

Online Incivility and Public Discourse

When newspaper reporter Marnie Eisenstadt¹ posted her story online about poverty in an Upstate New York community, predictably it received a slew of comments. Within a day, more than 500 people commented on the April 2016 story about poverty in the mid-sized city of Syracuse. They shared opinions, raised questions, and criticized the piece. Eisenstadt jumped into the fray frequently, answering questions and offering additional information all in a rational manner. For example, when ColdColdGoAway wrote: “How about finding the poor jobs????????????? So they won’t be poor!”² Eisenstadt offered a reasoned response: “@ColdColdGoAway: We have examined this, as well, in our series, The Cost of Poverty.”³ Then she provided a link to the previous story. When ColdColdGoAway persisted, writing: “I remember that story. That was one person’s story,”⁴ Eisenstadt was undaunted. “It was the beginning of an examination of a program that helped more than 100 people find and keep employment,”⁵ she explained and again provided a link to the rest of the series on poverty. When another poster, kayak, criticized a premise of the story that one way to solve the community’s poverty crisis was to build public housing within suburbs, Eisenstadt joined the conversation again. “There is not simple, easy one-size fits all answers to Syracuse’s complex poverty. There are many small answers, ways of doing things differently that might work. Here, the suggestion is not vast development of public housing in the suburbs. It is mixed income housing in places of opportunity. It’s not an answer for everyone, but data shows it could substantially change the lives of some.”⁶

What is notable about Eisenstadt's actions is that she is demonstrating a "deliberative moment"⁷ in the public talk of a comment stream on an online news site. She is rational and clear, and she bolsters her view with evidence. She is reciprocal, meaning she leaves room for other views and even disagreement. She comes across as understanding what others are saying, not just spouting off her own ideas.⁸ Certainly, the commenters she is responding to are pointed—but not uncivil. Also, she is not necessarily solving a public problem or fostering consensus,⁹ as deliberation aims to do, but she is trying to inform. Even if she does not intend to, she is claiming the comment stream as the "broader deliberative arena to which journalism contributes."¹⁰ She is fostering an environment in the virtual public sphere that is hospitable to the robust give-and-take of public debate that is vital to a healthy democracy.¹¹ She is creating a climate that offers the hope for the online space to "revive the public sphere"¹² as a place of "deliberative democracy" that sociologist and social psychologist Gabriel de Tarde envisioned in the salons and cafés of eighteenth century Paris.¹³ In his day, de Tarde saw what he called "dispersed crowds,"¹⁴ which were brought together by the newspaper to debate important issues of the day.¹⁵ Eisenstadt, in her small way, is creating that experience in her newspaper's online space.

This chapter focuses on the virtual versions of these cafés and salons, the comment streams of American newspapers where today's dispersed crowds gather to debate and banter and talk. I will explore the concept of deliberative democracy, specifically within the context of online discussions. I will argue that this deliberation—including disagreement—is essential to the vigorous public debate that is the hallmark of a democratic society.¹⁶ Disagreement—both civil and uncivil—involves a challenge to one's views.¹⁷ This challenge can create feelings of uneasiness or internal conflict called cognitive dissonance¹⁸ as people reconcile their views with others' opinions. This deliberation is essential to the democratic process because it allows all people to take part in the decisions that may highlight what topics are most urgent in our society. This form of communication takes on increased urgency online because the computer-mediated sphere offers more opportunity for people to speak out, so more informed voices might be drowned out. Or, as in the case of Eisenstadt, more rational voices may set a tone of deliberation. Deliberation is often associated with political talk,¹⁹ but in this chapter I explore the concept more broadly to topics outside of politics that are important to air publicly. For example, clearly an online debate about the merits of presidential contenders is political talk that is improved if it is deliberative. However, an online discussion about

the benefits of composting or growing one's own vegetables is not political per se, but it also offers more value to society as a whole if it also follows the guidelines of public deliberation. I will begin by explaining the concept of public deliberation in greater detail, and then I will explore specifically how disagreement fits into deliberation. Next I will explain how deliberation may operate online by synthesizing prior research.

PUBLIC DELIBERATION

At its core, public deliberation is about giving people room to speak out. The idea encompasses the value of equality that is embedded in American culture, although not always lived out. For deliberation to occur everyone must be allowed a voice and what those voices express should be rooted in reason.²⁰ The goal is to promote consensus, but deliberation provides room for people to disagree and debate. Deliberation also should be reciprocal, meaning it embraces different views.²¹ It should be conducted publicly, and it requires that people offer some sort of evidence to justify their viewpoints.²² In the best case, it offers solutions, not just problems, and it allows people to retain their own dignity throughout the debate.²³ As political communication scholars John Gastil and Laura W. Black explain: "When people deliberate, they carefully examine a problem and arrive at a well-reasoned solution after a period of inclusive, respectful consideration of diverse points of view."²⁴ Some scholars include participation in public forums or even contrasting media messages as forms of deliberation. Most theorists agree that public deliberation includes some type of "public talking"²⁵ that contributes to public opinion. Deliberation is about the discussion, the conversation, the exchange of ideas. It is about speaking out, so that others can hear, understand, and respond to what one is saying. It provides a sense of voice that is pivotal to how a free society should operate. People can form their own opinions and tell others, contributing to public good in society. Deliberation is not just a benefit of a free society but essential to maintaining that freedom. People must be part of the decision-making of government if a nation is to be of the people and for the people. As political scientist Harold D. Lasswell explained years ago: "Democratic governments act upon public opinion and public opinion acts openly and continually upon government. This open interplay of opinion and policy is the distinguishing mark of popular rule."²⁶

The concept of public deliberation grew out of political thought. In fact, Gastil and Black argue it is the organizing principle of all political

communication.²⁷ Theorist Hannah Arendt suggested that to be political means that decisions are made through discussion and persuasion not fights. “Everyone sees and hears from a different position,”²⁸ she explained. This give and take is at the heart of the type of debate that generates the “communicative power”²⁹ to influence political elections and legislation. Deliberation relies on the idea that a group may have knowledge greater than the individuals who comprise that group.³⁰ As a result, sharing ideas might improve decision-making. Deliberation happens or should happen in Congress, the courts, the media, and in the “land of middle democracy,”³¹ which is any place where people gather. James Madison considered deliberation so vital to America’s democracy that he included it as one of the nation’s core values, along with equality and the absence of tyranny, when he penned *The Federalist Papers*.³² Of course, talking about a problem may give those in power a sense of what the public thinks and feels, and thereby, inform the political process,³³ but that does not mean change will occur. True deliberation requires that people listen, not just speak,³⁴ that people act, not just listen.

Critics of the concept of public deliberation worry that speaking is not enough. Journalism scholar Michael Schudson, for instance, argues that the emphasis on spontaneous conversation is misplaced because the real goal should be talk that is not just public, but egalitarian—encompassing the ideas of many with different values and backgrounds.³⁵ Others view public deliberation as too idealistic because it assumes small efforts can bring about large changes, or they suggest deliberation is impossible in a complicated democratic system.³⁶ Public deliberation also has been criticized for being too narrow and perpetuating the same voices that always get heard and leaving out socially marginalized groups, such as women, people of color, and other minorities.³⁷ I embrace these criticisms, and suggest that public deliberation is not perfect. It is merely a start. We are a better society if we foster reciprocal conversations from a diversity of viewpoints about important issues, but deliberation alone cannot solve all our ills. I discuss these criticisms later in this chapter and in Part II.

In this book, I take a broad view of public deliberation. It is not reserved just for political talk. In fact, I argue that the concepts of public deliberation apply as well to discussion about almost any important issues, as they do to political topics. Part of the reason for my belief is that many topics, even those that are not overtly political, may offer political undertones. A debate over whether climate change is caused by how people have abused the environment or a natural process is not overtly political on the

face of it. It becomes political as people take partisan sides on the issue, and different viewpoints become aligned with particular parties. But the important part of the issue is the discussion that may or may not bring about understanding and change.

