9th Annual APSA Pre-Conference on Political Communication
Wednesday, August 31, 2011
University of Washington

Host: Department of Communication, University of Washington
Co-Chairs: Amber Boydstun (University of California, Davis) and
Shana Kushner Gadarian (Syracuse University)
Section President: Regina Lawrence (University of Texas, Austin)

Summarized Schedule

8:00-8:30am   **Registration**
Coffee, tea, and light pastries provided
Nutrition bars generously provided by Seattle-based Zing Bars
Location: Communication Bldg. First Floor Foyer and Room 126

8:35-10:15am   **Split Panel Session A**
Panel A1 (Comm. Room 120): Immigration, Foreign Policy, and Threat
Panel A2 (Comm. Room 226): Political Actor Portrayals and Advertising

10:20am   **Welcome**
Communication Bldg. Room 120

10:30-11:50am   **Plenary Roundtable: The Interplay between Research and Teaching in Political Communication**
Communication Bldg. Room 120

11:55am-12:45pm   **Lunch**
Boxed lunches provided
Mary Gates Commons

12:50-2:30pm   **Split Panel Session B**
Panel B1 (Comm. Room 120): Coverage of Unconventional Political Behavior
Panel B2 (Comm. Room 226): Experiments in Political Communication

2:35-4:15pm   **Split Panel Session C**
Panel C1 (Comm. Room 120): The Political Communication of Threat
Panel C2 (Comm. Room 226): Political Communication in China/US Relations
Panel C3 (Comm. Room 104): Methodological Medley

4:20-5:40pm   **Plenary Roundtable: The Political Communication of Threat**
Communication Bldg. Room 120

5:45-7:00pm   **Reception**
Wine, beer, and hors d'oeuvres provided
Mary Gates Commons

WiFi: On the back of your name badge you will find a WiFi username and password that should work across the UW campus. Throughout the day, you are welcome to use the Reading Room in Communication Building Room 204 or the Mary Gates Commons room (the main hall in Mary Gates Hall). We encourage participants attending panels to resist the temptation to multi-task.

Full Schedule

8:00-8:30am   **Registration**
Coffee, tea, and light pastries provided
Nutrition bars generously provided by Seattle-based Zing Bars
Location: UW Communication Bldg.
First Floor Foyer and Room 126

8:35-10:15am   **Split Panel Session A**

PANEL A1: IMMIGRATION, FOREIGN POLICY, AND THREAT
Location: Communication Bldg. Room 120
Chair: Martin Johnson (University of California, Riverside)
Discussant: Travis Ridout (Washington State University)

Paper 1 (8:35am): Media Frames and Immigration Debate
Danny Hayes (American University)
This paper examines the frames that appeared in immigration coverage on U.S. television news from May 2005 through June 2007, the last sustained period of public debate over immigration reform. I find that the sources of competing frames -- those arguing for more restrictive versus more permissive policies -- were very different, raising important implication for mass opinion on immigration

Paper 2 (8:50am): American Atrocity Revisited: U.S. Political and News Discourse in the Aftermath of the My Lai Massacre
Chuck Rowling (University of Washington), Timothy Jones (Bellevue College) and Penelope Sheet (University of Amsterdam)
This study examines the discourse that emerged following the 1968 My Lai Massacre. Drawing upon social psychology, we demonstrate that White House and military officials sought to limit the political fallout through the use of national identity-protective frames, which were then largely echoed by the press, despite challenges from Congress

Paper 3 (9:05am): Belief in Propaganda: Perceptions of Public Service Advertisements on Chinese Television
Ashley Esarey (Whitman College), Daniela Stockmann (Leiden University) and Zhang Jie (Communication University of China)
This paper utilizes focus groups conducted among Beijing residents to examine perspectives of public interest advertisements on television. Beijing residents see public service advertisements, a common form of propaganda, as more trustworthy than commercial advertisements, and are surprisingly supportive of state efforts to guide public attitudes.

Paper 4 (9:20am): The Longest War Story: Elite Rhetoric, Public Opinion, and the War in Afghanistan
Tim Groeling (University of California, Los Angeles) and Matthew Baum (Harvard University)
The unprecedented length of the Afghanistan war makes it an an interesting case for scholars of public opinion and military conflict. We examine the war by applying our "strategic bias" model of the foreign policy communication process and examining the actions of the media, political elites, and public, as well as the objective "situation on the ground."

