aristotle's *Rhetoric* and is currently pursued by scholars of rhetoric, cultural studies, and media studies. This choice reflects the unfortunate historical divergence of qualitative and quantitative political communication scholarship, and a division of scholarly labor that now emphasizes specialization in one or the other area of research. This course is an introduction to the quantitative side of political communication research only, and students interested in pursuing this subject further are strongly encouraged to consider coursework in media studies, rhetorical criticism, and rhetorical theory.

Third, this course has been designed to provide a broad overview of many important theoretical developments and debates in the field of political communication, but this broad theoretical overview necessarily ignores huge chunks of literature focusing on specific topic areas. For instance, the class will hardly touch on the subject of social capital and media use even though this is currently a vibrant research area among political communication scholars. This choice to privilege theory over broad literature reviews was made with a hope and an assumption. The assumption is that class time is better used discussing theoretical approaches and controversies rather than merely bringing students up to speed with broad areas of the research literature. The hope is that once students are armed with the theoretical insights gained from this course, they will be prepared to efficiently and effectively navigate their own way through these research literatures.

Fourth, different aspects of mass-mediated political communication are studied by political communication researchers, some of which are also studied by broader scholarly communities and are covered in other

courses available in the political science and mass communication departments. To avoid overlapping topics and to allow us to go in depth on research areas that are uniquely pursued by political communication scholars, this course will largely ignore relevant topics in the areas of media effects, policymaking, social networks, campaign effects and new media technologies to privilege areas of inquiry that are not duplicated elsewhere in the academy.

### Objectives

This course is intended to provide students with a broad overview of the political communication subfield. The assigned readings along with the recommended readings constitute a foundational part of what every well-trained political communication scholar should know about the field. By the end of this course, students should be able to:

- understand the study of political communication as an inherently interdisciplinary project
- appreciate a broad range of theoretical concepts and empirical approaches that play important roles in political communication research
- recognize the strengths and weaknesses of these theoretical concepts and empirical approaches

### Required Books

Arceneaux, Kevin, and Martin Johnson. 2013. *Changing Minds or Changing Channels? Partisan News in an Age of Choice*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Baker, C. Edwin. 2002. *Media, markets, and democracy*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Boczkowski, Pablo. 2010. *News at Work: Imitation in an age of information abundance*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Groeling, Tim. *When Politicians Attack: Party Cohesion in the Media*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Hallin, Daniel, and Paolo Mancini. 2004. *Comparing media systems: Three models of media and politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hamilton, James T. 2004. *All the news that's fit to sell: How the market transforms information into news*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Hayes, Danny and Matt Guardino. 2013. *Influence from Abroad: Foreign Voices, the Media, and U.S. Public Opinion*. Cambridge University Press.

Patterson, Thomas E. 2013. *Informing the News*. New York: Vintage Press.

### Other Readings

This course has a Moodle site that will be the primary vehicle for receiving course assignments and distributing course-related materials in electronic form. Readings from the course schedule marked with (M) denote readings that are posted on Moodle. Readings marked with (LSUL) denote those you must locate using the LSU library system. Two important reminders: electronic copies of readings obtained through the library system or the course Moodle are **not for redistribution** to persons outside this class.

## Assignments and Course Grade

Your final grade for this course will be determined by your performance on the following assignments:

- Final research paper (40% of final grade)
- Weekly participation in class discussions (20% of final grade)
- Small papers based on assigned readings (12-15 short papers, 40% of final grade)

### *Final research paper or take-home exam*

Students will be writing a final research paper that will be 20-25 double-spaced pages in length. This paper is a research paper on a topic related to the seminar readings (topic to be determined in consultation with the instructor). The idea here is to provide you with an opportunity to apply what you have read in the course to a substantive research problem.

### *Weekly participation in class discussions*

In-class discussion will be the primary mode of instruction for this course, and therefore it is vital that everyone participates. Participating means being an active conversation partner and engaging with other students. Participation does not mean dominating the conversation, trying to impress the professor or one's fellow students with how much you know, or even criticizing the readings or ideas that come up in conversation. Asking questions is a more desirable mode of participation than answering them. Asking good questions that open up lines of inquiry will contribute more to the conversation than providing good answers or merely dissecting a reading's faults and limitations. Criticizing a reading is useful but easy. The more productive but difficult work is intellectually engaging with a reading. Being completely confused about a reading is fine (and candor about such matters is encouraged) so long as you own up to it so that others in the seminar can benefit from the opportunity to test their own understanding of what a reading is about.

### *Discussion question papers for assigned readings*

Discussion question papers are assigned to provide short and long term benefits to all students taking the course. Each week, students will be assigned to write up a brief (1 page, single spaced) paper that centers on a question I give you. These papers require you to integrate and synthesize the readings from the course. The idea here is to provide you with an opportunity to develop your own perspectives about the theories, research designs, and topics covered in class. These papers are also useful preparation for comprehensive exams. These papers are due in class in hardcopy form.

### Formatting Instructions and Rules for the weekly discussion question papers:

- 1 page (fill the page with one or two lines of wobble room only – i.e. don't give me two-thirds of a page). If anything you should run out of space and have to edit accordingly. Don't go over the limit – be sure I can print out everything you write on one single sheet of paper.
- The essay should be single spaced
- 1 inch margins on all sides
- Use 12 point font – New Times Roman
- The Title of essay is the question I assign
- Put your name in the header
- Do NOT double space your header
- This is not a reaction paper or an opinion paper. Answer the question according to what the readings say; always support your own arguments about what the readings are saying with the logic and statements of the assigned readings. You don't need to give me the full citations in a bibliography or reference list for these weekly assignments, but when discussing the various authors use in-text and parenthetical citations as in the example below. Always provide the page number if quoting directly from an author.

The method of science is often confused with its content (Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias 2008). Goldberg (1963) argues that science is empirical but clarifies that it is not empiricism.

IMPORTANT NOTE: Obviously, the readings and paper listed for each date are to be completed by that class day.

### **Guidelines for Research Design Paper**

You are required to write a paper presenting a research project of your own choice (must be approved). A hardcopy solid draft of this paper is due in class on our last regular class meeting of the semester. The final drafts are due in my Political Science mailbox no later than 4:00pm on 5/7. Late solid drafts will not be graded, and your final draft will then not have the benefit of my suggested revisions. You'll also be dropped a letter grade for not turning in a draft. For the final papers, a 1/3 letter grade penalty per weekday will be imposed on all late papers. Thus, a final paper worth an A- that was turned in one day late would become a B+, then a B, then B- etc. Extensions without penalty will only be given when DIRE circumstances prevail.

