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**Course Description**

This course examines the connection between mass media, citizens, and politics. The seminar will focus on the content, processes, and effects of communication within the American political system with a focus on the role of mass media and emerging media technologies. Students will learn about foundational theories and concepts central to political communication, as well as the complex interrelationships between consumption of various types of media content and the thoughts, judgments, and behaviors of citizens. We will consider political communication outside the U.S. — in Europe, Latin America, and Asia — but we will mainly focus on media effects research at the intersection of communication and politics in the United States.

**Student Learning Outcomes**

1. Understand the relationship between media and American politics

2. Define and use the vocabulary of media and political communication terms

3. Articulate an understanding of political communication theories

4. Critique and evaluate differences in political media

5. Apply theories, data, and case studies to the current political landscape

6. Effectively articulate what you learn to others

**Required Texts**

All required readings will be provided in downloadable PDF format.

**Grading**

A+ 97-100%

A 93-96%

A- 90-92%

B+ 87-89%

B 83-86%

B- 80-82%

C+ 77-79%

C 73-76%

C- 70-72%

D+ 67-69%

D 60-66%

F 0-59%

W Withdrawal

WP Withdrawal Pass

WF Withdrawal Fail

AU Audit

R Repeat

I Incomplete

P Pass

S Satisfactory

U Unsatisfactory

**Assignments**

Research Paper 50%

Response Papers 20% (5 x 4%)

Review Reports/Discussion Leads 20% (2 x 10%)

Class Participation 10%

Research Paper (50%): The major requirement for this course is an original research paper written individually by each student and presented to other seminar participants. The paper should grow out of one of the topics or theories covered in the course and contain the following sections: (1) brief introduction, (2) literature review, (3) statement of hypothesis or research model, (4) actual or proposed methodology, (5) results or proposed analysis, (6) concluding discussion about what was or will be learned. The methodology may be quantitative or qualitative. The goal of the paper is to contribute, however modestly, to research in the area of political communication. The paper can present findings based on existing and available data sets (e.g., National Election Study, Annenberg National Election Survey, General Social Survey, DDB Life Style Archive, The Pew Internet and American Life Project, the National Annenberg Election Study, the Mass Communication Research Center Archive, etc.) or the collection of original data. Some of you may wish to extend projects you have developed elsewhere or to refine ideas toward completion of Master’s or Doctoral theses; please consult with me if this is the case, and share your progress to date.

Your paper will be evaluated on whether it integrates the concepts encountered in class into coherent and testable propositions that have implications for theory in political communication. Your research paper should reflect an original extension of the ideas we have encountered in class, not a simple recapitulation of past work. A three-page prospectus for your seminar paper is due in class Week 6 (10/02). Seminar presentations will be held during the last class period. The final paper is due December 7 by 4:00 P.M. and should be approximately 20-25 pages of text, not including cover, references, tables, and figures. This paper will be worth 50 percent of your final grade.

Review Reports/Discussion Leads (20%, or 2 x 10%): In addition, every student will be required to serve as a discussant for two class sessions. Discussants will write an 8- to 10-page summary, synthesis and critique of the week’s readings and provide a brief list of questions to facilitate discussion. As a discussant, you will be responsible for spurring but not necessarily leading student discussion of the readings by pointing out what you believe are the strengths and weaknesses of the readings and encouraging debate about your reflections. Ideally, you will choose a week that coincides with your broader interests. That way, your review of the reading materials will be useful to you when preparing your paper. Review reports will be sent to the class email list as an .doc or .pdf at least 6 hours before class (i.e., by noon on Tuesday). These reports will be graded and will be worth 20 percent of your grade, or 10% each.

Response Papers (20%, or 5 x 4%): Five times over the course of the semester, you will produce a brief set of written comments on the readings. You can choose which weeks to write a response paper, but you may not turn in a response paper for the weeks in which you are assigned to be the discussion leader. These comment papers should be 1-2 pages in length, though they may be shorter on weeks that are of less interest to you and longer on weeks that you feel inspired. Papers do not need to follow any particular format or necessarily cover all the readings, as long as they illustrate that you made an effort to process that week’s reading and have reflected on the research you encountered. Some of you may use these comment papers to summarize the key points of each of the readings into notes for their own future use. Others may organize their comments into critical essays or critiques on the general themes of the week. Yet others may focus on detailed reviews of a few readings or even a single reading, digging deeply into a topic of particular interest. Bring your comment papers to class and turn them in to me at the end. These five comment papers will be worth 20 percent of your final grade. Evaluation will be based on the number completed; I will not be evaluating the content of these papers.

