

## **POL-GA 3300.001; Advanced Research Seminar on Social Media and Politics**

**Fall 2020**

This course will look at the impact of social media on politics, broadly speaking. We will be examining both how social media can be used to answer existing questions about political behavior of masses and elites, and look at how social media impacts politics. Several aspects of social media generally stand out: it facilitates information flow, it eliminates gate-keepers of information (traditional media), and it can facilitate coordination. Social media also provides amazingly rich data with which to test theories of politics. We will be covering existing research on the impact of social media and politics, with a focus on how existing empirical work relates to long-standing political science research questions, and we will be dealing with issues of how future empirical work can test for causal inference with what must very often be observational data. Each week's class will generally be a mix of: 1) critically reading the existing literature on social media, and related political science work informing the topic being discussed; and 2) discussing current empirical work being carried out on social media. Students enrolled in the course will have the opportunity to work with data collected by the Center for Social Media and Politics ([CSMaP](#)) lab.

### **Instructors**

**Jonathan Nagler**, Professor of Politics, Co-Director of NYU Social Media and Political Participation (SMaPP) lab. 19 West 4<sup>th</sup> Street, REMOTE, 2-9676, jonathan dot nagler at nyu dot edu, @Jonathan\_Nagler

**Joshua A. Tucker**, Professor of Politics, Co-Director of NYU Social Media and Political Participation (SMaPP) lab. 19 West 4<sup>th</sup> Street, Room 430, 8-7598, joshua dot tucker at nyu dot edu, @j\_a\_tucker

### **Requirements**

Grading is based on class participation (20%), presentations during the semester (20%) and a term paper (60%). Auditors are welcome.

*Class Participation:* This is a graduate seminar, and all students will be expected to have done the required reading before each week's seminar and to contribute to the class discussion.

*Class Presentations:* Students will be required to make presentations on readings as well as research in progress. Students will be asked to sign up on the online syllabus for which readings they want to present. Contingent on class enrollment - each student will sign up

to present in two separate weeks. THE PRESENTATION SHOULD BE NO MORE THAN 15 MINUTES.

- I. INTRO SLIDE: What is the topic/research question of the week?
- II. 2-slide summary of each article
  - A. Main Research Question
  - B. Data/Methodology
  - C. Finding
- III. For (all readings, subset):
  - A. Do you believe it?
  - B. Interesting extensions?
  - C. When would it apply and not apply in other settings?
  - D. What would be the next paper that should be written to advance this topic?
- IV. If it is 2 people,
  - A. Split papers
  - B. coordinate on the part II slides

*Class Format:* Other than the first and last two classes, each of the remaining 11 weeks will be split into two parts. The first half of the class will take the format of a normal graduate seminar, with **brief** presentations on readings followed by seminar style discussion. The second half of the class will feature a presentation on ongoing research by either a member of the class, a member of the SMaPP lab, or an outside speaker.

*Term Paper:* Each PhD student enrolled in the course is required to write a term paper for this course that will take the form of a **research proposal** or a **research paper** utilizing social media data. A **research proposal** will look like an empirical journal article, only without the actual analysis. Thus it will include a statement of a research question or puzzle, a review of the literature related to the topic, theoretical arguments that can be used to provide an answer to the question, hypotheses drawn from these theories that can be tested empirically, and a description of what empirical evidence and methods will be used to test these hypotheses (including how the hypotheses could be falsified); it can of course also contain some initial analysis of the data. Writing a research proposal gives you a chance to really explore the important questions in writing a paper (a good question, relationship to the literature, research design, appropriate and available data) without the pressure of also having to complete the data analysis. Research proposals will be between 18-20 pages. A **research paper** will include the complete analysis, as well as discussion and directions for future analysis. Research papers will be between 20-30 papers. If you have previously written a research proposal for the course in a prior semester, you will be encouraged to turn that proposal into a research paper.

In an ideal world, you will then be able to turn the proposal or paper into a publishable paper that can be sent out to a journal. This is of course *not* a requirement of the course – you can walk away from your paper when the class is done if you want - but should be seen as a potential additional benefit of the course.

