

PWM-CS-HS2: Computational Social Science II

Digital Challenges to Institutions

Syllabus

Lecturer:

Prof. Dr. Andreas Jungherr

Contact:

Email: andreas.jungherr@uni-bamberg.de

Webseite: <https://andreasjungherr.net>

FMA/01.12

Feldkirchenstraße 21

96052 Bamberg

Office hours:

By appointment.

Secretary:

Silke Raffel

Email: silke.raffel@uni-bamberg.de

Phone: +49 951 863-2738

FMA/01.11

Feldkirchenstraße 21

96052 Bamberg

1 Course description:

Digital technology has enabled challenges to various societal institutions. These challenges emerge on the organizational and normative level of institutions. For instance, on the organizational level, we are witnessing challenges to media organizations or established political parties. While on the normative level, we witness challenges to the goals and actual workings of institutions along the lines of social justice and political representation. Some of these challenges promise a reinvigoration and strengthening of democratic participation and representation, while some aim at a restriction of participatory rights and political representation to specific groups.

In this course, we investigate various digitally enabled challenges to important societal institutions, such as journalism or political parties.

Please address your questions regarding entering the course to Mrs. Silke Raffel (silke.raffel@uni-bamberg.de).

Learning objectives:

- Advanced understanding of concepts, theories, causal relationships and methods relevant to the discussion and the investigation of digitally enabled challenges to institutions;
- Knowledge of the central paradigms in theory and research methods relevant to the discussion and the investigation of digitally enabled challenges to institutions and the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches;
- Understanding of the applicability or transfer of theories and paradigms from different scientific areas in relation to digitally enabled challenges to institutions.

2 Course requirements

2.1 Regular and active participation

The course features the discussion of the required readings. To benefit, students are expected to read the texts listed as required readings before each session and actively participate in the discussion for each session. In preparing the texts for each session, please use the following guiding questions where appropriate:

- What are the research questions?
- Which concepts are introduced to describe or analyze a phenomenon?
- How are these concepts measured?
- What causal relationships do the authors suggest or test?
- What methods do the authors use?
- Identify (dis)agreements between authors in this area.
- What do you feel is missing from the field? What choices by researchers in the field seem surprising to you?
- How can computational methods help in analyzing the phenomenon in question or associated puzzles.

If you are unclear about the terms used above, check out the following background readings:

- On concepts: Chapter 2, What Happened? in Howard, C. (2017). *Thinking like a political scientist: A practical guide to research methods*. The University of Chicago Press.
- On measurements: Chapter 2, What Happened? in Howard, C. (2017). *Thinking like a political scientist: A practical guide to research methods*. The University of Chicago Press.

- On causal relationships: Chapter 3, Why? in Howard, C. (2017). *Thinking like a political scientist: A practical guide to research methods*. The University of Chicago Press.
- On research design and methods: Chapter 4, Choosing a Research Design in Howard, C. (2017). *Thinking like a political scientist: A practical guide to research methods*. The University of Chicago Press.

Word to the wise: Not knowing these terms and being unable to use them will hurt you when trying to write your final paper.

You will find it useful to keep notes on the papers read by you.

2.2 Presentation

Students will be asked to present a research paper during one of the topical session. During the first session, each student will be assigned a text from the listed readings for presentations.

Please keep the following considerations in mind in preparing your presentation:

- Please plan your presentation to take between 10-15 minutes;
- Please prepare a slide deck with a presentation program of your choice (except for Prezi);
- In preparing the presentation please follow the guidelines discussed in the first session;
- Please prepare a handout of one to two pages for your fellow students, summarizing the main points of your presentation;
- Upload the handout on the day your presentation is due to the assignment folder on the course's Ilias repository. Use the following template for the filename "your_last_name-handout.pdf";
- The presentation will be graded and contribute 30% to your final grade.

If you do not follow these questions and guidelines this will be reflected in your grade.

Background Readings:

- Schwabish, J. (2017). *Better presentations: A guide for scholars, researchers, and wonks*. Columbia University Press.

