

Pandemic Policy and Public Opinion
Doctoral Seminar
16:194:670
Spring 2022

Instructor: Dr. Katherine Ognyanova
Email: katya.ognyanova@rutgers.edu
Online Office Hours: Book your preferred time at ognyanova.youcanbook.me
(e-mail me if none of the available times work for you)

- Zoom video or audio call: bit.ly/ko-office-hours
- Phone call: (609) 759-0896

Course Time: Thursday, 4:30pm-7:10pm
Course Zoom: bit.ly/zoom-670 (different from the office hours link!)

- Meeting ID: 926 4446 8399
- Password: 960759
- Join by phone: +1 646 558 8656

Course Website: canvas.rutgers.edu

Course Description

This course will explore major public policy issues and challenges facing American democracy that have been placed in stark relief by the COVID-19 pandemic. The pandemic will be used as a case study for exploring important social issues related to politics, policy, and public opinion.

The course will be taught virtually by faculty from three universities: *Rutgers University*, led by Dr. Katherine Ognyanova; *Harvard University*, led by Dr. Matthew Baum and *Northeastern University*, led by Dr. Jon Green. The class will combine theory with applied insights from *The COVID States Project* (covidstates.org)

Learning Objectives

At the end of the course, students will be able to critically review the theory, methodology, and findings of research examining key issues affecting Americans during the COVID-19 pandemic, including public trust, political polarization, socio-economic inequality, health policy and media.

Course Format

Our course will be conducted fully online using a synchronous format. We will meet weekly over Zoom using this link: bit.ly/zoom-670. Zoom is available for free to all Rutgers students - follow the [instructions here](#) to register for it.

Each week, the class will be conducted live across the three participating universities, with the host university rotating depending on which faculty member has the lead in a given week.

Class sessions will begin with a lecture (30-60 minutes) regarding a conceptual issue, followed by a class discussion of a mini case study related to the problem. Afterwards, we will conduct an Oxford-style debate in which two student teams will debate a pre-determined policy question arising from the topic at hand. At the end of each class, Rutgers students will also have a brief discussion of research methods.

Contact Information

Do not hesitate to contact me if you have questions, ideas, problems, or concerns related to this class. I encourage you to stop by for a chat during office hours at least once during the semester.

You can sign up for office hours meetings with me at ognyanova.youcanbook.me. If the times listed there do not work for you, e-mail me and we will find another convenient time to schedule an appointment. The office hours will be conducted over Zoom at bit.ly/ko-office-hours. Alternatively, you can call over the phone at (609) 759-0896 (direct number).

The most reliable way to reach me outside of office hours is over e-mail. Send your messages to katya.ognyanova@rutgers.edu. Please include “SCI 670” in the e-mail subject – that ensures your message will be tagged as high-priority mail and receive prompt attention. I will typically respond within a couple of days of receiving your email.

Required Readings

There is no required textbook for this class. All readings will be available on the course’s Canvas website (canvas.rutgers.edu). Log in using your Rutgers NetID, navigate to the course site, and browse the *Modules* page. The reading materials for each week of class are also listed in the *Course Outline* section of this syllabus.

If you encounter a problem with Canvas, you can contact the Rutgers Canvas help desk at help@oit.rutgers.edu or call them at 833-648-4357.

Course Attendance

You are expected to attend all classes. If you are unable to attend classes for longer than one week, you should contact a dean of students who can help verify your circumstances. University policy excuses absences due to religious observance or participation and permits students to make up work missed for that reason. You should notify me at least two weeks in advance if you are unable to come to class or take an exam due to religious observance.

Course Requirements and Evaluation

Participation (100 points)

In this course, we will work together to review and examine critical questions and themes related to communication and technology. Much of the class will be discussion-based, with limited lecturing on key points. Everyone is expected to be active in contributing to the conversations we will have in class. You should read all the required materials carefully and thoroughly, reflect critically on their strengths and weaknesses, identify their key points, and be prepared to discuss them.