Class Participation (10%): The final 10 percent of your class grade will be based on participation in seminar discussion. It is not enough that you just come to class. You must actively discuss the readings and engage in discussion with other seminar participants. Your weekly comment paper should be the starting point for ideas you want to share with the class. I am hopeful that the discussion that ensues will lead to the development of a classroom environment where ideas are discussed and debated in an open, respectful way.

**University and College Policies**

Accommodations for students with disabilities: If you are registered with the Office of Disability Services, please make an appointment with me as soon as possible to discuss any course accommodations that may be necessary. If you have a disability, but have not contacted the Office of Disability Services, please call (205) 348-4285 (Voice) or (205) 348-3081 (TTY) or visit 1000 Houser Hall to register for services. Students who may need course adaptations because of a disability are welcome to make an appointment to see me during office hours. Students with disabilities must be registered with the Office of Disability Services, 1000 Houser Hall, before receiving academic adjustments. Act Ethnical Community Statement: The University of Alabama is committed to an ethical, inclusive community defined by respect and civility.  The UAct website (http://www.ua.edu/uact) provides a list of reporting channels that can be used to report incidences of illegal discrimination, harassment, sexual assault, sexual violence, retaliation, threat assessment or fraud.

Statement on diversity: The University of Alabama values the diversity of its student body and is committed to providing a classroom atmosphere that encourages the equitable participation of all students. Patterns of interaction between the faculty member and students and among the students themselves may inadvertently communicate preconceptions about student abilities based on age, disability, ethnicity, gender, national origin, race, religion, class, regionalism and/or sexual orientation. These patterns are due in part to the differences the students themselves bring to the classroom. Instructors should be particularly sensitive to being equitable in the opportunities they provide students to answer questions in class, to contribute their own ideas, and to participate fully in projects in and outside of the classroom. As an institution of higher learning, The University of Alabama attaches great value to freedom of speech and open debate, but it also attaches great importance to the principles of civility and respect which govern an academic community. Harassment or other illegal discrimination against individuals or groups not only is a violation of University Policy and subject to disciplinary action, but also is inconsistent with the values and ideals of the University.

Harassment**:** Sexual harassment violates federal civil rights laws and University nondiscrimination policy.  The University of Alabama is committed to providing and promoting an atmosphere in which students can engage fully in the learning process. Toward this end, all members of the University community must understand that sexual harassment is strictly prohibited and will not be tolerated. The University's policy regarding sexual harassment is clear and explicit.  We are required to abide by the policy, located at -- http://eop.ua.edu/sex.html.

Honor code**:**All students in attendance at The University of Alabama are expected to be honorable and observe standards of conduct appropriate to a community of scholars. The University of Alabama expects from its students a higher standard of conduct than the minimum required to avoid discipline. At the beginning of each semester and on tests and projects, at the discretion of the course instructor, each student will be expected to sign an Honor Pledge.

***Honor Pledge:****I promise or affirm that I will not at any time be involved with cheating, plagiarism, fabrication, or misrepresentation while enrolled as a student at The University of Alabama. I have read the Academic Honor Code, which explains disciplinary procedures that will result from the aforementioned. I understand that violation of this* *code will result in penalties as severe as indefinite suspension from the University.*

Academic misconduct: Academic misconduct by students includes all acts of dishonesty in any academically related matter and any knowing or intentional help or attempt to help or conspiracy to help another student commit an act of academic dishonesty. Academic dishonesty includes, but is not limited to, each of the following acts when performed in any type of academic or academically related matter, exercise, or activity.

1. *Cheating*: Using or attempting to use unauthorized materials, information, study aids, or computer-related information.
2. *Plagiarism:* Representing the words, data, works, ideas, computer program or output, or anything not generated in an authorized fashion, as one’s own.
3. *Fabrication*: Presenting as genuine any invented or falsified citation or material.
4. *Misrepresentation:* Falsifying, altering, or mistaking the contents of documents or other materials related to academic matters, including schedules, prerequisites, and transcripts.

