

The Idea of a Public Sphere: Theories and Encounters

Annenberg School for Communication & Journalism, University of Southern California

Fridays, 2-4:50pm

Instructor:

Assistant Professor Mike Ananny

ananny@usc.edu

COURSE DESCRIPTION

Intended for graduate or senior undergraduate students in Communication and Journalism, this course is an in-depth examination of the idea of a democratic public sphere, with a special focus on how it appears in the design and use of networked information infrastructures meant to support free speech. Students will closely read and evaluate different theories and accounts of publicness (e.g., Calhoun, Dewey, Habermas, Young, Fraser, Baker, Fiss, Taylor), use these to critique sociotechnical systems that claim to serve public functions, and leave the course with theoretically grounded, normative and analytical frameworks with which to engage different meanings of 'public'.

This class will be a chance for students to do three things: (1) read some foundational literature on public spheres; (2) experiment with connecting this literature to contemporary examples of public spheres; (3) craft critiques of both public spheres examples and theories. Each week we will examine a different system, institution, event, or organization through the lens of public sphere theories, practicing developing grounded interpretations of public sphere examples. By the end of the course, students should be able to talk about the idea of a public sphere from different theoretical and normative perspectives, appreciate the tensions and tradeoffs inherent in public spheres, and analyze contemporary examples of public spheres.

The course is organized into 6 themes:

1. Foundations & Models
2. Law & Structures
3. Norms & Ideals
4. Sizes & Scales
5. Forms & 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 public spheres and why do they matter?

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 reading reaction papers – 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. The phone number for DSP is (213) 740-0776.

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, the Student Guidebook, contains the Student Conduct Code in Section 11.00, while the recommended sanctions are located in Appendix A: <http://www.usc.edu/dept/publications/SCAMPUS/gov/> . Students will be referred to the Office of Student Judicial Affairs and Community Standards for further review, should there be any suspicion of academic dishonesty. The Review process can be found at: <http://www.usc.edu/student-affairs/SJACS/> .

FAQs

Q: Can I miss class?

A: No, 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, please stay at home, rest up until you feel better, and send me an email letting me know that you're missing class.

Q: Can I submit a paper late?

A: No, please don't. Weekly reading reaction papers will not be accepted late 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 to check if it's okay to submit a late paper.

Q: What happens when I send you a question over email?

A: I'll 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: No, please don't. Social media are great, but email is where I do course business so that I can have a record of our conversations, write more than 140 characters, and not worry about whether I need to "friend" or "follow" students in order to communicate.

Q: When can I meet with you?

A: My office hours are TBD and I'll announce these in class. I'd prefer that you come by during this time, but if you really can't make that time and it's urgent, please email me to set up a time.

Q: Why should I take this class?

A: I think Communication and Journalism are two of the most dynamic and important fields of study and practice today. There are so many issues, technologies, and events they touch upon and impact. Embedded in almost all of their different innovations, though, are assumptions about what the public sphere is, what 'public' means (or should mean), and what role individuals and groups should play in media environments. My aim in this course is to give you space to think through and experiment with ideas of the public sphere so that you can be ready to critique or create the next innovations in novel ways, or ask old questions of new sociotechnical systems. Ideally, you leave this course with a better sense of what public spheres can be – and why they matter.

Due to prior commitments, I need to reschedule two of the class meetings: Friday, September 21st and Friday, October 19th. My hope is that we can find another time that works for everyone and we will discuss this more the first class. However, please let me know if you are considering taking this class and are concerned about this rescheduling.

EVALUATION

Reading Reaction Papers: 15%

Each week, you will write a short, approximately 500-word response paper that engages with at least two of that week's readings. You can pose questions, contrast two or more readings, connect themes you saw emerging among the readings, or make an argument in opposition to the readings. The goal is to give you a chance to reflect upon the readings, share your reflections with your classmates, and demonstrate critical engagement with the readings so you can arrive in class prepared to participate. These papers are evaluated using a broad grading system:

‘check-plus’ = a very thoughtful take on the readings that moves a conversation forward

‘check’ = a good effort and result that makes a contribution to class, but could be stronger

‘minus’ = not quite up to expectations, let's talk in person about how to do better

‘Opening’ Readings: 15%

Twice during the semester, you will individually (or as a team, depending on numbers) ‘open’ one of the readings. I'll say more in class about what this means, but it is essentially a more in-depth reaction paper in which you carefully and closely consider one or more readings, summarize their main points and tensions for us, and discuss what you see as their strengths and weaknesses and connections to course themes.