Reading reflections (200 points)

Each week after you complete the required readings, you should write a brief reflection discussing **two or more** of them and share it with the class. Your writing should demonstrate original thinking rather than simply provide a summary of the readings.

The assignment should be submitted **by the end of the day on Wednesday** of each week. We will use the Canvas discussion feature to post the reading reflections. You can find that section under *Discussions* on the course site, or follow the links included in *Course Materials*.

Each reading reflection should be at least 250 words long. If some of your classmates have shared their reading reflections before you submit yours, I encourage you to respond to the points they have made. Your post should conclude **with at least one thoughtful question** you have that was provoked by the readings. We will discuss those questions in class.

To get the full 200 points for this assignment, you need to submit at least **10 reading reflections** (worth 20 points each) that show critical thinking about the theories and themes examined in this class. Posts will only contribute to the reading reflection grade if they are published on time.

Debates (200 points)

At some point during the semester, each student will participate in an Oxford-style debate. The debates will take about 20 minutes and will be conducted during class time. Each debating team will consist of 2-3 members. You will be assigned a debate topic and partners at the start of the term. Students will be evaluated on their contributions to the debate alongside their team's overall preparation and integration of course material, not whether their team wins the debate.

The debates will employ modified Oxford rules. A proposition will be put forward and we'll poll class members for their position on the issue. There will be one "pro" and one "con" team for each debate. Each side will have up to 4 minutes to make its argument, followed by a 2-minute rebuttal of the opposing argument. You will be "on the clock" during the debate presentations and will be stopped in mid-presentation if you overshoot your allotted time.

Each member of the team must present part of its argument and/or rebuttal, although the team can decide how to divide the time. A team might choose to split both the argument and rebuttal time between its two members. Or, a team might decide to have one member present the argument and the other handle the rebuttal. After the rebuttal round, the debate will be opened

to the full class for questions and arguments. Following the full-class debate, we will re-vote the proposition.

Research design outlines (2 x 100 points)

During the semester, you will write two research design outlines. Each should be 3-5 pages long, excluding references. The outlines should describe the design of two research projects exploring the themes and/or the methods we will examine in class. Each outline should include: (1) a brief theoretical setup grounding your research in existing literature; (2) research questions or hypotheses; and (3) a proposed methodology. Each submission should outline a different project that you are interested in and could feasibly do.

Design outlines should be submitted through the *Assignment* section of the Canvas website for this course. The due dates are as follows:

- **March 6** Research design outline I
- **April 10** Research design outline II

I will provide feedback on each outline you submit. At the end of the semester, you will select one of your three ideas and develop it into a detailed research proposal.

Research proposal (300 points)

For your final project, you will select one of your design outlines and develop it into a comprehensive research proposal. The project should examine one or more aspects of the topics addressed in this course. Your proposal should include an empirical data collection strategy (e.g. a survey, interviews, digital trace data collection, content analysis, an experiment, etc.). The proposed methodology should be realistic, describing a project that you can feasibly complete (e.g. you should not suggest that you will complete ten thousand interviews; or analyze all the data on the Internet).

The proposal should include:

- A literature review summarizing relevant previous research in the area;
- Research questions or hypotheses. You should provide an appropriate justification of the hypotheses, or an explanation of the importance and originality of the research questions;
- A detailed description of the data collection and analysis – including recruitment or sampling strategies where appropriate, as well as the instruments that will be used to collect the data (e.g. if you are using a survey, you should attach it as an appendix; if you are using interviews or focus groups, you should include a protocol for them; if you are using digital trace data, you should describe all the tools used to collect it and how you intend to employ those). Your methodology should also describe exactly how your collected data will be analyzed to examine your research questions or test your hypotheses.
- A bibliography containing the list of references cited in the paper.

The proposal should be 15-20 pages long and should include at least 20-25 references. The text should be double-spaced, using a 12-point font with a 1-inch margin on all sides. It should be

formatted in APA style (one resource about it is the [Purdue Online Writing Lab](https://www.purdue.edu/online-writing-lab/)). It is a good idea to use a citation manager to store and format your references (e.g. www.zotero.com).