DELIBERATION BEYOND POLITICS

I submit that even topics without political undertones may be ripe for public deliberation. For example, online sites proliferate, on which people talk about all types of issues, from stories in that day's newspaper to the basics of child rearing or even ratings of the best restaurant in town. When people are recommending the best spot for barbecue on a foodie Facebook page, the discourse is improved if people state their beliefs rationally, are open to others' opinions, and offer evidence for their point of view. In the realm of interpersonal communication, these concepts suggest a form of discussion that makes communication more open and more valuable. In that sense, deliberative qualities in any type of speech offer benefits for society as a whole. It is always best to listen, not just talk; to be open to other's ideas; to offer a grounded rationale for one's thinking. The topics that are examined in this book—the 2016 U.S. presidential campaign, the debate over removing vestiges of the Confederacy from government spaces, and the continuing fight for marriage equality—certainly have political ramifications. However, I believe the principles outlined in this chapter and throughout the book apply more broadly. It is better for democracy when people can publicly deliberate about politics. Similarly, it is good for society when people can publicly deliberate about any subject. As such, deliberation cuts across a wide swatch of fields beyond political science, including interpersonal communication, mass communication, public affairs, social psychology, and sociology.³⁸ Yes, public deliberation is important for democracy. It is also important for life.

For example, consider what erupted on Twitter after a Texas school district decided not to cancel classes on a particularly rain-soaked day in May 2016.³⁹ The district tweeted that classes remained in session, and urged people to stay safe getting to school. People challenged the decision somewhat politely on Twitter, joking they would enjoy swimming through school hallways or needed a sailboat to get to class. Then they turned to memes, which are “socially constructed public discourses”⁴⁰ circulated online to make a point. One meme used an animated image file called a gif to show President Barack Obama, shaking his head and saying, “No,” as if

the president were disagreeing with the school district's decision to keep classes open. Another meme used a gif of a baby clenching his hands in disgust, apparently at the district's ruling. While this is certainly not the public deliberation that Madison, the Father of the Constitution, likely imagined, I submit these tweets follow much of the conventions of public deliberation. They allowed a variety of people from a cross-section of the community to speak directly to the government and challenge a government decision. These tweets did not offer much evidence or seek to solve a problem through consensus, but they did make a rational point: It is flooding too much for school to remain in session. Certainly, it would be an overstatement to label this public deliberation. But it offers a deliberative moment; deliberation light, if you will. Society gains because the school district learns what the public thinks about its actions. People gain because they have a chance to speak, to air their grievances publicly. In a very real sense, this online exchange demonstrates the ideals of democratic deliberation, a belief that the public use of arguments and reasoning among free and equal individuals is vital to society.⁴¹

DELIBERATIVE DISAGREEMENT

Of course, true deliberation often may be “profoundly uncomfortable”⁴² because it requires talk among people who are different from each other. As a result, exposure to disagreement is a key aspect of much deliberation.⁴³ In fact, political scientists Amy Gutmann and Dennis Thompson assert that “moral disagreement”⁴⁴—conflict about fundamental issues—is the root of deliberation. This is not disagreement just to be disagreeable. This is not taking an alternative view only to be contrary. In this type of disagreement, people feel an intense moral rightness deep in their beings. So when people challenge their view,⁴⁵ it hurts. In this sense, the online discussions about barbecue or a school closing lack the potential for true deliberation because the stakes are not high enough. These issues certainly can offer deliberative moments, and society is improved by those discourses. But for deliberation writ large, people must care enough about their viewpoint to feel a sense of loss when it is threatened. It requires morally loaded topics, such as abortion, immigration, or the #BlackLivesMatter movement that rose up in response to the shooting deaths of unarmed black men at the hands of police.⁴⁶ These are also the type of issues most likely to elicit strong opinions⁴⁷ and generate online comments.⁴⁸ Our need to speak out is strongest when we feel the

most passionate about a topic. In addition, society benefits the most from deliberation on topics that elicit this passion.

EMOTION AND REASON

This also suggests that while deliberation should be rational, it cannot be divorced from emotion. While some assert that deliberation requires a lack of emotion, I support the view of affective intelligence theory,⁴⁹ which argues that emotions and reason can and should co-exist and actually complement each other. Theories differ regarding whether emotions are automatic responses to an experience⁵⁰ or if they only occur if people have thought about how they feel.⁵¹ My intent is not to resolve this debate, which has raged for decades. However, it seems clear that emotions by their very nature help people evaluate stimuli and make decisions about what to do.⁵² Emotions are temporary states that can range from positive to negative in response to a specific situation.⁵³ The very nature of emotions is to help in people's survival by providing clues about how they should proceed.⁵⁴ So when people are deciding their opinion on important issues, it seems natural that emotions—their responses to those issues—would be part of how they make up their minds. This is the heart of affective intelligence theory,⁵⁵ which proposes that cognitive processes—the thinking about things—are not separate from the emotional processes—the feeling about things. So how can one be rational while still emotional? The paradox relies on balance between the two. Often, we assign a negative connotation to emotion (“thinking with one's heart rather than one's head,” for example). Or we see emotions as dichotomous—either bad or good—rather than merely spontaneous, natural human responses to stimuli. However, the word emotion actually stems from the Latin root of the word “to move.”⁵⁶ Emotions are what move us to act in many cases. These emotional responses may help us understand important issues more fully than reason alone. Consider abortion. A person may reach a decision to support abortion rights after much thought and research but also by being emotionally moved by the story of woman impregnated during rape who seeks the freedom to end the pregnancy. Similarly, someone who opposes abortion may reach that decision through careful analysis but may also be influenced by an emotional response to seeing a premature baby live outside the womb. The moment when emotion and reason depart from any potential for deliberation is when emotion takes over completely: “To be

passionate is to be gripped, seized, or possessed by primordial forces beyond one's rational control."⁵⁷ When emotion and reason remain in balance, deliberation can occur. In fact, it seems unlikely that people could make a reasoned argument, supported by fact, and open to others' viewpoints without feeling some passion on the subject. I certainly would not want to spend much time with a person who only thought but never felt. Nor would I appreciate a person who only felt but never thought. Balance is the key here.

PROS AND CONS OF DISAGREEMENT

A great deal of research suggests that exposing people to viewpoints that differ from their own opinions has merit. These so-called crosscutting arguments help people become more familiar with others' viewpoints and the reasons they may hold these opinions.⁵⁸ This may not persuade people to change their outlook, but it may help them at least see where those who disagree with them are coming from. It may make people see the legitimate reasons for others holding divergent views, even if they still passionately disagree. "What makes opinion deliberative is not merely that it has been built upon careful contemplation, evidence, and supportive arguments, but also that it has grasped and taken into consideration the opposing views of others,"⁵⁹ as several political communication scholars put it. Exposure to disagreement may increase tolerance for difference⁶⁰ and could create a more informed populace, as people reflect on why they hold their own beliefs when those opinions are challenged.⁶¹ Here is how this works: As people try to justify their own beliefs, they may turn to factual information or concrete arguments, which increase their own knowledge⁶² even if it does not change their opinions. This is the cognitive dissonance⁶³ explanation for disagreement, which argues that people try to relieve the discomfort they feel because other people see things differently than they do. People employ interpersonal strategies, such as changing their own viewpoint or trying to convert others, to relieve this discomfort.⁶⁴ There is also some evidence that exposure to disagreement leads to less political polarization.⁶⁵

However, other research suggests that exposure to crosscutting viewpoints does not deepen people's knowledge of their own position⁶⁶ but merely makes people more entrenched. In this scenario, people dig in their heels and become more certain of their opinions when they are challenged. Another negative consequence of disagreement is that it may foster

ambivalence or make people less sure of their own beliefs.⁶⁷ As a result, people may withdraw from participating in the democratic process by shunning such as activities as voting, handing out leaflets for a cause, or protesting at an event. The reasoning is that people step back as they are trying to resolve their internal conflict about how they feel regarding the issue. For some, it may seem easier to withdraw than to resolve this conflict. This is the heart of the cross-pressures hypothesis,⁶⁸ which posits that exposure to disagreement in one's social group demobilizes people from participating politically. Sometimes this is termed the "deliberation-participation paradox"⁶⁹ because exposure to diverse views is a core tenet of deliberation but it may actually lead to less participation, which is the opposite of deliberation's goal to increase societal participation. This puts deliberation and political participation at cross-purposes. Increasing one decreases the other. Disagreement also may "thwart self-expression" because people are afraid of social rejection if they speak out, leading to a "silencing effect."⁷⁰ Another negative effect of disagreement is that people perceive those who disagree with them as biased. This creates the potential for a "bias-perception conflict spiral,"⁷¹ where people perceive those who disagree with them as biased and that leads them to take conflict-escalating actions against them, which reinforce this sense of bias.⁷² These conflict-escalation actions could include some of the common aspects of uncivil online debate, such as name-calling, insults, profanity, or an out-right accusation of bias. No one is left better by such an exchange.