#### Formatting

- 11-12 point font and 1 inch margins,
- Use a standard font (such as New Times Roman)
- LASER printed on one side only of 8.5" X 11" white paper
  - Organized using section headings
  - Employ gender-neutral/inclusive language
- Follow the APSA style of internal citations (copy of manual provided to you)
- Double spaced (except for abstract, hypotheses, references, and footnotes)
  - Contain page numbers throughout.
- Stapled – don't put it in some fancy paper cover

#### Organization

Your paper should (roughly) follow the outline that appears below:

- i. Title Page (no set style)
- ii. Abstract (150-500 words, single spaced)
- I. Introduction
  - a. Research Question
  - b. Literature Review
- II. Theory and Hypotheses
  - a. Analytical Framework/Theory
  - b. Hypotheses
- III. Data and Methods
  - a. Measurement Operations
  - b. Testing
- IV. Conclusion
- V. Works Cited (APSA Citation Style)

#### Substantive Components

1. Research Question: You must first formulate an *original* question of interest. Covering time-worn ground is not acceptable. Pay particular attention to why others ought to be interested in your research, and what new and innovative questions you are going to address that others have failed to analyze or have done so poorly. In other words, sell the importance and uniqueness of your proposal/question to the reader. Ask yourself the following:
  1. Has this already been done?
  2. Is this an important question?
  3. What would we better understand if we knew the answer to the question?
  4. Would answering this question contribute to the cumulative body of scientific knowledge?
  5. Will your proposed analysis actually answer the question you are posing?
2. Literature Review: Present a brief, analytical summary of the major schools of thought or approaches to the problem. Be certain to locate specific authors in the spectrum of thought. The purpose here is not to present an encyclopedic or exhaustive survey. The literature should instead be reviewed in a way that sets up what you want to do. Prepare this section with an eye toward identifying unaddressed questions, unresolved controversies, and problems with previous research that may have led to biased, invalid, or inconclusive findings. Thus, this should once again lead you toward justifying why your research proposal is of such importance and what you will do to address the deficiencies found in the extant literature.
3. Theory/Analytical Framework: Some research framework (a model, theory, or logically interconnected set of hypotheses) should be developed and presented. This need not be a full-scale exposition of judicial behavior or systemic causes of war, for example, but you must highlight the major tenets of the theory from which you will derive your hypotheses. This might be an original theory based on the work of others, one that has sufficient precedent in the literature, or one that has already been largely developed and tested and accepted, but which you are going to test in a new and useful manner. If you are going to be testing someone else's theory, you must be able to demonstrate why your tests are going to reveal something that had not been considered before, or how it will shed new light on an old subject. Note that if you are using a formal approach, you must explicitly state your assumptions and specify the deductions.
4. Hypotheses: From your theory, you must derive several hypotheses, or predictions, that will allow you to test some version of your theory. Each hypothesis should be indented in the text, single spaced, and formally starred and numbered, as in the following example:

H<sub>1</sub>: The faster the rate of change in the modernization process within any given society (X<sub>1</sub>), the higher the level of political instability within that society (Y).
5. Measurement Operations: In this section you should explain how you will go about operationalizing or measuring the concepts contained in your hypotheses. Your discussion should address the following questions:

How will you convert the hypotheses into concrete and readily testable terms and relationships?  
What sorts of information will you use to measure the constructs in your hypotheses/  
When and how will you acquire this information?

You may find it useful to prepare a table that specifies the measurement rules and data sources. (Any such table or figure should be inserted directly into the text of the paper.) Consider the following example.

**Table 1: Operational Definitions, Descriptive Statistics, and Data Sources**

Variable	Operational Definition	Data Source	Descriptive Statistics
<i>Focus of News Story (Y)</i>	1=Strategy 2=Issues 3=Candidate Traits 4=Adwatch 5=Horserace	Content analysis of each newspaper story; Kappa=.88	Range 1,5 Mean 2 Std Dev 2
<i>Income (X<sub>1</sub>)</i>	Median income in market area divided by 1000.	<i>2004 Editor and Publisher International Yearbook</i> 2000 U.S. Census	Range 20,63.9 Mean 41.3 Std Dev 6.1
<i>% Young Audiences in Market (X<sub>2</sub>)</i>	Percent of market ages 20-44.	<i>2004 Editor and Publisher International Yearbook</i> 2000 U.S. Census	Range 28.7,51.5 Mean 43.1 Std Dev 4.2
<i>% Female in Market (X<sub>3</sub>)</i>	% of Females in market.	<i>2004 Editor and Publisher International Yearbook</i> 2000 U.S. Census	Range 42.1,52.9 Mean 50 Std Dev .985
<i>Circulation (X<sub>4</sub>)</i>	Circulation numbers	<i>2004 Editor and Publisher International Yearbook</i>	Range 7.87, 13.32 Mean 11.62 Std Dev 1.4
<i>State (X<sub>5</sub>)</i>	Colorado=1 Washington=0	News Content	Range 0,1 Mean .469 Std Dev .499
<i>Election Week (X<sub>6</sub>)</i>	Number of weeks into the Election	News Content	Range 1,9 Mean 6.64 Std Dev 2.65

6. Testing: You need to explain how you will go about conducting your analysis and testing your hypotheses. Note that it is understood that you may be relatively unfamiliar with econometric specifications and other advance quantitative techniques. What is expected is that you mention the technique that you believe is appropriate (e.g. cross-sectional, linear regression, time-series, logit or probit, etc.), identify the unit(s) of analysis, justify case selection, and specify the time-range of the study. Consultation with the professor is highly recommended before writing this section.

7. Conclusion: In the conclusion you need to sell the importance of your anticipated findings. Some questions to ponder:

What do you expect to find?

What will your potential findings mean for political science and the real world?

Will you contribute toward theory building?

Will you discover some knowledge that is previously unknown and/or that may conceivably be put to use by policy makers or political practitioners?

Why are we better off for having learned what you expect to find?

8. Works Cited: This listing should appear at the very end of your paper. Note that all sources cited in the text of your paper must appear in this section. Do not include any source that is not explicitly

cited in your paper. Each entry should be single-spaced and indented after the first line, with one space between entries. Be sure to follow the *APSA Style Guide*.