MA students and undergraduates will have the option of writing an 18-20 page **literature review** instead of the **research proposal**.

Regardless of whether you are writing a research paper, proposal, or literature review, you are required to meet with one of the course instructors no later than October 31st. A week prior to this meeting, you should email the instructor with whom you are meeting a one-page summary/outline of your planned paper. You should schedule these meetings by emailing Tasha Gordon <ng64@nyu.edu>.

**Papers are due Monday, December 14<sup>th</sup> by Midnight.**

*Oral Presentation of Term Paper.* This will take place the last week (or two weeks, depending on how many students enroll) of the course. The idea here is to mimic giving a conference presentation on your own research.

### **Readings**

As this is a Ph.D. class, we will assume you can download readings yourself. However, we will also set up a Google Drive to facilitate the sharing of readings for the class.

### **Office Hours**

Nagler will hold office hours on Tuesdays from 6pm to 7pm. Sign up [Office-Hour-Spreadsheet](#)

Tucker will hold office hours on Mondays from 10:45 – 12:15. You can sign up here:

<https://calendar.google.com/calendar/selfsched?sstoken=UVBGa1FDYzJVdFVWfGRIZmF1bHR8MTk3ZjEyZjlxN2U4YTgxNGI0YzQ5NmJjNDNjZmViZTc>

To schedule meetings with either outside of office hours, please email Natasha Gordon (ng64@nyu.edu).

### **Course Schedule, Weekly Topics, and Assigned Readings**

Note: Readings here are Subject to Change (and you should feel free to make suggestions). Anyone in the class can add relevant readings to the “Additional Readings”, please put your initials before the reading so we can follow up with you; also please put a copy of the reading in the Google Drive if you add it.

**Week 1, Sep 7, Intro and Some Logistics**

- a. Introductions
- b. Introduction to the SMaPP Lab
- c. Course logistics
- d. Sign up for class presentations

## **Week 2, September 12th: What makes social media distinct for information flow in politics?**

We want to talk about what social media is, and what characteristics it has. For instance, it lowers the barriers to broadcasting information (mainstream media or even fringe media are longer gatekeepers of information). It can facilitate coordination among masses. And it lets us measure opinion via topics talked about and via responses to posts by elites.

### **READINGS:**

- a. Persily “Can Democracy Survive the Internet” (JoD)
- b. Tucker et al. “From Liberation to Turmoil (JoD)
- c. Barberá, P and Steinert-Threlkeld “How to Use Social Media Data for Political Science Research” forthcoming chapter in *The SAGE Handbook of Research Methods in Political Science and International Relations*
- d. Pew 2019 Social Media Use in the US Update:  
<https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2019/04/10/share-of-u-s-adults-using-social-media-including-facebook-is-mostly-unchanged-since-2018/>
- e. Pew, In Emerging Economies, “Smartphone and Social Media Users have Broader Social Networks”,

### **ADDITIONAL READINGS:**

- Persily, Nate “[The Internet’s Challenge to Democracy](#)”, forthcoming in *Social Media and Democracy*.

### Week 3, Sept. 21: Networks & Ideology

Users of social media reveal much about themselves by their online behavior (their creation of 'digital trace' data). They choose which accounts to follow, what stories or pages to like and/or share, etc. Since Barbera 2015, assuming homophily in following behavior has been a common way to estimate ideology. Such annotation of individuals greatly enriches our ability to learn about political behavior and opinion on social media as we can now observe behavior of millions of people whose ideology can be identified (though remember, identified with error!!).

#### READINGS:

- a. Barbera, Pablo. 2015. "Birds of the Same Feather Tweet Together: Bayesian Ideal Point Estimation Using Twitter Data." *Political Analysis* 23(1):76–91.
- b. Bond, Robert and Solomon Messing. 2015. "Quantifying Social Media's Political Space: Estimating Ideology from Publicly Revealed Preferences on Facebook." *American Political Science Review* 109(1):62–78.
- c. Eady, et-al, "Measuring Ideology Using URL Shares", Working Paper.