*Academic misconduct cases related to this course shall be resolved by the Assistant Dean for Undergraduate Student Services* *in the College of Communication and Information Sciences*, where the alleged action took place. Appeals from the decisions may be made to the academic dean; appeals from the academic dean’s decisions may be made to the Office for Academic Affairs.

Penalties for academic misconduct can range from a reprimand to a penalty as severe as suspension for a definite time or even indefinite suspension. Indefinite suspension normally requires a minimum of one semester. After one semester students may appeal for reinstatement. Academic deans have the authority to impose the full range of penalties. Divisional academic misconduct monitors may impose penalties only after receiving a voluntary written confession. Misconduct monitors are authorized to impose penalties up to but not including suspension, and may impose penalties of suspension or indefinite suspension if authority to do so has been delegated by the academic dean. All persons who admit to or are found guilty of an academic offense for which a penalty less than an indefinite suspension is imposed will receive a penalty of indefinite suspension if they admit to or are found guilty of another offense of academic misconduct.

A penalty of indefinite suspension is mandated for a finding of guilt on all second offenses. All second offense accusations are referred immediately to the Dean of the College for resolution. “Second offense accusations” assume resolution of first offenses (i.e., finding of guilt) and that students have been afforded the opportunity to learn from the first offense. Multiple misconduct accusations, where the accusations have not been resolved, may result in a penalty more severe than is typical in first offenses, including indefinite suspension. For second-offense cases that are in progress at the beginning of a semester, a student will be allowed to enroll and continue through completion of semester even if the outcome of the accusation is suspension. If an academic misconduct case is underway during a student’s final semester, the awarding of the degree may be dependent upon the resolution of the case. In all cases that involve suspension as a penalty, the Office of Academic Records and University Registrar will be notified immediately of the suspension and a hold will be placed on the student’s record to prevent further enrollment. (UA Faculty Handbook, 5 January 2005)

Severe weather guidelines: The guiding principle at The University of Alabama is to promote the personal safety of our students, faculty and staff during severe weather events. It is impossible to develop policies which anticipate every weather-related emergency. These guidelines are intended to provide additional assistance for responding to severe weather on campus. UA is a residential campus with many students living on or near campus. In general classes will remain in session until the National Weather Service issues safety warnings for the city of Tuscaloosa. Clearly, some students and faculty commute from adjacent counties. These counties may experience weather related problems not encountered in Tuscaloosa. Individuals should follow the advice of the National Weather Service for that area taking the necessary precautions to ensure personal safety. Whenever the National Weather Service and the Emergency Management Agency issue a warning, people in the path of the storm (tornado or severe thunderstorm) should take immediate lifesaving actions. When West Alabama is under a severe weather advisory, conditions can change rapidly. It is imperative to get to where you can receive information from the National Weather Service and to follow the instructions provided. Personal safety should dictate the actions that faculty, staff and students take.

The Office of University Relations will disseminate the latest information regarding conditions on campus in the following ways:

* Weather advisory posted on the UA homepage
* Weather advisory sent out through UA Alerts to faculty, staff and students
* Weather advisory broadcast over WVUA at 90.7 FM
* Weather advisory broadcast over Alabama Public Radio (WUAL) at 91.5 FM
* Weather advisory broadcast over WVUA-TV/WUOA-TV, and on the website at http://wvua23.com/weather.

In the case of a tornado warning (tornado has been sighted or detected by radar; sirens activated), all university activities are automatically suspended, including all classes and laboratories. If you are in a building, please move immediately to the lowest level and toward the center of the building away from windows (interior classrooms, offices, or corridors) and remain there until the tornado warning has expired. Classes in session when the tornado warning is issued can resume immediately after the warning has expired at the discretion of the instructor. Classes that have not yet begun will resume 30 minutes after the tornado warning has expired provided at least half of the class period remains.

