

Political Communication Proseminar

SPCM 529, Sec. SA. / PS 519, Sec. SA

2:00-4:50 pm Wednesdays
115 David Kinley Hall
CRN 43499 / 40573 (4 hours)

Professor Scott Althaus
Office: 256 Lincoln Hall

E-mail: salthaus@uiuc.edu
Phone: 333-8968

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 "new media" technologies 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 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 therefore only briefly touch upon 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

The following books are required reading for the course. The Illini Bookstore reports problems ordering the Hamilton book, so you may need to obtain a used copy somewhere. All of the following titles are on reserve at the Communication Library in Gregory Hall:

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

Bennett, W. Lance. 2008. *News: The Politics of Illusion*. 8th ed. New York: Longman.

Dewey, John. 1927. *The public and its problems*. New York: H. Holt and Company.

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.

Lippmann, Walter. 1922. *Public opinion*. New York: Free Press.

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

Other Readings

Electronic copies of most of the assigned readings listed below can be obtained through the Online Research Resources page of the UIUC Library (<http://www.library.uiuc.edu/orr/?mode=J>).

Electronic copies of other assigned readings will be provided by the instructor through a password-protected course Moodle (<https://moodle.atlas.uiuc.edu/>).

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, and graduate students are not allowed to print these readings for free in departmental computer labs. Students are strongly encouraged to organize themselves so that one person is responsible on a rotating basis for printing out, photocopying, and distributing readings assigned for each week.

Assignments and Course Grade

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

- Final research paper or take-home exam (30% of final grade)
- Weekly participation in class discussions (20% of final grade)
- Discussion guides for assigned readings (6-7 short papers, 40% of final grade)
- In-class book presentations (10% of final grade)

Final research paper or take-home exam

Students will be writing a final paper that will be 20-25 double-spaced pages in length. This paper can take either of two forms: a research paper on a topic related to the seminar readings (topic to be determined in consultation with the instructor), or a take-home final exam that requires you to integrate and synthesize the readings from the course. The idea here is to provide you with an opportunity to apply what you have read in the course, either to a substantive research problem, or to stepping back and crystallizing your own perspectives about the theories, research designs, and topics covered in class. Advanced graduate students are encouraged, but not required, to pursue the research paper option. Master's level students are encouraged, but not required, to consider the take-home exam option, which provides an opportunity to integrate and synthesize the full range of course readings.

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 guides for assigned readings

Discussion guides are assigned to provide a collective benefit to all students taking the course. Each week, students will be assigned to write up brief (roughly 1-2 pages, single spaced) discussion guides for particular readings. These guides serve three purposes: (1) they summarize a reading to focus attention on main points and to highlight its relevance to issues of concern in the course, (2) they raise questions about a reading that can be used to stimulate discussion, and (3) they connect new readings to old readings in order to highlight common themes and to point out how current readings raise, address, or underscore questions sparked by previous reading assignments. By the end of the course, each student will possess a discussion guide for every major reading covered during the semester. This collection that will prove invaluable for reviewing course material, studying for comprehensive exams, and as a foundation for future engagement with research conducted in the political communication subfield.

There is no set format for discussion guides, but they should address the three purposes described above in the process of summarizing and raising questions about each reading. In addition to summarizing main arguments/contributions, these guides will be helpful in drawing connections to other readings. Since the set of readings for a given week is often chosen to highlight a particular area of controversy, it will be especially helpful when constructing these guides to note how your assigned reading relates to others assigned in a given week. Keep in mind that our interest is not only in exploring the broad theoretical issues at the heart of research on political communication, but also in exploring the ways that different scholars have attempted to study these issues. Relevant questions therefore include not only theoretical or philosophical issues but also questions related to methodological approaches, research designs, operationalization of key concepts/variables, interpretation of findings, etc.

You are expected to provide enough paper copies of your discussion guides for everyone in the class (one for each student, plus one for me). If you get them to my e-mail account or my Political Science department mailbox by noon on the Tuesday before each class, I will be able to photocopy them for you without charge. If for some reason you will be unable to attend a class for which you are assigned to provide a discussion guide, it is your responsibility to either trade assigned readings with someone else in the class who can attend, or arrange someone else to distribute your discussion guides at the start of the relevant class period.

In-class book presentations

In-class book presentations will consist of two students commenting on each assigned book. Each student taking the class will be responsible for presenting one book. In addition to short in-class presentations, each of the assigned students will also produce short (normally 2-4 page single-spaced) summaries of their comments on the readings. Normally, one student will summarize its main arguments, theoretical contributions, and findings relevant to course projects, while the other critiques those

arguments, contributions, and findings. Other arrangements are possible in consultation with the instructor.