2.3 Term paper

Students will be asked to hand in a term paper. Please adhere to the following guidelines:

- Style requirements:
 - Font: Times New Roman, 12pt;

- Line separation: 1.5;
 - Page borders: 2.5 cm left and right, 2cm above and below;
 - Page set: Block;
 - The first line of each paragraph is indented;
- Citation Style: Please follow the citation convention of the American Political Science Review (APSR) available at <http://www.apsanet.org/APSR-Submission-Guidelines-August-2016>, or you could simply use the reference style *APA* in the references manager of your choice;
 - Cover page: University, department, course title, paper title, name, Matriknr., semester count, study program, and e-mail-address;
 - Length: ca. 4000 words +/-10%
 - Deadline: Please return the paper on March 31 electronically at andreas.jungherr@uni-bamberg.de and by hardcopy with Silke Raffel (room FMA/01.11). The date is mandatory and can only be extended in case of officially certified illness;
 - Use the following template for the filename "your_last_name-paper.pdf".
 - The term paper will be graded and contribute 70% to your final grade.

Background Readings:

- Basbøll, T. (2018a). The paper. *Inframethodology*. https://blog.cbs.dk/inframethodology/?page_id=614.
- Becker, H. S. (1998). *Tricks of the trade: How to think about your research while you're doing it*. The University of Chicago Press.
- Becker, H. S. (2020). *Writing for social scientists: How to start and finish your thesis, book, or article* (3rd ed.). University of Chicago Press.
- Belcher, W. L. (2019). *Writing your journal article in 12 weeks: A guide to academic publishing success* (2nd ed.). The University of Chicago Press.
- Gerring, J. (2012). *Social science methodology: A unified framework* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Howard, C. (2017). *Thinking like a political scientist: A practical guide to research methods*. The University of Chicago Press.
- Luker, K. (2008). *Salsa dancing into the social sciences: Research in an age of info-glut*. Harvard University Press.

3 Course plan

Class will meet online at the following dates and times:

Wednesday 10:00–12:00 c.t.

- 3.1 Week 1: Introduction (20. October)**
 - 3.2 Week 2: Contesting institutions (27. October)**
 - 3.3 Week 3: Communication infrastructures and the challenge of institutions (3. November)**
 - 3.4 Week 4: Legitimizing challenges: Injustice, Representation, and Voice (10. November)**
 - 3.5 Week 5: Challenging the news 1 – Economics (17. November)**
 - 3.6 Week 6: Challenging the news 2 – Partisan media (24. November)**
 - 3.7 Week 7: Challenging the news 3 – The media as enemy (1. December)**
 - 3.8 Week 8: Challenging party democracy 1 – Populism (8. December)**
 - 3.9 Week 9: Challenging party democracy 2 – Technocracy (15. December)**
 - 3.10 Week 10: Challenging party democracy 3 – Strong leaders (22. December)**
 - 3.11 Week 11: Challenging party democracy 4 – Social movements (12. January)**
 - 3.12 Week 12: Challenging science (19. January)**
 - 3.13 Week 13: Suppressing challenges (26. January)**
 - 3.14 Week 14: Using challenges (2. February)**
 - 3.15 Week 15: Conclusion & discussion (9. February)**
-

3.1 Week 1: Introduction (20. October)

3.2 Week 2: Contesting institutions (27. October)

Required Reading:

- Fligstein, N., & McAdam, D. (2012). *A theory of fields*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199859948.001.0001>. Chapter 4: Change and Stability in Strategic Action Fields (p. 83–113)
- Offe, C. (2006). Political institutions and social power: Conceptual explorations. In I. Shapiro, S. Skowronek, & D. Galvin (Eds.), *Rethinking political institutions. the art of the state* (pp. 9–31). New York University Press.

