

COMM 573:

Networked Publics: Theories & Encounters

Annenberg School for Communication & Journalism
University of Southern California

Thursday, 2-4:50pm

Location: ANN-211

Mike Ananny, Assistant Professor
ananny@usc.edu

Office Hours: Tuesdays 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 institutions and 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), use critiques of these theories to extend the concept of “public,” examine newer work on the idea of networked publics in light of these debates, and build toward a theoretically informed critique of a contemporary sociotechnical system that claims to serve public functions, or that students see as relevant to the idea of publicness.

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, and students are required to analyze existing, contemporary sociotechnical systems in light of theories of the public. Essentially, the entire course focuses on three questions: what are networked publics, where have they come from, and why do they matter?

Learning Objectives

By the end of the course, students should be able to talk about publics from different theoretical and normative perspectives, appreciate the tensions and tradeoffs inherent in them, critique contemporary, networked publics, and make connections between ideals of publicness and designs of communication infrastructures, institutions, 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 often under a great deal of pressure, with the amount and type of pressure varying at different points in the semester. If you feel overwhelmed, please reach out for help. Please talk to me, or USC Student Counseling Services (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%): Post to Blackboard every week by 7pm Wednesday

Each week, you will write a short, approximately 350-500 word memo that engages with at least two 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:

'check-plus' = thoughtful and sophisticated analysis that moves a conversation forward

'check' = a good effort that contributes to class, but could have been 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 Wednesday night before Thursday's class**. You are encouraged but not required to read your classmates' memos.

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%)

Six times (6x) during the semester, you will individually 'open' a reading. 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 neither is required. *Even if you are not opening a reading, you are expected to have read it and come to class prepared to discuss.*

'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%) :: Due November 2

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%) :: Due November 9

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%) :: Due December 13

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 24 :: 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 are your definitions of "public" and "public sphere"? What publics and 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 31 :: Foundations & Models (Part One)

THOUGHT QUESTIONS

How have different authors historically defined the public sphere? What do they include and exclude, how do they conceptualize the "public good" and relate it to theories of rights? What does each theory of the public assume about individuals, their behavior, their associations? 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.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.

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

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

Week #3, September 7 :: Foundations & Models (Part Two)

THOUGHT QUESTIONS

How does Calhoun define a Habermasian public sphere? How does he interpret Habermas's historical work? Where do these conditions exist today? What is Benson's critique of Habermas, how does Fung balance different priorities, and why have media scholars often focused on Habermas? Where does the "unencumbered self" appear in these accounts?

READINGS

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.

Warner, Michael. (2002). Publics and counterpublics. *Public Culture*, 14(1), 49-90.

Recommended:

Mouffe, Chantal (2000). Deliberative Democracy or Agonistic Pluralism. *Political Science Series*

https://www.ihs.ac.at/publications/pol/pw_72.pdf

Week #4, September 14 :: Norms & Ideals (Part One)

THOUGHT QUESTIONS

What connections do authors make among ideals of participation, civil society, and the public sphere? What models of change do they imply or advocated? What empirical or theoretical evidence do they use to support their claims?

READINGS

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.

Jenkins, Henry, & Carpentier, Nico. (2013). Theorizing participatory intensities: A conversation about participation and politics. *Convergence: The Journal of Research into New Media Technologies*. doi:10.1177/1354856513482090

Kelty, Christopher M. (2017). Too much democracy in all the wrong places: Toward a grammar of participation. *Current Anthropology*, 58(S15). doi:doi:10.1086/688705

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 21 :: Norms & Ideals (Part Two)

THOUGHT QUESTIONS

How does each author critique dominant or historical models of publics by highlighting material communication or critical-cultural engagement? How might earlier models of public spheres (e.g., Calhoun, Taylor, Habermas) be revised to address their critiques – or are their visions of publicness simply too far afield from earlier models?

READINGS (one more than usual, but a few of them are short)

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.

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

Neal, Mark A. (1998). Introduction: Toward a black public *What the music said: Black popular music and black public culture* (pp. 1-24). New York, NY: Routledge.

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, Iris Marion. (2006). De-centered deliberative democracy. *Kettering Review*, 24(3), 43-53.

Week #6, September 28 :: Laws & Institutions (Part One)

THOUGHT QUESTIONS

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 for state involvement in a public sphere can be read into the state's relationship with institutions like journalism, prisons, and philanthropy? Why are these questions for Communication scholars?

READINGS

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

Churcher, Kalen M. A. (2011). Journalism behind bars: The Louisiana State Penitentiary's Angolite magazine. *Communication, Culture & Critique*, 4, 382-400.