A list of books appears below. **Each of these books should already be on reserve at the Communication Library in Gregory Hall.** Depending on how many students end up taking the class, we may not have sufficient numbers to cover all of these books. Final decisions will be made by the second week of the semester about which books will be assigned. If students have any preferences for presenting one of the books, please make them known: the instructor is happy to take preferences into account when assigning students to books.

Date	Book	Presenters
9/24	Neuman, W. Russell, Marion Just, and Ann Crigler. 1992. <i>Common knowledge: News and the construction of social meaning</i> . Chicago: University of Chicago Press.	Lauren Pantages (presenting) Andy Bloeser (critiquing)
9/24	Mutz, Diana C. 2006. <i>Hearing the Other Side: Deliberative Versus Participatory Democracy</i> . Cambridge University Press.	Jason Rittenberg (presenting) Leslie Caughell (critiquing)
10/15	Entman, Robert M. 2003. <i>Projections of power: Framing news, public opinion and U.S. foreign policy</i> . Chicago: University of Chicago.	
10/15	Bennett, W. Lance, Regina G. Lawrence, and Steven Livingston. 2007. <i>When the press fails: Political power and the news media from Iraq to Katrina</i> . Chicago: University of Chicago.	
10/22	Patterson, Thomas. 1993. <i>Out of order</i> . New York: Vintage Books.	
10/22	Gamson, William. 1992. <i>Talking politics</i> . New York: Cambridge University Press.	
12/3	Johnston, Richard, Michael G. Hagen, and Kathleen Hall Jamieson. 2004. <i>The 2000 presidential election and the foundations of party politics</i> . New York: Cambridge University Press.	
12/3	Shaw, Daron R. 2006. <i>The race to 270: The electoral college and the campaign strategies of 2000 and 2004</i> . Chicago: University of Chicago Press.	

Class Schedule

8/27 Overview of the Field and History of Political Communication [INDIVIDUAL READING ONLY; NO CLASS MEETING DUE TO THE APSA CONVENTION IN BOSTON]

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.

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.

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

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.

For further reading

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.

9/3 Theoretical Origins of the Field: The Lippmann-Dewey Debate

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.

9/10 Normative Perspectives on Political Communication

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

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.

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

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

For further reading

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. 1996. *Models of democracy*. Second ed. Stanford, CA: Stanford University 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.

9/17 Understanding News Exposure

Graber, Doris A. 1988. *Processing the news: How people tame the information tide*. 2nd ed. White Plains: Longman. Chapters 2, 7, 8 and 10

Lang, Annie. 2000. The limited capacity model of mediated message processing. *The Journal of Communication* 50 (1):46-70.

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.

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

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> [Read pages 1-11, read the “conclusions” and “recommendations” portions

of each the five subsections, and read “Summary of Recommendations” section on pages 23-26]

Althaus, Scott, David Tewksbury, Jason Barabas, William Eveland, Myiah Hutchens Hively, Fei Shen, Robert Shapiro, Erika Franklin Fowler, Ken Goldstein, Dhavan Shah. 2008. “Roundtable: Media measures for the ANES” *Political Communication Report* 18(1). Available URL: http://www.jour.unr.edu/pcr/1801_2008_winter/roundtable.html [Read each of the four responses; skim the Althaus and Tewksbury response]

For further reading

Bennett, W. Lance. 2008. *News: The politics of illusion*. 8th ed. New York: Longman. Chapter 3, “The news audience: information processing and public opinion.”

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.

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.

9/24 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.

Mondak, Jeffery. 1995. *Nothing to read: Newspapers and elections in a social experiment*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. Chapter 5, “News media and political discussion.”

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.

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.

Book Presentations

Neuman, W. Russell, Marion Just, and Ann Crigler. 1992. *Common knowledge: News and the construction of social meaning*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Mutz, Diana C. 2006. *Hearing the other side: Deliberative versus participatory democracy*. Cambridge University Press.

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.

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.

Mutz, Diana C., and Paul S. Martin. 2002. Facilitating communication across lines of political difference: The role of mass media. *American Political Science Review* 95 (1):97-114.

Page, Benjamin I. 1996. *Who deliberates? Mass media in modern democracy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

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

Zhao, W., & Chaffee, S. H. 1995. Campaign advertisements versus television news as sources of political issue information. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 59, 41-65.

