COMM 573:
Networked Publics: Theories and Encounters

Annenberg School for Communication & Journalism
University of Southern California

Tuesday, 2-4:50pm
Location: ANN-211

Mike Ananny, Assistant Professor
ananny@usc.edu

Office Hours: Mondays 12:30-1:45pm in ANN-310b (or email for appointment)

This course introduces students to historical and contemporary debates around how publics are made, what they can look like, and what they should be. It traces normative models of the public across communication infrastructures, focusing on the role that networked information technologies play in how publics are imagined and realized.

Intended for PhD students in Communication, students will closely read and evaluate foundational accounts of publicness (*e.g.*, Calhoun, Dewey, Habermas, Young, Fraser, Baker, Fiss, Taylor), examine newer work on the idea of networked publics in light of these historical accounts, and build toward a theoretically informed critique of a contemporary sociotechnical system that claims to serve public functions, or that students argue serves public functions.

The course is organized into 6 themes:

1. Foundations & Models
2. Norms & Ideals
3. Laws & Institutions
4. Sizes & Scales
5. Designs & Practices
6. Imaginings & Innovations

The readings are designed to address weekly "thought questions" that guide students' reflections as they encounter different theories and examples of public spheres. Essentially, the entire course is focused on a single question: what are networked public spheres and why do they matter?

Learning Objectives
By the end of the course, students should be able to talk about public spheres from different theoretical and normative perspectives, appreciate the tensions and tradeoffs inherent in them, make critiques of contemporary, networked public spheres, and see connections between the study of public sphere communication infrastructures and sociotechnical systems.

Expectations & Norms
Students are expected to be present and focused in each meeting; a course like this works best when students engage with the readings and each other thoughtfully, professionally, and attentively. See this as a space to practice critiquing ideas and your fellow students as colleagues. Please use computers for note taking only, silence phones before each meeting begins, and refrain from having back-channel or side conversations. Your participation is crucial. Please speak up, take risks, and experiment with taking new perspectives you wouldn't normally adopt. It is also critically important that you do each week's readings and that you meet the deadlines for the weekly memos – in a course like this you can't afford to fall behind on the readings or come to class unprepared.

Statement for Students with Disabilities
Any student requesting academic accommodations based on a disability is required to register with Disability Services and Programs (DSP) each semester. A letter of verification for approved accommodations can be obtained from DSP. Please be sure the letter is delivered to me (or to TA) as early in the semester as possible. DSP is located in STU 301 and is open 8:30 a.m.–5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday. Website for DSP and contact information: (213) 740-0776 (Phone), (213) 740-6948 (TDD only), (213) 740-8216 (FAX) ability@usc.edu.

Statement on Academic Integrity
USC seeks to maintain an optimal learning environment. General principles of academic honesty include the concept of respect for the intellectual property of others, the expectation that individual work will be submitted unless otherwise allowed by an instructor, and the obligations both to protect one's own academic work from misuse by others as well as to avoid using another's work as one's own. All students are expected to understand and abide by these principles. *SCampus* (http://scampus.usc.edu/), the Student Guidebook, contains the University Student Conduct Code (see University Governance, Section 11.00), while the recommended sanctions are located in Appendix A.

Emergency Preparedness / Course Continuity in a Crisis
In case of a declared emergency if travel to campus is not feasible, USC executive leadership will announce an electronic way for instructors to teach students in their residence halls or homes using a combination of Blackboard, teleconferencing, and other technologies. See the university's site on Campus Safety and Emergency Preparedness: http://preparedness.usc.edu/

Stress Management
Students are under a lot of pressure. If you start to feel overwhelmed, it is important that you reach out for help. A good place to start is the USC Student Counseling Services office at 213-740-7711. The service is confidential, and there is no charge.

Your @usc.edu Email Address
Please be sure that you either check your @usc.edu email address regularly, that it doesn't go over quota, or that you forward it to an email address you *do* check regularly. Your USC email the primary way for us to communicate and it is linked to Blackboard announcements.

Laptop & Phone Policy

Your phone must be switched *off* during class and I will ask you to turn it off if I see you using it. You may use your laptops in class but *only* to take notes, research issues that arise during class, or otherwise add to the seminar's conversation. Research shows that using phones or laptops in class for things other than class work harms your learning and that of those around you. **If I think laptops are distracting others, I may ban them from class at any time.**

FAQs

Q: Can I miss class?
A: Please don't. A class like this really depends upon people doing the reading, showing up, asking good questions, and engaging with everyone present. That said, if you're truly ill or have a great reason to be absent, please send me an email letting me know that you're missing class.

Q: Can I submit a memo or paper late?
A: No, please don't. Weekly memos will not be accepted after the due date and all other papers will be graded down a partial letter grade for each day the paper is late. *E.g.*, a B-plus paper that is one day late will be given a B; an A paper that is one day late will be given an A-minus. The idea here is not to have a strict and unreasonable late policy, but to ensure that students have an equal amount of time to do their work. Of course, if you have a valid medical or personal emergency please email me as soon as possible and we'll work something out.

Q: What happens when I send you a question over email?
A: I generally answer emails within 24 hours, often faster. (If I'm traveling it might be a bit longer.) If it's a more involved question that doesn't need an immediate reply I might suggest that we meet during my office hours instead. I generally don't answer email on weekends or on weekdays after 7pm.

Q: Can I communicate with you over Twitter or Facebook or other social media about the class?
A: Please don't. Social media are great, but email is where I do course business so that I can write more than 140 characters, and not worry about whether I need to "friend" or "follow" students.

Q: When can I meet with you?
A: I'd prefer that you come by during my office hours (listed above), but if you can't make it then, email me and we'll find another time.

Q: Can I use this seminar to work on a dissertation chapter or prospectus?
A: The point of this seminar is to give you time to think deeply about a new body literature, hear your colleagues' analyses, and help you build frameworks for future research. This seminar should certainly complement your dissertation research. It's a place to try out relevant research questions and explore empirical settings – but, from weekly memos to your final project, you should always generate *original* work in this seminar, never re-using writing you've already done for other classes or your dissertation.