#### Additional Readings:

- Measuring ideology using different techniques on social media
  - Preoțiu-Pietro, D., Liu, Y., Hopkins, D., & Ungar, L. (2017). Beyond binary labels: political ideology prediction of twitter users. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)* (Vol. 1, pp. 729-740).
  - Colleoni, E., Rozza, A., & Arvidsson, A. (2014). Echo chamber or public sphere? Predicting political orientation and measuring political homophily in Twitter using big data. *Journal of Communication*, 64(2), 317-332.
  - Fang, A., Ounis, I., Habel, P., Macdonald, C., & Limsopatham, N. (2015, August). Topic-centric classification of twitter user's political orientation. In *Proceedings of the 38th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval* (pp. 791-794). ACM.
  - Temporao, Michael, Corentin Vande Kerckhove, Clifton van der Linden, Yannick Dufresne and Julien M. Hendrickx. 2018. "Ideological Scaling of Social Media Users: A Dynamic Lexicon Approach." *Political Analysis* 26(4):457–473.
- Using other data to measure political orientation
  - Pan, J., & Xu, Y. (2018). China's ideological spectrum. *The Journal of Politics*, 80(1), 254-273.
  - Gentzkow, M., & Shapiro, J. M. (2010). What drives media slant? Evidence from US daily newspapers. *Econometrica*, 78(1), 35-71.
- Using social media as a tool of measurement

- Zeitzoff, T., Kelly, J., & Lotan, G. (2015). Using social media to measure foreign policy dynamics: An empirical analysis of the Iranian–Israeli confrontation (2012–13). *Journal of Peace Research*, 52(3), 368-383.
- Messing, Solomon, Patrick van Kessel and Adam Hughes. 2017. “Sharing the News in a Polarized Congress: Partisan and Ideological Divides Shape Which News Outlets Legislators Share Links to on Facebook.” Pew Research Center, December 17.

## Week 4, Sept 28: Causal Inference in Online Data

Since most work on social media data is done with observational data, drawing causal inferences can be challenging. It is difficult (some would say impossible) to conduct a field experiment where people are randomly assigned either to engage with social media at all, or to engage in particular ways. We will read some attempts at field experiments, as well as attempts to use instruments to deal with self-selection, and a paper arguing that valid inferences can be drawn with neither.

### READINGS

- Muller, Karsten and Carlo Schwarz, “From Hashtag to Hate Crime: Twitter and Anti-Minority Sentiment”, (SSRN-2019)
- Enikolopov, Ruben, Alexey Makarin, and Maria Petrova, “Social Media and Protest Participation: Evidence from Russia”, SSRN, 2018.
- Siegel, Alexandra, et-al, “Tweeting Beyond Tahrir: Ideological Diversity and Political Intolerance in Egyptian Twitter Networks”, 2019.
- Allcott, Hunt, Luca Braghieri, Sarah Eichmeyer, and Matthew Gentzkow. “The Welfare Effects of Social Media”. (SSRN-2019) ([Here](#) is a video summary)

### Additional Readings



## Week 5, October 5: Text and Images

Social media messages include text and images that can convey information. Typically analysts look at text to try to determine the object of the text, the sentiment or stance of the text towards that object (favorable or unfavorable), and the topic of the text. But images also include information that can be extracted. Images can convey information about events, and may present that image in a particular tone. This week we look at some papers making use of topic modelling with text and image analysis.