10/1 Making News

Crouse, Timothy. 1973. *The boys on the bus*. Chapter 1, "On the bus." (New York: Ballantine)

Tuchman, Gaye. 1972. Objectivity as strategic ritual: An examination of newsmen's notions of objectivity. *American Journal of Sociology* 77 (January):660-679.

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.

Tuchman, Gaye. 1978. *Making news: A study in the construction of reality*. New York: Free Press. Chapter 2, "Space and the news net."

Bennett, W. Lance. 2008. *News: The politics of illusion*. 8th ed. New York: Longman. Chapters 5, 6, and 7.

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."

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.

Cohen, Bernard. 1963. *The press and foreign policy*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

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.

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.

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.

- 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.
- 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.
- Tuchman, Gaye. 1978. *Making news: A study in the construction of reality*. New York: Free Press.

10/8 Economics of News Production

- Bennett, W. Lance. 2008. *News: The politics of illusion*. 8th ed. New York: Longman. Chapter 4, "The political economy of news."
- 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

- 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.

10/15 News Autonomy

- Bennett, W. Lance. 1990. Toward a theory of press-state relations in the United States. *Journal of Communication* 40 (2):103-125.
- 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".
- Althaus, Scott L. 2003. When news norms collide, follow the lead: New evidence for press independence. *Political Communication* 20 (4):381-414.

- Entman, Robert M. 2003. Cascading activation: Contesting the white house's frame after 9/11. *Political Communication* 20 (4):415-432.
- Wolfsfeld, Gadi. 2004. *Media and the path to peace*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Chapter 1, "Building theory."
- Wolfsfeld, Gadi, and Tamir Sheafer. 2006. Competing actors and the construction of political news: The contest over waves Israel. *Political Communication* 23:333-54.

Book Presentations

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

For further reading

- Hallin, Daniel C. 1986. *The "uncensored war": The media and Vietnam*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Mermin, Jonathan. 1999. *Debating war and peace: Media coverage of U.S. intervention in the post-Vietnam era*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton 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.
- 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.

10/22 News as Narrative

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.

Pan, Zhongdang, and Gerald M. Kosicki. 1993. Framing analysis: An approach to news discourse. *Political Communication* 10:55-75.

Gamson, William A. 1996. Media discourse as a framing resource. In *The Psychology of Political Communication*, edited by A. N. Crigler. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Problems with the Narrative Style

Bennett, W. Lance. 2008. *News: The Politics of Illusion, 8th ed.* Chapter 2, "News content: Four information biases that matter." (New York: Longman)

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.

Arguments Pro and Con

Patterson, Thomas. 1993. *Out of order*. Chapter 5, "News, truth, and that state of nature we call election coverage." New York: Vintage Books.

Graber, Doris. 1994. "Why voters fail information tests: Can the hurdles be overcome?" *Political Communication*. 11: 331-346.

Book Presentations

Patterson, Thomas. 1993. *Out of order*. New York: Vintage Books.

Gamson, William. 1992. *Talking politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

10/29 News Bias

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.

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

Patterson, Thomas E., and Wolfgang Donsbach. 1996. News decisions: Journalists as partisan actors. *Political Communication* 13:455-68.

- Gilens, Martin. 1996. Race and poverty in America: Public misperceptions and the American news media. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 60 (4):515-541.
- 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.
- 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.

For further reading

- Druckman, James N., and Michael Parkin. 2005. The impact of media bias: How editorial slant affects voters. *Journal of Politics* 67 (4):1030-1049.
- 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.
- Niven, David. 2002. *Tilt? The search for media bias*. Westport, CN: Praeger.
- 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.

11/5 The Early Trajectory of Media Effects Research

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

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.

For further reading

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.

11/12 The Agenda-Setting Tradition

Classic Readings

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

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.

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.

Effects on Policymakers

Cook, Fay Lomax, Tom R. Tyler, Edward G. Goetz, Margaret T. Gordon, David Protes, Donna R. Leff, and Harvey L. Molotch. 1983. Media and agenda setting: Effects on the public, interest group leaders, policy makers, and policy. *The Public Opinion Quarterly* 47 (1):16-35.

Intermedia Agenda-Setting

Danielian, Lucig H., and Stephen D. Reese. 1989. A closer look at intermedia influences on agenda setting: The cocaine issue of 1986. In *Communication campaigns about drugs: Government, media, and the public*, edited by P. J. Shoemaker. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Shaw, D. R., and B. H. Sparrow. 1999. From the inner ring out: News congruence, cue-taking, and campaign coverage. *Political Research Quarterly* 52 (2):323-351.