EVALUATION

Weekly Memos with Question (20%): <mark>***Post to Blackboard every week by 7pm Monday***</mark>

Each week, you will write a short, approximately 350-500 word memo that engages with <u>at least two</u> of the week's readings. You have considerable freedom: you can pose questions you had as you read; contrast readings; connect themes you saw emerging among texts; critique authors' arguments; situate texts in relation to networked technologies. The goal is to reflect upon the readings and share reflections with your classmates so you arrive to class ready to participate. Memos will be graded as such:

> 'check-plus' = thoughtful and sophisticated analysis that moves a conversation forward
> 'check' = a good effort that contributes to class, but could have be stronger
> 'minus' = not quite up to expectations, let's talk in person about how to improve

Please distribute each week's memo to the *entire class*, through Blackboard, by ***7pm of the Monday night before Tuesday's class***.

Peer Feedback on Memo (5%)

Once during the semester you will give written feedback on one of your peer's weekly memos and meet with them to discuss the feedback (a video / voice call is fine if scheduling is tricky). When it's your turn to give feedback you'll submit your review to me and the peer (a few paragraphs on the strengths and opportunities for improvement in your peer's work); when it's your turn to get feedback you'll submit a short reflection on the feedback to me and your peer reviewer (just a couple of paragraphs on what you heard in the feedback and how you'll address it going forward)

'Opening' Readings (20%)

Four times (4x) during the semester, you will individually 'open' one of the readings. I'll say more in class about what this means, but the ideal opening: stays close to the text (no divergences until we have a shared, grounded understanding of the author's argument); situates the text in relation to other readings and the course themes; and moves conversation forward, generating new research questions that critique and extend the text. You can make a hand-out or slides if you like, but <u>neither is required</u>.

'Opening' Systems (10%)

Twice (2x) during the semester, individually or in a pair, you will lead a discussion on a sociotechnical system that you think is relevant to the course's public sphere themes. These may be systems that you discussed in your weekly memo or systems that you would like to think through as a group in the context of the week's readings. Please be ready to discuss, for example: why you think it is an instance of a public sphere, who participates in it, what norms are embedded in its design, where its content comes from, how it is regulated (broadly construed), how you might study it, what research questions you would like to ask through it, what its history is, who is responsible for maintaining it, how it relates to this week's readings. (If you learned about the system from a news or trade press article, please feel free to email those articles beforehand through Blackboard.)

***Project proposal (5%)* :: <mark>Due November 8</mark>**

In preparation for your final project (see below), you will submit a proposal that describes what you're going to do, what theories or questions you'll be working with, what literature you're using or analyzing, what research methods you'll be using, what your timeline is, and any resources you require. This is meant to be a check-in so that you and I can understand what your final project will be and what you need to make it successful. In addition to this written proposal, I'm happy to meet with you 1-1 to discuss your plans.

Peer Feedback on Proposal (5%) :: <mark>Due November 15</mark>

In the spirit of the memo feedback, you will review one of your peer's project proposal (someone different than the person whose memo you reviewed). As with the memo feedback, you'll submit your review to me and your peer (a few paragraphs on the strengths and opportunities for improvement in your peer's work); and you'll submit a short reflection on the feedback to me and your peer reviewer (a couple of paragraphs on what you heard in the feedback and how you'll address it going forward).

***Final project (40%)* :: <mark>Due December 8</mark>**

You have considerable freedom to decide the topic of your final project, but I ask you to choose one of the following formats: (1) a traditional "deep analysis" paper (5,000-6,000 words) in which you identify, analyze, and synthesize among a body of literature on some aspect of public spheres; (2) a system evaluation paper (5,000-6,000 words) that is essentially a more in-depth public sphere case study (it must be a different example) in which you engage more deeply with theory and analyze gaps in theoretical literature and/or system design; (3) a system design in which you prototype a new example public sphere (we can discuss different design approaches and prototyping materials) *and* write a description (3,000 words) of how your prototype connects to the theoretical literature and course concepts. For this system design option, you are encouraged to work in a group to *prototype* the system, but each group member must submit his/her own description paper.

For all formats and papers, you are encouraged to use the readings we've discussed in class, consult the "recommended/supplemental" reading list at the end of the syllabus, and find sources of your own. I will say more about this project in class. In the final class, you will give a 10-15 minute presentation on the state of your final project, getting feedback from the class that should feed into your final paper submission (due during the exam period).

SCHEDULE

Depending on how the course unfolds, I may change the order of readings, or swap some for readings from the 'recommended' list at the end of the syllabus. If so, I will give you 2 weeks' notice.

Week #1, August 23 :: Introduction & Overview

Introductions, review the syllabus, course themes and expectations. Discuss contemporary examples of networked public spheres and how they relate to course themes.

QUESTIONS:
What is your definition of a public sphere? What public spheres do you participate in? What do you expect of public spheres, how do you know when one is 'working'? What do you think the norms and values of a public sphere should be, why, and how do you see these instantiated in networked infrastructure design?

Week #2, August 30 :: Foundations & Models (Part One)

THOUGHT QUESTIONS
How have different authors historically conceptualized the public sphere? What is included and excluded within each idea of "public" and how does it relate to the concept of a "public good"? What does each theory of the public assume about individuals, how they behave, and why they associate with each other? How can we analytically and empirically distinguish among: group, market, community, and public?

READINGS
Calhoun, C. (1998). The public good as a social and cultural project. In W. Powell & E. Clemens (Eds.), *Private action and the public good* (pp. 20-35): Yale University Press.

Dewey, J. (1954). Search for the public. *The public and its problems* (pp. 3-36). New York: Swallow Press.

Marres, N. (2005). Issues spark a public into being: A key but often forgotten point of the Lippmann-Dewey debate. In B. Latour & P. Weibel (Eds.), *Making things public: Atmospheres of democracy* (pp. 208-217). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Taylor, C. (2002). Modern social imaginaries. *Public Culture, 14*(1), 91-124.

Week #3, September 6 :: <u>Foundations & Models (Part Two)</u>

<u>THOUGHT QUESTIONS</u>
What does Calhoun say qualifies as a Habermasian public sphere? How does he interpret Habermas's readings of particular time periods and material conditions? Where do these conditions exist (or do not exist) today? What is Benson's critique of Habermas, how does Fung balance different priorities, and why have media scholars often focused on Habermas? And, thinking back to last week's idea of the "unencumbered self", how can a critique of individualism become a critique of Habermas's public sphere?