PANEL A2: POLITICAL ACTOR PORTRAYALS AND ADVERTISING
Location: Communication Bldg. Room 226
Chair: Claire Robinson (Massey University, New Zealand)
Discussants: Betty Hanson (University of Connecticut) and Stephanie Burkhalter (Humboldt State University)

Paper 1 (8:35am): Vote for Me or Else! How Candidates Used the Threat of Potential Losses in the 2010 Presidential Elections in Ivory Coast
Williams Yamkam (University of Arkansas, Fort Smith)
Two candidates squared off in the run-off of the presidential elections. One is a Christian, from the South, and is a beloved native son, whereas the other claims to be Moslem, from the North, and seems to be the candidate of the 'international community'. What (subtle) political threats did they use to win votes?

Paper 2 (8:50am): Comparative Advertising and Strategy in U.S. House Elections
Jack D. Collens (University of Georgia)
In this paper, I examine the role of marketing professionals in campaigns for the U.S. House. Specifically, I find that candidates behave strategically in their use of comparative advertising, a type of advertisement that has received relatively little attention in political science but is prevalent in marketing literature.

Paper 3 (9:05am): Rhetoric in Presidential Campaign Ads: Party Mobilizer, Public Informer or Both?
Joseph Cobetto (University of Missouri, Columbia)
The presidential television ad is a ubiquitous feature of our presidential campaigns. This study analyzes texts from presidential campaign television ads from 1952-2008. This paper sets out to demonstrate if the rhetoric offered in these ads principally helps inform viewers generally, or really only helps mobilize partisan ones.

Paper 4 (9:20am): The Government'll Get You, If You Don't Watch Out! Communicating Populist Threats to the People
John S. Nelson (University of Iowa)
Populist politics are rampant. Notorious for resentments, they construct familiar threats, from bankers and bosses to Washington insiders. How do telespots communicate them? Populist ads from 1968 through 2010 use horror aesthetics for stock scenes of menace and response, with "champions" acting to "take back" what is rightfully "the people's."

10:20am   **Welcome**
                       Location: UW Communication Bldg. Room 120

10:30-11:50am   **Plenary Roundtable: The Interplay between Research and Teaching in Political Communication**
                       Location: UW Communication Bldg. Room 120
                       Chair: Lilach Nir (The Hebrew University of Jerusalem)
                       Participants: Michael Delli Carpini (University of Pennsylvania), Danny Hayes (American University), Stephen Reese (University of Texas, Austin), Laura Roselle (Elon University)

11:55am-12:45pm   **Lunch**
Boxed lunches provided
Location: Mary Gates Commons

12:50-2:30pm   **Split Panel Session B**

PANEL B1: COVERAGE OF UNCONVENTIONAL POLITICAL BEHAVIOR
Location: Communication Bldg. Room 120
Chair: Leticia Bode (University of Wisconsin, Madison)
Discussants: David Karpf (Rutgers University) and Tim Groeling (University of California, Los Angeles)

Paper 1 (12:50pm): The language of threat in the rhetoric of #teaparty
G. R. Boynton (University of Iowa) and Glenn Richardson (Kutztown University)
The shooting of Representative Giffords and her constituents shocked the nation and brought to sharp focus the potential consequences of the language of hate in politics. The debate, the language of #teaparty leading up to it, and the language stream that followed is the focus of our paper.

Paper 2 (1:05pm): Tea for Three: Revisiting the Protest Paradigm and Media Coverage of the Tea Party Movement by Cable News Outlet
David A. Weaver (University of California, Santa Barbara) and Joshua M. Scacco (University of Texas, Austin)
The emergence of the 'Tea Party' movement stimulated much media coverage and commentary regarding movement participants and goals. This research examines cable news framing of the movement through the lens of the protest paradigm and asks whether application of the paradigm followed the ideological contours of each news source.

Paper 3 (1:20pm): A Rising Tide of Tea and Ink: News Media Coverage of the Tea Party Movement versus Other Major Protests
Damon T. Di Cicco (University of Washington) and Colin Lingle (University of Washington)
This content analysis explores how news coverage of the Tea Party compares with other major protests since 2003. We examine print and cable news content in terms of traditional protest representations, the reach of Tea Party messaging, and the use of American symbols and imagery to invoke national/citizen identities

Paper 4 (1:35pm): Theories of Conspiracy Theories
Joseph M. Parent (University of Miami) and Joseph E. Uscinski (University of Miami)
Scholars have long observed that Americans manage threat by turning to conspiracy theories. However, the varying popularity and underlying causes of conspiracy theorizing have been under-researched. This paper seeks to measure the prevalence of conspiracy theorizing in the public and test extant prevailing hypotheses about the sources of conspiracy theorizing.