### Citation and Academic Honesty

LSU's policy on plagiarism is the following: "Plagiarism is defined to include any use of another's work and submitting that work as one's own. This means not only copying passages of writing or direct quotations but also paraphrasing or using structure or ideas without citation." Most of the work you will do for this class will require you to deal closely with books and articles assigned for this class; some projects may require you to do additional research. In either case, the rule of thumb is this: If you use material from a source (either one assigned from this class or something you've retrieved through outside research), you must cite it. Please review the University's excellent guidelines on plagiarism and academic integrity at <http://www.lsu.edu/judicialaffairs/> and <http://www.lsu.edu/judicialaffairs/Plagiarism.htm>.

**Please note:** If I even suspect plagiarism I am required by university policy to turn in the assignment to the dean of the graduate school. This means it is beyond my control what happens from that point forward. So – PLEASE ask any questions if you are uncertain about what constitutes plagiarism (it often happens unintentionally). Please make EVERY effort to avoid putting me in the terrible position of turning your work in to the dean of students.

### ADA Statement

The Americans with Disabilities Act requires that reasonable accommodations be provided for students with physical, cognitive, systemic, learning and psychiatric disabilities. Please contact me at the beginning of the quarter to discuss any such accommodations for this course. In order to have any accommodations met, you must be registered with the LSU Office of Disabilities Services. More information on registering and accommodation is available on the ODS website: <http://appl003.lsu.edu/slas/ods.nsf/index>

## Class Schedule

### 1/15 Course overview and Introduction

### 1/22 Overview of the Field and History of Political Communication

Nimmo, Dan D., and Keith R. Sanders. 1981. Introduction: The emergence of political communication as a field. In *Handbook of political communication*, edited by D. D. Nimmo and K. R. Sanders. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications. (M)

Graber, Doris A. 1993. Political communication: Scope, progress, promise. In *The state of the discipline II*, edited by A. W. Finifter. Washington D. C.: American Political Science Association. (M)

Graber, Doris A., James M. Smith. 2005. Political communication faces the 21st century. *Journal of Communication* 55 (3):479-507. (LSUS)

#### *For further reading*

Lippmann, Walter. 1922. *Public opinion*. New York: Free Press. Chapters 1, 14-17, 21-28.

Dewey, John. 1927. *The public and its problems*. Denver: Alan Swallow. Chapters 4, 5, and 6.

Kaid, Lynda L., ed. 2004. *Handbook of political communication research*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Nimmo, Dan D., and David L. Swanson, eds. 1990. *New directions in political communication*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Semetko, Holli A., and Margaret Scammell. 2012. *The SAGE Handbook of Political Communication*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Wolfsfeld, Gadi. 2011. *Making sense of media and politics: Five principles in political communication*. New York: Routledge.

### 1/29 Normative Perspectives on Political Communication

\*Baker, C. Edwin. 2002. *Media, markets, and democracy*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Part II, pp. 123-213.

\*Patterson, Thomas E. 2013. *Informing the News*. New York: Vintage Press.

Althaus, Scott. 2013. "What's Good and Bad in Political Communication Research? Normative Standards for Evaluating Media and Citizen Performance." In Holli Semetko and Margaret Scammell, eds. *The SAGE Handbook of Political Communication*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Zaller, John. 2003. A new standard of news quality: Burglar alarms for the monitorial citizen. *Political Communication* 20 (2):109-130. (LSUS)

Bennett, W. Lance. 2003. The burglar alarm that just keeps ringing: A response to Zaller. *Political Communication* 20 (2):131 - 138. (LSUS)

#### *For further reading*



- Bimber, Bruce. 2003. *Information and American democracy: Technology in the evolution of political power*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Christians, Clifford G., Theodore L. Glasser, Denis McQuail, Kaarle Nordenstreng, and Robert A. White. 2009. *Normative theories of the media: Journalism in democratic societies*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Commission on the Freedom of the Press. 1947. *A free and responsible press*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Cook, Timothy E. 2005. *Governing with the news: The news media as a political institution*. 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Edelman, Murray. 1988. *Constructing the political spectacle*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Held, David. 2006. *Models of democracy*. 3rd ed. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Schudson, Michael. 1998. *The good citizen: A history of American civic life*. New York: Free Press.
- Siebert, Fred S., Theodore Peterson, and Wilbur Schramm. 1956. *Four theories of the press*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Hallin, Daniel C. 1994. *We keep America on top of the world: Television, journalism, and the public sphere*. New York: Routledge. Chapter 2, "The American news media: A critical theory perspective."
- Schudson, Michael. 2000. *Good citizens & bad history: Today's political ideals in historical perspective*. John Seigenthaler Chair of Excellence First Amendment Studies, College of Mass Communication, Middle Tennessee State University.

## 2/5 Understanding News Exposure

- Graber, Doris A. 1988. *Processing the news: How people tame the information tide*. 2nd ed. White Plains: Longman. Chapters 2, 7 and 10 (M)
- Lang, Annie. 2000. The limited capacity model of mediated message processing. *The Journal of Communication* 50 (1):46-70. (LSUS)
- Price, Vincent, and John Zaller. 1993. Who gets the news? Alternative measures of news reception and their implications for research. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 57:133-164. (LSUS)
- Bartels, Larry. 1993. Messages received: The political impact of media exposure. *American Political Science Review* 87 (2):267-285. (LSUS)
- Eveland, William P., Myiah J. Hutchens, and Fei Shen. 2009. Exposure, attention, or 'use' of news? Assessing aspects of the reliability and validity of a central concept in political communication research. *Communication Methods and Measures* 3 (4):223 - 244. (LSUS)
- Althaus, Scott L., Anne M. Cizmar, and James G. Gimpel. 2009. Media supply, audience demand, and the geography of news media consumption in the United States. *Political Communication* 26 (3):249-277. (LSUS)

*For further reading*

- Althaus, Scott L., and David H. Tewksbury. 2007. Toward a new generation of media use measures for the American National Elections Studies. *Report to the ANES Board of Overseers*. Available URL: <http://www.electionstudies.org/resources/papers/Pilot2006/nes011903.pdf>
- Chaffee, Steven H., and Stacey F. Kanihan. 1997. Learning about politics from the mass media. *Political Communication* 14 (4):421-430.
- Eveland, William P. 2001. The cognitive mediation model of learning from the news: Evidence from nonelection, off-year election, and presidential election contexts. *Communication Research* 28 (5):571.
- Graber, Doris A. 1990. Seeing is remembering: How visuals contribute to learning from television news. *Journal of Communication* 40 (3):134-155.
- Graber, Doris A. 2001. *Processing politics: Learning from television in the Internet age*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mitchelstein, Eugenia, and Pablo J. Boczkowski. 2010. Online news consumption research: An assessment of past work and an agenda for the future. *New Media & Society* 12 (7):1085-1102.
- Prior, Markus. 2009. The immensely inflated news audience: Assessing bias in self-reported news exposure. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 73 (1):130-143.
- Prior, Markus. 2009. Improving media effects research through better measurement of news exposure. *Journal of Politics* 71 (3):893-908.
- Robinson, John P., and Mark R. Levy. 1986. *The main source: Learning from television news*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Weaver, David H. 1980. Audience need for orientation and media effects. *Communication Research* 7(3):361-373.
- Webster, James G. 2005. Beneath the veneer of fragmentation: Television audience polarization in a multichannel world. *Journal of Communication* 55 (2):366-82.