<u>READINGS</u>
Benson, R. (2009). Shaping the public sphere: Habermas and beyond. *American Sociologist, 40*, 175-197.

Calhoun, C. (1992). Introduction: Habermas and the public sphere. In C. Calhoun (Ed.), *Habermas and the Public Sphere* (pp. 1-48). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Fung, A. (2003). "Recipes for public spheres: Eight institutional design choices and their consequences." *The Journal of Political Philosophy 11*(3): 338–367.

Lunt, P., & Livingstone, S. (2013). Media studies' fascination with the concept of the public sphere: Critical reflections and emerging debates. *Media, Culture & Society, 35*(1), 87-96.

Week #4, September 13 :: <u>Norms & Ideals (Part One)</u>

<u>THOUGHT QUESTIONS</u>
What connections do they make among the ideals of participation, civil society, and the public sphere? What models of change are implied or advocated for by the different authors? What empirical or theoretical evidence do they use to support their claims?

<u>READINGS</u>
Christians, C.G., Glasser, T.L., McQuail, D., Nordenstreng, K., & White, R.A. (2009). The principles and practice of democracy. *Normative theories of the media* (pp. 91-113). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Kelty, C., Panofsky, A., Currie, M., Crooks, R., Erickson, S., Garcia, P., . . . Wood, S. (2015). Seven dimensions of contemporary participation disentangled. *Journal of the Association for Information Science & Technology, 66*(3), 474-488.

Schudson, M. (2000). Good citizens and bad history: Today's political ideals in historical perspective. *The Communication Review, 4*(1), 1-19. doi:10.1080/10714420009359458

Shaw, A., & Hill, B.M. (2014). Laboratories of oligarchy? How the iron law extends to peer production. *Journal of Communication*. doi: 10.1111/jcom.12082

Week #5, September 20 :: <u>Norms & Ideals (Part Two)</u>

<u>**THOUGHT QUESTIONS**</u>

How does each author critique the idea of a public sphere by highlighting some aspect of communication? How might earlier models of public spheres (e.g., Calhoun, Taylor, Habermas) be revised to take into account their critiques?

<u>**READINGS**</u>

Dobson, A. (2012). Listening: The new democratic deficit. *Political Studies, 60*(4), 843-859.

Fraser, N. (1990). Rethinking the public sphere: A contribution to the critique of actually existing democracy. *Social Text, 25*/26, 56-80.

Squires, C. R. (2002). Rethinking the Black Public Sphere: An Alternative Vocabulary for Multiple Public Spheres. *Communication Theory, 12*(4), 446-468. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2885.2002.tb00278.x

Young, I.M. (1995). The ideal of community and the politics of difference. In P. A. Weiss & M. Friedman (Eds.), *Feminism and community* (pp. 233-257). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Week #6, September 27 :: <u>Laws & Institutions (Part One)</u>

<u>**THOUGHT QUESTIONS**</u>

How do different types of state media governance suggest different visions of democracy? What is the role of the state in establishing or regulating the public sphere? What rationales are offered for state involvement in a public sphere? Why are these questions for Communication scholars?

<u>**READINGS**</u>

Baker, C.E. (2002). Different democracies and their media. *Media, markets, and democracy* (pp. 129-153). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Castells, M. (2008). The new public sphere: Global civil society, communication networks, and global governance. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 616*(1), 78-93.

Pickard, V. (2013). Social democracy or corporate libertarianism? Conflicting media policy narratives in the wake of market failure. *Communication Theory, 23*(4), 336-355. doi:10.1111/comt.12021

Schudson, M. (1994). "The 'public sphere' and its problems: Bringing the state (back) in." *Notre Dame Journal of Law, Ethics & Public Policy 8*: 529-546.

Week #7, October 4 :: <u>No physical meeting, informal fieldwork assignment</u>

Immerse yourself in some environment or experience you think of as a "public" and post a 300-500 word reflection to Blackboard. E.g., you might attend a physical community meeting in your neighborhood, go to a City Hall forum, join a Wikipedia page, observe a subreddit, follow a Twitter hashtag, or participate in something else that you consider to be a "public". Tell us what you did, what you observed, and connect to at least 2 of the readings we've discussed so far.

Week #8, October 11 :: <u>Laws & Institutions (Part Two)</u>

<u>THOUGHT QUESTIONS</u>
How does the First Amendment relate to the idea of the public sphere? How does U.S. Supreme Court First Amendment case law help us understand the court's interpretation of public sphere? What images of the public do Bollinger, Fiss, Schauer, and Strömbäck assume are possible and how do these images influence their thinking about the press as a public institution?

<u>READINGS</u>
Bollinger, L.C. (1991). The central image. *Images of a free press* (pp. 1-23). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Fiss, O. (1996). The democratic mission of the press. *The irony of free speech* (pp. 50-78). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Strömbäck, J. (2005). In search of a standard: Four models of democracy and their normative implications for journalism. *Journalism Studies, 6*(3), 331-345.

Schauer, F. (2005). Towards an institutional first amendment. *Minnesota Law Review, 89*, 1256-1279.

<u>Recommeded:</u>
Browse the list of short posts and papers from the Harvard Law Review "Freedom of the Press" symposium: http://harvardlawreview.org/roundtable/symposium-freedom-of-the-press/

Week #9, October 18 :: <u>Sizes & Scales (Part One)</u>

<u>THOUGHT QUESTIONS</u>

What kind of publics do different scales of communication give rise to? Where is the transnational public sphere, and what kinds of diversity does the concept of multiculturalism require or create?

<u>READINGS</u>

Dahl, R. A., & Tufte, E. R. (1973). Size and democracy in political thought Size and democracy (pp. 4-16). Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Dahl, R. A., & Tufte, E. R. (1973). Dimensions of size and democracy Size and democracy (pp. 17-29). Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Bennett, L., & Segerbergb, A. (2012). The logic of connective action: Digital media and personalization of contentious politics. Information, Communication & Society, 15(5), 739-768.

Fraser, N. (2014). Transnationalizing the public sphere: On the legitimacy and efficacy of public opinion in a post-Westphalian world. In K. Nash (Ed.), Transnationalizing the public sphere (pp. 8-42). London, UK: Polity.

Glasser, T. L., Awad, I., & Kim, J. W. (2009). The claims of multiculturalism and journalism's promise of diversity. Journal of Communication, 59(1), 57-78.