Much depends on how people encounter disagreement. People who are in the political minority in their community may be less likely to vote or get involved politically because they feel unsupported in their viewpoints, but disagreement has little effect on those in the political majority.⁷³ For those in the political minority, the principles of deliberation and participatory democracy are at cross-purposes.⁷⁴ If you encourage one, you decrease the likelihood of the other. It is worth pointing out that this is also an unlikely scenario because most people cannot sustain a social network where they feel so isolated without joining a more hospitable group.⁷⁵ The more common scenario is to be in a group where most people think like you or where you are confronted with a mixture of viewpoints. Research has shown in these cases that disagreement does not hamper political participation.⁷⁶ In fact, when people are faced with a mix of opinions, exposure to opposing viewpoints may speed the process toward participation: "Cross-pressures may actually help some voters make up their minds, rather than hinder the crystallization of their voting preferences."⁷⁷ If

political participation is defined as more than just voting, people may be more likely to volunteer for a cause or get involved with their political party when they encounter disagreement. Another study found that encouraging uncivil—but not civil—disagreement initiated a chain reaction that led to increased aggressive intentions and then greater likelihood to get politically involved in an issue.⁷⁸ So in that sense the incivility actually sparks an emotional response that boosts intention to participate politically.

DIGITAL DELIBERATION

Public deliberation started in face-to-face communication, through collective discussion groups, such as formal meetings or informal meetings in salons and cafés.⁷⁹ However, in this book I am focusing solely on deliberation in the digital sphere. In the early days of the Internet, two competing ideals surfaced about whether the web would be a more egalitarian space for public debate. The “cybertopia” viewpoint saw the web as an anonymous space that muted differences between people, fostered cohesion, and gave the power to speak out to groups who did not have that opportunity offline.⁸⁰ A cartoon by Peter Steiner that appeared in *The New Yorker* magazine in 1993 and became an icon of the early Internet age exemplifies this view. The cartoon depicts a dog sitting at a computer with the caption: “On the Internet, nobody knows you’re a dog.”⁸¹ The idea was that anyone could speak out online, so more voices would get heard. Also, online communication fosters *weak ties* between people,⁸² and these weak ties were thought to encourage diversity in digital connections.⁸³ In contrast, critics of this utopian view espoused the “cyberghetto”⁸⁴ philosophy. This viewpoint held that the Internet reinforced the biases in the offline world because it retained “vestiges of traditional communities with similar hierarchical social linkages and class-structured relationships.”⁸⁵ In other words, the same people who got heard in the offline world, largely white men, continued to have the greatest voice online because the same societal structures are in place in both spheres. In fact, the digital divide, a term used to describe the fact that some people cannot afford Internet access or computers, may have exacerbated the problem. People who had little voice offline may have had even less online because they could not even afford to join the conversation.

What really happened was a mixture of both. In the earliest days, voices of the marginalized groups, such as women or people of color, were largely absent online. But that changed in time. Blogging in particular offered a

promise of digital equality because people could do it for free.⁸⁶ For example, the mommy blogging movement of the late 1990s and early 2000s gave women by the millions a voice, and these women saw the web as a tangible means to express themselves in ways they could not before.⁸⁷ The web became empowering for marginalized groups, such as African-American women, low-income families, and sexual minorities,⁸⁸ in part because people could more easily find others like them online.

Social media also opened up opportunities to speak out for women and people of color. For example, after police shot an unarmed black man in Ferguson, MO, in 2014, social media gave African-Americans a format to challenge what traditional media were reporting about the shooting.⁸⁹ In addition, hashtags—keywords signified with a pound or hash sign—started being used on Twitter, Facebook, Instagram, and YouTube as a potent, although limited, tool to give voice to the silenced and to galvanize activism efforts. For example, #BlackLivesMatter was used to highlight challenges to the discourse surrounding marginalization of African-Americans. #YesAllWomen was used to speak out against female subjugation after a man in California went on a killing spree in 2014, motivated by his revenge against females for rejecting his advances.⁹⁰ However, a digital inequality that mirrored the inequities based on race, class, gender, and education perpetuated offline also held sway online. For example, while men and women were equally likely to blog, male blogs gained greater attention from the media.⁹¹ Even as women's numbers online are soaring, research has shown their voices are often muted, as they are offline,⁹² or they get verbally attacked for what they say.⁹³ Also, the idea that people would gather with people different from them online largely failed to materialize. In fact, online groups tend to be as homogenous online as off.⁹⁴ If anything, the web may amplify the tendency people have to interact with those like them because people have more power to find out others' beliefs before choosing discussion partners through online platforms than they would in their own neighborhoods.⁹⁵ So they can continually expose themselves to people who think as they do.

In the context of public deliberation, experts are also divided on the potential for it online. Some argue that if people communicate with people different from them online, the potential for deliberation is limited because people are more likely to argue than deliberate.⁹⁶ However, liked-minded people may not deliberate either because they are just repeating what others say, creating an echo chamber of ideas. Some scholars have found evidence of deliberation online, through comments streams and other forms of

engagement. For example, a content analysis of 2,107 comments posted on the Facebook walls of presidential candidates in 2008 and 2012 showed that sites like Facebook “represent spaces that accommodate a new public sphere,”⁹⁷ with 40% of the commenters offering some rationale for their views, and another 11% providing concrete evidence, such as links to other sites, statistics, or data. In-depth interviews with 69 people in a separate study found that people felt more comfortable sharing their views online, compared with discussing them with a neighbor who might not agree.⁹⁸ Another study found that comments posted on news stories of *The New York Times* and *The Guardian* websites demonstrated attributes of deliberation, including respectfulness, diversity of ideas, and disagreement.⁹⁹ The same study, however, found that comments posted on stories from other news organizations expressed little diversity, were often derogatory, and did not express openness to others’ ideas. Similarly, in a survey of 435 newspaper journalists,¹⁰⁰ 65% of the sample reported that they did not see comment streams as promoting the civil discourse that makes up deliberation. Some argue that the online context is less valuable for deliberation because computer-mediated communication offers fewer cues for communicating the nuances of speech, such as emotion, but others suggest this weakness is a strength because true deliberation should allow for rational discussion without too much emotion.¹⁰¹ Certainly, there are differences between the experiences of deliberating online versus offline. Young white males with at least a bachelor’s degree are over-represented among online deliberators, compared to people who deliberate offline.¹⁰² Online deliberators also view the digital climate to be more politically and racially diverse than those who debate only face to face.¹⁰³ Online deliberation tends to foment more negative emotions and is less likely to lead to consensus or political actions, such as working for a campaign, compared to face-to-face deliberation.¹⁰⁴ Both types increase people’s knowledge of issues and general political understanding.¹⁰⁵ In summary, these studies suggest that the Internet holds potential for deliberation,¹⁰⁶ but how much the online space has realized that potential is not fully understood.