Public Sphere Case Study: 15%

Once during the semester, you will present a case study of a public sphere. I will provide more detail on this in class but it's essentially a chance for you to choose an example of a public sphere (an online system, institution, event, organization), read it critically for its theoretical and normative assumptions, discuss how a theory does or does not account for the system, and suggest grounded improvements in a theory or system. I encourage you to choose your own example and I'm quite flexible on what counts as an example, but I can also provide you with a list of examples from which to choose.

Project proposal (10%)

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.

Final project (45%)

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.

SCHEDULE

Please note: Depending on students' reactions and how the course unfolds, I may want to change the order of some of these readings, or swap some of these for readings from the 'recommended' list at the end of the syllabus. If so, I will be sure to give you 2 weeks notice.

Week #1, August 31 :: Introduction & Overview

Introductions, review the syllabus, course themes and expectations. Do an in-class reading exercise and examine a public sphere technology together.

DISCUSSION 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'?

Week #2, September 7 :: Foundations & Models (Part One)

THOUGHT QUESTIONS

What does it mean to study "the public"? How do different authors conceptualize the public sphere? What is included and excluded within each idea of "public"?

READINGS

Dewey, J. (1927/1954). The public and its problems. New York, Swallow Press. (selections)

Calhoun, C. (1998). The public good as a social and cultural project. Private Action and the Public Good. W. Powell and E. Clemens, Yale University Press: 20-35.

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.

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

CASE STUDY

Presented by instructor.

Week #3, September 14 :: Foundations & Models (Part Two)

THOUGHT QUESTIONS

How does Habermas define the public sphere? How is this public sphere tied to its time period and material conditions? What is Fraser's critique of Habermas? What is *your* critique of Habermas?

READINGS

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

Dahlgren, P. (1991). Introduction. *Communication and citizenship: Journalism and the public sphere*. P. Dahlgren and C. Sparks. London, UK, Routledge: 1-24.

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

Habermas, J. (1996). *Between facts and norms: Contributions to a discourse theory of law and democracy*. Cambridge, UK, Polity Press. (Chapters 7 & 8 only)

CASE STUDY

Presented by instructor.

Week #4, September 21 :: Law & Structures (Part One) – NOTE: time will need to be rescheduled

THOUGHT QUESTIONS

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 studies?

READINGS

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

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

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.

Sunstein, C. (1994). *Democracy and the problem of free speech*. New York: Free Press. (Chapters 1-4)

CASE STUDY

Presented by student or team of students; see instructor for suggestions.

Week #5, September 28 :: Law & Structures (Part Two)

THOUGHT QUESTIONS

How does the First Amendment relate to the idea of the public sphere? How does Supreme Court First Amendment case law help us understand the public sphere? What images of the public do Fiss and Horwitz presume?

READINGS

Bollinger, L. C. (2010). *Uninhibited, robust and wide-open: A free press for a new century*. Oxford, UK, Oxford University Press.

Fiss, O. (1996). *The irony of free speech*. Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press. (Chapters 1 & 3)

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.

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

CASE STUDY

Presented by student or team of students; see instructor for suggestions.

Week #6, October 5 :: Norms & Ideals (Part One)

THOUGHT QUESTIONS

How does each author understand "participation" and what connections do they make between participation and the public sphere? What democratic values are attached to participation and what examples are offered? Who is assumed to be participating?

READINGS

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

Christians, C. G., T. L. Glasser, et al. (2009). *Normative theories of the media*. Urbana, IL, University of Illinois Press. (Chapters 1 & 4)

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

Pateman, C. (1970). *Participation and democratic theory*. Cambridge, UK, Cambridge University Press. (Chapters 1 & 2)

CASE STUDY

Presented by student or team of students; see instructor for suggestions.

Week #7, October 12 :: Norms & Ideals (Part Two)

THOUGHT QUESTIONS

How does Cohen describe the ideals and aims of deliberative democracy? What critiques do the authors make of the participation and deliberation as democratic ideals?

READINGS

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.

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.