Week #10, October 25 :: <u>Sizes & Scales (Part Two)</u>

<u>THOUGHT QUESTIONS</u>

What public spheres are assumed in aggregation technologies designed to harness and rationalize the scale and diversity discussed last week? What exactly is being counted, and what assumptions do these aggregations make about the political dynamics of individuals and collectives? Who has power to make or resist aggregations?

<u>READINGS</u>

Herbst, S. (1995). Quantification and reality. Numbered voices: How opinion polling has shaped American politics (pp. 7-27). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Igo, S. (2007). Introduction: America in aggregate. The averaged American: Surveys, citizens, and the making of a mass public (pp. 1-22). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Peters, John Durham. (2001). "The only proper scale of representation": The politics of statistics and stories. Political Communication, 18, 433-449.

Salmon, C.T., & Glasser, T.L. (1995). The politics of polling and the limits of consent. In T. L. Glasser & C. T. Salmon (Eds.), Public opinion and the communication of consent (pp. 437-458). New York: The Guilford Press.

Week #11, November 1 :: <u>Designs & Practices (Part One)</u>

<u>THOUGHT QUESTIONS</u>
How are platforms, infrastructures, social media, and utilities like or unlike publics? What forms of association does each create or require for its normative aims?

<u>READINGS</u>
Andrejevic, M. (2013). Public service media utilities: Rethinking search engines and social networking as public goods. *Media International Australia, Incorporating Culture & Policy, 146*(123-132).

Gillespie, T. (Forthcoming). Governance of and by platforms. In J. Burgess, T. Poell & A. Marwick (Eds.), *SAGE Handbook of Social Media*. London, UK: SAGE.

Napoli, P. M. (2015). Social media and the public interest: Governance of news platforms in the realm of individual and algorithmic gatekeepers. *Telecommunications Policy*. doi: 10.1016/j.telpol.2014.12.003

Plantin, J.-C., Lagoze, C., Edwards, P. N., & Sandvig, C. (2016). Infrastructure studies meet platform studies in the age of Google and Facebook. *New Media & Society*. doi:10.1177/1461444816661553

Week #12, November 8 :: <u>Designs & Practices (Part Two)</u>
-- PROJECT PROPOSALS DUE --

<u>THOUGHT QUESTIONS</u>
What images of the public are invoked or critiqued in Barry's and Marres's discussions of materiality? Are these "platforms" for publics, as discussed last week? How are the networked publics created through affective news challenges to Habermas? How do materials and practices appear in the account of Weibo publics?

<u>READINGS</u>
Barry, A. (2013). The affected public *Material politics: Disputes along the pipeline* (pp. 95-115). New York, NY: Wiley-Blackwell.

Marres, N. (2012). The invention of material publics: Returns to American pragmatism. *Material participation: Technology, the environment and everyday publics* (pp. 28-59). London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Papacharissi, Z., & Oliveira, M. (2012). Affective news and networked publics: The rhythms of news storytelling on #Egypt. *Journal of Communication, 62*(2), 266-282.

Rauchfleisch, Adrian, & Schäfer, Mike S. (2014). Multiple public spheres of Weibo: a typology of forms and potentials of online public spheres in China. *Information, Communication & Society, 18*(2), 139-155. doi: 10.1080/1369118X.2014.940364

Week #13, November 15 :: Imaginings & Innovations (Part One)
-- PEER FEEDBACK ON PROJECT PROPOSALS DUE --

THOUGHT QUESTIONS
Recalling Taylor's notion of a "social imaginary" from the first week, what kind of publics are imagined or prototyped in algorithmic media? How does an algorithmically calculated public differ from the publics convened through polls, surveys, and questionnaires? What kind of research tools and environments are required to know networked publics?

READINGS
Crawford, K. (2016). Can an algorithm be agonistic? Ten scenes from life in calculated publics. *Science, Technology & Human Values, 41*(1), 77-92. doi:10.1177/0162243915589635

Gillespie, T. (2014). The relevance of algorithms. In T. Gillespie, P. Boczkowski & K. A. Foot (Eds.), *Media technologies: Essays on communication, materiality, and society* (pp. 167-194). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Kennedy, H., & Moss, G. (2015). Known or knowing publics? Social media data mining and the question of public agency. *Big Data & Society, 2*(2). doi:10.1177/2053951715611145.

Napoli, P. M. (2014). Automated media: An institutional theory perspective on algorithmic media production and consumption. *Communication Theory, 24*(3), 340-360. doi:10.1111/comt.12039

Week #14, November 22 :: Imaginings & Innovations (Part Two)

THOUGHT QUESTIONS
How are publics *made* through design activities? How does the design and deployment of digital technologies in design settings relate to Gusfield's account of the social construction of public problems?

READINGS
Coleman, G. (2013). Introduction: A tale of two worlds *Coding freedom: The ethics and aesthetics of hacking* (pp. 1-22). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Gusfield, J. R. (1984). Introduction *The culture of public problems: Drink-driving and the symbolic order* (pp. 1-23). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

LeDantec, Christopher A., & DiSalvo, Carl. (2013). Infrastructuring and the formation of publics in participatory design. *Social Studies of Science, 43*, 241-264. doi: 10.1177/0306312712471581

Venturini, T., Ricci, D., Mauri, M., Kimbell, L., & Meunier, A. (2015). Designing controversies and their publics. *Design Issues, 31*(3), 74-87. doi: 10.1162/DESI_a_00340.

RECOMMENDED/SUPPLEMENTAL READINGS, ORGANIZED BY THEMES

FOUNDATIONS & MODELS

Benhabib, S. (1992). Models of public space: Hannah Arendt, the Liberal Tradition, and Jurgen Habermas. Habermas and the public sphere. C. Calhoun. Cambridge, MA, The MIT Press: 73-98.

Calhoun, C. (1993). "Civil society and the public sphere." Public Culture 5(3): 267-280.

Christman, John. (1987). Autonomy: A defense of the split-level self. Southern Journal of Philosophy, 25, 281-294.

Christman, J. (1991). Liberalism and individual positive freedom. *Ethics, 101*(2), 343-359.