### Readings

- Barbera, Pablo, Andreu Casa, Jonathan Nagler, Patrick Egan, Richard Bonneau, John T. Jost, Joshua A. Tucker, "Who Leads? Who Follows? Measuring Issue Attention and Agenda Setting by Legislators and the Mass Public Using Social Media Data", *American Political Science Review*,
- Zachary C. Steinert-Threlkeld and Jungseock Joo: "Event Data from Images"
- Casas, Andreu and Nora Webbe Williams "Images that Matter: Online Protests and the Mobilizing Role of Pictures"

### Additional Readings

- Roberts, Margaret E., Brandon M. Stewart, Dustin Tingley, Christopher Lucas, Jetson Leder-Luis, Shana Kushner Gadarian, Bethany Albertson, and David G. Rand. "Structural topic models for open-ended survey responses." *American Journal of Political Science* 58, no. 4 (2014): 1064-1082.
- Casas et al. Images as Data for Social Science Research: An Introduction to Convolutional Neural Nets for Image Classification

## Week 6: Monday, October 12: Linking survey data and social media data

Social Media provides us the opportunity to get a wide set of data with many respondents giving us unfiltered views. But we do not necessarily know much about who is saying what we observe. By linking social media data with survey data we can find out what types of people are engaging in different production and consumption behaviors on social media. And we can try to observe the impact of those social media behaviors on political attitudes and actions.

### READINGS:

- Klasnja et al. (2018) "Measuring Public Opinion with Social Media Data". *The Oxford Handbook of Polling and Survey Methods*. P.555-582
- Munger, et-al (SMaPP), "How Accurate are Survey Responses on Social Media and Politics", forthcoming, *Political Communication*.
- Buntain, C., McGrath, E., Golbeck, J., Lafree, G., & Golbeck, J. (2016). Comparing Social Media and Traditional Surveys Around the Boston Marathon Bombing. *#Microposts: 6th Workshop on Making Sense of Microposts (WWW'16 Companion)*.
- Munger, et-al (SMaPP), "Political Knowledge and Misinformation in the Era of Social Media: Evidence from the 2015 UK Election".
- Eady, et-al (SMaPP), "Social Media , Information, and Polarization in the US 2016 Presidential Election"
- Dimitrova, Daniela V, Adam Shehata, Jesper Stromback, Lars W. Nord, "The Effects of Digital Media on Political Knowledge and Participation in Election Campaigns Evidence From Panel Data". 2014. *Communication Research*. Vol 41 (1): 95-118

### Additional Readings:

## Week 7, Oct 19: Protest and social media

Social media can be used to coordinate protest activity. But in addition to providing information about planned activities, it can change incentives to participate as participants may have different benefits and costs to attending as attendance (or failure to attend) will be more likely to be public.

### READINGS:

- Larson, Jennifer, et al., (SMaPP), "Social Networks and Protest Participation: Evidence from 130 Million Twitter Users," *American Journal of Political Science*, 2019.
- Gonzalez-Bailon et al. (2011) "The Dynamics of Protest Recruitment through an Online Network", *Scientific Reports* 1:197.
- Bennett and Segerberg (2012) "The Logic of Connective Action: Digital media and the personalization of contentious politics," *Information, Communication & Society*, 15(5):739-768.
- Casas et al. (CSMaP): The Mechanisms of Protest Recruitment through Social Media Networks

### Additional Readings:

1. Kuran, Timur. 1991. "Now Out of Never: The Element of Surprise in the East European Revolution of 1989." *World Politics*. 44(1): 7–48.
2. Barberá, Pablo, Ning Wang, Richard Bonneau, John T. Jost, Jonathan Nagler, Joshua Tucker. and Sandra Gonzalez-Bailon. 2015. "The Critical Periphery in the Growth of Social Protests", *PLOS One*, DOI:10.1371/journal.pone.0143611., [PLOSone](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0143611).
3. Tufekci and Wilson, "Social Media and the Decision to Participate in Political Protest: Observations From Tahrir Square", [Journal of Communication](https://doi.org/10.1177/1075547012450000) , 2012.

## Week 8, October 26: Non-protest Political Participation and Social Media

As with protest activity, social media can help with coordination, and makes participation, or failure to participate, more public. It also provides information about activities of elites, friends, peers, etc..