CONCLUSION

So what does all this mean for the potential for deliberation on social media or on news story comment streams? For these digital spaces to become fully realized as a deliberative space, people must act more like Eisenstadt, the

journalist mentioned at the start of this chapter. These spaces hold promise, but that promise cannot be realized without a conscious effort on the part of all people, not just journalists or politicians, to actively deliberate online. The conversation space on the web developed in the freewheeling early days, back when the Internet was called the World Wide Web. It grew from the earlier forms of online conversations, such as computer-conferencing systems like the Whole Earth ‘Lectronic Link (WELL), and later listservs, user groups, and chat rooms.¹⁰⁷ Then came news story comment streams and social-networking sites. People learned to use a pound sign to signify the topic of a tweet or add a smile emoticon to soften a message, but they did not claim the space as deliberative.

An anything-goes attitude seemed to develop online, and newspaper comment streams in particular became quickly mired in non-deliberative speech. Despite this early rocky start, I believe that some deliberation does take place in online comments, and this form of discourse is important to encourage. The goal should be to foster deliberative speech through creating a normative atmosphere for this discourse, rather than focusing on the limitations of online communication. The more people like Eisenstadt stop, listen, answer questions, provide evidence, and remain rational, the closer we will be to realizing a deliberative space online that truly rejuvenates the public sphere¹⁰⁸ as a spot for the discussion about politics and other important issues of the day, like the cafés and salons of an earlier time.¹⁰⁹ The online space can become the type of space that influences politics and elections,¹¹⁰ and informs the public in way that is not imagined today.

CLASSROOM DISCUSSION PROMPTS

1. Explain the core principles of public deliberation. What attributes must communication include to be considered “deliberative”?
2. The author makes a distinction between public deliberation and “deliberative moments.” Define each and provide an example.
3. Do online comments have potential to be deliberative? Explain why or why not.
4. Using a type of online communication you are familiar with (e.g. tweets, Instagram posts, SnapChat), explain its potential for deliberative discourse. What could be done to make discourse on this platform more deliberative?

NOTES

1. Marnie Eisenstadt, "Syracuse's Public Housing Creates Prisons of Poverty; What If They Could Move to Suburbs?" *Syracuse.com*, April 14, 2016. http://www.syracuse.com/poverty/2016/04/syracuses_public_housing_creat.html (Eisenstadt 2016).
2. ColdColdGoAway, April 14, 2016, comment posted on Eisenstadt, "Syracuse's Public Housing Creates Prisons of Poverty; What If They Could Move to Suburbs?"
3. Eisenstadt, April 14, 2016, comment posted on Eisenstadt, "Syracuse's Public Housing Creates Prisons of Poverty; What If They Could Move to Suburbs?"
4. ColdColdGoAway, April 14, 2016, comment posted on Eisenstadt, "Syracuse's Public Housing Creates Prisons of Poverty; What If They Could Move to Suburbs?"
5. Eisenstadt, April 14, 2016, comment posted on Eisenstadt, "Syracuse's Public Housing Creates Prisons of Poverty; What If They Could Move to Suburbs?"
6. Eisenstadt, April 14, 2016, comment posted on Eisenstadt, "Syracuse's Public Housing Creates Prisons of Poverty; What If They Could Move to Suburbs?"
7. John Gastil and Laura W. Black, "Public Deliberation as the Organizing Principle of Political Communication Research," *Journal of Public Deliberation* 4, no. 1 (2008): Article 3, 7 (Gastil and Black 2008).
8. James S. Fishkin, *Democracy and Deliberation*, (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1991); John Gastil, *Political Communication and Deliberation*, (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2011); Amy Gutmann and Dennis Thompson, *Democracy and Disagreement*, (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996); Lawrence R. Jacobs, Fay Lomax Cook, and Michael X. Delli Carpini, *Talking Together: Public Deliberation and Political Participation in America*, (Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 2009); Natalie J. Stroud, Joshua M. Scacco, Ashley Muddiman, and Alexander L. Curry, "Changing Deliberative Norms on News Organizations' Facebook Sites," *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 20 (2015): 188–203 (Fishkin 1991; Gastil 2011; Gutmann and Thompson 1996; Jacobs et al. 2009; Stroud et al. 2015).
9. Gastil and Black, "Public Deliberation as the Organizing Principle of Political Communication Research"; Jacobs, Cook, and Delli Carpini, *Talking Together: Public Deliberation and Political Participation in America*.
10. Stephen D. Reese, "The New Geography of Journalism Research," *Digital Journalism* 4, no. 7 (2016): 818–826 (Reese 2016).

11. Hannah Arendt, *The Human Condition* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1958); H el ene Landemore, "Democratic Reason: The Mechanism of Collective Intelligence in Politics," in *Collective Wisdom: Principles and Mechanisms*, eds. H el ene Landemore and John Elster (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2012): 251–289 (Arendt 1958; Landemore 2012).
12. Zizi Papacharissi, "Democracy Online: Civility, Politeness, and the Democratic Potential of Online Political Discussion," *New Media & Society* 6, no. 2 (2004): 259 (Papacharissi 2004).
13. Elihu Katz, "Back to the Street: When Media and Opinion Leaves Home," *Mass Communication and Society* 17 (2014): 454–463; Gabriel de Tarde, *On Communication and Social Influence*, ed. Terry N. Clark (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1889/1969) (Katz 2014; de Tarde 1889).
14. De Tarde, *On Communication and Social Influence*, 318.
15. Katz, "Back to the Street: When Media and Opinion Leaves Home."
16. Fishkin, *Democracy and Deliberation*; Gastil, *Political Communication and Deliberation*; Gutmann and Thompson, *Democracy and Disagreement*; Jacobs, Cook, and Delli Carpini, *Talking Together: Public Deliberation and Political Participation in America*; Landemore, "Democratic Reason: The Mechanism of Collective Intelligence in Politics."
17. Casey A. Klofstad, Anand Edward Sokhey, and Scott D. McClurg, "Disagreeing About Disagreement: How Conflict in Social Networks Affects Political Behavior," *American Journal of Political Science* 57 (2013): 120–134; Lilach Nir, "Ambivalent Social Networks and Their Consequences for Participation," *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* 17 (2005): 422–442 (Klofstad et al. 2013; Nir 2005).
18. Leon Festinger, *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*, (Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press, 1957) (Festinger 1957).
19. Gastil and Black, "Public Deliberation as the Organizing Principle of Political Communication Research."
20. Jacobs, Cook, and Delli Carpini, *Talking Together: Public Deliberation and Political Participation in America*.
21. Gutmann and Thompson, *Democracy and Disagreement*.
22. Gutmann and Thompson, *Democracy and Disagreement*.
23. Ulrike Klinger and Uta Russmann, "The Sociodemographics of Political Public Deliberation: Measuring Deliberative Quality in Different User Groups," *Communications* 40, no. 4 (2015): 471–484 (Klinger and Russmann 2015).
24. Gastil and Black, "Public Deliberation as the Organizing Principle of Political Communication Research," 2.