## **2/12 Consequences of News Exposure and Nonexposure**

- Tichenor, P.J., G.A. Donohue, and C.N. Olien. 1970. Mass media flow and differential growth in knowledge. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 34 (2):159-170. (LSUS)
- Davison, W. Phillips. 1983. The third-person effect in communication. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 47:1-15. (LSUS)
- 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. (LSUS)
- \*Prior, Markus. 2007. *Post-broadcast democracy: How media choice increases inequality in political involvement and polarizes elections*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 1, 2, 4, 5 and 8.

*For further reading*

- Baum, Matthew A. 2003. Soft news and political knowledge: Evidence of absence or absence of evidence? *Political Communication* 20 (2):173-190.
- Baum, Matthew A. 2003. *Soft news goes to war: Public opinion and American foreign policy in the new media age*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Gamson, William. 1992. *Talking politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Huckfeldt, Robert R., Paul E. Johnson, and John D. Sprague. 2004. *Political disagreement: The survival of diverse opinions within communication networks*: Cambridge University Press.
- Jerit, Jennifer, Jason Barabas, and Toby Bolsen. 2006. Citizens, knowledge, and the information environment. *American Journal of Political Science* 50 (2):266-82.
- Ksiazek, Thomas B., Edward C. Malthouse, and James G. Webster. 2010. News-seekers and avoiders: Exploring patterns of total news consumption across media and the relationship to civic participation. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* 54 (4):551-568.
- Mondak, Jeffery. 1995. *Nothing to read: Newspapers and elections in a social experiment*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Mutz, Diana C. 2006. *Hearing the other side: Deliberative versus participatory democracy*: Cambridge University Press.
- Neuman, W. Russell, Marion Just, and Ann Crigler. 1992. *Common knowledge: News and the construction of social meaning*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Page, Benjamin I. 1996. *Who deliberates? Mass media in modern democracy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Perloff, Richard M. 2009. Mass media, social perception, and the third-person effect. In *Media effects: Advances in theory and research*, edited by J. Bryant and M. B. Oliver. New York: Routledge.
- Prior, Markus. 2003. Any good news in soft news? The impact of soft news preference on political knowledge. *Political Communication* 20 (2):149-171.
- Walsh, Katherine Cramer. 2004. *Talking about politics: Informal groups and social identity in American life*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Zhao, W., & Chaffee, S. H. 1995. Campaign advertisements versus television news as sources of political issue information. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 59, 41-65.

## 2/19 Making News

- Tuchman, Gaye. 1972. Objectivity as strategic ritual: An examination of newsmen's notions of objectivity. *American Journal of Sociology* 77 (January):660-679. (LSUS)
- Tuchman, Gaye. 1978. *Making news: A study in the construction of reality*. (New York: Free Press.) Chapter 2, "Space and the news net." (M)
- \*Boczkowski, Pablo. 2010. *News at Work: Imitation in an age of information abundance*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4, and 7 (skim chapters 5 and 6).
- \*Groeling, Tim. 2010. *When Politicians Attack: Party Cohesion in the Media*. Cambridge University Pres. Chapters: Introduction, 1,2,5 and Conclusion. (skim other chapters)

*For further reading*

- Arnold, R. Douglas. 2004. *Congress, the press, and political accountability*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Barnhurst, Kevin and Diana Mutz. 1997. "American journalism and the decline in event-centered reporting." *Journal of Communication*. 47(4): 27-53.
- Blumler, Jay, and Michael Gurevitch. 1995. *The crisis of public communication*. New York: Routledge. Chapter 3, "Politicians and the press: An essay on role relationships."
- Boczkowski, Pablo J., Eugenia Mitchelstein, and Martin Walter. 2011. Convergence across divergence: Understanding the gap in the online news choices of journalists and consumers in Western Europe and Latin America. *Communication Research* 38 (3):376-396.
- Cohen, Bernard. 1963. *The press and foreign policy*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Crouse, Timothy. 1973. *The boys on the bus*. New York: Ballantine.
- Darnton, Robert. 1990. Journalism: All the news that fits we print. In *The Kiss of Lamourette: Reflections in Cultural History*, edited by R. Darnton. New York: Norton.
- Entman, Robert. 1991. "Framing U.S. Coverage of international news: Contrasts in narratives of the KAL and Iran Air incidents." *Journal of Communication*. 41(4): 6-27.
- Epstein, Edward. 1973. *News from nowhere*. New York: Vintage.
- Gans, Herbert. 1979. *Deciding What's News: A study of CBS Evening News, NBC Nightly News, Newsweek, and Time*. New York: Pantheon.
- Graber, Doris. A. 2005. *Mass media and American politics*. 7th ed. Washington, DC: CQ Press. Chapter 4, "News Making and News Reporting Routines."
- Kaniss, Phyllis. 1991. *Making local news*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- McQuail, Denis. 2005. *McQuail's mass communication theory*. 5th ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mitchelstein, Eugenia, and Pablo J. Boczkowski. 2009. Between tradition and change: A review of recent research on online news production. *Journalism* 10 (5):562-586.
- Molotch, Harvey, and Marilyn Lester. 1974. News as purposive behavior: On the strategic use of routine events, accidents, and scandals. *American Sociological Review* 39 (1):101-112.
- Parenti, Michael. 1986. *Inventing reality: The politics of the mass media*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Patterson, Thomas. 1993. *Out of order*. New York: Knopf.
- Pew Research Center's Project for Excellence in Journalism. 2008. The changing newsroom. Washington D.C.: Project for Excellence in Journalism. Available URL: <http://www.journalism.org/node/11961>
- Schudson, Michael. 1978. *Discovering the news: A social history of American newspapers*. New York: Basic Books.
- Schudson, Michael. 2000. The sociology of news production revisited (again). In *Mass media and society*, edited by J. Curran and M. Gurevitch. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Shoemaker, Pamela J. 2009. *Mediating the message: Theories of influences on mass media content*. 3rd ed. New York: Routledge.
- Sigal, Leon. 1973. *Reporters and officials: The organization and politics of newsmaking*. Lexington, Mass: D.C. Heath and Co.
- Sparrow, Bartholomew H. 1999. *Uncertain guardians: The news media as a political institution*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Tuchman, Gaye. 1978. *Making news: A study in the construction of reality*. New York: Free Press.