**Course Schedule**

Week 1: 08/29 Course Introduction

Week 2: 09/04 The Scope of Political Communication

* Blumler, J. G. & Kavanaugh, D. (1999). The third age of political communication: Influences and features. *Political Communication, 16*, 209-230.
* McLeod, D. M., Kosicki, G. M., and McLeod, J. M. (2002). Resurveying the boundaries of political communication effects. In J. Bryant and D. Zillmann (Eds.). *Media effects: Advances in theory and research* (pp. 215-267). Hilsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
* Bennett, W. L. & Iyengar, S. (2008) A new era of minimal effects? The changing foundations of political communication*. Journal of Communication, 58*, 707-731.
* Holbert, R. L., Garrett, R. K., & Gleason, L. S. (2010). A new era of minimal effects? A response to Bennett and Iyengar. *Journal of Communication, 60*, 15-34.

Week 3: 09/11 News Discourse and the Public Sphere

* Edelman, M. J. (1993). Contestable categories and public opinion. *Political Communication, 10*, 231-242.
* Reese, S. D. & Shoemaker, P. J. (2016). A media sociology for the networked public sphere: The hierarchy of influences model. *Mass Communication and Society, 19*, 389-410.
* Papacharissi, Z. (2009). The virtual sphere 2.0: The Internet, the public sphere, and beyond. In Chadwick & P. N. Howard (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of Internet politics* (pp. 230-245).
* Chadwick, A., Dennis, J., & Smith, A. P. (2016). Politics in the age of hybrid media. The Routledge companion to social media and politics, 7-22.

Recommended:

* Dahlgren, P. (2005) The Internet, public spheres, and political communication: Dispersion and deliberation. *Political Communication, 22*, 147-162.

Week 4: 09/18 Agenda Setting, Priming, and Framing

* Kosicki, G. M. (1993). Problems and opportunities in agenda-setting research. *Journal of Communication, 43*, 100-127.
* Malhotra, N., & Krosnick, J. A. (2007). Retrospective and prospective performance assessments during the 2004 election campaign: Tests of mediation and news media priming. *Political Behavior, 29*, 249-278.
* Nelson, T. E., Clawson, R. A., & Oxley, Z. M. (1997). Media framing of a civil liberties conflict and its effect on tolerance. *American Political Science Review, 91*, 567-583.
* Lecheler, S., & de Vreese, C. H. (2011). Getting real: The duration of framing effects. *Journal of Communication, 61*, 959-983.

Recommended:

* Walgrave, S. & Van Aelst, P. (2006). The contingency of the mass media’s political agenda setting power: Toward a preliminary theory. *Journal of Communication, 56*, 88-109.
* Lenz, G. S. (2009). Learning and opinion change, not priming: Reconsidering the priming hypothesis. *American Journal of Political Science, 53*, 821-837.

Week 5: 09/25 Learning, Media Cues, and Public Opinion

* Eveland, W. P., Jr. (2004). The effect of political discussion in producing informed citizens: The roles of information, motivation, and elaboration. *Political Communication, 21,* 177-193.
* Bode, L. (2016). Political news in the news feed: Learning politics from social media. *Mass Communication and Society, 19,* 24-48.
* Zaller, J., & Feldman, S. (1992). A simple theory of the survey response: Answering questions versus revealing preferences. *American Journal of Political Science, 36*, 579-616.
* Shah, D. V., Watts, M. D., Domke, D. & Fan, D. P. (2002). News framing and cueing of issue regimes: Explaining Clinton’s public approval in spite of scandal. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 66*, 339-370.

Recommended:

* Prior, M. (2003). Any good news in soft news? The impact of soft news preference on political knowledge. *Political Communication, 20*, 149-172.
* Zaller, J. (2012). What Nature and Origins Leaves Out. *Critical Review, 24*, 569-642.

Week 6: 10/02 Political Campaigns: Attack Ads, Fake News, and Hybrid Campaigns

* Ansolabehere, S., Iyengar, S., Simon, A., and Valentino, N. (1995). Does attack advertising demobilize the electorate? *American Political Science Review, 88*, 829-838.
* Allcott, H. & Gentzkow, M. (2017). Social media and fake news in the 2016 Election. *Journal of Economic Perspectives, 31,* 211-236.
* Guess, A., Nyhan, B., & Reifler, J. (2018). Selective exposure to misinformation: Evidence from the consumption of fake news during the 2016 Election. Report to the European Research Council.
* Wells, C. et al. (2016). How Trump drove coverage to the nomination: Hybrid media campaigning. *Political Communication, 00*, 1-8.