### READINGS:

- a. Bond, et-al, "A 61-million-person experiment in social influence and political mobilization", [Nature](#), 2012
- b. Jones JJ, Bond RM, Bakshy E, Eckles D, Fowler JH (2017). "Social influence and political mobilization: Further evidence from a randomized experiment in the 2012 U.S. presidential election." *PLOS ONE* 12(4): e0173851. [PLOS ONE](#)
- c. Settle, J. E., Bond, R. M., Coviello, L., Fariss, C. J., Fowler, J. H., & Jones, J. J. (2016). From posting to voting: The effects of political competition on online political engagement. *Political Science Research and Methods*, 4(2), 361-378.

### Additional Readings:

- Other types of political participation
  - Enikolopov, R., Petrova, M., & Sonin, K. (2018). Social media and corruption. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 10(1), 150-74.
  - Petrova, M., Sen, A., & Yildirim, P. (2017). Social media and political donations: New technology and incumbency advantage in the United States
  - Skoric, M. et al (2015). Social media and citizen engagement: A meta-analytic review. *New Media & Society*. Vol 18, Issue 9, pp. 1817 - 1839. [NA]
  - Pew Research Center, 2018: Public attitudes toward political engagement on social media <http://www.pewinternet.org/2018/07/11/public-attitudes-toward-political-engagement-on-social-media/> [NA]
  - Miller, P. R., Bobkowski, P. S., Maliniak, D., & Rapoport, R. B. (2015). Talking politics on Facebook: Network centrality and political discussion practices in social media. *Political Research Quarterly*, 68(2), 377-391. doi:10.1177/1065912915580135 [NA]

## Week 9: November 2: Echo Chambers, Media Bubbles, Extremism and Polarization

One of the biggest questions about social media is whether it changes the sources of information people have in ways to bias those sources towards their own ideological predispositions, and/or to severely restrict the range of viewpoints they read about. This extends to a host of issues of whether people find information shared by known entities, and in particular friends, to be more believable than information they receive via other means.

### READINGS:

- SMaPP, “**Tweeting From Left to Right: Is Online Political Communication More Than an Echo Chamber?**”, *Psychological Sciences*, 2015:  
<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/0956797615594620>
- Messing and Westwood, 2012, “Selective Exposure in the Age of Social Media; Endorsements Trump Partisan Source Affiliation When Selecting News Online,” [\*Communications Research\*](#)
- Bakshy, Messing & Adamic, “Exposure to Ideologically Diverse News and Opinion on Facebook”, 2015, [Science](#) [ responses]
- Barbera chapter 3 on political polarization from Persily/Tucker book (Full .pdf of book is now in folder -- read Chapter 3.
- Bail, Christopher et al. 2019. “Exposure to Opposing Views can Increase Political Polarization: Evidence from a Large-Scale Field Experiment on Social Media.” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* pp. 1–6.  
<http://www.pnas.org/content/early/2018/08/27/1804840115>
- Eady, et-al (SMaPP), “Are People on Social Media in Bubbles”, *Sage Open*

### Additional Readings

- Guess, Andrew, Benjamin Lyons, Brendan Nyhan and Jason Reifler. 2018. “Avoiding the Echo Chamber about Echo Chambers.” Knight Foundation Report.  
[https://kf-site-production.s3.amazonaws.com/media\\_elements/files/000/000/133/original/Topos\\_KF\\_White-Paper\\_Nyhan\\_V1.pdf](https://kf-site-production.s3.amazonaws.com/media_elements/files/000/000/133/original/Topos_KF_White-Paper_Nyhan_V1.pdf)
- Karslen et al, 2017. “Echo chamber and trench warfare dynamics in online debates.” [\*European Journal of Communication\*](#) 32(3): 257-273. [NA]
- Vaccari et al, 2016. “Of Echo Chambers and Contrarian Clubs: Exposure to Political Disagreement Among German and Italian Users of Twitter.” [Social Media + Society](#) [NA]
- Add Kate Starbird new paper about BLM + IRA accounts
- Barberá, Pablo. 2015. “How Social Media Reduces Mass Political Polarization. Evidence from Germany, Spain, and the U.S.”  
[http://pablobarbera.com/static/barbera\\_polarization\\_APSA.pdf](http://pablobarbera.com/static/barbera_polarization_APSA.pdf)