Your writing should be clear and logically organized. The text should flow smoothly and demonstrate an excellent writing style. Be sure to carefully proofread the final draft and confirm that it is clearly written, grammatically correct, and free of spelling errors.

Assignments should be submitted through the *Assignments* section of Canvas by **May 8**. Your submission should be included as a single-file attachment in PDF or Word format. Papers submitted by e-mail will not be accepted. Late papers will be accepted up to **5 days** after the deadline, but each day of delay will reduce your grade by 20 points.

On our last day of class, you will present your research proposal and get one more chance to receive peer and instructor feedback before submitting a final draft. Research presentations should be 15-20 minutes long (depending on the number of students in class).

Grade Breakdown & Scale

A and B grades in this course are reserved for outstanding work. To get a high grade, students need to participate actively in class, be thorough and careful in assignments, and demonstrate excellent understanding of the subject, research skills, critical thinking, and originality in their work. The grade breakdown is as follows:

Class participation	100 points
Reading reflections	200 points
Debate team	200 points
Research outlines	200 points
Research proposal	300 points
Total:	1000 points

The final grade will be awarded according to the following scale:

A	900-1000 points
B+	850-899 points
B	800-849 points
C+	750-799 points
C	700-749 points
D	600-699 points
F	Below 600 points

Grade appeals

You can appeal individual assignment grades in writing up to 7 days after the grades are announced. In order to be reviewed, your appeal has to be submitted over e-mail. Once the course grades are announced, they are final and will only be changed in case of an error in the computation of the student's score.

Academic Integrity

You are required to complete your own assignments and always acknowledge the sources of contributions, materials, quotes, and ideas that you did not develop yourself. The consequences of scholastic dishonesty in this class and at Rutgers University in general are very serious. For more details, consult the [University's academic integrity policy](#). Any violation will at a minimum result in no credit earned for the assignment in question. Serious violations of academic integrity may prevent students from completing the course or their academic program. If you have questions about issues related to plagiarism or academic integrity, do not hesitate to contact me.

Accommodation

This course will accommodate any student in need of assistance. Students with documented disabilities who need accommodations should contact the Rutgers Disabilities Services Office (see disabilityservices.rutgers.edu for details). You can also speak with a SC&I adviser by visiting the Office of Student Services in the SC&I Building, Room 214 or calling them at 848-932-7500 (dial 2 as your menu choice). Please contact me with information about the requested assistance and present your Letter of Accommodation as early in the semester as possible.

Additional Resources

The university offers a number of resources that you can access if needed:

- If you need a consultation on **research materials** and ways to find them, you can contact the Rutgers University [subject specialist librarians](#).
- The SC&I IT Services can help you with various **technological problems**. You can find them in CI 120, by phone at 848-932-5555, or by email at help@comminfo.rutgers.edu.
- If you encounter a **problem with Canvas**, you can contact the Rutgers Canvas help desk at help@oit.rutgers.edu or call them at 833-648-4357.
- Student wellness services are available to you at Rutgers. You can contact CAPS for **mental health support** at rhscaps.rutgers.edu or by phone at 848-932-7884.
- The Office for Violence Prevention and Victim Assistance provides confidential crisis intervention, counseling, and advocacy for victims of **sexual and relationship violence**. You can reach VPVA at vpva.rutgers.edu and 848-932-1181.
- The Office of Disability Services can be reached for help with accommodation and facilities for **students with disabilities** at ods.rutgers.edu, or by phone at 848-445-6800.
- On occasion, the university may have to **cancel classes** due to inclement weather. To check if classes are canceled, visit campusstatus.rutgers.edu or call 732-932-7799.