Christman, J. (2013). Freedom, autonomy, and social selves. In B. Baum & R. Nichols (Eds.), *Isaiah Berlin and the politics of freedom: 'Two concepts of liberty' 50 years later* (pp. 87-101). London, UK: Routledge.

Dahlberg, L. (2005). "The Habermasian public sphere: Taking difference seriously?" *Theory and Society 34*(2): 111-136.

Ferree, M. M., W. Gamson, et al. (2002). "Four models of the public sphere in modern democracies." *Theory and Society 31*: 289-324.

Flyvbjerg, Bent. (1998). Habermas and Foucault: Thinkers for civil society? *British Journal of Sociology, 49*(2), 210-233.

Fraser, N. (1990). Rethinking the public sphere: A contribution to the critique of actually existing democracy. *Social Text, 25/26*, 56-80.

Garnham, N. (1992). *The media and the public sphere. Habermas and the Public Sphere*. C. Calhoun. Cambridge, MA, The MIT Press: 359-376.

Glasser, T. L. and C. T. Salmon (1995). The politics of polling and the limits of consent. Public opinion and the communication of consent. T. L. Glasser and C. T. Salmon. New York, The Guilford Press: 437-458.

Habermas, J. (1974). The public sphere: An encyclopedia article. *New German Critique, 3*, 49-55.

Habermas, J. (1989). The structural transformation of the public sphere. Cambridge, MA, The MIT Press.

Habermas, J. (1998). Three normative models of democracy. The inclusion of the other: Studies in political theory. Cambridge, MA, MIT Press: 240-252.

Held, D. (2006). Deliberative democracy and the defence of the public realm. Models of democracy. Stanford, CA, Stanford University Press: 231-255.

Held, D. (2006). Introduction. Models of democracy. Stanford, CA, Stanford University Press: 1-8.

Lippmann, W. (1922/1997). Public opinion. New York, NY, Free Press.

Lippmann, W. (1925/1993). The phantom public. Edison, NJ, Transaction Publishers.

Lunt, Peter, & Livingstone, Sonia. (2013). Media studies' fascination with the concept of the public sphere: Critical reflections and emerging debates. Media, Culture & Society, 35(1), 87-96.

Mansbridge, J. (1998). On the contested nature of the public good. Private Action and the Public Good. W. Powell and E. Clemens, Yale University Press: 3-19.

Markell, P. (1997). "Contesting consensus: Rereading Habermas on the public sphere." Constellations 3(3): 377-400.

Peters, J. D. (1995). Historical tensions in the concept of public opinion. Public Opinion and the Communication of Consent. C. T. S. Theodore L. Glasser. New York, The Guildford Press: 3-32.

Sandel, M. (1984). The procedural republic and the unencumbered self. *Political Theory, 12*, 81-96.

Schudson, M. (1992). Was there ever a public sphere? If so, when? Reflections on the American case. Habermas and the public sphere. C. Calhoun. Cambridge, MA, MIT Press: 143-163.

Speier, H. (1950). "Historical development of public opinion." American Journal of Sociology 55(4): 376-388.

Taylor, C. (1979). What's wrong with negative liberty? In A. Ryan (Ed.), The idea of freedom: Essays in honor of Isaiah Berlin (pp. 175-193). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Thompson, E. P. (1971). The Moral Economy of the English Crowd in the Eighteenth Century. *Past & Present*(50), 76-136.

Thompson, J. B. (1990). *Ideology and modern culture: Critical social theory in the era of mass communication*. Stanford, CA, Stanford University Press: 109-121.

Tully, James. (2013). 'Two concepts of liberty' in context. In B. Baum & R. Nichols (Eds.), Isaiah Berlin and the politics of freedom: 'Two concepts of liberty' 50 years later (pp. 23-51). London, UK: Routledge.

Warner, M. (1990). The letters of the republic: Publication and the public sphere. Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.

Warner, M. (2005). Publics and counterpublics. New York, NY, Zone Books.

NORMS & IDEALS

Arendt, H. (1958/1998). *The human condition*. Chicago, IL, University of Chicago Press. (Selections)

Askay, David A. (2014). Silence in the crowd: The spiral of silence contributing to the positive bias of opinions in an online review system. *New Media & Society*. doi: 10.1177/1461444814535190

Barber, Benjamin R. (1984). *Strong democracy: Participatory politics for a new age*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Benkler, Y. (2006). *The wealth of networks: How social production transforms markets and freedom*. New Haven, CT, Yale University Press.

Benkler, Y., & Nissenbaum, H. (2006). Commons-based peer production and virtue. *The Journal of Political Philosophy, 14*(1), 394-419.

Bickford, S. (1996). *The dissonance of democracy: Listening, conflict, and citizenship*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Brown, Wendy. (1998). Freedom's silences. In R. C. Post (Ed.), *Censorship and Silencing: Practices of Cultural Regulation* (pp. 313-327).

Bucy, E. P. and K. S. Gregson (2001). "Media participation: A legitimizing mechanism of mass democracy." New Media & Society 3(3): 357-380.

Christiano, T. (1997). The significance of public deliberation. *Deliberative democracy: Essays on reason and politics*. J. Bohman and W. Rehg. Cambridge, MA, MIT Press: 243-277.

Cohen, J. (1997). Deliberation and democratic legitimacy. *Deliberative democracy: Essays on reason and politics*. J. Bohman and W. Rehg. Cambridge, MA, MIT Press: 67-91.

Cohen, J. (1997). Procedure and substance in deliberative democracy. *Deliberative democracy: Essays on reason and politics*. J. Bohman and W. Rehg. Cambridge, MA, MIT Press: 407-437.

Couldry, N. (2009). Rethinking the politics of voice. *Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies, 23*(4), 579-582.

Couldry, N. (2010). *Why voice matters: Culture and politics after neoliberalism*. London, UK: SAGE.

Crawford, K. (2009). Following you: Disciplines of listening in social media. *Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies, 23*(4), 525-535.

Crawford, K. (2011). Listening, not lurking: The neglected form of participation. In H. Greif, L. Hjorth, A. Lasén & C. Lobet-Maris (Eds.), *Cultures of participation: Media practices, politics and literacy* (pp. 63-74). Berlin, Germany: Peter Lang.

Dahlberg, L. (2007). "Rethinking the fragmentation of the cyberpublic: from consensus to contestation." New Media & Society 9(5): 827-847.