- Vraga, Emily. 2016. "Party Differences in Political Content on Social Media." *Online Information Review* 40(5): 595–609.
- Barbera, Pablo, and Gonzalo Rivero. 2014. "Political discussions on Twitter during elections are dominated by those with extreme views." *LSE European Politics and Policy (EUROPP) Blog*, December 9, 2014. Downloaded September 9, 2017 from <http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/europpblog/2014/12/09/political-discussions-on-twitter-during-elections-are-dominated-by-th>
- Geschke, Daniel, Jan Lorenz, and Peter Holtz. "The triple-filter bubble: Using agent-based modelling to test a meta-theoretical framework for the emergence of filter bubbles and echo chambers." *British Journal of Social Psychology* (2018).
- Singer and Confessore, 2018. *The New York Times*. "[Republicans Find a Facebook Workaround: Their Own Apps.](#)" [NA]

## Week 10: November 9: Online Advertising

Facebook and Google have become huge platforms for advertisers to target users with specific interests or characteristics. Here we look at how political actors take advantage of this.

### READINGS:

- Chester and Montgomery, *Internet Policy Review*, "The Role of Digital Marketing in Political Campaigns."
- Kruike-meier, et. al, *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, "Political Microtargeting: Relationship between personalized advertising on Facebook and Voters' Responses," 2016, Vol 19, (6): 367-372.
- Liberini, et-al, "Politics in the Facebook Era: Evidence from the 2016 US Presidential Election", working paper
- Edelson, Sakhuja, Dey, and McCoy, "An Analysis of United States Online Political Advertising", NYU-Tandon.
  - AND, see accompanying website: [Online-Political-Ads-Analysis](#)]

## Week 11: November 16: (Correcting) Misinformation Online:

There really is such a thing as `Fake News`: one definition is that it is content produced for profit that is known by the creator to be false, but is claimed to be true.

Unfortunately, categorizing other items along the `truthiness` scale is harder. But it is a topic of major interest, as is the issue of how to minimize its impact.

### READINGS:

- Guess, et-al (SMaPP), *Science Advances*, 2019 “Less than you Think: Prevalence and Predictors of Fake News Dissemination on Facebook”, Vol 5(1).
- Grinberg, Lazer, et-al, “Fake News on Twitter During the 2016 U.S. Presidential Election”, *Science*
- “Trends in the diffusion of Misinformation on Social Media” (Allcott, Gentzkow, and Yu 2018. <https://web.stanford.edu/~gentzkow/research/fake-news-trends.pdf>
- Pennycook, Epstein, Mosleh, Arechar, Eckles, Rand, “Understanding and reducing the spread of misinformation online “ <https://psyarxiv.com/3n9u8>
- Berinsky, Adam and Chole Wittenberg, “Misinformation and Its Correction”, Chapter in Edited Volume by Persily/Tucker.

### Additional Readings:

- “Do tabloids poison the well of social media? Explaining democratically dysfunctional news sharing” (Chadwick, Vaccari, O’Loughlin 2018) **[MR]** <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444818769689>
  - Sharing tabloid news on social media is a significant predictor of democratically dysfunctional misinformation and disinformation behaviors.
- “Social Media and Fake News in the 2016 Election” (Allcott and Gentzkow, JEP, 2017) <https://pubs.aeaweb.org/doi/pdfplus/10.1257/jep.31.2.211> <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.31.2.211>
- Adam Badawy, Kristina Lerman, and Emilio Ferrara (2018). “Who Falls for Online Political Manipulation?” In: , [arXiv](https://arxiv.org/abs/1808.08808)
  - Chadwick, A., Vaccari, C., & O’Loughlin, B. (2018). Do tabloids poison the well of social media? Explaining democratically dysfunctional news sharing. *New Media & Society*, 20(11), 4255–4274. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444818769689>
- Broderick, Ryan, “No One Knows How Bad Fake News Is On WhatsApp, But If Brazil's Election Is Any Indication, It's Bad,” BuzzFeed News. <https://www.buzzfeednews.com/article/ryanhatethis/no-one-knows-how-bad-fake-news-is-on-whatsapp-but-if>