Course summary

Week	Dates	Main topic	Lead instructor
1	January 20	Introductions, syllabus review	Ognyanova
2	January 27	Overview and historical context	All
3	February 3	Executive power	Baum
4	February 10	Partisanship and polarization	Green
5	February 17	Voting and elections	Green
6	February 24	Foreign policy and pandemic diplomacy	Baum
7	March 3	Civil liberties and democratic values	Baum
	<i>March 6</i>	<i>Research outline I due</i>	
8	March 10	Democratic institutions	Ognyanova
	<i>March 17</i>	<i>SPRING BREAK</i>	
9	March 24	Inequality and the pandemic	Green
10	March 31	Protests	Green
11	April 7	Mental health	All
	<i>April 10</i>	<i>Research outline II due</i>	
12	April 14	Science communication	Ognyanova
13	April 21	Media coverage	Ognyanova
14	April 28	Misinformation	Baum
15	May 5	<i>Final Presentations</i>	Ognyanova
	<i>May 8</i>	<i>Research proposal due</i>	

Course Outline

The course schedule is subject to change: materials may be added or replaced during the semester. If that happens, the changes will be reflected on Canvas and announced in class/over email.

Week 1 – January 20

Introductions, syllabus review

Read the course syllabus.

Week 2 – January 27

Overview and historical context

CNN Editorial Research. (2022). Covid-19 Pandemic Timeline Fast Facts. CNN.

<https://www.cnn.com/2021/08/09/health/covid-19-pandemic-timeline-fast-facts/index.html>

Mallapaty, S., Callaway, E., Kozlov, M., Ledford, H., Pickrell, J., & Van Noorden, R. (2021). How COVID vaccines shaped 2021 in eight powerful charts. *Nature*, 600(7890), 580–583.

<https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-021-03686-x>

Week 3 – February 3

Executive power

Baccini, L., & Brodeur, A. (2020). Explaining Governors' Response to the COVID-19 Pandemic in the United States. *American Politics Research*, 49(2), 215–220.

Goelzhauser, G., & Konisky, D. M. (2019). The State of American Federalism 2018–2019: Litigation, Partisan Polarization, and the Administrative Presidency. *Publius: The Journal of Federalism*, 49(3), 379–406.

Crouch, J., Rozell, M. J., & Sollenberger, M. A. (2017). The Unitary Executive Theory and President Donald J. Trump. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 47(3), 561–573.

Karbassi, S. (2021, March 4). Understanding Biden's Invocation of the Defense Production Act. *Lawfare*. www.lawfareblog.com/understanding-bidens-invocation-defense-production-act

OPTIONAL:

Reports available at covidstates.org/reports :

- Executive Approval Reports:
Report #5 (July 2020), Report #6: (July 2020), Report #12 (September 2020),
Report #22 (October 2020), Report #46 (March 2021), Report #66 (October 2021),
- Report #15: Public Support for a COVID-19 Relief Package (September 2020)
- Report #19: Public Health and Trump Support (October 2020)
- Report #20: Public Opinion on Government Reaction to COVID-19 (October 2020)

DEBATE TOPIC:

It is unconstitutional executive overreach for the President to require that certain groups of Americans (e.g., healthcare workers, teachers, first responders) get the COVID vaccine.

Week 4 – February 10

Partisanship and polarization

- Bawn, K., Cohen, M., Karol, D., Masket, S., Noel, H., & Zaller, J. (2012). A Theory of Political Parties: Groups, Policy Demands and Nominations in American Politics. *Perspectives on Politics*, 10(3), 571–597.
- Barber, M. J., & McCarty, N. (2015). Causes and Consequences of Polarization. In N. Persily (Ed.), *Solutions to Political Polarization in America* (pp. 15–58). Cambridge University Press.
- Gollwitzer, A., Martel, C., Brady, W. J., Pärnamets, P., Freedman, I. G., Knowles, E. D., & Van Bavel, J. J. (2020). Partisan differences in physical distancing are linked to health outcomes during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 4(11), 1186–1197.
- Druckman, J. N., Klar, S., Krupnikov, Y., Levendusky, M., & Ryan, J. B. (2021). How Affective Polarization Shapes Americans' Political Beliefs: A Study of Response to the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Journal of Experimental Political Science*, 8(3), 223–234.
- Azari, J. (2016). Weak parties and strong partisanship are a bad combination. *Vox*. www.vox.com/mischiefs-of-faction/2016/11/3/13512362/weak-parties-strong-partisanship-bad-combination
- Blake, A. (2021). The slippery slope of the GOP's anti-vaccine-mandate push. *Washington Post*. www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2021/10/13/slippery-slope-gops-anti-vaccine-mandate-push/