Dobson, A. (2010). Democracy and nature: Speaking and listening. *Political Studies, 58*(4), 752-768.

Dobson, A. (2014). *Listening for democracy: Recognition, representation, reconciliation*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Friedland, L. A., T. Hove, et al. (2006). "The networked public sphere." *Javnost - The Public 13*(4): 5-26.

Giroux, H. A. (2011). "The crisis of public values in the age of the new media." Critical Studies in Media Communication 28(1): 8-29.

Gray, Mary L. (2010). From websites to Wal-mart: Youth, identity work, and the queering of boundary publics in Small Town, USA. In C. Pullen & M. Cooper (Eds.), LGBT identity and online new media (pp. 288-298). New York, NY: Routledge.

Hardin, R. (2003). Street-level Epistemology and Democratic Participation. Debating Deliberative Democracy. P. L. James S. Fishkin. Oxford, Blackwell Publishing: 163-181.

Hargittai, E. and G. Walejko (2008). "The participation divide: Content creation and sharing in the digital age." Information, Communication & Society 11(2): 239-256.

Hess, C. and E. Ostrom (2011). Introduction: An overview of the knowledge commons. Understanding knowledge as a commons: From theory to practice. C. Hess and E. Ostrom. Cambridge, MA, MIT Press: 3-26.

Hindman, M. (2008). The myth of digital democracy. Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press.

Jenkins, H. (2010, May 24, 2010). "Why participatory culture is not web 2.0: Some basic distinctions." Confessions of an Aca-Fan Retrieved July 17, 2010, from http://henryjenkins.org/2010/05/why_participatory_culture_is_n.html.

Jenkins, H., & Carpentier, N. (2013). Theorizing participatory intensities. Convergence: The Journal of Research into New Media Technologies, 19(3), 265-286.

Lacey, K. (2011). Listening overlooked: An audit of listening as a category in the public sphere. Javnost - The Public, 18(4), 5-20.

Keeling, Kara, & Kun, Josh. (2011). Introduction: Listening to American Studies. *American Quarterly, 63*(3), 445-459.

Knight, J. and J. Johnson (1997). What sort of political equality does deliberative democracy require? Deliberative democracy: Essays on reason and politics. J. Bohman and W. Rehg. Cambridge, MA, MIT Press: 279-319.

Kreiss, Daniel, Finn, Megan, & Turner, Fred. (2011). The limits of peer production: Some reminders from Max Weber for the network society. *New Media & Society, 13*(2), 243-259.

Lacey, K. (2006). The invention of a listening public: Radio and its audiences. Mass media, culture and society in 20th century Germany. C. Ross and K. C. Fuehrer. Basingstoke, Palgrave: 61-79.

Mansbridge, J. (2003). "Rethinking representation." The American Political Science Review 97(4): 515-528.

Ostrom, E. (1990). Governing the commons: The evolution of institutions for collective action. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Page, B. I. and R. Y. Shapiro (1992). Rational public opinion. The rational public. Chicago, IL, The University of Chicago Press.

Pateman, C. (1970). Participation and democratic theory. Cambridge, UK, Cambridge University Press.

Prior, M. (2005). "News vs. entertainment: How increasing media choice widens gaps in political knowledge and turnout." American Journal of Political Science 49(3): 577-592.

Prior, M. (2007). Post-broadcast democracy: How media choice increases inequality in political involvement and polarizes elections. Cambridge, UK, Cambridge University Press.

Tironi, Manuel. (2014). Counter-enactments in participatory experiments. *Science, Technology, & Human Values*. doi: 10.1177/0162243914560649

Young, I. M. (1997). Difference as a resource for democratic communication. Deliberative democracy: Essays on reason and politics. J. Bohman and W. Rehg. Cambridge, MA, MIT Press: 383-406.

Young, I. M. (2000). Inclusion and democracy. New York, NY, Oxford University Press.

Young-Bruehl, E. (2009). Why Arendt matters. New Haven, CT, Yale University Press.

LAWS & INSTITUTIONS

Baker, C. E. (1998). "The media that citizens need." University of Pennsylvania Law Review 147(2): 317-408.

Baker, C. E. (2001). Media, markets, and democracy. Cambridge, UK, Cambridge University Press.

Baker, C. E. (2007). Media concentration and democracy: Why ownership matters. Cambridge, UK, Cambridge University Press.

Barron, J. (1967). "Access to the press: A new first amendment right." Harvard Law Review 80(8): 1641-1678.

Barron, J. (2003). "Rights of access and reply to the media in the United States today." Communications and the Law 25: 1-12.

Barzilai-Nahon, K. (2007). "Gatekeeping: A critical review." Annual Review of Information Science and Technology 43: 1-79.

Barzilai-Nahon, K. (2008). "Toward a theory of network gatekeeping: A framework for exploring information control." Journal of the American Society for Information Science 59: 1493-1512.

Bollinger, L. C. (1991). Images of a free press. Chicago, IL, The University of Chicago Press. OR

Boyle, J. (2008). The public domain: Enclosing the commons of the mind. New Haven, CT, Yale University Press.

Brown, W. (2015). *Undoing the demos: Neoliberalism's stealth revolution*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press

Curran, J. (2000). Rethinking media and democracy. Mass media and society. J. Curran and M. Gurevitch. New York, NY, Oxford University Press: 120-154.

Downey, John, Mihelj, Sabina, & Konig, Thomas. (2012). Comparing public spheres: Normative models and empirical measurements. European Journal of Communication. doi: 10.1177/0267323112459447

Fiss, O. (1996). The silencing effect of speech. The irony of free speech (pp. 5-26). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Fiss, Owen. (1996). Liberalism divided: Freedom of speech and the many uses of state power. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Fiss, Owen. (1987). Why the state? *Harvard Law Review*, 100, 781-794.

Horwitz, R. B. (1991). "The First Amendment meets some new technologies: Broadcasting, common carriers, and free speech in the 1990s." Theory and Society 20: 21-72.

Horwitz, R. B. (2005). Communications regulation in protecting the public interest. The press. G. Overholser and K. H. Jamieson. Oxford, UK, Oxford University Press: 284-302.

Lessig, L. (1999). Code and other laws of cyberspace. New York, Basic Books.

Lessig, L. (2001). The future of ideas, Random House.