25. Jacobs, Cook, and Delli Carpini, *Talking Together: Public Deliberation and Political Participation in America*, 4.
26. Harold D. Lasswell, *Democracy Through Public Opinion*, (Menasha, WI: George Banta Publishing Co., 1941): 15 (Lasswell 1941).
27. Gastil and Black, "Public Deliberation as the Organizing Principle of Political Communication Research."
28. Arendt, *The Human Condition*, 57.
29. Jürgen Habermas, "Three Normative Models of Democracy," *Democratic and Constitutional Theory Today* 1, no. 1 (1994): 1–10 (Habermas 1994).
30. Landemore, "Democratic Reason: The Mechanism of Collective Intelligence in Politics."
31. Gutmann and Thompson, *Democracy and Disagreement*, 12.
32. Fishkin, *Democracy and Deliberation*.
33. Jacobs, Cook, and Delli Carpini, *Talking Together: Public Deliberation and Political Participation in America*.
34. Vincent Price, Joseph N. Cappella, and Lilach Nir, "Does Disagreement Contribute to More Deliberative Opinion?" *Political Communication* 19 (2002): 95–112 (Price et al. 2002).
35. Michael Schudson, "Why Conversation is Not the Soul of Democracy," *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 14 (1997): 297–309 (Schudson 1997).
36. Seong-Jae Min, "Online Vs. Face-To-Face Deliberation: Effects on Civic Engagement," *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 12 (2007): 1369–1387 (Min 2007).
37. Steffen Albrecht, "Whose Voice is Heard in Online Deliberation? A Study of Participation and Representation in Political Debates on the Internet," *Information, Communication & Society* 8, no.1 (2006): 62–82; Min, "Online Vs. Face-To-Face Deliberation: Effects on Civic Engagement"; Klinger and Russmann, "The Sociodemographics of Political Public Deliberation: Measuring Deliberative Quality in Different User Groups" (Albrecht 2006).
38. Klinger and Russmann, "The Sociodemographics of Political Public Deliberation: Measuring Deliberative Quality in Different User Groups."
39. Maribel Molina, "Twitter Users React to Austin ISD Not Cancelling, Delaying Classes," *Austin American-Statesman*, May 19, 2016. <http://austin.blog.statesman.com/2016/05/19/twitter-users-react-to-austin-isd-not-cancelling-delaying-classes/> (Molina 2016).
40. Limor Shifman, *Memes in Digital Culture*, (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2014) (Shifman 2014).
41. Landemore, "Democratic Reason: The Mechanism of Collective Intelligence in Politics."

42. Schudson, "Why Conversation is Not the Soul of Democracy," 299.
43. Scott D. McClurg, "The Electoral Relevance of Political Talk: Examining Disagreement and Expertise in Social Networks on Political Participation," *American Journal of Political Science* 50, no. 3 (2006): 737–754 (McClurg 2006a).
44. Gutmann and Thompson, *Democracy and Disagreement*, 1.
45. Klofstad, Sokhey, and McClurg, "Disagreeing About Disagreement: How Conflict in Social Networks Affects Political Behavior."
46. Gina Masullo Chen, "Social Media: From Digital Divide to Empowerment," in *The Routledge Companion to Media and Race*, ed. Christopher P. Campbell (New York, NY: Routledge, 2016) (Chen 2016).
47. Gi Woong Yun and Sun-Yeon Park, "Selective Posting: Willingness to Post a Message Online." *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 16, no. 2 (2011): 201–277 (Yun and Park 2011).
48. Stroud et al., "Changing Deliberative Norms on News Organizations' Facebook Sites."
49. George E. Marcus, W. Russell Neuman, and Michael MacKuen, *Affective Intelligence and Political Judgment*, (Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 2000) (Marcus et al. 2000).
50. Robert B. Zajonc, "Feeling and Thinking: Preferences Need No Inferences," *American Psychologist* 35 (1980): 151–175; Robert B. Zajonc, "On the Primacy of Affect," *American Psychologist* 39, no. 2 (1984): 117–123 (Zajonc 1980, 1984).
51. Nico H. Frijda, *The Emotions*, (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 1984); Richard S. Lazarus, "On the Primacy of Cognition," *American Psychologist* 39, no. 2 (1984): 124–129 (Frijda 1984; Lazarus 1984).
52. Marcus, Neuman, and MacKuen, *Affective Intelligence and Political Judgment*.
53. Paul D. Bolls, "Understanding Emotion from a Superordinate Dimensional Perspective: A Productive Way Forward for Communication Processes and Effects," *Communication Monographs* 77, no. 2 (2010): 146–152 (Bolls 2010).
54. Tori Rodriguez, "Negative Emotions are Key to Well-Being," *Scientific American*, May 1, 2013. http://www.scientificamerican.com/article/negative-emotions-key-well-being/?WT.mc_id=SA_FB_MB_EG (Rodriguez 2013).
55. Marcus, Neuman, and MacKuen, *Affective Intelligence and Political Judgment*.
56. Marcus, Neuman, and MacKuen, *Affective Intelligence and Political Judgment*.

57. Marcus, Neuman, and MacKuen, *Affective Intelligence and Political Judgment*, 14.
58. Diana C. Mutz, "Cross-Cutting Social Networks: Testing Democratic Theory in Practice," *American Political Science Review* 96, no. 1 (2002): 111–126; Price, Cappella, and Nir, "Does Disagreement Contribute to More Deliberative Opinion?" (Mutz 2002a).
59. Price, Cappella, and Nir, "Does Disagreement Contribute to More Deliberative Opinion?"
60. Mutz, "Cross-Cutting Social Networks: Testing Democratic Theory in Practice."
61. McClurg, "The Electoral Relevance of Political Talk: Examining Disagreement and Expertise in Social Networks on Political Participation"; Robert Huckfeldt, Jeannette Morehouse Mendez, and Tracy Osborn, "Disagreement, Ambivalence, and Engagement: The Political Consequences of Heterogeneous Networks," *Political Psychology* 25, no. 1 (2004): 65–95; Robert Huckfeldt, Ken'Ichi Ikeda, and Franz Urban Pappi, "Patterns of Disagreement in Democratic Politics; Comparing Germany, Japan, and the United States," *American Journal of Political Science* 49, no. 3 (2005): 497–514; Nir, "Ambivalent Social Networks and Their Consequences for Participation" (Huckfeldt et al. 2004, 2005).
62. Francis L.F. Lee, "The Impact of Political Discussion in a Democratizing society: The Moderating Role of Disagreement and Support for Democracy," *Communication Research* 36, no. 3 (2009): 379–399 (Lee 2009).
63. Festinger, *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*.
64. David C. Matz and Wendy Wood, "Cognitive Dissonance in Groups: The Consequences of Disagreement," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 88, no. 1 (2005): 22–37 (Matz and Wood 2005).
65. Younghwan Kim, "Does Disagreement Mitigate Polarization? How Selective Exposure and Disagreement Affect Political Polarization," *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 92, no. 4 (2015): 915–937 (Kim 2015).
66. Mutz, "Cross-Cutting Social Networks: Testing Democratic Theory in Practice."
67. Mutz, "Cross-Cutting Social Networks: Testing Democratic Theory in Practice"; Nir, "Ambivalent Social Networks and Their Consequences for Participation"; Lilach Nir, "Disagreement and Opposition in Social Networks: Does Disagreement Discourage Turnout," *Political Studies* 59 (2011): 674–692 (Nir 2011).

68. Scott D. McClurg, "Political Disagreement in Context: The Conditional Effect of Neighborhood Context, Disagreement and Political Talk in Electoral Participation," *Political Behavior* 28 (2006): 349–366; Mutz, "Cross-Cutting Social Networks: Testing Democratic Theory in Practice"; Diana C. Mutz, "The Consequences of Cross-Cutting Networks for Political Participation," *American Journal of Political Science* 46, no. 4 (2002): 838–855; Nir, "Ambivalent Social Networks and Their Consequences for Participation"; Nir, "Disagreement and Opposition in Social Networks: Does Disagreement Discourage Turnout" (McClurg 2006b; Mutz 2002b).
69. Francis L.F. Lee, "Does Discussion With Disagreement Discourage All Types of Political Participation? Survey Evidence from Hong Kong," *Communication Research* 39, no. 4 (2012): 543–562 (Lee 2012).
70. Magdalena E. Wojcieszak and Vincent Price, "Perceived Versus Actual Disagreement: Which Influences Deliberative Experiences?" *Journal of Communication* 62 (2012): 431 (Wojcieszak and Price 2012).
71. Kathleen A. Kennedy and Emily Pronim, "When Disagreement Gets Ugly: Perceptions of Bias and the Escalation of Conflict," *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 34, no. 6 (2008): 835 (Kennedy and Pronim 2008).
72. Myojung Chung, Greg J. Munno, and Brian Moritz, "Triggering Participation: Exploring the Effects of Third-Person and Hostile Media Perceptions on Online Participation," *Computers in Human Behavior* 53 (2015): 452–461 (Chung et al. 2015).
73. McClurg, "Political Disagreement in Context: The Conditional Effect of Neighborhood Context, Disagreement and Political Talk on Electoral Participation"; Nir, "Disagreement and Opposition in Social Networks: Does Disagreement Discourage Turnout"; Nir, "Ambivalent Social Networks and Their Consequences for Participation."
74. Nir, "Disagreement and Opposition in Social Networks: Does Disagreement Discourage Turnout."
75. Nir, "Disagreement and Opposition in Social Networks: Does Disagreement Discourage Turnout"; see also Elisabeth Noelle-Neumann, "The Spiral of Silence: A Theory of Public Opinion," *Journal of Communication* 24, no. 2 (1974): 43–51 (Noelle-Neumann 1974).
76. C.J. Pattie and R.J. Johnson, "Conversation, Disagreement and Political Participation," *Political Behavior* 31(2009): 261–285 (Pattie and Johnson 2009).
77. Nir, "Ambivalent Social Networks and Their Consequences for Participation," 438.