DEBATE TOPIC:

The COVID-19 pandemic exposed fundamental flaws with the United States' political institutions and system of government.

Week 5 – February 17

Voting and elections

- Malhotra, N., & Kuo, A. G. (2008). Attributing Blame: The Public's Response to Hurricane Katrina. *The Journal of Politics*, 70(1), 120–135.
- Healy, A., & Malhotra, N. (2009). Myopic Voters and Natural Disaster Policy. *American Political Science Review*, 103(3), 387–406.
- Yoder, J., Handan-Nader, C., Myers, A., Nowacki, T., Thompson, D. M., Wu, J. A., Yorgason, C., & Hall, A. B. (2021). How did absentee voting affect the 2020 U.S. election? *Science Advances*, 7(52), eabk1755.
- Ghitza, Y., & Robinson, J. (2021). *What Happened in 2020 National Analysis*. Catalist. catalist.us/wh-national/
- Ennis, P. K., & Lagodny, J. (n.d.). We predicted the states Biden would win 100 days before the election. *Washington Post*. Retrieved January 12, 2022, from www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2020/11/12/we-predicted-states-biden-would-win-100-days-before-election/
- The Economist Staff. (2020). How The Economist presidential forecast works. *The Economist*. projects.economist.com/us-2020-forecast/president/how-this-works

DEBATE TOPIC:

The COVID-19 pandemic hurt Donald Trump's chances of re-election.

Week 6 – February 24

Foreign policy and pandemic diplomacy

- Lacatus, C. (2019). Populism and the 2016 American Election: Evidence from Official Press Releases and Twitter. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 52(2), 223–228.
- Jeong, G.-H., & Quirk, P. J. (2019). Division at the Water's Edge: The Polarization of Foreign Policy. *American Politics Research*, 47(1), 58–87.

Sharun, K., & Dhama, K. (2021). COVID-19 Vaccine Diplomacy and Equitable Access to Vaccines Amid Ongoing Pandemic. *Archives of Medical Research*, 52(7), 761–763.

Fukuyama, F. (2021, November 15). The Pandemic and Political Order. *Foreign Affairs*.
www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/world/2020-06-09/pandemic-and-political-order

Kertzer, J. D. (2018). Public Opinion and Foreign Policy. In J. D. Kertzer, *International Relations*. Oxford University Press. doi.org/10.1093/obo/9780199743292-0244

DEBATE TOPIC:

When it comes to sharing COVID vaccines with the world, America should first make sure that its own citizens are vaccinated before prioritizing help for other countries.

Week 7 – March 3

Civil liberties and democratic values

Gelfand, M. J., Jackson, J. C., Pan, X., Nau, D., Pieper, D., Denison, E., Dagher, M., Lange, P. A. M. V., Chiu, C.-Y., & Wang, M. (2021). The relationship between cultural tightness–looseness and COVID-19 cases and deaths: A global analysis. *The Lancet Planetary Health*, 5(3), e135–e144.

Canes-Wrone, B., Howell, W. G., & Lewis, D. E. (2008). Toward a Broader Understanding of Presidential Power: A Reevaluation of the Two Presidencies Thesis. *The Journal of Politics*, 70(1), 1–16.

Brinkley, A. (2006). Civil Liberties in Times of Crisis. *Bulletin of the American Academy of Arts & Sciences*, 26–29.