## 2/26 Economics of News Production

- \*Baker, C. Edwin. 2002. *Media, markets, and democracy*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Part I, pp. 1-121.
- \*Hamilton, James T. 2004. *All the news that's fit to sell: How the market transforms information into news*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press. Chapters 1, 2, 3 (skim), 5, and 6.

### *For further reading*

- Albarran, Alan B. 2002. *Media economics: Understanding markets, industries and concepts*. 2nd ed. Ames, IA: Iowa State Press.
- Doyle, Gillian. 2002. *Understanding media economics*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hoskins, Colin, Stuart McFadyen, and Adam Finn. 2004. *Media economics: Applying economics to new and traditional media*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- McChesney, Robert W. 2003. *Corporate media and the threat to democracy*. Seven Stories Press.
- Napoli, Philip M. 2003. *Audience economics: Media institutions and the audience marketplace*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Picard, Robert G. 1989. *Media economics: Concepts and issues*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Webster, James, and Patricia Phalen. 1997. *The mass audience: Rediscovering the dominant model*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Webster, James G., Lawrence W. Lichty, and Patricia F. Phalen. 2005. *Ratings analysis: The theory and practice of audience research*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.

## 3/5 News Autonomy

- Bennett, W. Lance. 1990. Toward a theory of press-state relations in the United States. *Journal of Communication* 40 (2):103-125. (LSUS)
- Bennett, W. Lance, Regina G. Lawrence, and Steven Livingston. 2007. *When the press fails: Political power and the news media from Iraq to Katrina*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Chapter 2 "The Semi-Independent Press". (M)
- Althaus, Scott L. 2003. When news norms collide, follow the lead: New evidence for press independence. *Political Communication* 20 (4):381-414. (LSUS)

\*Hayes, Danny, and Matt Guardino. 2013. *Influence from Abroad: Foreign Voices, the Media, and U.S. Public Opinion*. Cambridge University Press.

*For further reading*

Bennett, W. Lance. 1996. An introduction to journalism norms and representations of politics. *Political Communication* 13 (4):373-384.

Bennett, W. Lance, Regina G. Lawrence, and Steven Livingston. 2007. *When the press fails: Political power and the news media from Iraq to Katrina*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Entman, Robert M. 2003. *Projections of power: Framing news, public opinion and U.S. foreign policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Entman, Robert M. 2003. Cascading activation: Contesting the white house's frame after 9/11. *Political Communication* 20 (4):415-432. (LSUS)

Hallin, Daniel C. 1986. *The "uncensored war": The media and Vietnam*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Herman, Edward, and Noam Chomsky. 1988. *Manufacturing consent: The political economy of the mass media*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Mermin, Jonathan. 1999. *Debating war and peace: Media coverage of U.S. intervention in the post-Vietnam era*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Parenti, Michael. 1986. *Inventing reality: The politics of the mass media*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Sheafer, Tamir, and Gadi Wolfsfeld. 2009. Party systems and oppositional voices in the news media: A study of the contest over political waves in the United States and Israel. *International Journal of Press/Politics* 14 (2):146-165. (LSUS)

Schiffer, Adam J. 2008. *Conditional press influence in politics*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Sellers, Patrick. 2010. *Cycles of spin: Strategic communication in the U.S. Congress*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Wolfsfeld, Gadi. 1997. *Media and political conflict: News from the Middle East*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Wolfsfeld, Gadi. 2004. *Media and the path to peace*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Chapter 1, "Building theory."

Wolfsfeld, Gadi. 2004. *Media and the path to peace*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Zaller, John, and Dennis Chiu. 2000. Government's little helper: U.S. press coverage of foreign policy crises, 1946-1999. In *Decisionmaking in a glass house: Mass media, public opinion, and American and European foreign policy in the 21st century*, edited by B. L. Nacos, R. Y. Shapiro and P. Isernia. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

### **3/12 News Bias**

D'Alessio, M. Allen. 2000. Media bias in presidential elections: A meta-analysis. *The Journal of Communication* 50 (4):133-156. (M)

- Groeling, Tim. 2013. Media Bias by the Numbers: Challenges and Opportunities in the Empirical Study of Partisan News." *Annual Review of Political Science* 16: 129-151.
- Gilens, Martin. 1996. Race and poverty in America: Public misperceptions and the American news media. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 60 (4):515-541. (LSUS)
- Dalton, Russell J., Paul A. Beck, and Robert Huckfeldt. 1998. Partisan cues and the media: Information flows in the 1992 presidential election. *American Political Science Review* 92(1): 111-26. (LSUS)
- Kahn, Kim Fridkin, and Patrick J. Kenney. 2002. The slant of the news: How editorial endorsements influence campaign coverage and citizens' views of candidates. *American Political Science Review* 96:381-94. (LSUS)

*For further reading*

- Grabe, Maria E., and Erik P. Bucy. 2011. Image bite analysis of political visuals: Understanding the visual framing process in election news. In *The sourcebook for political communication research*, edited by E. P. Bucy and R. L. Holbert. New York: Routledge. (M)
- Clawson, Rosalee A., and Rakuya Trice. 2000. Poverty as we know it: Media portrayals of the poor. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 64 (1):53-64.
- Druckman, James N., and Michael Parkin. 2005. The impact of media bias: How editorial slant affects voters. *Journal of Politics* 67 (4):1030-1049.
- Gentzkow, Matthew, and Jesse M. Shapiro. 2010. What drives media slant? Evidence from U.S. daily newspapers. *Econometrica* 78 (1):35-71.
- Gilens, Martin, and Craig Hertzman. 2000. Corporate ownership and news bias: Newspaper coverage of the 1996 Telecommunications Act. *The Journal of Politics* 62 (2):369-386.
- Groeling, Tim, and Samuel Kernell. 1998. Is network news coverage of the president biased? *Journal of Politics* 60 (4):1063-1087.
- Groseclose, Tim, and Jeffrey Milyo. 2005. A measure of media bias. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 120 (4):1191-1237.
- Hofstetter, C. Richard. 1976. *Bias in the news: Network television coverage of the 1972 election campaign*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press. Chapters 1, 2 and 8. (M)
- Niven, David. 2002. *Tilt? The search for media bias*. Westport, CN: Praeger.
- Patterson, Thomas E., and Wolfgang Donsbach. 1996. News decisions: Journalists as partisan actors. *Political Communication* 13:455-68.
- Watts, Mark D., David Domke, Dhavan V. Shah, and David P. Fan. 1999. Elite cues and media bias in presidential campaigns. *Communication Research* 26 (2):144-75.