78. Gina Masullo Chen and Shuning Lu, "Online Political Discourse: Exploring Differences in Effects of Civil and Uncivil Disagreement in News Website Comments," *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* 61, no. 1 (2017). doi:[10.1080/08838151/2016/1273922](https://doi.org/10.1080/08838151/2016/1273922) (Chen and Lu 2017).
79. Jacobs, Cook, and Delli Carpini, *Talking Together: Public Deliberation and Political Participation in America*.
80. Albrecht, "Whose Voice is Heard in Online Deliberation? A Study of Participation and Representation in Political Debates on the Internet"; Bosah Ebo, *Cyberghetto or Cybertopia? Race, Class and Gender on the Internet*, ed., (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1998): 2 (Bosah 1998).
81. Michael Cavanaugh, "'Nobody Knows You're a Dog': As Iconic Internet Cartoon Turns 20, Creator Peter Steiner Knows the Idea is as Relevant as Ever," *The Washington Post*, July 13, 2013. https://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/comic-riffs/post/nobody-knows-youre-a-dog-as-iconic-internet-cartoon-turns-20-creator-peter-steiner-knows-the-joke-rings-as-relevant-as-ever/2013/07/31/73372600-f98d-11e2-8e84-c56731a202fb_blog.html (Cavanaugh 2013).
82. Gina Masullo Chen, "Tweet This: A Uses and Gratifications Perspective on How Active Twitter Use Gratifies a Need to Connect with Others," *Computers in Human Behavior* 27 (2011): 755–762; Mark Granovetter, "The Strength of Weak Ties," *American Journal of Sociology* 78, no. 6 (1973): 1360–1380 (Chen 2011; Granovetter 1973).
83. Howard Rheingold, *The Virtual Community: Homesteading on the Electronic Frontier*, (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2000) (Rheingold 2000).
84. Ebo, *Cyberghetto or Cybertopia? Race, Class and Gender on the Internet*, 2.
85. Ebo, *Cyberghetto or Cybertopia? Race, Class and Gender on the Internet*, 2.
86. Dan Gillmor, *We the Media*, (Santa Rosa, CA: O'Reilly Media, 2004); J. Schradie, "The Trend of Class, Race, and Ethnicity in Social Media Inequality: Who Still Cannot Afford to Blog," *Information, Communication & Society* 15, no. 4 (2012): 555–571 (Gillmor 2004; Schradie 2012).
87. Gina Masullo Chen, "Why Do Women Write Personal Blogs? Satisfying Needs for Self-Disclosure and Affiliation Tell Part of the Story," *Computers in Human Behavior* 28 (2012): 171–180; Bonnie A. Nardi, Diane J. Schiano, Michelle Gumbrecht, and Luke Swartz, "Why We Blog," *Communications of the ACM* 47, no. 2 (2004): 41–46; Lori Kido Lopez, "The Radical Act of 'Mommy Blogging': Refining Motherhood Through the Blogosphere," *New Media & Society* 11, no. 5 (2009): 729–747; Sarah Pedersen and Caroline Macafee, "Gender Differences in British Blogging," *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 12

- (2007): 1471–1492 (Chen 2012; Nardi et al. 2004; Lopez 2009; Pedersen and Macafee 2007).
88. Bharat Mehra, Cecelia Merkel, and Ann Peterson Bishop, “The Internet for Empowerment of Minority and Marginalized Groups,” *New Media & Society* 6, no. 6 (2004): 781–802 (Mehra et al. 2004).
 89. Chen, “Social Media.”
 90. Bernadette Barker-Plummer and Dave Barker-Plummer, “Hashtag Feminism, Digital Media, and New Dynamics of Social Change: A Case Study of #YesAllWomen,” in *Social Media and Politics: A New Way to Participate in the Political Process*, ed. Glenn W. Richardson Jr., (Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger, 2017): 79–96; Samantha C. Thrift, “#YesAllWomen As Feminist Meme Event,” *Feminist Media Studies* 14, no. 6 (2014): 1090–1092 (Barker-Plummer and Barker-Plummer 2017; Thrift 2014).
 91. Gina Masullo Chen, “Don’t Call Me That: A Techno-Feminist Critique of the Term *Mommy Blogger*,” *Mass Communication and Society* 16, no. 4 (2013): 510–532; Dustin Harp and Mark Tremayne, “The Gendered Blogosphere: Examining Inequality Using Network and Feminist Theory,” *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 32, no. 2 (2006): 247–264 (Chen 2013; Harp and Tremayne 2006).
 92. Susan C. Herring, Inna Kouper, Lois Ann Scheidt, and Elijah Wright, “Women and Children Last: The Discursive Construction of Weblogs,” in *Into the Blogosphere: Rhetoric, Community and Culture Weblogs*, eds. Laura Gurak, Smilijana Antonijevic, Laurie Johnson, Clancy Ratcliff, and Jennifer Reyman, (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, 2004) (Herring et al. 2004).
 93. Kristi K. Cole, “‘It’s Like She’s Eager to Be Verbally Abuse’: Twitter, Trolls, and (En)Gendering Disciplinary Rhetoric,” *Feminist Media Studies*, 15, no. 2 (2015): 356–358 (Cole 2015).
 94. Elanor Colleoni, Alessandro Rozza, and Adam Arvidsson, “Echo Chamber or Public Sphere? Predicting Political Orientation and Measuring Political Homophily in Twitter Using Big Data,” *Journal of Communication* 64, no. 2 (2014): 317–332; Itai Himelboim, Stephen McCreery, and Marc Smith, “Birds of a Feather Tweet Together: Integrating Network and Content Analyses to Examine Cross-Ideology Exposure on Twitter,” *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 18, no. 2 (2013): 40–60 (Colleoni et al. 2014; Himelboim et al. 2013).
 95. Hai Lang, “The Organizational Principles of Online Political Discussion: A Relational Event Stream Model for Analysis of Web Forum Deliberation,” *Human Communication Research* 40 (2014): 483–507 (Lang 2014).