Gostin, L. O., & Hodge, J. G., Jr. (2020). US Emergency Legal Responses to Novel Coronavirus: Balancing Public Health and Civil Liberties. *JAMA*, 323(12), 1131–1132.

Alsan, M., Braghieri, L., Eichmeyer, S., Kim, M. J., Stantcheva, S., & Yang, D. (2020). *Civil Liberties in Times of Crisis* (No. w27972; p. w27972). National Bureau of Economic Research.

Rothstein, M. A. (2020). The Coronavirus Pandemic: Public Health and American Values. *Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics*, 48(2), 354–359.

OPTIONAL:

Reports available at covidstates.org/reports:

- Report #13: Trust in Institutions (September 2020)

- Report #25: Public Support for COVID-19 Measures (November 2020) and Report #32 (January 2021)
- Report #37: Gun Purchases During the COVID-19 Pandemic (January 2021)
- Public Support for Vaccine Mandates: Report #52 (May 2021), Report #53 (vaccine passports, May 2021), Report #58 (July 2021), Report #64 (October 2021)
- Report #72: School Board Elections (November 2021)

DEBATE TOPIC:

Lockdowns and mandates for wearing masks and getting vaccinated are an unconstitutional violation of Americans' civil liberties.

Week 8 – March 10 **Democratic institutions**

Citrin, J., & Stoker, L. (2018). Political Trust in a Cynical Age. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 21(1), 49–70.

Hanitzsch, T., Van Dalen, A., & Steindl, N. (2018). Caught in the Nexus: A Comparative and Longitudinal Analysis of Public Trust in the Press. *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, 23(1), 3–23.

Newton, K., Stolle, D., & Zmerli, S. (2018). Social and Political Trust. In E. Uslaner M. (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Social and Political Trust* (pp. 37–56). Oxford University Press.

Sturgis, P., Brunton-Smith, I., & Jackson, J. (2021). Trust in science, social consensus and vaccine confidence. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 1–7.

Kum, D. (2020). Fueled by a History of Mistreatment, Black Americans Distrust the New COVID-19 Vaccines. *Time*. time.com/5925074/black-americans-covid-19-vaccine-distrust/

OPTIONAL:

Everett, J. A. C., Colombatto, C., Awad, E., Boggio, P., Bos, B., Brady, W. J., Chawla, M., Chituc, V., Chung, D., Drupp, M. A., Goel, S., Grosskopf, B., Hjorth, F., Ji, A., Kealoha, C., Kim, J. S., Lin, Y., Ma, Y., Maréchal, M. A., ... Crockett, M. J. (2021). Moral dilemmas and trust in leaders during a global health crisis. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 5(8), 1074–1088.

DEBATE TOPIC:

In the early days of the pandemic, CDC could gain more public trust by emphasizing that scientists did not yet know enough about COVID-19, rather than issuing controversial policy recommendations.

Week 9 – March 24

Inequality and the pandemic

- Hardy, B. L., & Logan, T. D. (2020). *Racial Economic Inequality Amid the COVID-19 Crisis*. The Hamilton Project.
- Kim, S. J., & Bostwick, W. (2020). Social Vulnerability and Racial Inequality in COVID-19 Deaths in Chicago. *Health Education & Behavior*, 47(4), 509–513.
- Hanage, W. P., Testa, C., Chen, J. T., Davis, L., Pechter, E., Seminario, P., Santillana, M., & Krieger, N. (2020). COVID-19: US federal accountability for entry, spread, and inequities—lessons for the future. *European Journal of Epidemiology*, 35(11), 995–1006.
- Perry, B. L., Aronson, B., & Pescosolido, B. A. (2021). Pandemic precarity: COVID-19 is exposing and exacerbating inequalities in the American heartland. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118(8), e2020685118.
- Finley, A. (2020). Women’s household labor is essential. Why isn’t it valued? *Washington Post*.
www.washingtonpost.com/outlook/2020/05/29/womens-household-labor-is-essential-why-isnt-it-valued/
- Jagannathan, M. (2021). People of color face multiple barriers to vaccine access—Including “skepticism of a system that has treated them poorly.” *MarketWatch*.
www.marketwatch.com/story/people-of-color-face-multiple-barriers-to-vaccine-access-including-skepticism-of-a-system-that-has-treated-them-poorly-11619444206

DEBATE TOPIC:

Pandemic-related economic relief should be means-tested, not universal.