Paper 5 (1:50pm): How Celebrities Become Political During Times of Threat
Todd Belt (University of Hawaii, Hilo)
This paper evaluates the growing prevalence of celebrities in news coverage of threats to public safety. Three models explaining the phenomenon are evaluated using three case studies: Hurricane Katrina, the Deepwater Horizon disaster, and the Tucson shootings. Results are evaluated in terms of prospects for democratic discourse.

PANEL B2: INFORMATION PROCESSING IN POLITICAL COMMUNICATION
Location: Communication Bldg. Room 226
Chair: Toby Bolsen (Georgia State University)
Discussant: Matt Levendusky (University of Pennsylvania)

Paper 1 (12:50pm): Communication, Persuasion, and the Conditioning Value of Selective Exposure: Like Minds May Unite and Divide But They Mostly Tune Out
Kevin Arceneaux (Temple University), John Cryderman (Temple University) and Martin Johnson (University of California, Riverside)
Does opinionated news polarize and harden opinions? We integrate the elaboration likelihood model of attitude development into our theoretical model of selective media exposure. By allowing participants to reveal viewing preferences in an experimental setting, we find viewing preferred programming moderates the influence of political stimuli on evaluations of arguments.

Paper 2 (1:05pm): Visualizing the Facts: Visual Processing's Role in Combating Political Misinformation
Ashley Muddiman (University of Texas, Austin)
Research has examined the threat of political misinformation but findings fall short of determining how people learn correct political facts. This experiment examines whether characteristics of fact-checking messages, namely the use of visual icons, help individuals remember information. Findings examine message strategies that may slow the spread of political misinformation.

Paper 3 (1:20pm): A Field Experiment on the Internet's Effect in an African Election: Savvier Citizens, Disaffected Voters, or Both?
Catie Snow Bailard (George Washington University)
While scholarship is already underway investigating when the Internet will (and will not) facilitate political organization, this study makes a unique contribution to this effort by considering whether the Internet also influences the desire to organize in the first place. Through a randomized field experiment conducted in Tanzania in the months leading up to the 2010 presidential election, this study explores whether the Internet influenced individuals' perception of the fairness of the election and recount.

Paper 4 (1:35pm): Friend or Foe: From Social Interaction to Leadership Judgment
Claire Robinson (Massey University, New Zealand)
This paper discusses how people use the perceptive tools they are equipped with as social beings to assess the extent to which a political leader or potential leader manages threat at mediated face-to-face, one-on-one, small and large group interpersonal distances, and how this then translates into leadership judgment.

2:35-4:15pm   **Split Panel Session C**

PANEL C1: THE POLITICAL COMMUNICATION OF THREAT
Location: Communication Bldg. Room 120
Chair: Jack Collens (University of Georgia)
Discussant: Tom Birkland (North Carolina State University)

Paper 1 (2:35pm): Norms, Threat Appeals, and Actions for the Public Good
Toby Bolsen (Georgia State University)
This paper utilizes data from a survey-experiment to test hypotheses about how social norms and threat appeals shape individuals' intentions to discuss energy conservation with others and actual donations to a non-profit conservation organization. The results accentuate the importance of incorporating norms into the study of political behavior.

Paper 2 (2:50pm): Framing and Ideology in Television News: Representations of Islam as Security Threat in Britain and France
Chris Flood (University of Surrey)
The paper deals with the relationship between framing and ideology in the production of TV news outputs. It introduces a model of ideological marking which is applied to the representation of Islam(ism) as security threat on the main evening news bulletins broadcast by BBC1 and France 2, flagship channels of their respective countries.

Paper 3 (3:05pm): A Theory on Danger Frames
Ingrid D. Anderson (Washington University in St. Louis)
This paper uses neuroscience literature on fear conditioning to develop hypotheses about how people respond to political information framed in terms of threat or danger. It examines whether danger frames create political considerations that are more vivid and enduring, and whether those considerations are more likely to influence political attitudes.

Paper 4 (3:20pm): Structural Stigma of Disease and Coercive Public Health Policy
Dina Shapiro (University of Pennsylvania)
In 1986, a California proposal to quarantine AIDS infected individuals received two million supporting votes; even though there was no credible medical or public health argument favoring this measure. Analysis of the political campaign for this initiative illustrates how support was built by conveying stigmatizing information about AIDS infected individuals.