**3/19 Cross-National Perspectives on Political Communication**

- \*Hallin, Daniel, and Paolo Mancini. 2004. *Comparing media systems: Three models of media and politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4, 8 and 9.

- Strömbäck, Jesper, and Lynda Lee Kaid. 2008. A framework for comparing election news coverage around the world. In *The handbook of election news coverage around the world*, edited by J. Strömbäck and L. L. Kaid. New York: Routledge. (M)
- Aalberg, Toril, Peter van Aelst, and James Curran. 2010. media systems and the political information environment: A cross-national comparison. *The International Journal of Press/Politics* 15 (3):255-271.
- Curran, James, Shanto Iyengar, Anker Brink Lund, and Inka Salovaara-Moring. 2009. Media system, public knowledge and democracy. *European Journal of Communication* 24 (1):5-26.

*For further reading*

- Nisbet, Erik C., and Teresa A. Myers. Forthcoming. Anti-American sentiment as a media effect? Arab media, political identity, and public opinion in the Middle East. *Communication Research*. (LSUS)
- Iyengar, S., J. Curran, A.B. Lund, I. Salovaara-Moring, K.S. Hahn, and S. Coen. 2010. Cross-national versus individual-level differences in political information: A media systems perspective. *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion & Parties* 20 (3):291-309. (M)
- Åsard, Erik, and W. Lance Bennett. 1997. Democracy and the marketplace of ideas: Communication and government in the United States and Sweden. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- de Vreese, Claes H., Susan A. Banducci, Holli A. Semetko, and Hajo G. Boomgaarden. 2006. The news coverage of the 2004 European parliamentary election campaign in 25 countries. *European Union Politics* 7 (4):477-504.
- Esser, Frank, and Barbara Pfetsch, eds. 2004. *Comparing political communication: Theories, cases, and challenges*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ferree, Myra Marx, William A. Gamson, and Jürgen Gerhards. 2002. *Shaping abortion discourse: Democracy and the public sphere in Germany and the United States*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Galtung, Johan, and Mari Holmboe Ruge. 1965. The structure of foreign news: The presentation of the Congo, Cuba and Cyprus Crises in four Norwegian newspapers. *Journal of Peace Research* 2 (1):64-90.
- Howard, Philip N. 2010. *Digital Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy: Information Technology and Political Islam*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Høyer, Sverre, and Horst Pöttker, eds. 2005. *Diffusion of the news paradigm 1850-2000*. Göteborg, Sweden: Nordicom.
- Norris, Pippa. 2000. *A virtuous circle: Political communications in postindustrial societies*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Porto, Mauro P., and Daniel C. Hallin. 2009. Media and democratization in Latin America. *International Journal of Press/Politics* 14 (3):291-295. [see all five articles in this special issue on political communication in Latin America]
- Rugh, William A. 2004. *Arab mass media: Newspapers, radio, and television in Arab politics*. Westport, CN: Praeger.



Plasser, Fritz, and Gunda Plasser. 2002. *Global political campaigning: A worldwide analysis of campaign professionals and their practices*. Westport, CN: Praeger.

Strömbäck, Jesper, and Lynda Lee Kaid, eds. 2008. *The handbook of election news coverage around the world*. New York: Routledge.

Wu, H. Denis. 2000. Systemic determinants of international news coverage: A comparison of 38 countries. *Journal of Communication* 50 (2):110-130.

### 3/26 The Early Trajectory of Media Effects Research

Hovland, Carl I., Arthur A. Lumsdaine, and Fred D. Sheffield. 1949. *Experiments on mass communication*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press. Chapters 2 and 3. (M)

Berelson, Bernard, Paul Lazarsfeld, and William McPhee. 1954. *Voting: A study of opinion formation in a presidential campaign*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Chapter 11, "Political processes: The role of the mass media." (M)

Converse, Philip. 1962. Information flow and the stability of partisan attitudes. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 26:578-599. (LSUS)

Chaffee, Steven H., and J. L. Hochheimer. 1985. The beginnings of political communication research in the United States: Origins of the "limited effects" model. In *The media revolution in America and Western Europe*, edited by E. M. Rogers and F. Balle. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing. (M)

#### *For further reading*

Katz, Elihu, and Paul Lazarsfeld. 1955. *Personal influence: The part played by people in the flow of mass communications*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press. Chapters 1, 2, 12 and 15. (M)

Lazarsfeld, Paul F., and Robert K. Merton. 1948. Mass communication, popular taste and organized social action. In *The communication of ideas, a series of addresses*, edited by L. Bryson. New York: Harper and Brothers.

Klapper, Joseph. 1960. *The effects of mass communication*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Lang, Kurt, and Gladys E. Lang. 2006. Personal influence and the new paradigm: Some inadvertent consequences. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 608 (1):157-178.

Patterson, Thomas, and Robert McClure. 1976. *The unseeing eye: The myth of television power in national politics*. New York: Putnam.

Pooley, Jefferson. 2006. Fifteen pages that shook the field: Personal Influence, Edward Shils, and the remembered history of mass communication research. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 608 (1):130-156.