Week 10 – March 31

Protests

- Wasow, O. (2020). Agenda Seeding: How 1960s Black Protests Moved Elites, Public Opinion and Voting. *American Political Science Review*, 114(3), 638–659.
- Gause, L. (2022). Revealing Issue Salience via Costly Protest: How Legislative Behavior Following Protest Advantages Low-Resource Groups. *British Journal of Political Science*, 52(1), 259–279.

Kampmark, B. (2020). Protesting in Pandemic Times: COVID-19, Public Health, and Black Lives Matter. *Contention*, 8(2), 1–20.

Brown, D. K. (2021). The insurrection at the Capitol challenged how US media frames unrest and shapes public opinion. *The Conversation*. theconversation.com/the-insurrection-at-the-capitol-challenged-how-us-media-frames-unrest-and-shapes-public-opinion-152805

Williamson, V., & Skocpol, T. (2017). What can (or should) activists learn from the tea party? *Washington Post*. www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2017/05/11/what-can-or-should-activists-learn-from-the-tea-party/

OPTIONAL:

Watch video: *United in Anger* www.youtube.com/watch?v=MrAzU79PBVM

DEBATE TOPIC:

50 years from now we will consider the summer of 2020 to have fundamentally altered the course of U.S. politics.

Week 11 – April 7

Mental health

Giuntella, O., Hyde, K., Saccardo, S., & Sadoff, S. (2021). Lifestyle and mental health disruptions during COVID-19. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118(9).

Huckins, J. F., daSilva, A. W., Wang, W., Hedlund, E., Rogers, C., Nepal, S. K., Wu, J., Obuchi, M., Murphy, E. I., Meyer, M. L., Wagner, D. D., Holtzheimer, P. E., & Campbell, A. T. (2020). Mental Health and Behavior of College Students During the Early Phases of the COVID-19 Pandemic: Longitudinal Smartphone and Ecological Momentary Assessment Study. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 22(6), e20185.

Kola, L., Kohrt, B. A., Hanlon, C., Naslund, J. A., Sikander, S., Balaji, M., Benjet, C., Cheung, E. Y. L., Eaton, J., Gonsalves, P., Hailemariam, M., Luitel, N. P., Machado, D. B., Misganaw, E., Omigbodun, O., Roberts, T., Salisbury, T. T., Shidhaye, R., Sunkel, C., ... Patel, V. (2021). COVID-19 mental health impact and responses in low-income and middle-income countries: Reimagining global mental health. *The Lancet Psychiatry*, 8(6), 535–550.

Czeisler, M. É. (2020). Mental Health, Substance Use, and Suicidal Ideation During the COVID-19 Pandemic—United States, June 24–30, 2020. *MMWR. Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, 69.

Öngür, D., Perlis, R., & Goff, D. (2020). Psychiatry and COVID-19. *JAMA*, 324(12), 1149–1150.

DEBATE TOPIC:

Absent strict regulatory oversight, the proliferation of virtual mental health care (“teletherapy”) during the COVID-19 pandemic will likely do more harm than good for patients facing mental health challenges.