- Tucker et al., “Social Media, Political Polarization, and Political Disinformation: A Review of the Scientific Literature” [Link](#)

## Week 12: November 23: Hate Speech and incivility online

It's widely believed that hate-speech can lead to violence. And as with other aspects of social media, the appearance of hate-speech on social media (speech absent from many other public forums) can communicate to people that hateful views are more common than previously believed. If people update about the commonality of such beliefs, and implicitly the acceptability of those beliefs, they may update their own beliefs and/or behavior. Thus studying hate-speech on social media is viewed as an important topic.

Student Presenter(s): David

### READINGS:

- Siegel, et-al, SMAPP, "Trumping Hate on Twitter? Online Hate Speech and White Nationalist Rhetoric in the 2016 US Election Campaign and its Aftermath", Working Paper (forthcoming, *Quarterly Journal of Political Science*)
- Munger, "Tweetment Effects on the Tweeted: An Experiment to Decrease Online Harassment", 2017, [Political Behavior](#)
- Siegel & Baadan. (Under Review, 2018). "#No2Sectarianism: Experimental Approaches to Reducing Sectarian Hate Speech Online." [https://alexandra-siegel.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/Siegel\\_Badaan\\_Nov2018.pdf](https://alexandra-siegel.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/Siegel_Badaan_Nov2018.pdf)
- Siegel (Forthcoming 2019). "Online Hate Speech" In *Social Media and Democracy: The State of the Field*.

### Additional Readings:

- Müller, Karsten and Schwarz, Carlo, Making America Hate Again? Twitter and Hate Crime Under Trump (March 30, 2018). Available at: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3149103> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3149103>
- Müller, Karsten and Schwarz, Carlo, Fanning the Flames of Hate: Social Media and Hate Crime (May 21, 2018). Available at: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3082972>.
- Barbera and Theocarlis, incivility and politicians
- Savvas Zannettou et al (2018). "What is Gab? A Bastion of Free Speech or an Alt-Right Echo Chamber?" In WWW '18 Companion: The 2018 Web Conference Companion. Available at: <http://www0.cs.ucl.ac.uk/staff/G.Stringhini/papers/gab-CYBERSAFETY2018.pdf>
- Burnap & Williams (2015). "Cyber Hate Speech on Twitter: An Application of Machine Classification and Statistical Modeling for Policy and Decision Making." *Policy Internet*. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1002/poi3.85>
- Collection of essays in: "Perspectives on Harmful Speech Online." (April 2017). Available at: <https://cyber.harvard.edu/publications/2017/08/harmfulspeech>
- Ben-David, Anat & Matamoros-Fernandez, Ariadna (2016) Hate speech and covert discrimination on social media: Monitoring the Facebook pages of

extreme-right political parties in Spain. *International Journal of Communication*, 10, pp. 1167-1193. URL: <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/101369/>

- Savvas Zannettou et al (2018). "What is Gab? A Bastion of Free Speech or an Alt-Right Echo Chamber?" In WWW '18 Companion: The 2018 Web Conference Companion. Available at: <http://www0.cs.ucl.ac.uk/staff/G.Stringhini/papers/gab-CYBERSAFETY2018.pdf>
- Burnap & Williams (2015). "Cyber Hate Speech on Twitter: An Application of Machine Classification and Statistical Modeling for Policy and Decision Making." *Policy Internet*. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1002/poi3.85>
- Burnap & Williams (2016). "Us and them: identifying cyber hate on Twitter across multiple protected characteristics." *EPJ Data Science*. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjds/s13688-016-0072-6>

**Week 13: November 30th: Student Presentations**

**Week 14: December 7th: Student Presentations**

**Monday, December 14th:** Final papers due by 5:00 PM.