96. Jennifer Stromer-Galley, "Diversity of Political Conversation on the Internet: Users' Perspectives," *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 8, no. 3 (2003): n.p. (Stromer-Galley 2003).
97. Lindita Camaj and Arthur D. Santana, "Political Deliberation on Facebook During Electoral Campaigns: Exploring the Relevance of Moderator's Technical Role and Political Ideology," *Journal of Information, Technology & Politics* 12, no. 4 (2015): 325 (Camaj and Santana 2015).
98. Stromer-Galley, "Diversity of Political Conversation on the Internet: Users' Perspectives."
99. Carlos Ruiz, David Domingo, Josep Lluís Micó, Javier Díaz-Noci, Koldo Meso, and Pere Maship, "Public Sphere 2.0? The Democratic Qualities of Citizen Debates in Online Newspapers." *The International Journal of Press/Politics* 16, no. 4 (2011): 463–487 (Ruiz et al. 2011).
100. Arthur D. Santana, "Online Readers' Comments Represent New Opinion Pipeline," *Newspaper Research Journal* 32, no. 3 (2011): 66–88 (Santana 2011).
101. Min, "Online Vs. Face-To-Face Deliberation: Effects on Civic Engagement."
102. Baek et al., "Online Versus Face-to-Face Deliberation? Who? Why? What? With What Effects?" (Baek et al. 2011).
103. Baek et al., "Online Versus Face-to-Face Deliberation? Who? Why? What? With What Effects?"
104. Min, "Online Vs. Face-To-Face Deliberation: Effects on Civic Engagement"; Lincoln Dahlberg, "Re-Constructing Digital Democracy: an Outline of Four Positions," *New Media & Society* 13, no. 6 (2011): 855–872; Papacharissi, "Democracy Online: Civility, Impoliteness, and the Democratic Potential of Online Political Discussion Groups." (Dahlberg 2011).
105. Min, "Online Vs. Face-To-Face Deliberation: Effects on Civic Engagement."
106. Todd Graham and Tamara Witschge, "In Search of Online Deliberation: Towards a New Method of Examining the Quality of Online Discussions," *Communications* 28 (2003): 173–204 (Graham and Witschge 2003).
107. Rheingold, *The Virtual Community: Homesteading on the Electronic Frontier*.
108. Papacharissi, "Democracy Online: Civility, Politeness, and the Democratic Potential of Online Political Discussion."
109. De Tarde, *On Communication and Social Influence*; Katz, "Back to the Street: When Media and Opinion Leaves Home."
110. Habermas, "Three Normative Models of Democracy." *Democratic and Constitutional Theory Today*.

REFERENCES

- Albrecht, Steffen. 2006. Whose Voice Is Heard in Online Deliberation? A Study of Participation and Representation in Political Debates on the Internet. *Information, Communication & Society* 8 (1): 62–82.
- Arendt, Hannah. 1958. *The Human Condition*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Barker-Plummer, Bernadette, and Dave Barker-Plummer. 2017. Hashtag Feminism, Digital Media, and New Dynamics of Social Change: A Case Study of #YesAllWomen. In *Social Media and Politics: A New Way to Participate in the Political Process*, ed. Glenn W. Richardson Jr., 79–96. Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.
- Bolls, Paul D. 2010. Understanding Emotion from a Superordinate Dimensional Perspective: A Productive Way Forward for Communication Processes and Effects. *Communication Monographs* 77 (2): 146–152.
- Camaj, Lindita, and Arthur D. Santana. 2015. Political Deliberation on Facebook During Electoral Campaigns: Exploring the Relevance of Moderator’s Technical Role and Political Ideology. *Journal of Information, Technology & Politics* 12 (4): 325–341.
- Cavna, Michael. 2013. ‘Nobody Knows You’re a Dog’: As Iconic Internet Cartoon Turns 20, Creator Peter Steiner Knows the Idea is as Relevant as Ever. *The Washington Post*, July 13. https://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/comic-riffs/post/nobody-knows-youre-a-dog-as-iconic-internet-cartoon-turns-20-creator-peter-steiner-knows-the-joke-rings-as-relevant-as-ever/2013/07/31/73372600-f98d-11e2-8e84-c56731a202fb_blog.html. Accessed 23 May 2016.
- Chen, Gina Masullo. 2011. Tweet This: A Uses and Gratifications Perspective on How Active Twitter Use Gratifies a Need to Connect with Others. *Computers in Human Behavior* 27: 755–762.
- Chen, Gina Masullo. 2012. Why Do Women Write Personal Blogs? Satisfying Needs for Self-Disclosure and Affiliation Tell Part of the Story. *Computers in Human Behavior* 28: 171–180.
- Chen, Gina Masullo. 2013. Don’t Call Me That: A Techno-Feminist Critique of the Term *Mommy Blogger*. *Mass Communication and Society* 16 (4): 510–532.
- Chen, Gina Masullo. 2016. Social Media: From Digital Divide to Empowerment. In *The Routledge Companion to Media and Race*, ed. Christopher P. Campbell. New York: Routledge.
- Chen, Gina Masullo, and Shuning Lu. 2017. Online Political Discourse: Exploring Differences in Effects of Civil and Uncivil Disagreement in News Website Comments. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* 61 (1). doi:10.1080/08838151/2016/1273922.
- Chung, Myojung, Greg J. Munno, and Brian Moritz. 2015. Triggering Participation: Exploring the Effects of Third-Person and Hostile Media

- Perceptions on Online Participation. *Computers in Human Behavior* 53: 452–461.
- Cole, Kristi K. 2015. It's Like She's Eager to Be Verbally Abused: Twitter, Trolls, and (En)Gendering Disciplinary Rhetoric. *Feminist Media Studies* 15 (2): 356–358.
- Colleoni, Elanor, Alessandro Rozza, and Adam Arvidsson. 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.
- Dahlberg, Lincoln. 2011. Re-Constructing Digital Democracy: An Outline of Four Positions. *New Media & Society* 13 (6): 855–872.
- De Tarde, Gabriel. 1889/1969. *On Communication and Social Influence*, ed. Terry N. Clark. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ebo, Bosah. 1998. *Cyberghetto or Cybertopia? Race, Class and Gender on the Internet*, ed. Bosah Ebo. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Eisenstadt, Marnie. 2016. Syracuse's Public Housing Creates Prisons of Poverty; What If They Could Move to Suburbs? *Syracuse.com*, April 14. http://www.syracuse.com/poverty/2016/04/syracuses_public_housing_creat.html. Accessed 13 May 2016.
- Fishkin, James S. 1991. *Democracy and Deliberation*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Festinger, Leon. 1957. *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Frijda, Nico H. 1984. *The Emotions*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Gastil, John. 2011. *Political Communication and Deliberation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gastil, John, and Laura W. Black. 2008. Public Deliberation as the Organizing Principle of Political Communication Research. *Journal of Public Deliberation* 4 (1): Article 3.
- Gillmor, Dan. 2004. *We the Media*. Santa Rosa, CA: O'Reilly Media.
- Graham, Todd, and Tamara Witschge. 2003. In Search of Online Deliberation: Towards a New Method of Examining the Quality of Online Discussions. *Communications* 28: 173–204.
- Granovetter, Mark. 1973. The Strength of Weak Ties. *American Journal of Sociology* 78 (6): 1360–1380.
- Gutmann, Amy, and Dennis Thompson. 1996. *Democracy and Disagreement*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Habermas, Jürgen. 1994. Three Normative Models of Democracy. *Democratic and Constitutional Theory Today* 1 (1): 1–10.
- Harp, Dustin, and Mark Tremayne. 2006. The Gendered Blogosphere: Examining Inequality Using Network and Feminist Theory. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 32 (2): 247–264.