Week 12 – April 14**Science communication**

- Scheufele, D. A. (2014). Science communication as political communication. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 111(Supplement 4), 13585–13592.
- Kim, D. K. D., & Kreps, G. L. (2020). An Analysis of Government Communication in the United States During the COVID-19 Pandemic: Recommendations for Effective Government Health Risk Communication. *World Medical & Health Policy*, 12(4), 398–412.
- Guttman, N., & Lev, E. (2021). Ethical Issues in COVID-19 Communication to Mitigate the Pandemic: Dilemmas and Practical Implications. *Health Communication*, 36(1), 116–123.
- Krause, N. M., Brossard, D., Scheufele, D. A., Xenos, M. A., & Franke, K. (2019). Trends—Americans’ Trust in Science and Scientists. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 83(4), 817–836.
- Rommel, A. (2021). ‘It’s a minefield’: COVID vaccine safety poses unique communication challenge. *Nature*, 593(7860), 488–489.

OPTIONAL:

Green, J., Druckman, J., Baum, M., Lazer, D., Ognyanova, K., Simonson, M., Lin, J., Santillana, M., & Perlis, R. (Forthcoming). Using general messages to persuade on a politicized scientific issue. *British Journal of Political Science*.

DEBATE TOPIC:

Medical experts should provide relevant information and advice, but they should not be on TV publicly advocating for specific government policies.

Week 13 – April 21**Media coverage**

- Parrish, A. J., Vos, S. C., & Cohen, E. L. (2015). Media Effects and Health. In N. G. Harrington (Ed.), *Health Communication: Theory, Method, and Application* (pp. 364–396).

- Hart, P. S., Chinn, S., & Soroka, S. (2020). Politicization and Polarization in COVID-19 News Coverage. *Science Communication*, 42(5), 679–697.
- Chung, M., & Jones-Jang, S. M. (2021). Red Media, Blue Media, Trump Briefings, and COVID-19: Examining How Information Sources Predict Risk Preventive Behaviors via Threat and Efficacy. *Health Communication*, 1–8.
- Jiang, X., Hwang, J., Shah, D. V., Ghosh, S., & Brauer, M. (2021). News Attention and Social-Distancing Behavior Amid COVID-19: How Media Trust and Social Norms Moderate a Mediated Relationship. *Health Communication*, 1–10.
- Covid coverage by the U.S. national media is an outlier, a study finds. (2021). *The New York Times*. www.nytimes.com/2021/03/24/world/covid-coverage-by-the-us-national-media-is-an-outlier-a-study-finds.html

DEBATE TOPIC:

The consistent focus on negative developments in most US mainstream news coverage of COVID-19 did more harm than good to public health.

Week 14 – April 28

Misinformation and misperception

- Iyengar, S., & Massey, D. S. (2019). Scientific communication in a post-truth society. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(16), 7656–7661.
- Druckman, J. N., Ognyanova, K., Baum, M. A., Lazer, D., Perlis, R. H., Volpe, J. D., Santillana, M., Chwe, H., Quintana, A., & Simonson, M. (2021). The role of race, religion, and partisanship in misperceptions about COVID-19. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 24(4), 638–657.
- Lazer, D., Baum, M. A., Benkler, Y., Berinsky, A. J., Greenhill, M., Menczer, F., Metzger, J., & Nyhan, B. (2018). The science of fake news: Addressing fake news requires a multidisciplinary effort. *Science*, 4.
- Enders, A. M., Uscinski, J. E., Klofstad, C., & Stoler, J. (2020). The different forms of COVID-19 misinformation and their consequences. *Harvard Kennedy School Misinformation Review*.
- Hofer, B. K., & Sinatra, G. (2022). “Don’t Look Up”: Hollywood’s primer on climate denial illustrates 5 myths that fuel rejection of science. *The Conversation*. theconversation.com/dont-look-up-hollywoods-primer-on-climate-denial-illustrates-5-myths-that-fuel-rejection-of-science-174266

OPTIONAL:

Reports available at covidstates.org/reports:

- Report #14: Misinformation and Vaccine Acceptance (September 2020)
- Report #18: Covid Fake News on Twitter (October 2020)
- Report #60: COVID-19 Vaccine Misinformation (August 2021)

DEBATE TOPIC:

Public health-related misinformation is a primary cause of vaccine hesitancy in the United States.

Week 15 – May 5

Final presentations