Current controversies

Takeshita, Toshio. 2006. Current critical problems in agenda-setting research. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* 18 (3):275-296.

For further reading

Bosso, C. J. 1989. Setting the agenda: mass media and the discovery of famine in Ethiopia. *Manipulating public opinion: Essays on public opinion as a dependent variable*:153-74.

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

Edwards, George C., and B. Dan Wood. 1999. Who influences whom? The President, Congress, and the media. *American Political Science Review* 93 (2):327-44.

Golan, Guy. 2006. Intermedia agenda setting and global news coverage: Assessing the influence of the New York Times on three television evening news programs. *Journalism Studies* 7 (2):323-333.

McCombs, Maxwell, and Jian-Hua Zhu. 1995. Capacity, diversity, and volatility of the public agenda: Trends from 1954 to 1994. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 59 (4):495-525.

McCombs, Maxwell, and Salma I. Ghanem. 2001. The convergence of agenda setting and framing. In *Framing public life: Perspectives on media and our understanding of the social world*, edited by S. D. Reese, O. H. Gandy and A. E. Grant. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

McCombs, Maxwell, Donald L. Shaw, and David Weaver, eds. 1997. *Communication and democracy: Exploring the intellectual frontiers in agenda-setting theory*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

McCombs, Maxwell. 2005. A look at agenda-setting: Past, present, and future. *Journalism Studies* 6 (4):543-557.

Mutz, Diana C., and Joe Soss. 1997. Reading public opinion: The influence of news coverage on perceptions of public sentiment. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 61 (3):431-451.

Walgrave, Stefaan, and Peter Van Aelst. 2006. The contingency of the mass media's political agenda setting power: Toward a preliminary theory. *Journal of Communication* 56 (1):88-109.

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.

11/19 Current Perspectives on Information Processing Effects

- 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.
- Iyengar, Shanto. 1990. Framing responsibility for political issues: The case of poverty. *Political Behavior* 12 (1):19-40.
- Druckman, James N. 2004. Political preference formation: Competition, deliberation, and the (ir)relevance of framing effects. *American Political Science Review* 98 (4):671-687.
- 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.
- 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.
- Davison, W. Phillips. 1983. The third-person effect in communication. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 47:1-15.

For further reading

- Capella, Joseph N., and Kathleen Hall Jamieson. 1997. *The spiral of cynicism: The press and the public good*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Iyengar, Shanto, and Donald Kinder. 1987. *News that matters: Television and American opinion*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Iyengar, Shanto. 1991. *Is anyone responsible?: How television frames political issues*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Perloff, Richard M. 2002. The third-person effect. In *Media effects: Advances in theory and research*, edited by J. Bryant and D. Zillman. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- 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.

11/26 [NO CLASS—THANKSGIVING BREAK]

12/3 Current Perspectives on Persuasion and Learning in the Campaign Context

- 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.
- 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.
- Zaller, John. 2002. The statistical power of election studies to detect media exposure effects in political campaigns. *Electoral Studies* 21 (2):297-329.
- 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.
- Franz, Michael M., and Travis N. Ridout. 2007. Does political advertising persuade? *Political Behavior* 29:465-91.

Book presentations

- Johnston, Richard, Michael G. Hagen, and Kathleen Hall Jamieson. 2004. *The 2000 presidential election and the foundations of party politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Shaw, Daron R. 2006. *The race to 270: The electoral college and the campaign strategies of 2000 and 2004*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

For further reading

- Freedman, Paul, Michael Franz, and Kenneth Goldstein. 2004. Campaign advertising and democratic citizenship. *American Journal of Political Science* 48 (4):723-41.
- Iyengar, Shanto, and Adam F. Simon. 2000. New perspectives and evidence on political communication and campaign effects. *Annual Review of Psychology* 51:149-169.
- 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.

McGuire, William J. 1985. Attitudes and attitude change. In *Handbook of Social Psychology*, edited by G. Lindzey and E. Aronson. New York: Random House.

Zaller, John. 1992. *The nature and origins of mass opinion*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

12/10 Fragmentation, Manipulation, and the Future of Political Communication

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

Bennett, W. Lance. 2008. Political communication and democratic governance: From mass society to personal information networks. In *Domestic perspectives on contemporary democracy*, edited by P. F. Nardulli. 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.