Background Readings:

- Fligstein, N., & McAdam, D. (2012). *A theory of fields*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199859948.001.0001>.
- Levin, Y. (2020). *A time to build: From family and community to Congress and the campus, how recommitting to our institutions can revive the American Dream*. Basic Books.
- Müller, J.-W. (2021a). *Democracy rules*. Allen Lane.
- Streeck, W., & Thelen, K. (2005). Introduction: Institutional change in advanced political economies. In W. Streeck & K. Thelen (Eds.), *Beyond continuity: Institutional change in advanced political economies* (pp. 1–39). Oxford University Press.

3.3 Week 3: Communication infrastructures and the challenge of institutions (3. November)

Required Reading:

- Castells, M. (2013). *Communication power* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press. Introduction to the 2013 Edition (p. xix–xivii).
- Jungherr, A., Schroeder, R., & Stier, S. (2019). Digital media and the surge of political outsiders: Explaining the success of political challengers in the United States, Germany, and China. *Social Media + Society*, 5(3), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305119875439>.

Background Readings:

- Atkinson, J. D. (2009). *Alternative media and politics of resistance: A communication perspective*. Peter Lang Publishing.
- Bailard, C. S. (2014). *Democracy's double-edged sword: How internet use changes citizens' views of their government*. Johns Hopkins University Press.

- Gurri, M. (2018). *The revolt of the public and the crisis of authority in the new millennium* (2nd ed.). Stripe Press.
- Jungherr, A., & Schroeder, R. (2021a). *Digital transformations of the public arena*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009064484>.

Presentations:

- Bailard, C. S. (2012). A field experiment on the internet's effect in an African election: Savvier citizens, disaffected voters, or both? *Journal of Communication*, 62(2), 330–344. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2012.01632.x>.
- Nisbet, E. C., Stoycheff, E., & Pearce, K. E. (2012). Internet use and democratic demands: A multinational, multilevel model of internet use and citizen attitudes about democracy. *Journal of Communication*, 62(2), 249–265. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2012.01627.x>.

3.4 Week 4: Legitimizing challenges: Injustice, Representation, and Voice (10. November)

Required Reading:

- Freelon, D., Marwick, A., & Kreiss, D. (2020). False equivalencies: Online activism from left to right. *Science*, 369(6508), 1197–1201. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abb2428>.
- Mouffe, C. (2016). Democratic politics and conflict: An agonistic approach. *Política común*, 9. <https://doi.org/10.3998/pc.12322227.0009.011>.

Background Readings:

- Bennett, W. L., Lawrence, R. G., & Livingston, S. (2007). *When the press fails: Political power and the news media from Iraq to be Katrina*. The University of Chicago Press.
- della Porta, D. (2020). Conceptualising backlash movements: A (patch-worked) perspective from social movement studies. *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 22(4), 585–597. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1369148120947360>.
- Hirschman, A. O. (1970). *Exit, voice, and loyalty: Responses to decline in firms, organizations, and states*. Harvard University Press.
- Mair, P. (2013). *Ruling the void: The hollowing of Western democracy*. Verso.
- Marantz, A. (2019). *Antisocial: Online extremists, techno-utopians, and the hijacking of the American conversation*. Viking.
- Rosanvallon, P. (2011). *Democratic legitimacy: Impartiality, reflexivity, proximity*. Princeton University Press.

- Schäfer, A., & Zürn, M. (2021). *Die demokratische Regression*. Suhrkamp.

Presentations:

- Richardson, A. V. (2017). Bearing witness while black: Theorizing African American mobile journalism after Ferguson. *Digital Journalism*, 5(6), 673–698. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2016.1193818>.
- Rodríguez-Pose, A. (2018). The revenge of the places that don't matter (and what to do about it). *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, 11(1), 189–209. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cjres/rsx024>.

3.5 Week 5: Challenging the news 1 – Economics (17. November)

Required Reading: Background Readings:

- Nielsen, R. K. (2020). Economic contexts of journalism. In K. Wahl-Jorgensen & T. Hanitzsch (Eds.), *The handbook of journalism studies* (2nd ed., pp. 324–340). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315167497-21>.