Recommended:

* Franz, M. M., & Ridout, T. N. (2010). Political advertising and persuasion in the 2004 and 2008 presidential elections. *American Politics Research, 38*, 303-329.
* Garrett, R. K., Weeks, B. E., & Neo, R. L. (2016). Driving a wedge between evidence and beliefs: How online ideological news exposure promotes political misperceptions. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 21,* 331-348.
* Lawrence, R. G. & Boydstun, A. E. (2017). What we should really be asking about media attention to Trump. *Political Communication, 34*, 150-153.

Week 7: 10/09 NO CLASS

Week 8: 10/16 Political Socialization and Participation

* Brady, H. E., Verba, S. E., & Schlozman, K. L. (1995). Beyond SES: A resource model of political participation. *American Political Science Review, 89*, 271-294.
* Lee, N. J., Shah, D. V., & McLeod, J. M. (2012). Processes of Political Socialization: A Communication Mediation Approach to Youth Civic Engagement. *Communication Research*.
* Valentino, N. A., & Sears, D. O. (1998). Event-driven political communication and the preadult socialization of partisanship. *Political Behavior, 20*, 127-154.
* Gil de Zúñiga, H., Veenstra, A., Vraga, E., & Shah, D. (2010). Digital democracy: Reimagining pathways to political participation. *Journal of Information Technology & Politics, 7*, 36-51.

Recommended:

* McLeod, J. M., Scheufele, D. A., & Moy, P. (1999). Community, communication, and participation: The role of mass media and interpersonal discussion in local political participation. *Political Communication, 16*.
* Bakker, T. P. & de Vreese, C. H. (2011). Good News for the Future? Young People, Internet Use, and Political Participation. *Communication Research, 38*, 451-470.

Week 9: 10/23 Hostile Media, Third-Person Effects, and Corrective Actions

* Vallone, R. P., Ross, L. & Lepper, M. R. (1985). The hostile media phenomenon: Biased

perception and perceptions of media bias in coverage of the Beirut massacre. *Journal of*

*Personality and Social Psychology, 49*, 577-585.

* Davison, W. P. (1983). The third-person effect in communication. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 47*, 1-15.
* Gunther, A. C., & Storey, J. D. (2003). The influence of presumed influence. *Journal of Communication, 53*, 199-215.
* Rojas, H. (2010). “Corrective” actions in the public sphere: How perceptions of media and media effects shape political behaviors. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research, 22*, 343-363.

Recommended:

* Rojas, H., Barnidge, M., & Abril, E. P. (2016). Egocentric publics and corrective action. *Communication and the Public, 1*, 27-38.
* Tsfati, Y. & Cohen, J., (2005) Democratic consequences of hostile media perceptions: The case of Gaza settlers. *The Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics, 10*, 28-51.
* Perloff, R. (1999) The third-person effect: A critical review and synthesis. *Media Psychology, 1*, 353-378.

Week 10: 10/30 Protest, Political Consumerism, and Transnational Activism

* Bennett, W. L. & Segerberg. A. (2012). The logic of connective action: Digital media and the personalization of contentious politics. *Information, Communication & Society, 15*, 739-768.
* Juris, J. S. (2012). Reflections on #Occupy everywhere: Social media, public space, and emerging logics of aggregation. *American Ethnologist, 39*, 259-279.
* Stolle, Hooghe, D. M., & Micheletti, M. (2005). Politics in the supermarket: Political consumerism as a form of political participation. *International Political Science Review, 26*, 245-269.
* Bennett, W. L. (2005). Social movements beyond borders: Understanding two eras of transnational activism. In D. Della Porta & S. Tarrow (Eds.), *Transnational Protest and Global Activism*. Chapter 9.

Recommended:

* Lim, M. (2012). Clicks, cabs, and coffee houses: Social media and oppositional movements in Egypt, 2004-2011*. Journal of Communication, 62*, 231-248.
* Harlow, S. (2012). Social media and social movements: Facebook and an online Guatemalan justice movement that moved offline. *New Media & Society, 14*, 225-243.
* Thomas, E. F., Cary, N., Smith, L. G., Spears, R., & McGarty, C. (2018). The role of social media in shaping solidarity and compassion fade: How the death of a child turned apathy into action but distress took it away. *New Media & Society*. Advance online publication.