Lessig, L. (2004). Free culture. New York, NY, Penguin Press.

Lessig, L. (2009, October 9, 2009). Against transparency: The perils of open government. *The New Republic*. Retrieved August 17, 2010, from http://www.tnr.com/article/books-and-arts/against-transparency

Munshi, D., Kurian, P., Fraser, R., & Rupar, V. (2014). 'Shadow publics' in the news coverage of socio-political issues. *Journalism, 15*(1), 89-108.

Peters, C., & Witschge, T. (2014). From grand narratives of democracy to small expectations of participation: Audiences, citizenship, and interactive tools in digital journalism. *Journalism Practice*. doi: 10.1080/17512786.2014.928455

Sunstein, C. (1994). A new deal for speech. *Hastings Communication and Entertainment Law Journal, 17*, 137-160.

Wahl-Jorgensen, K. (2007). *Journalists and the public: Newsroom culture, letters to the editor, and democracy*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

SIZES & SCALES

Benkler, Y. (2011). Networks of power, degrees of freedom. International Journal of Communication, 5, 721-755.

Blumer, H. (1948). "Public opinion and public opinion polling." American Sociological Review 13: 542-554.

boyd, d., & Crawford, K. (2012). Critical questions for big data. Information, Communication & Society, 15(5), 662-679.

Castells, M. (2008). "The new public sphere: Global civil society, communication networks, and global governance." Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 616(1): 78-93.

Crawford, Kate. (2014, May 30, 2014). The anxieties of big data. The New Inquiry. Retrieved August 20, 2014, from http://thenewinquiry.com/essays/the-anxieties-of-big-data/

Couldry, N. (2014). What and where is the transnational public sphere? In K. Nash (Ed.), *Transnationalizing the public sphere* (pp. 43-59). London, UK: Polity.

Dahl, R. A., & Tufte, E. R. (1973). *Size and democracy*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Dean, J. (2003). "Why the net is not a public sphere." Constellations 10(1): 95-112.

Dahlberg, L. (2001). "Computer-mediated communication and the public sphere: A critical analysis." Journal of Computer Mediated Communication 7(1).

Ito, M. (2008). Networked publics: Introduction. Networked publics. K. Varnelis. Cambridge, MA, The MIT Press.

Lipari, L. (1999). "Polling as ritual." Journal of Communication 49(1): 83-102.

Lupia, A. and G. Sin (2003). "Which public goods are endangered?: How evolving communication technologies affect "The logic of collective action"." Public Choice 117(315-331).

Mukherjee, R. (2016). Toxic Lunch in Bhopal and Chemical Publics. *Science, Technology & Human Values*. doi: 10.1177/0162243916645196

Papacharissi, Z. (2002). "The virtual sphere." New Media & Society 4(1): 9-27.

Papacharissi, Z. (2010). A private sphere: Democracy in a digital age. Cambridge, UK, Polity Press.

Poell, T., & van Dijck, J. (2016). Constructing Public Space: Global Perspectives on Social Media and Popular Contestation — Introduction. International Journal of Communication, 10.

Sunstein, C. R. (2003). The law of group polarization. Debating deliberative democracy. J. S. Fishkin and P. Laslett. Malden, MA, Blackwell Publishing: 80-101.

Wyatt, R. O., E. Katz, et al. (2000). "Bridging the spheres: Political and personal conversation in public and private spaces." Journal of Communication: 71-92.

DESIGNS & PRACTICES

Ahva, L. (2012). "Public journalism and professional reflexivity." Journalism.

Alexander, Jeffrey C. (2004). Cultural pragmatics: Social performance between ritual and strategy. Sociological Theory, 22(4), 527-573.

Balkin, J. M. (2008). "Media access: A question of design." George Washington Law Review 76(4): 101-118.

Braun, J. and T. Gillespie (2011). "Hosting the public discourse, hosting the public: When online news and social media converge." Journalism Practice 5(4): 383-398.

Bruns, A., & Burgess, J. (2015). Twitter hashtags from ad hoc to calculated publics. In N. Rambukkana (Ed.), *Hashtag publics: The power and politics of discursive networks* (pp. 13-28). Berlin, Germany: Peter Lang.

Bruns, A., & Highfield, T. (2015). Is Habermas on Twitter? Social media and the public sphere. In G. Enli (Ed.), *The Routledge companion to social media and politics* (pp. 56-73). London, UK: Routledge.

Curran, J. (2005). What democracy requires of the media. The press. G. Overholser and K. H. Jamieson. Oxford, UK, Oxford University Press: 120-140.

DiSalvo, C. (2012). Adversarial design. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

DiSalvo, C. (2014). Critical making as materializing the politics of design. The Information Society, 30(2), 96-105. doi: 10.1080/01972243.2014.875770

DiSalvo, C., Louw, M., Holstius, D., Nourbakhsh, I., & Akin, A. (2012). Toward a public rhetoric through participatory design: Critical engagements and creative expression in the neighborhood networks project. Design Issues, 28(3), 48-61.

Dunbar-Hester, Christina. (2012). Soldering toward media democracy: Technical practice as symbolic value in radio activism. *Journal of Communication Inquiry, 36*(2), 149-169.

Dylko, I. B. (2015). How Technology Encourages Political Selective Exposure. *Communication Theory*. doi: 10.1111/comt.12089

Flanagan, M., Howe, D., & Nissenbaum, H. (2008). Embodying values in technology: Theory and practice. In J. van den Hoven & J. Weckert (Eds.), *Information technology and moral philosophy* (pp. 322-353). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Flanagin, A.J., Flanagin, C., & Flanagin, J. (2010). Technical code and the social construction of the internet. *New Media & Society, 12*(2), 179-196.

Friedman, Batya (Ed.). (2004). *Human values and the design of computer technology*. Stanford, CA: Center for the Study of Language and Information.

Gillespie, T. (2010). "The politics of 'platforms'." New Media & Society 12(3): 347-364.

Glasser, T. L. (1999). The idea of public journalism. The idea of public journalism. T. L. Glasser. New York, NY, The Guildford Press: 3-20.

Haas, T. and L. Steiner (2001). "Public journalism as a journalism of publics: Implications of the Habermas-Fraser debate for public journalism." Journalism 2(2): 123-147.

Hamilton, J. T. (2005). The market and the media. The press. G. Overholser and K. H. Jamieson. Oxford, UK, Oxford University Press: 351-371.