### 4/2 Media Effects Research since the 1970s

McCombs, Maxwell, and Donald Shaw. 1972. The agenda-setting function of mass media. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 36:176-187. (LSUS)

Iyengar, Shanto, Mark D. Peters, and Donald R. Kinder. 1982. Experimental demonstrations of the 'not-so-minimal' consequences of television news programs. *American Political Science Review* 76 (4):848-858. (LSUS)

Althaus, Scott L., and Young Mie Kim. 2006. Priming effects in complex information environments: Reassessing the impact of news discourse on presidential approval. *Journal of Politics* 68 (4):957-973. (LSUS)

Chong, Dennis, and James N. Druckman. 2010. Dynamic public opinion: Communication effects over time. *American Political Science Review* 104 (4):663-680. (LSUS)

Scheufele, Dietram A., and David Tewksbury. 2007. Framing, agenda setting, and priming: The evolution of three media effects models. *Journal of Communication* 57 (1):9-20. (LSUS)

#### *For further reading*

Bartels, Larry M. 2006. Priming and persuasion in presidential campaigns. In *Capturing campaign effects*, edited by H. E. Brady and R. Johnston. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Berinsky, Adam J., and Donald Kinder. 2006. Making sense of issues through media frames: Understanding the Kosovo crisis. *Journal of Politics*, 68(3), 610-656.

Capella, Joseph N., and Kathleen Hall Jamieson. 1997. *The spiral of cynicism: The press and the public good*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Chong, Dennis, and James N. Druckman. 2007. Framing public opinion in competitive democracies. *American Political Science Review* 101 (4):637-655.

Dearing, James W., and Everett M. Rogers. 1996. *Agenda-setting*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Druckman, James N. 2004. Political preference formation: Competition, deliberation, and the (ir)relevance of framing effects. *American Political Science Review* 98 (4):671-687.

Erbring, Lutz, Edie N. Goldenberg, and Arthur H. Miller. 1980. Front-page news and real-world cues: A new look at agenda-setting by the media. *American Journal of Political Science* 24 (1):16-49.

Freedman, Paul, Michael Franz, and Kenneth Goldstein. 2004. Campaign advertising and democratic citizenship. *American Journal of Political Science* 48 (4):723-41.

Gerber, Alan S., James G. Gimpel, Donald P. Green, and Daron R. Shaw. 2011. How large and long-lasting are the persuasive effects of televised campaign ads? Results from a randomized field experiment. *American Political Science Review* 105 (1):135-150.

Iyengar, Shanto, and Adam F. Simon. 2000. New perspectives and evidence on political communication and campaign effects. *Annual Review of Psychology* 51:149-169.

Iyengar, Shanto, and Donald Kinder. 1987. *News that matters: Television and American opinion*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Iyengar, Shanto. 1990. Framing responsibility for political issues: The case of poverty. *Political Behavior* 12 (1):19-40.

Iyengar, Shanto. 1991. *Is anyone responsible? How television frames political issues*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Just, Marion R., Ann N. Crigler, Dean E. Alger, Timothy E. Cook, Montague Kern, and Darrell M. West. 1996. *Crosstalk: Citizens, candidates, and the media in a presidential campaign*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kinder, Donald R. 1998. Communication and opinion. *Annual Review of Political Science* 1:167-97.
- Krosnick, Jon A., and Laura A. Brannon. 1993. The impact of the Gulf War on the ingredients of presidential evaluations: Multidimensional effects of political involvement. *American Political Science Review*, 87(4), 963-975.
- Krosnick, Jon, and Donald R. Kinder. 1990. Altering the foundations of support for the president through priming. *American Political Science Review* 84 (2):497-512.
- Lodish, Leonard M., Magid Abraham, Stuart Kalmenson, Jeanne Livelsberger, Beth Lubetkin, Bruce Richardson, and Mary Ellen Stevens. 1995. How T.V. advertising works: a meta-analysis of 389 real world split cable T.V. advertising experiments. *Journal of Marketing Research* 32 (2):125-139.
- McGuire, William J. 1985. Attitudes and attitude change. In *Handbook of Social Psychology*, edited by G. Lindzey and E. Aronson. New York: Random House.
- Price, Vincent, and David Tewksbury. 1997. News values and public opinion: A theoretical account of media priming and framing. In *Progress in Communication Sciences*, edited by G. Barnett and F. Boster. London: Ablex Publishing. (M)
- Scheufele, Dietram A. 2000. Agenda-setting, priming, and framing revisited: Another look at cognitive effects of political communication. *Mass Communication and Society* 3 (2):297 - 316.
- Weaver, David, Maxwell McCombs, and D L. Shaw. 2004. Agenda-setting research: Issues, attributes, and influences. In *Handbook of Political Communication Research*, edited by L. L. Kaid. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Zaller, John. 1992. *The nature and origins of mass opinion*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Zaller, John. 1996. The myth of massive media impact revived: New support for a discredited idea. In *Political persuasion and attitude change*, edited by D. C. Mutz, P. M. Sniderman and R. A. Brody. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Zaller, John. 2002. The statistical power of election studies to detect media exposure effects in political campaigns. *Electoral Studies* 21 (2):297-329.

#### 4/9 Selective Exposure Research

- \*Arceneaux, Kevin, and Martin Johnson. *Changing Minds or Changing Channels? Partisan News in an Age of Choice*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2013.
- Iyengar, Shanto, and Kyu S. Hahn. 2009. Red media, blue media: Evidence of ideological selectivity in media use. *Journal of Communication* 59 (1):19-39. (LSUS)
- Stroud, N. J. (2010). Polarization and partisan selective exposure. *Journal of Communication*, 60(3): 556-576.

Bennett, W. Lance, and Shanto Iyengar. 2008. A new era of minimal effects? The changing foundations of political communication. *Journal of Communication* 58 (4):707-731. (LSUS)

Holbert, R. Lance, R. Kelly Garrett, and Laurel S. Gleason. 2010. A new era of minimal effects? A response to Bennett and Iyengar. *Journal of Communication* 60 (1):15-34. (LSUS)

Bennett, W. Lance, and Shanto Iyengar. 2010. The shifting foundations of political communication: Responding to a defense of the media effects paradigm. *Journal of Communication* 60 (1):35-39. (LSUS)

Prior, Markus. 2013. Media and Political Polarization. *Annu. Rev. Polit. Sci.* 2013. 16:101–27.

#### *For further reading*

Stroud, Natalie. 2008. Media use and political predispositions: Revisiting the concept of selective exposure. *Political Behavior* 30 (3):341-366. (LSUS)

Klapper, Joseph. 1960. *The effects of mass communication*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press. Chapter 2, "Reinforcement, minor change, and related phenomena."

Frey, Dieter, and Berkowitz Leonard. 1986. Recent research on selective exposure to information. In *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*: Academic Press.

Iyengar, Shanto, Kyu S. Hahn, Jon A. Krosnick, and John Walker. 2008. Selective exposure to campaign communication: The role of anticipated agreement and issue public membership. *The Journal of Politics* 70 (01):186-200.