Background Readings:

- Auletta, K. (2018). *Frenemies: The epic disruption of the ad business (and everything else)*. Penguin Press.
- Hamilton, J. T. (2004). *All the news that's fit to sell: How the market transforms information into news*. Princeton University Press.
- Petre, C. (2021). *All the news that's fit to click: How metrics are transforming the work of journalists*. Princeton University Press.
- Rusbridger, A. (2018). *Breaking news: The remaking of journalism and why it matters now*. Canongate.
- Usher, N. (2021). *News for the rich, white, and blue: How place and power distort American journalism*. Columbia University Press.

Presentations:

- Gentzkow, M., & Shapiro, J. M. (2008). Competition and truth in the market for news. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 22(2), 133–154. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.22.2.133>.
- Martin, G. J., & McCrain, J. (2019). Local news and national politics. *American Political Science Review*, 113(2), 372–384. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055418000965>.
- Sehl, A., Cornia, A., & Nielsen, R. K. (2021). How do funding models and organizational legacy shape news organizations' social media strategies? a comparison of public service and private sector news media in six countries. *Digital Journalism*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2021.1968920>.

3.6 Week 6: Challenging the news 2 – Partisan media (24. November)

Required Reading:

- Prior, M. (2013). Media and political polarization. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 16, 101–127. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-100711-135242>.

Background Readings:

- Arceneaux, K., & Johnson, M. (2013). *Changing minds or changing channels? partisan news in an age of choice*. The University of Chicago Press.
- Berry, J. M., & Sobieraj, S. (2016). *The outrage industry: Political opinion media and the new incivility*. Oxford University Press.
- Groeling, T. (2013). Media bias by the numbers: Challenges and opportunities in the empirical study of partisan news. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 16, 129–151. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-040811-115123>.
- Hemmer, N. (2016). *Messengers of the right: Conservative media and the transformation of American politics*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Lichter, S. R. (2017). Theories of media bias. In K. Kenski & K. H. Jamieson (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of political communication* (pp. 403–416). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199793471.013.44_update_001.
- Peck, R. (2019). *Fox populism: Branding conservatism as working class*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108634410>.
- Sherman, G. (2014). *The loudest voice in the room: How the brilliant, bombastic Roger Ailes built Fox News – and divided a country*. Random House.
- Stroud, N. J. (2011). *Niche news: The politics of news choice*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199755509.001.0001>.

Presentations:

- Arceneaux, K., Johnson, M., Lindstädt, R., & Wielen, R. J. V. (2015). The influence of news media on political elites: Investigating strategic responsiveness in Congress. *American Journal of Political Science*, 60(1), 5–29. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12171>.
- Martin, G. J., & Yurukoglu, A. (2017). Bias in cable news: Persuasion and polarization. *American Economic Review*, 107(9), 2565–2599. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.20160812>.

3.7 Week 7: Challenging the news 3 – The media as enemy (1. December)

Required Reading:

- Holt, K., Figenschou, T. U., & Firschlich, L. (2019). Key dimensions of alternative news media. *Digital Journalism*, 7(7), 860–869. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2019.1625715>.

Background Readings:

- Barwise, P., & York, P. (2020). *The war against the BBC: How an unprecedented combination of hostile forces is destroying Britain's greatest cultural institution... and why you should care*. Penguin Books.
- Feldman, L. (2017). The hostile media effect. In K. Kenski & K. H. Jamieson (Eds.), *The oxford handbook of political communication* (pp. 549–564). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199793471.013.011_update_001.
- Haller, M. (2017). *Die "Flüchtlingskrise" in den Medien*. Otto Brenner Stiftung. <https://www.otto-brenner-stiftung.de/wissenschaftsportal/informationsseiten-zu-studien-2021/studien-2017/die-fluechtlingskrise-in-den-medien/>.
- Ladd, J. M. (2012). *Why Americans hate the media and how it matters*. Princeton University Press.

Presentations:

- Maurer, M., Jost, P., Haßler, J., & Kruschinski, S. (2019). Auf den Spuren der Lügenpresse: Zur Richtigkeit und Ausgewogenheit der Medienberichterstattung in der "Flüchtlingskrise". *Publizistik*, 64(1), 15–35. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11616-018-00466-y>.
- Sehl, A., Simon, F. M., & Schroeder, R. (2020). The populist campaigns against European public service media: Hot air or existential threat? *International Communication Gazette*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1748048520939868>.