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

Reich, Rob. (2016). On the role of foundations in democracies. In Rob Reich, Chiara Cordelli, & Lucy Bernholz (Eds.), *Philanthropy in democratic societies: History, institutions, values* (pp. 64-81). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

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 5 :: Laws & Institutions (Part Two)

THOUGHT QUESTIONS

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, Strömbäck, and Carlson assume are possible and how do these images influence their thinking about journalism as a profession, or the press as a public institution?

READINGS

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

Carlson, Matt. (2017). Establishing the boundaries of journalism's public mandate. In Chris Peters & Marcel Broersma (Eds.), *Rethinking journalism again: Societal role and public relevance in a digital age* (pp. 49-63). London, UK: Routledge.

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

Steel, John. (2017). Reappraising journalism's normative foundations. In Chris Peters & Marcel Broersma (Eds.), *Rethinking journalism again: Societal role and public relevance in a digital age* (pp. 35-48). London, UK: Routledge.

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

Recommended:

Browse Harvard Law Review's "Freedom of the Press" symposium:

<http://harvardlawreview.org/roundtable/symposium-freedom-of-the-press/>

Week #8, October 12 :: Sizes & Scales (Part One)

THOUGHT QUESTIONS

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?

READINGS (*one more than usual, but a few of them are short*)

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.

Dahl, R. A., & Tufte, E. R. (1973). Size and democracy in political thought & Dimensions of size and democracy. *Size and democracy* (pp. 4-16, 17-29). Stanford: Stanford University Press.

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

Chouliaraki, Lillie. (2013). Mediating vulnerability: cosmopolitanism and the public sphere. *Media, Culture & Society*, 35(1), 105-112. doi:10.1177/0163443712464564

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.

Week #9, October 19 :: Sizes & Scales (Part Two)

THOUGHT QUESTIONS

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—and the chances of an aggregation being "wrong"?

READINGS

Bouk, Dan. (2015). Valuing lives, in four movements. *How our days became numbered: Risk and the rise of the statistical individual* (pp. 147-182). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

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 #10, October 26 :: Designs & Practices (Part One)

THOUGHT QUESTIONS

How are platforms, infrastructures, social media, and utilities like or unlike publics? What forms of association do they create or require, and where do conceptions of the public appear in their design and governance?

READINGS

Gillespie, Tarleton. (2017). Governance of and by platforms. In Jean Burgess, Thomas Poell, & Alice Marwick (Eds.), *SAGE Handbook of Social Media*. London, UK: SAGE.

Klonick, Kate. (2017). The New Governors: The People, Rules, and Processes Governing Online Speech. *Harvard Law Review*, 131.

Napoli, Philip M., & Caplan, Robyn. (2017). Why media companies insist they're not media companies, why they're wrong, and why it matters. *First Monday*, 22(5).

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

Crawford, K., & Gillespie, T. (2014). What is a flag for? Social media reporting tools and the vocabulary of complaint. *New Media & Society*. doi:10.1177/1461444814543163

Week #11, November 2 :: Designs & Practices (Part Two)

-- PROJECT PROPOSALS DUE --

THOUGHT QUESTIONS

What publics do authors invoke in their discussions of materiality? Are these "platforms" or publics? How do publics appear in Weibo, Black Twitter, indigenous communities in Northern Canada, or those living alongside oil pipelines?

READINGS

Barry, A. (2013). The affected public *Material politics: Disputes along the pipeline* (pp. 95-115). New York: Wiley.

Brock, André. (2012). From the blackhand side: Twitter as a cultural conversation. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 56(4), 529-549. doi:10.1080/08838151.2012.732147

Callison, Candis. (2014). Introduction *How climate change comes to matter: The communal life of facts* (pp. 1-38). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

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.

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 #12, November 9 :: Imaginings & Innovations (Part One)

-- PEER FEEDBACK ON PROJECT PROPOSALS DUE --

THOUGHT QUESTIONS

Recalling Taylor's "social imaginary," what publics are imagined or prototyped in algorithmic media? How do algorithmically calculated publics differ from publics—or individuals—convened through polls, surveys, and questionnaires? What research tools and environments are needed to know networked, algorithmic publics?

READINGS

Cheney-Lippold, John. (2017). Introduction *We are data: Algorithms and The Making of Our Digital Selves* (pp. 1-36). New York, NY: NYU Press.

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.