- Herring, Susan C., Inna Kouper, Lois Ann Scheidt, and Elijah Wright. 2004. Women and Children Last: The Discursive Construction of Weblogs. In *Into the Blogosphere: Rhetoric, Community and Culture Weblogs*, ed. Laura Gurak, Smiljana Antonijevic, Laurie Johnson, Clancy Ratcliff, and Jennifer Reyman. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota.
- Himelboim, Itai, Stephen McCreery, and Marc Smith. 2013. Birds of a Feather Tweet Together: Integrating Network and Content Analyses to Examine Cross-Ideology Exposure on Twitter. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 18 (2): 40–60.
- Huckfeldt, Robert, Jeannette Morehouse Mendez, and Tracy Osborn. 2004. Disagreement, Ambivalence, and Engagement: The Political Consequences of Heterogeneous Networks. *Political Psychology* 25 (1): 65–95.
- Huckfeldt, Robert, Ken'ichi Ikeda, and Franz Urban Pappi. 2005. Patterns of Disagreement in Democratic Politics: Comparing Germany, Japan, and the United States. *American Journal of Political Science* 49 (3): 497–514.
- Jacobs, Lawrence R., Fay Lomax Cook, and Michael X. Delli Carpini. 2009. *Talking Together: Public Deliberation and Political Participation in America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Katz, Elihu. 2014. Back to the Street: When Media and Opinion Leaves Home. *Mass Communication and Society* 17: 454–463.
- Kennedy, Kathleen A., and Emily Pronim. 2008. When Disagreement Gets Ugly: Perceptions of Bias and the Escalation of Conflict. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 34 (6): 833–848.
- Kim, Younghwan. 2015. Does Disagreement Mitigate Polarization? How Selective Exposure and Disagreement Affect Political Polarization. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 92 (4): 915–937.
- Klinger, Ulrike, and Uta Russmann. 2015. The Sociodemographics of Political Public Deliberation: Measuring Deliberative Quality in Different User Groups. *Communications* 40 (4): 471–484.
- Klofstad, Casey A., Anand Edward Sokhey, and Scott D. McClurg. 2013. Disagreeing about Disagreement: How Conflict in Social Networks Affects Political Behavior. *American Journal of Political Science* 57: 120–134.
- Landemore, H el ene. 2012. Democratic Reason: The Mechanism of Collective Intelligence in Politics. In *Collective Wisdom: Principles and Mechanisms*, ed. H el ene Landemore, and John Elster, 251–289. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lang, Hai. 2014. The Organizational Principles of Online Political Discussion: A Relational Event Stream Model for Analysis of Web Forum Deliberation. *Human Communication Research* 40: 483–507.
- Lasswell, Harold D. 1941. *Democracy Through Public Opinion*. Menasha, WI: George Banta Publishing.

- Lazarus, Richard S. 1984. On the Primacy of Cognition. *American Psychologist* 39 (2): 124–129.
- Lee, Francis L.F. 2009. The Impact of Political Discussion in a Democratizing Society: The Moderating Role of Disagreement and Support for Democracy. *Communication Research* 36 (3): 379–399.
- Lee, Francis L.F. 2012. Does Discussion With Disagreement Discourage All Types of Political Participation? Survey Evidence from Hong Kong. *Communication Research* 39 (4): 543–562.
- Lopez, Lori Kido. 2009. The Radical Act of ‘Mommy Blogging’: Refining Motherhood Through the Blogosphere. *New Media & Society* 11 (5): 729–747.
- Marcus, George E., W. Russell Neuman, and Michael MacKuen. 2000. *Affective Intelligence and Political Judgment*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Matz, David C., and Wendy Wood. 2005. Cognitive Dissonance in Groups: The Consequences of Disagreement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 88: 22–37.
- McClurg, Scott D. 2006a. The Electoral Relevance of Political Talk: Examining Disagreement and Expertise in Social Networks on Political Participation. *American Journal of Political Science* 50 (3): 737–754.
- McClurg, Scott D. 2006b. Political Disagreement in Context: The Conditional Effect of Neighborhood Context, Disagreement and Political Talk on Electoral Participation. *Political Behavior* 28: 349–366.
- Mehra, Bharat, Cecelia Merkel, and Ann Peterson Bishop. 2004. The Internet for Empowerment of Minority and Marginalized Groups. *New Media & Society* 6 (6): 781–802.
- Min, Seong-Jae. 2007. Online Vs. Face-To-Face Deliberation: Effects on Civic Engagement. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 12: 1369–1387.
- Molina, Maribel. 2016. Twitter Users React to Austin ISD Not Cancelling, Delaying Classes. *Austin American-Statesman*, May 19. <http://austin.blog.statesman.com/2016/05/19/twitter-users-react-to-austin-isd-not-cancelling-delaying-classes/>. Accessed 19 May 2016.
- Mutz, Diana C. 2002a. Cross-Cutting Social Networks: Testing Democratic Theory in Practice. *American Political Science Review* 96 (1): 111–126.
- Mutz, Diana C. 2002b. The Consequences of Cross-Cutting Networks for Political Participation. *American Journal of Political Science* 46 (4): 838–855.
- Nardi, Bonnie A., Diane J. Schiano, Michelle Gumbrecht, and Luke Swartz. 2004. Why We Blog. *Communications of the ACM* 47 (2): 41–46.
- Nir, Lilach. 2005. Ambivalent Social Networks and Their Consequences for Participation. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* 17: 422–442.
- Nir, Lilach. 2011. Disagreement and Opposition in Social Networks: Does Disagreement Discourage Turnout? *Political Studies* 59: 674–692.
- Noelle-Neumann, Elisabeth. 1974. The Spiral of Silence: A Theory of Public Opinion. *Journal of Communication* 24 (2): 43–51.

- Papacharissi, Zizi. 2004. Democracy Online: Civility, Politeness, and the Democratic Potential of Online Political Discussion. *New Media & Society* 6 (2): 259–283.
- Pattie, C.J., and R.J. Johnson. 2009. Conversation, Disagreement and Political Participation. *Political Behavior* 31: 261–285.
- Pedersen, Sarah, and Caroline Macafee. 2007. Gender Differences in British Blogging. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 12: 1471–1492.
- Price, Vincent, Joseph N. Cappella, and Lilach Nir. 2002. Does Disagreement Contribution to More Deliberative Opinion? *Political Communication* 19: 95–112.
- Reese, Stephen D. 2016. The New Geography of Journalism Research. *Digital Journalism* 4 (7): 818–826.
- Rheingold, Howard. 2000. *The Virtual Community: Homesteading on the Electronic Frontier*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Rodriguez, Tori. 2013. Negative Emotions are Key to Well-Being. *Scientific American*, May 1. http://www.scientificamerican.com/article/negative-emotions-key-well-being/?WT.mc_id=SA_FB_MB_EG. Accessed 21 June 2016.
- Ruiz, Carlos, David Domingo, Josep Lluís Micó, Javier Díaz-Noci, Koldo Meso, and Pere Maship. 2011. Public Sphere 2.0? The Democratic Qualities of Citizen Debates in Online Newspapers. *The International Journal of Press/Politics* 16 (4): 463–487.
- Santana, Arthur D. 2011. Online Readers' Comments Represent New Opinion Pipeline. *Newspaper Research Journal* 32 (3): 66–88.
- Schudson, Michael. 1997. Why Conversation Is Not the Soul of Democracy. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 14: 297–309.
- Schradie, Jen. 2012. The Trend of Class, Race, and Ethnicity in Social Media Inequality: Who Still Cannot Afford to Blog. *Information, Communication & Society* 15 (4): 555–571.
- Shifman, Limor. 2014. *Memes in Digital Culture*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Stromer-Galley, Jennifer. 2003. Diversity of Political Conversation on the Internet: Users' Perspectives. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 8 (3).
- Stroud, Natalie J., Joshua M. Scacco, Ashley Muddiman, and Alexander L. Curry. 2015. Changing Deliberative Norms on News Organizations' Facebook Sites. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 20: 188–203.
- Thrift, Samantha C. 2014. #YesAllWomen as Feminist Meme Event. *Feminist Media Studies* 14 (6): 1090–1092.
- Wojcieszak, Magdalena E., and Vincent Price. 2012. Perceived Versus Actual Disagreement: Which Influences Deliberative Experiences? *Journal of Communication* 62: 418–436.

- Yun, Gi Woong, and Sun-Yeon Park. 2011. Selective Posting: Willingness to Post a Message Online. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 16 (2): 201–277.
- Zajonc, Robert B. 1980. Feeling and Thinking: Preferences Need No Inferences. *American Psychologist* 35: 151–175.
- Zajonc, Robert B. 1984. On the Primacy of Affect. *American Psychologist* 39 (2): 117–123.



<http://www.springer.com/978-3-319-56272-8>

Online Incivility and Public Debate

Nasty Talk

Chen, G.M.

2017, XV, 218 p. 9 illus., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-3-319-56272-8