Levendusky, Matthew. *How Partisan Media Polarize America*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2013.

Sears, David O., and Jonathan L. Freedman. 1967. Selective exposure to information: A critical review. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 31 (2):194-213.

Stroud, Natalie J. 2011. *Niche news: The politics of news choice*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Sunstein, Cass. 2001. *Republic.com*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

#### **4/16 NO CLASS – SPRING BREAK**

#### **4/23 Current Perspectives on the New Media System**

Schudson, Michael, and Susan E. Tift. 2005. American journalism in historical perspective. In *Institutions of American democracy: The press*, edited by K. H. Jamieson and G. Overholser. New York: Oxford University Press. (M)

Webster, James G. 2005. Beneath the veneer of fragmentation: Television audience polarization in a multichannel world. *Journal of Communication* 55 (2):366-82. (LSUS)

Tewksbury, David. 2005. The seeds of audience fragmentation: Specialization in the use of online news sites. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* 49 (3):332-48.

Hindman, Matthew. 2011. Less of the same: The lack of local news on the Internet. Washington D.C.: Federal Communications Commission. Available URL: [http://transition.fcc.gov/ftp/Daily\\_Releases/Daily\\_Business/2011/db0615/DOC-307524A1.pdf](http://transition.fcc.gov/ftp/Daily_Releases/Daily_Business/2011/db0615/DOC-307524A1.pdf)

Bimber, Bruce. 2012. "Digital Media and Citizenship." In Holli Semetko and Margaret Scrammell, eds. *The SAGE Handbook of Political Communication*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

*For further reading*

W. Lance Bennett, Deen G. Freelon, Muzammil M. Hussain, and Chris Wells. 2012. "Digital Media and Youth Engagement." In Holli Semetko and Margaret Scrammell, eds. *The SAGE Handbook of Political Communication*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Coleman, Stephen, and Jay G. Blumer. 2012. "The Internet and Citizenship: Democratic Opportunity or More of the Same?" In Holli Semetko and Margaret Scrammell, eds. *The SAGE Handbook of Political Communication*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Pew Research Center's Project for Excellence in Journalism. 2010. New media, old media: How blogs and social media agendas relate and differ from the traditional press. Washington D.C.: Project for Excellence in Journalism. Available URL: <http://www.journalism.org/node/20621>

Althaus, Scott L., and David Tewksbury. 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 (2):180-207.

Prior, Markus. 2007. *Post-broadcast democracy: How media choice increases inequality in political involvement and polarizes elections*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ladd, Jonathan M. *Why Americans Hate the Media and How It Matters*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2012.

Barnhurst, Kevin G., and John Nerone. 2001. *The form of news: A history*. New York: Guilford Press.

Zhou, Yuqiong, and Patricia Moy. 2007. Parsing framing processes: The interplay between online public opinion and media coverage. *Journal of Communication* 57 (1):79-98. (LSUS)

Shah, Dhavan V., Jaeho Cho, Seungahn Nah, Melissa R. Gotlieb, Hyunseo Hwang, Nam-Jin Lee, Rosanne M. Scholl, and Douglas M. McLeod. 2007. Campaign ads, online messaging, and participation: Extending the communication mediation model. *Journal of Communication* 57 (4):676-703. (LSUS)

Nie, Norman H., I. I. Darwin W. Miller, Saar Golde, Daniel M. Butler, and Kenneth Winneg. 2010. The World Wide Web and the U.S. political news market. *American Journal of Political Science* 54 (2):428-439. (LSUS)

Hindman, Matthew. 2008. *The myth of digital democracy*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Pew Research Center's Project for Excellence in Journalism. 2010. How news happens: A study of the news ecosystem of one American city. Washington D.C.: Project for Excellence in Journalism. Available URL: [http://www.journalism.org/analysis\\_report/how\\_news\\_happens](http://www.journalism.org/analysis_report/how_news_happens)

Shah, Dhavan V., Jaeho Cho, William P. Eveland, and Nojin Kwak. 2005. Information and expression in a digital age: Modeling Internet effects on civic participation. *Communication Research* 32 (5):531-565.

Shah, Dhavan V., Nojin Kwak, and R. Lance Holbert. 2001. "Connecting" and "disconnecting" with civic life: Patterns of internet use and the production of social capital. *Political Communication* 18(2):141-162.

Tewksbury, David. 2003. What do Americans really want to know? Tracking the behavior of news readers on the Internet. *Journal of Communication* 53(4):694-710. (LSUS)

#### 4/30 The Future of Political Communication

Semetko, Holli A. and Margaret Scammell. 2012. "Introduction: The Expanding Field of Political Communication in the Era of Continuous Connectivity." In Holli Semetko and Margaret Scammell, eds. *The SAGE Handbook of Political Communication*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. (M)

Fred Fletcher and Mary Lynn Young. 2012. "Political Communication in a Changing Media Environment." In Holli Semetko and Margaret Scammell, eds. *The SAGE Handbook of Political Communication*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. (M)

Jacobs, Lawrence R. and Robert Y. Shapiro. 2011. "Public Opinion and the Media in the New Communications Era." In Robert Y. Shapiro and Lawrence R. Jacobs, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of American Public Opinion and the Media*. Oxford University Press. (M)

Newman, Russell W., Bruce Bimber, and Matthew Hindman. 2011. "The Internet and the Four Dimensions of Citizenship." In Robert Y. Shapiro and Lawrence R. Jacobs, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of American Public Opinion and the Media*. Oxford University Press. (M)

Mutz, Diana C., and Paul S. Martin. 2001. Facilitating communication across lines of political difference: The role of mass media. *American Political Science Review* 95(1):97-114. (LSUS)

Blumler, Jay, and Dennis Kavanagh. 1999. The third age of political communication: Influences and features. *Political Communication* 16(3): 209-230. (LSUS)

#### *For further reading*

Blumler, Jay G., and Michael Gurevitch. 2000. Rethinking the study of political communication. In *Mass media and society*, edited by J. Curran and M. Gurevitch. New York: Oxford University Press.

Bennett, W. Lance. 2008. Engineering consent: The persistence of a problematic communication regime. In P. F. Nardulli (Ed.), *Domestic perspectives on contemporary democracy* (pp. 131-154). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

**Audio recording** of The future of political communication research: Where we've been, where we're going. Roundtable discussion at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association in Washington, DC, Aug. Sep. 1-4, 2005.

**5/7 Final papers due in my Political Science mailbox no later than 4:00pm**