3.8 Week 8: Challenging party democracy 1 – Populism (8. December)

Required Reading:

- Bonikowski, B. (2017). Ethno-nationalist populism and the mobilization of collective resentment. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 68(S1), S181–S213. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-4446.12325>.

Background Readings:

- Mouffe, C. (2018). *For a left populism*. Verso.
- Müller, J.-W. (2016). *What is populism?* University of Pennsylvania Press.

- Pappas, T. S. (2019). *Populism and liberal democracy: A comparative and theoretical analysis*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198837886.001.0001>.
- Rosanvallon, P. (2020a). *Das Jahrhundert des Populismus: Geschichte – Theorie – Kritik*. Hamburger Edition.

Presentations:

- Baldwin-Philippi, J. (2019). The technological performance of populism. *New Media & Society*, 21(2), 376–397. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444818797591>.
- Gerbaudo, P. (2018). Social media and populism: An elective affinity? *Media, Culture & Society*, 40(5), 745–753. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0163443718772192>.
- Watts, J., & Bale, T. (2019). Populism as an intra-party phenomenon: The British Labour Party under Jeremy Corbyn. *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 21(1), 99–115. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1369148118806115>.

3.9 Week 9: Challenging party democracy 2 – Technocracy (15. December)

Required Reading:

- Bickerton, C., & Accetti, C. I. (2020). Technocracy and political theory. In E. Bertsou & D. Caramani (Eds.), *The technocratic challenge to democracy* (pp. 29–43). Routledge.

Background Readings:

- Bertsou, E., & Caramani, D. (Eds.). (2020b). *The technocratic challenge to democracy*. Routledge.
- Bickerton, C. J., & Accetti, C. I. (2021). *Technopopulism: The new logic of democratic politics*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198807766.001.0001>.
- Caramani, D. (2017). Will vs. reason: The populist and technocratic forms of political representation and their critique to party government. *American Political Science Review*, 111(1), 54–67. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055416000538>.

Presentations:

- Bertsou, E., & Caramani, D. (2020a). People haven't had enough of experts: Technocratic attitudes among European citizens. *American Journal of Political Science*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12554>.
- Deseriis, M. (2020). Digital movement parties: A comparative analysis of the technopolitical cultures and the participation platforms of the movimento 5 stelle and the piratenpartei. *Information, Communication & Society*, 23(12), 1770–1786. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2019.1631375>.

3.10 Week 10: Challenging party democracy 3 – Strong leaders (22. December)

Required Reading:

- Pasquino, G. (2007). The five faces of Silvio Berlusconi: The knight of anti-politics. *Modern Italy*, 12(1), 39–54. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13532940601134817>.
- Rahat, G., & Kenig, O. (2018). *From party politics to personalized politics? party change and political personalization in democracies*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198808008.001.0001>. Chapter 6: Political Personalization (p. 115–136).

Background Readings:

- Castaldo, A., & Verzichelli, L. (2020). Technocratic populism in Italy after Berlusconi: The trendsetter and his disciples. *Politics and Governance*, 8(4), 485–495. <https://doi.org/10.17645/pag.v8i4.3348>.
- Pedder, S. (2018). *Revolution française: Emmanuel Macron and the quest to reinvent a nation*. Bloomsbury Continuum.
- Popkin, S. L. (2021). *Crackup: The Republican implosion and the future of presidential politics*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190913823.001.0001>.
- Stille, A. (2006). *The sack of Rome: Media + money + celebrity = power = Silvio Berlusconi*. The Penguin Press.
- Urbinati, N. (2019). *Me the people: How populism transforms democracy*. Harvard University Press.

