**Hsueh comments on Murphy dissertation draft (12-13)**

**General comments**

I read your dissertation’s different studies to be broadly about the relationship between globalization and the state, whether it is the emergence of the welfare state and the mediating role of media in affecting individual attitudes toward the state’s role or the quality of democracy as understood by level/ nature of media freedom. In other words, the general themes are the globalization-media-welfare nexus and the globalization-media democracy nexus.

Your Introduction’s literature review should therefore focus on the different perspectives on the relationship between globalization and the state and society and how your study on media’s effects (with competing scholastic perspectives on this effect) sheds new light on the relationship between state and society and globalization. Media is explanatory variable (study #1), dependent variable (study #2), and mediating variable (study #3), respectively, in each of your studies.

I concur with you that when perusing dissertations I read the first couple of chapters and I too form a quick impression. It is because of this Orfeo and I agree that the Introduction chapter should be strong, even if error on the side of narrowness and succinctness.

I also agree with Orfeo that the first and third studies should come first, and the second study should be the last one. The first two studies examine media’s effects and the third study, study how media is affected by economic globalization.

You can be more philosophical on how your studies contribute to intellectual history on media’s effect on politics in the Conclusion chapter. Importantly, you should discuss the implications of each of your papers for the literature on the relationship between globalization and the welfare state and the relationship between globalization and democracy. For example, that liberalization of trade (as opposed to liberalization of FDI and capital markets) does not necessarily lead to more democratic societies in the short- and long-run because trade openness does not require nor necessitate transparency is an unique argument and important finding; and complements existing scholarship on the relationship between economic liberalization and authoritarianism and economic liberalization and increased social control, etc.

**Introduction chapter**

You do not state until page 7 that “the overarching thesis of this volume…is that the rise of modern media around the world has, in different ways, helped state elites to promote certain perceptions of international integration to fundamentally undemocratic ends.” Is this in fact your overarching thesis? If so, how exactly does each study get at a piece of this argument and why should we care? This needs to be stated really early on and should be the main goal of your Introduction chapter.

I suggest starting with a clear puzzle or set of puzzles, which motivates your three studies on media and globalization. You don’t even use the word puzzle or state explicitly what is it that you find particularly puzzling until page 4!

Beware of far-reaching statements. For example, this is pretty far-reaching, beyond the scope of your dissertation, to argue that variation in domestic media environments explains why some states have liberalized more inclusively and others liberalized more exclusively: “It is the view of this dissertation that variation across domestic media environments can help us to explain broad empirical patterns in global and comparative political economy, such as why some states in some periods have liberalized in broadly inclusive ways, (for instance, the “embedded liberalism” of post-war Europe (Ruggie 1982), while others have liberalized far less inclusively (for instance, the many neoliberal economic openings of the late 1980s).” Do you do that? Not sure any of your three studies actually address these broad patterns.

Beyond stating explicitly your dissertation’s puzzle(s), you should explicitly name your IV and DV’s dimensions before introducing the analytical framework in such general terms: “Although this is the general pattern to which the following studies testify, each study disaggregates and ‘operationalizes’ distinct dimensions of variation and tests distinct causal mechanisms to approach this broad thesis in the most grounded and tractable ways possible.”

You write, “as a result, the broad theoretical argument which motivates and unites the individual studies is rarely obvious within any particular article.” But it should be obvious, even if it is just to include a few lines in each article discussing how each study serves your larger theoretical arguments/ themes.

You mention “gaps” your dissertation seeks to address. Which ones? Relatedly, this is not a dissertation on the evolution of ideas. Thus, instead of framing the debates on the effect of media on mass politics as intellectual history, it may be more effective to simply lay out the different sides of the debate about the role of the media and then jump right into how media fits into the globalization and the state debates. Straightforwardly state that media has been viewed as positively (empowerment/ watchdog) and negatively (propaganda). Within each side of the debate, you can cite the older studies if you want but I wouldn’t get too detailed about the really old ones. For example, “benign democratic notions of the media” is the liberal perspective.