Heinrich, A. (2012). Foreign reporting in the sphere of network journalism. Journalism Practice, 6(5-6), 766-775.

Herbst, S. and J. Beninger (1994). The changing infrastructure of public opinion. Audiencemaking: How the media create the audience. J. S. Ettema and D. C. Whitney. London, UK, Sage: 95-114.

Herbst, S. (2001). "Public opinion infrastructures: Meanings, measures, media." Political Communication 18(4): 451-464.

Hickman, L. A. (1990). Publics as products. John Dewey's pragmatic technology. Bloomington, IN, Indiana University Press.

Introna, L. and H. Nissenbaum (2000). "Shaping the Web: Why the Politics of Search Engines Matters." The Information Society 16(3): 1-17.

Marres, N. (2005). Issues spark a public into being: A key but often forgotten point of the Lippmann-Dewey debate. Making things public: Atmospheres of democracy. B. Latour and P. Weibel. Cambridge, MA, MIT Press: 208-217.

Nissenbaum, H. (2001, March, 2001). How computer systems embody values. IEEE Computer, 118-120.

Oliver, P. E. and D. J. Myers (1999). "How events enter the public sphere: Conflict, location, and sponsorship in local newspaper coverage of public events." American Journal of Sociology 105(1): 38-87.

Razlogova, Elena. (2011). The listener's voice: Early radio and the American public. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Sack, W. (2007). Picturing the public. Structures of participation in digital culture. J. Karaganis. New York, NY, Social Science Research Council & Columbia University Press: 164-175.

Schudson, M. and S. E. Tifft (2005). American journalism in historical perspective. The press. G. Overholser and K. H. Jamieson. Oxford, UK, Oxford University Press: 17-47.

Schudson, M. (2008). Six or seven things news can do for democracy. Why democracies need an unlovable press. Cambridge, UK, Polity Press: 11-26.

Shaw, A. and Y. Benkler (2012). "A tale of two blogospheres: Discursive practices on the left and right." American Behavioral Scientist 56(4): 459-487.

Steen, Marc. (2014). Upon opening the black box and finding it full: Exploring the ethics in design practices. Science, Technology, & Human Values. doi: 10.1177/0162243914547645

Swidler, A. (1986). Culture in action: Symbols and strategies. American Sociological Review, 51(2), 273-286.

Wahl-Jorgensen, K. (2002). "The construction of the public in letters to the editor: Deliberative democracy and the idiom of insanity." Journalism 3(2): 183-204.

Wahl-Jorgensen, K. (2002). "Understanding the conditions for public discourse: four rules for selecting letters to the editor." Journalism Studies 3(1): 69-81.

IMAGININGS & INNOVATIONS

Balkin, J. M. (2004). "Digital speech and democratic culture: A theory of freedom of expression for the information society." New York University Law Review 79(1): 1-55.

Balkin, J. M. (2008). "The future of free expression in a digital age." Pepperdine Law Review 36: 101-118.

Baresch, B., L. Knight, et al. (2011). Friends who choose your news: An analysis of content links on Facebook. International Symposium on Online Journalism. Austin, TX.

Beer, D. (2009). "Power through the algorithm? Participatory web cultures and the technological unconscious." New Media & Society 11(6): 985-1002.

Birkbak, A., & Carlsen, H. B. (2015). The public and its algorithms: Comparing and experimenting with calculated publics. In L. Amoore & V. Piotukh (Eds.), *Algorithmic life: Calculative devices in the age of big data* (pp. 21-34). London, UK: Routledge.

Bucher, T. (2016). The algorithmic imaginary: exploring the ordinary affects of Facebook algorithms. *Information, Communication & Society*, 1-15. doi:10.1080/1369118X.2016.1154086

Couldry, Nick. (2014). The myth of 'us': Digital networks, political change and the production of collectivity. *Information, Communication & Society*. doi: 10.1080/1369118X.2014.979216

Crawford, K. (2009). "Following you: Disciplines of listening in social media." Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies 23(4): 525-535.

DiSalvo, C. (2009). Design and the construction of publics. Design Issues, 25(1), 48-63.

Etling, B., J. Kelly, et al. (2010). "Mapping the Arabic blogosphere: politics and dissent online." New Media & Society 12(8): 1225-1243.

Faris, R., Roberts, H., Etling, B., Othman, D., & Benkler, Y. (2015). Score another one for the internet? The role of the networked public sphere in the U.S. net neutrality policy debate. Cambridge, MA: Berkman Center for Internet & Society.

Ford, S. M. (2011). "Reconceptualizing the public/private distinction in the age of information technology." *Information, Communication & Society 14*(4): 550-567.

Kelty, C. (2005). "Geeks, social imaginaries, and recursive publics." *Cultural Anthropology 20*(2): 185-214.

Kelty, C. M. (2014). The fog of freedom. In T. Gillespie, P. Boczkowski, & K. A. Foot (Eds.), *Media technologies: Essays on communication, materiality, and society* (pp. 195-220). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Latour, B. and P. Weibel, Eds. (2005). *Making things public: Atmospheres of democracy*. Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.

Marres, N., & Weltevrede, E. (2013). Scraping the social? Issues in live social research. Journal of Cultural Economy, 6(3), 313-335. doi: 10.1080/17530350.2013.772070

Robles-Anderson, E. (2012). The Crystal Cathedral: Architecture for mediated congregation. Public Culture, 24(3), 577-599. doi: 10.1215/08992363-1630672

Sunstein, C. (2009). Republic.com 2.0. Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press. (Selections)

Taylor, C. (2004). The public sphere. Modern social imaginaries, Duke University Press: 83-99.

Taylor, Alex S, Lindley, Sian, Regan, Tim, & Sweeney, David. (2014). Data and life on the street. *Big Data & Society*. doi: 10.1177/2053951714539278

Tufekci, Zeynep. (2014). Engineering the public: Big data, surveillance and computational politics. *First Monday, 19*(7).

Tushnet, R. (2008). "Power without responsibility: Intermediaries and the First Amendment." George Washington Law Review 76(4): 101-131.

Warf, Barney. (2015). The Hermit Kingdom in cyberspace: Unveiling the North Korean internet. *Information, Communication & Society, 18*(1), 109-120.