Presentations:

- de Nadal, L. (2021). On populism and social movements: From the Indignados to Podemos. *Social Movement Studies*, 20(1), 36–56. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14742837.2020.1722626>.
- Galvin, D. J. (2020). Party domination and base mobilization: Donald Trump and Republican party building in a polarized era. *The Forum*, 18(2), 135–168. <https://doi.org/10.1515/for-2020-2003>.
- Perottino, M., & Guasti, P. (2020). Technocratic populism à la française? the roots and mechanisms of Emmanuel Macron's success. *Politics and Governance*, 8(4), 545–555. <https://doi.org/10.17645/pag.v8i4.3412>.

3.11 Week 11: Challenging party democracy 4 – Social movements (12. January)

Required Reading:

- Cammaerts, B. (2012). Protest logics and the mediation opportunity structure. *European Journal of Communication*, 27(2), 117–134. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0267323112441007>.
- Gitlin, T. (2013). Occupy's predicament: The moment and the prospects for the movement. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 64(1), 3–25. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-4446.12001>.

Background Readings:

- Haunss, S., & Sommer, M. (Eds.). (2020). *Fridays for Future – Die Jugend gegen den Klimawandel*. transcript. <https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839453476>.
- della Porta, D., Fernández, J., Kouki, H., & Mosca, L. (2017). *Movement parties against austerity*. Polity Press.
- Karpf, D. (2012a). *The MoveOn effect: The unexpected transformation of american political advocacy*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199898367.001.0001>.
- Rosanvallon, P. (2008). *Counter-democracy: Politics in an age of distrust*. Cambridge University Press.

Presentations:

- Chamorel, P. (2019). Macron versus the yellow vests. *Journal of Democracy*, 30(4), 48–62. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jod.2019.0068>.
- Dennis, J. (2020). A party within a party posing as a movement? Momentum as a movement faction. *Journal of Information Technology & Politics*, 17(2), 97–113. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19331681.2019.1702608>.
- Rucht, D., & Rink, D. (2020). Mobilisierungsprozesse von Fridays for Future. In S. Haunss & M. Sommer (Eds.), *Fridays for Future – Die Jugend gegen den Klimawandel* (pp. 95–114). transcript. <https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839453476-004>.
- Tillery Jr., A. B. (2019). What kind of movement is Black Lives Matter? the view from Twitter. *Journal of Race, Ethnicity, and Politics*, 4(2), 297–323. <https://doi.org/10.1017/rep.2019.17>.

3.12 Week 12: Challenging science (19. January)

Required Reading:

- Hilgartner, S., Hurlbut, J. B., & Jasanoff, S. (2021). Was “science” on the ballot? *Science*, 371(6532), 893–894. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abf8762>.

- Iljerman, H., Lewis Jr., N. A., Przybylski, A. K., Weinstein, N., DeBruine, L., Ritchie, S. J., Vazire, S., Forscher, P. S., Morey, R. D., Ivory, J. D., & Anvari, F. (2020). Use caution when applying behavioural science to policy. *Nature Human Behavior*, 4, 1092–1094. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-020-00990-w>.
- Michaels, D., & Monfortonis, C. (2005). Manufacturing uncertainty: Contested science and the protection of the public's health and environment. *American Journal of Public Health*, 95(S1), S39–S48.
- Nogrady, B. (2021). 'I hope you die': How the COVID pandemic unleashed attacks on scientists. *Nature*, 598, 250–253. <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-021-02741-x>.

Background Readings:

- Giddens, A. (2011). *The politics of climate change*. Polity Press.
- Hulme, M. (2009). *Why we disagree about climate change: Understanding controversy, inaction and opportunity*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511841200>.
- Kitcher, P. (2001). *Science, truth, and democracy*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/0195145836.001.0001>.
- Kitcher, P. (2011). *Science in a democratic society*. Prometheus Books.
- McIntyre, L. (2018). *Post-truth*. The MIT Press.
- Oreskes, N., & Conway, E. M. (2010). *Merchants of doubt: How a handful of scientists obscured the truth on issues from tobacco smoke to global warming*. Bloomsbury Press.
- Pielke Jr., R. A. (2007). *The honest broker: Making sense of science in policy and politics: Making sense for science in policy and politics*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511818110>.
- Saltelli, A., Bammer, G., Bruno, I., Charters, E., Di Fiore, M., Didier, E., Espeland, W. N., Kay, J., Piano, S. L., Mayo, D., Pielke Jr., R. A., Portaluri, T., Porter, T. M., Puy, A., Rafols, I., Ravetz, J. R., Reinert, E., Sarewitz, D., Stark, P. B., ... Vineis, P. (2020). Five ways to ensure that models serve society: A manifesto. *Nature*, 582, 482–484. <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-020-01812-9>.