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

Sandvig, Christian, Hamilton, Kevin, Karahalios, Karrie, & Langbort, Cedric. (2016). When the Algorithm Itself is a Racist: Diagnosing Ethical Harm in the Basic Components of Software. *International Journal of Communication*, 4972-4990.

Striphas, Ted. (2015). Algorithmic culture. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 18(4-5), 395-412. doi:10.1177/1367549415577392

Week #13, November 16 :: Imaginings & Innovations (Part Two)

THOUGHT QUESTIONS

This week is a somewhat idiosyncratic tour of sociotechnical cultures, conceptions of publicness, and media-centric models of change. How are publics *made* through different design activities and sociotechnical cultures? How does the design and deployment of digital technologies in design settings 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.

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.

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

Thompson, Krista. (2015). Introduction: Of shine, bling, and bixels. *Shine: The visual economy of light in African diasporic aesthetic practice* (pp. 1-46). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Turner, Fred. (2009). Burning Man at Google: a cultural infrastructure for new media production. *New Media & Society*, 11(1-2), 73-94. doi:doi:10.1177/1461444808099575

Recommended:

Guldi, Jo. (2017). A History of the Participatory Map. *Public Culture*, 29(1 81), 79-112. doi:10.1215/08992363-3644409

Marwick, Alice, & Lewis, Rebecca. (2017). Media manipulation and disinformation online. *Data & Society*: https://datasociety.net/pubs/oh/DataAndSociety_MediaManipulationAndDisinformationOnline.pdf

Week #14, November 23 :: THANKSGIVING, NO CLASS

**Week #15, November 30 :: Student Presentations & Course Wrap-Up
Final Papers Due Friday, December 13th**

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.
- 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.

Baker, Houston A. (1995). Critical memory and the black public sphere. In Black Public Sphere Collective (Ed.), *The Black public sphere: A public culture book* (pp. 7-37). New York, NY: Public Culture.

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.

Canovan, Margaret. (1999). Trust the People! Populism and the Two Faces of Democracy. *Political Studies*, 47(1), 2-16. doi:10.1111/1467-9248.00184

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.
- Hartman, Saidiya V. (1997). *Scenes of Subjection: Terror, Slavery, and Self-Making in Nineteenth-Century America*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- 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.
- 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.
- Lingel, Jessica, & boyd, danah. (2013). 'Keep it secret, keep it safe': Information poverty, information norms, and stigma. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 64(5), 981-991.
- 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.
- Rankine, Claudia. (2014). *Citizen: An American lyric*. Minneapolis, MN: Graywolf Press.
- Tironi, Manuel. (2014). Counter-enactments in participatory experiments. *Science, Technology, & Human Values*. doi: 10.1177/0162243914560649
- 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.
- 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.
- Kerslake, E., & Kinnell, M. (1998). Public libraries, public interest and the information society: Theoretical issues in the social impact of public libraries. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*, 30(3), 159-167.
- 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>
- Lingel, Jessa, & Sinnreich, Aram. (2016). Incoded counter-conduct: What the incarcerated can teach us about resisting mass surveillance. *First Monday*, 21(5).
- Munshi, D., Kurian, P., Fraser, R., & Rupa, 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
- Strömbäck, J. (2005). In search of a standard: Four models of democracy and their normative implications for journalism. *Journalism Studies*, 6(3), 331-345.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.

Porter, Theodore M. (1986). *The rise of statistical thinking: 1820-1900*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Porter, Theodore M. (1995). *Trust in numbers*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University 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.

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.

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).

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*. 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. *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.
- 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. Tift (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.

Barocas, Solon, & Selbst, Andrew D. (2016). Big data's disparate impact. *California Law Review*, 104, 671-732. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.15779/Z38BG31>

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

Beer, David. (2016). *Metric power*. London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

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.
- 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
- 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.
- Geiger, R. Stuart. (2016). Bot-based collective blocklists in Twitter: the counterpublic moderation of harassment in a networked public space. *Information, Communication & Society*, 19(6), 787-803. doi:10.1080/1369118X.2016.1153700
- 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.
- Kelty, C. (2005). "Geeks, social imaginaries, and recursive publics." *Cultural Anthropology* 20(2): 185-214.
- 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.
- Latour, B. and P. Weibel, Eds. (2005). *Making things public: Atmospheres of democracy*. Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.
- Mager, A. (2016). Search engine imaginary: Visions and values in the co-production of search technology and Europe. *Social Studies of Science*. doi:10.1177/0306312716671433
- 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
- Powell, Alison. (2016). Hacking in the public interest: Authority, legitimacy, means, and ends. *New Media & Society*. doi:10.1177/1461444816629470
- 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.

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.

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