PANEL C2. POLITICAL COMMUNICATION IN CHINA/US RELATIONS
Co-Sponsored by The Chahar Institute in Beijing, The Carter Center China Program in Atlanta, and The Halle Institute for Global Learning at Emory University

Location: Communication Bldg. Room 226
Chair: Joshua Scacco (University of Texas, Austin)
Discussant: Yong Deng (US Naval Academy)

Paper 1 (2:35pm): The Rise of China: Elite Perceptions and the Future of US-China relations
Yawei Liu (The Carter Center & Emory University) and Justine R. Zheng (London School of Economics)
The authors examine the views of American and Chinese elites on the rise of China, drawing on media sources and interviews. They discuss how China's newly gained confidence, and even threatening arrogance, will impact China's political reform. The authors draw tentative conclusions on how these perceptions will affect the US-China relationship.

Paper 2 (2:50pm): China's Intellectuals and the New Public Diplomacy: 2010-2015
Kejin Zhao (Tsinghua University & The Chahar Institute)
China's new academic initiative in public diplomacy, the priority issues and challenges ahead are discussed, based on recent publications and interviews with more than 50 Chinese government officials and scholars between 2003 and 2010.

Paper 3 (3:05pm): Image Management in Public Diplomacy: A Political Psychology Perspective
Doris A. Graber (University of Illinois, Chicago)
Public diplomacy is difficult because it requires communicating across cultural barriers. What kinds of psychological hurdles confront practitioners of public diplomacy? This paper highlights the challenging psychological appraisals that public diplomacy practitioners must make when they try to convey favorable images of their country.

Paper 4 (3:20pm): Information and Emotion: Challenges and Opportunities for Political Communication in China-US Relations
Holli A. Semetko (Emory University)
National and transnational news media continue to be the most important source of information for most people about foreign affairs. New public diplomacy initiatives launched in the US and China in 2009 are discussed, drawing on case studies and content analysis, in the context of political communication research and international relations.

PANEL C3: METHODOLOGICAL MEDLEY
Location: Communication Bldg. Room 104
Chair and Discussant: Kevin Arceneaux (Temple University)

Paper 1 (2:35pm): Pressing the Gas and Putting on the Breaks: Punctuated Equilibrium, Media Attention, and the Policy Process
Michelle Wolfe (University of Texas, Austin)
This paper extends how we understand the role of the media in a punctuated equilibrium framework of agenda setting by arguing that changes in media coverage contribute to positive and negative feedback cycles by amplifying, attenuating, and sustaining attention to an issue on the formal agenda.

Paper 2 (2:50pm): Blogosphere Authority Index 2.0: Change and Continuity in the American Political Blogosphere, 2007-2010.
David A. Karpf (Rutgers University)
This paper relies upon two years of data collection through the Blogosphere Authority Index (BAI) to track changes among elite political blogs. It develops an argument that combines elements of Hindman's "Missing Middle" and Benkler's "Networked Information Economy" Theses. It also offers a look at pending upgrades to the BAI system.

Paper 3 (3:05pm): Shared Frames? Evaluating Mediated Communication as a Globalizing Force The Case of Climate Change
Abby Jones (George Washington University)
To help better understand the juxtaposition between the growing "globalization" assertions seen in policy and political communications writing, as well as among political leaders, and the still largely nationally based media systems which impact public opinion, this research uses content analysis and develops a model to compare the media coverage of public policy (specifically, climate change) over time and between nations in terms of framing and sourcing of news

Paper 4 (3:20pm): Correlates of Media Freedom
Douglas Van Belle (Victoria University of Wellington) and Jenifer Whitten-Woodring (University of Massachusetts, Lowell)
What factors promote media freedom? We theorize that apart from democracy, political culture, natural resources and ethnic fractionalization largely determine whether a state is receptive to free media. Using an expanded media freedom dataset from 1948 to 2009, we build and test a model of the correlates of media freedom.

4:20-5:40pm   **Plenary Roundtable: The Political Communication of Threat**
                     Location: UW Communication Bldg. Room 120
                     Chair: Regina Lawrence (University of Texas, Austin)
                     Participants: Tom Birkland (North Carolina State University), Robert Entman (George Washington University), Steve Livingston (George Washington University)

5:45-7:00pm   **Reception**
                     Wine, beer, and hors d'oeuvres provided
                     Location: Mary Gates Commons