Presentations:

- Kahan, D. M., Peters, E., Wittlin, M., Slovic, P., Ouellette, L. L., Braman, D., & Mandel, G. (2012). The polarizing impact of science literacy and numeracy on perceived climate change risks. *Nature Climate Change*, 2, 732–735. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate1547>.
- Pielke Jr., R. A., & Ritchie, J. (2021). Distorting the view of our climate future: The misuse and abuse of climate pathways and scenarios. *Energy Research & Social Science*, 72(101890). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2020.101890>.

3.13 Week 13: Suppressing challenges (26. January)

Required Reading:

- Keller, D., & Leerssen, P. (2020). Facts and where to find them: Empirical research on internet platforms and content moderation. In N. Persily & J. A. Tucker (Eds.), *Social media and democracy: The state of the field, prospects for reform* (pp. 220–251). Cambridge University Press.

Background Readings:

- Kaye, D. (2019). *Speech police: The global struggle to govern the internet*. Columbia Global Reports.
- Roberts, M. E. (2018). *Censored: Distraction and diversion inside China's great firewall*. Princeton University Press.
- Strossen, N. (2018). *Hate: Why we should resist it with free speech, not censorship*. Oxford University Press.
- Weidmann, N. B., & Rød, E. G. (2019). *The internet and political protest in autocracies*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190918309.001.0001>.

Presentations:

- King, G., Pan, J., & Roberts, M. E. (2017). How the chinese government fabricates social media posts for strategic distraction, not engaged argument. *American Political Science Review*, 111(3), 484–501. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055417000144>.
- Pan, J. (2017). How market dynamics of domestic and foreign social media firms shape strategies of internet censorship. *Problems of Post-Communism*, 64(3-4), 167–188. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10758216.2016.1181525>.

3.14 Week 14: Using challenges (2. February)

Required Reading:

- Schwartzberg, M. (2015). Epistemic democracy and its challenges. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 18, 187–203. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-110113-121908>.

Background Readings:

- Benkler, Y. (2011). *The penguin and the leviathan: How cooperation triumphs over self-interest*. Crown Publishing Group.
- Higgins, E. (2021). *We are Bellingcat: An intelligence agency for the people*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

- Kay, J., & King, M. (2020). *Radical uncertainty: Decision-making beyond the numbers*. W. W. Norton & Company.
- Lafont, C. (2020). *Democracy without shortcuts: A participatory conception of deliberative democracy*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198848189.001.0001>.
- Landemore, H. (2012). *Democratic reason: Politics, collective intelligence, and the rule of the many*. Princeton University Press.
- Landemore, H., & Elster, J. (Eds.). (2012). *Collective wisdom: Principles and mechanisms*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511846427>.
- Surowiecki, J. (2004). *The wisdom of crowds: Why the many are smarter than the few and how collective wisdom shapes business, economies, societies and nations*. Random House.

Presentations:

- Lee, D., Levi, M., & Brown, J. (2021). Democratic societal collaboration in a whitewater world. *Digital technology and democratic theory* (pp. 219–240). The University of Chicago Press. <https://doi.org/10.7208/9780226748603-009>.
- Theocharis, Y., Vitoratou, S., & Sajuria, J. (2017). Civil society in times of crisis: Understanding collective action dynamics in digitally-enabled volunteer networks. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 22(5), 248–265. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcc4.12194>.

3.15 Week 15: Conclusion & discussion (9. February)