Week 11: 11/06 Workshop

Week 12: 10/23 Conversation, Disagreement, and Selective Exposure

* Mutz, D. C. & Martin, P. S. (2001). Facilitating communication across lines of difference: The role of mass media. *American Political Science Review, 45*, 97-114.
* Brundidge, J. (2010). Encountering “difference” in the contemporary public sphere: The contribution of the Internet to the heterogeneity of political discussion networks. *Journal of Communication, 60*, 680–700.
* Stroud, N. J. (2008). Media use and political predispositions: Revisiting the concept of selective exposure. *Political Behavior*, *30*, 341-366.
* Garrett, R. K. (2009). Echo chambers online? Politically motivated selective exposure among Internet news users. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 14*, 265-285.

Recommended:

* Huckfeldt, R., Johnson, P. E., & Sprague, J. (2002). Political environments, political dynamics, and the survival of disagreement. *Journal of Politics, 64*, 1-21.
* Mutz, D. C. (2002). The consequences of cross-cutting networks for political participation. *American Journal of Political Science, 46*, 838-855.
* Wojcieszak, M. E., & Mutz, D. C. (2009). Online groups and political discourse: Do online discussion spaces facilitate exposure to political disagreement? *Journal of Communication, 59*, 40–56.
* Barnidge, M. (2017). Exposure to political disagreement in social media versus face-to-face and anonymous online settings. *Political Communication, 34,* 302-321.

Week 13: 11/20 Social Identity and Lifestyle Politics

Tajfel, H. (1982). Social psychology of intergroup relations. *Annual Review of Psychology, 33*, 1-39.

Huddy, L. (2001). From social to political identity: A critical examination of social identity theory. *Political Psychology, 22*, 127-156.

Bennett, W. L. (1998). The uncivic culture: Communication, identity, and the rise of lifestyle politics. *PS: Political Science & Politics, 31*, 741-761.

Walsh, K. C. (2012). Putting inequality in its place: Rural consciousness and the power of perspective. *American Political Science Review, 106*, 517-532.

Recommended:

Lea, M., Spears, R., Watt, S. E., & Rogers, P. (2000). The InSIDE story: Social psychological processes affecting on-line groups.

Rains, S. A., Kenski, K., Coe, K., & Harwood, J. (2017). Incivility and political identity on the Internet: Intergroup factors as predictors of incivility in discussions of news online. *Journal of Computer‐Mediated Communication, 22*, 163-178.

Chan, M. (2017). Media use and the social identity model of collective action: Examining the roles of online alternative news and social media news. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly, 94*, 663-681.

Week 14: 11/27 Political Polarization and Populism

Prior, M. (2013). Media and political polarization. *Annual Review of Political Science, 16*, 101-127.

Iyengar, S., Sood, G., & Lelkes, Y. (2012). Affect, not ideology: Social identity perspective on polarization. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 76*, 405-431.

Aalberg, T. & de Vreese, C. H. (2016). Comprehending populist political communication. In T. Aalberg, F. Esser, C. Reinemann, J. Strömbäck, & C. H. de Vreese (Eds.), *Populist Political Communication in Europe*. Chapter 1.

Bos, L., Van der Brug, W., & De Vreese, C. (2011). How the media shape perceptions of right-wing populist leaders. *Political Communication, 28*, 182-206.

Recommended:

Garrett, R. K., Gvirsman, S. D., Johnson, B. K., Tsfati, Y., Neo, R., & Dal, A. (2014). Implications of pro-and counterattitudinal information exposure for affective polarization. *Human Communication Research, 40*, 309-332.

Mason, L. (2016). A cross-cutting calm: How social sorting drives affective polarization. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 80*, 351-377.

Rogowski, J. C., & Sutherland, J. L. (2016). How ideology fuels affective polarization. *Political Behavior, 38*, 485-508.

Hameleers, M., & Jewelry, D. (2017). It's us against them: A comparative experiment on the effects of populist messages communicated via social media. *Information, Communication & Society, 20*, 1425-1444.

Heiss, R., & Matthes, J. (2017). Who ‘likes’ populists? Characteristics of adolescents following right-wing populist actors on Facebook. *Information, Communication & Society, 20*, 1408-1424.

Week 15: 12/04 Presentations