P. 3, what does this mean: “legitimately scientific models of information”? Or “information theory,” for that matter?

I suggest that you either have a separate section in the Introduction chapter on research methods. Or highlight your innovative research design and research method(s) in each summary of your studies.

The **first empirical study**, Mass Media and the Domestic Politics of Economic Globalization,” argues that mass media does not necessarily lead the welfare state to be more responsive to domestic groups because mass media tends to diffuse perceptions of responsibility and in turn shape vote intentions accordingly. This is a multi-tiered research design—linking individual attitudes to national-level policymaking.

The **second empirical study**, “Why are the Most Trade-Open Countries More Likely to Repress the Media,” contends that different types of economic openness require different degrees of transparency; and therefore, depending on the type of economic openness that is paramount, degree of media freedom will vary. In this understanding, financial openness will lead to greater media freedom.

The **final study,** Media Ownership and the Social Construction of Globalization” argues that different types of media ownership (as mediating variable) affect mass public responses/ attitudes toward globalization.

**Mass Media and the Domestic Politics of Globalization**

Starting with a puzzle that is more specific to the study is better than something so broad such as, “Much is known about the domestic politics of globalization but political scientists have largely ignored one critical link between the international economy and most individuals around the world: the mass media.”

From there, state your argument strongly, which you don’t do until page 4 of the study: “Mass media can have subtle but perverse effects on the distributive politics of open economies, disempowering domestic groups from holding national policymakers accountable for the unevenly distributed costs of globalization.” “Mass media tends to shift the perceptual and behavioral response of protectionist individuals away from blaming and acting against the government on the politics of openness.”

Media has independent effect on political outcomes. Survey data from France shows that “mass media has independent effects on individuals’ perceptions, blame attributions, and behavior around issues of economic openness.” This argument is then tested cross-nationally “on pooled cross-sectional, time-series data from most countries in the world between 1960 and 2010.”

The state-level associations are interpreted, as evidence for the argument that policymakers are more likely to neglect domestic groups harmed by political decisions to liberalize markets the more prevalent is mass media within their states.

So how do you define mass media, other than to say that mass media is a political institution? I think this missing piece segues/ leads naturally to what is currently your third study.

**Media Ownership and the Social Construction of Globalization**

In this study, which you can claim builds on, “Mass Media and the Domestic Politics of Globalization,” you define/ disaggregate what you mean by mass media as institution by focusing on media ownership and differentiating between foreign and state owners. You argue that different types of owners will seek to represent globalization in a way that dissociates it from demands for state intervention. How about private ownership? What role might they play? Media is the intervening variable in your argument.

Three levels of analysis demonstrate your argument about the effects of media ownership variation on public demand for state intervention. The research design here is particularly strong, assuming the data you have is robust in favor of your argument – you first show the relationship between market openness and attitudes regarding state intervention in the economy with cross-national, longitudinal data. Next, you present within-case evidence to show how ownership changes (from mixed to strictly foreign ownership) in New Zealand shaped changes in public attitudes toward the state’s role in the economy. Finally, qualitative content analysis shows the precise mechanism of change, the social constructionist role of media.

**Why Are the Most Trade-Open Countries More Likely to Repress the Media?**

This study begins with the interesting puzzle that the most trade open countries have lower levels of media freedom. The study investigates media freedom as dependent variable by differentiating between different types of economic openness and their effects (levels and long-term versus short-term changes). Economic openness in general increases the likelihood for the state to repress the media; and different types of openness (trade, FDI, inward capital flows) have different effects on media freedom as a function of how much each type of openness rewards transparency. Financial markets have the most positive effect on increasing media freedom in the long run because the functioning of this form of economic globalization requires transparency.

This is a complicated argument that would be difficult to show. A mixed-methods research design employs large-N statistical tests (which incorporate more years and better media freedom data) combined with process-tracing in Argentina and Mexico.