Kreiss, D., M. Finn, et al. (2011). "The limits of peer production: Some reminders from Max Weber for the network society." *New Media & Society* 13(2): 243-259.

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.

CASE STUDY

Presented by student or team of students; see instructor for suggestions.

Week #8, October 19 :: Sizes & Scales (Part One) – **NOTE: time will need to be rescheduled**

THOUGHT QUESTIONS

What size and scale of public does each author presume and why? What aspects of a public sphere work at some scales but not others? What technologies are implicated in creating different scales of public spheres?

READINGS

Anderson, B. (1983/2006). *Imagined communities*. London, UK, Verso. (Selections)

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.

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

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

CASE STUDY

Presented by student or team of students; see instructor for suggestions.

Week #9, October 26 :: Sizes & Scales (Part Two)

THOUGHT QUESTIONS

What technologies of aggregation appear in the readings and how are they described or justified by appeals to democratic values? How do these aggregations model individuals? Who has power to make or resist these aggregations, and how are they subsequently used or made meaningful?

READINGS

Herbst, S. (1995). Numbered voices: How opinion polling has shaped American politics. Chicago, IL, The University of Chicago Press.

Igo, S. (2007). The averaged American: Surveys, citizens, and the making of a mass public. Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press. (Selections)

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

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

CASE STUDY

Presented by student or team of students; see instructor for suggestions.

Week #10, November 2 :: Forms & Practices (Part One)

THOUGHT QUESTIONS

How and where does each author locate the public sphere (profession, institution, market)? Recalling the discussion of norms and ideals, what does each space assume or offer, e.g., in terms of diversity, public engagement, participation deliberation?

READINGS

Carey, J. W. (1995). The press, public opinion, and public discourse. Public opinion and the communication of consent. T. L. Glasser and C. T. Salmon. New York, NY, Guildford Press.

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

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.

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

CASE STUDY

Presented by student or team of students; see instructor for suggestions.

Week #11, November 9 :: Forms & Practices (Part Two)

THOUGHT QUESTIONS

How is the public represented in each example below? What kind of agency or power do they have? What are the relationships between the representation of public opinion and the design of the public sphere?

READINGS

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.

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

Herbst, S. (1993). "The meaning of public opinion: Citizens' constructions of political reality." *Media, Culture & Society* 15: 437-454.

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

CASE STUDY

Presented by student or team of students; see instructor for suggestions.

Week #12, November 16 :: Imaginings & Innovations (Part One)

THOUGHT QUESTIONS

Using Taylor's notion of a "social imaginary", what is being imagined or explored in each of the other readings? What assumptions are being made about publics and public spheres in each? How do individuals, groups, public goods, and democratic values appear in each article?

READINGS

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

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

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

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

CASE STUDY

Presented by student or team of students; see instructor for suggestions.

Week #13, November 23 :: Thanksgiving, No Class

Week #14, November 30 :: Imaginings & Innovations (Part Two)

THOUGHT QUESTIONS

What technological forms appear in each writing? How are new public spheres realized in each, what assumptions about democratic values does each article explore? What types of experiments in public spheres are missing from this list?

READINGS

Anderson, C. W. (2011). "Deliberative, agonistic, and algorithmic audiences: Journalism's vision of its public in an age of audience transparency." *International Journal of Communication* 5: 529-547.

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

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

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

CASE STUDY

Presented by student or team of students; see instructor for suggestions.

Week #15, December 7:: Student Presentations of Final Projects

RECOMMENDED/SUPPLEMENTAL READINGS, ORGANIZED BY WEEKS & TOPIC

WEEKS 2 & 3 :: 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.

Benson, R. (2009). "Shaping the public sphere: Habermas and beyond." American Sociologist 40: 175-197.

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

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

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.

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

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.

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.

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.

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

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.

WEEKS 4 & 5 :: LAWS & STRUCTURES

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.

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

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.

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.

WEEKS 6 & 7 :: NORMS & IDEALS

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

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

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

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.

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.

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

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.

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.

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.

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

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.

WEEKS 8 & 9 :: SIZES & SCALES

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.

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).

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.

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.

WEEKS 10 & 11 :: FORMS & PRACTICES

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

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.

Herbst, S. and J. Beninger (1994). The changing infrastructure of public opinion. *Audience-making: 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.

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.

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.

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.

WEEKS 12 & 14 :: 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.

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.

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

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

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

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