

Science/Health Communication: MMC 6409 - 2980

Fall 2023

(Syllabus subject to change based on the best interests of students' learning in the course)

Basic Information

Instructor: Haoran “Chris” Chu

Email: chu.h@ufl.edu (Preferred method of communication. Please include MMC6400 in the subject line.)

Office Phone Number: 352-294-9115

Class Periods: 1098 Weimer, Wednesday, 10-E1, 5:10 – 8:10 pm

Office Hours: Wednesday 2:30 – 5:00 pm or by appointment, 2066A Weimer or virtually

Course Descriptions

This course is an intensive exploration into the realm of communication techniques, theories, and strategies pertaining to scientific and health-related contexts. The course is designed to develop a deep and holistic understanding of the complex dynamics of public engagement, message framing, risk communication, and health literacy. In this course, students will delve into critical issues like misinformation in science and health, how to translate complex scientific information for lay audiences, ethics in health communication, and the impacts of cultural, societal, and psychological factors on how scientific and health information is interpreted and acted upon.

Lectures and readings will provide theoretical and practical insights, drawing from the fields of communication studies, psychology, public health, and sociology. However, the heart of this course is the active participation and in-depth discussion of students. A significant portion of the class will be devoted to discussions, case studies, and critique of real-world science communication strategies, where students will have the opportunity to exercise critical thinking, debate, and collaborative problem-solving.

The course encourages students to actively engage with contemporary topics and scenarios, linking academic knowledge to current science and health communication challenges. As a result, by the end of the course, students will not only acquire a comprehensive understanding of the principles of science and health communication but will also be equipped with practical skills to effectively communicate scientific and health-related matters in their professional careers.

This course is essential for those aiming to pursue a career in scientific or health education, public health advocacy, science journalism, policymaking, or any role that involves interpreting and disseminating scientific or health information to a variety of stakeholders.

Note: Students' active participation and contribution to class discussions are critical to the success of this course, fostering an environment of shared learning and intellectual growth. As such, students are expected to come prepared to each class, having thoroughly engaged with the reading materials.

LEARNING MATERIALS

- No text is required. However, you expected to read all assigned readings, including any that are added later in the semester and those suggested by your fellow students.
- Readings for each week will be made available on Canvas or emailed to you, on occasion.
- For your own research and interest, check out academic journals such as *Science Communication*, *Public Understanding of Science*, *Health Communication*, *Journal of Health Communication*, *American Journal of Public Health*, & *Social Science and Medicine*.

Please Note:

- This syllabus and other course content are subject to change based the best interest of student learning. Changes will be announced on Canvas and via email. It is **YOUR RESPONSIBILITY to check your UF email regularly.**

COURSE OBJECTIVES

By the end of this course, students will be able to:

- **Conceptualize and Interpret:** Understand, interpret, and critically evaluate the theories, models, and key concepts within the field of science and health communication.
- **Analyze and Critique:** Engage in critical analysis of different modes of communication, including their construction, distribution, and reception, within the context of scientific and health discourse.
- **Contextual Understanding:** Develop a nuanced understanding of the social, political, cultural, and ethical contexts that shape and are shaped by science and health communication.
- **Effective Communication:** Design, implement, and assess effective science and health communication strategies that are appropriate to the topic, audience, and context.
- **Practical Application:** Translate theoretical understanding into practical skills, preparing for roles in health and science communication that require synthesizing complex information, anticipating public reactions, and responding to communication challenges.

GRADING CRITERIA

NOTE: Please understand that **points and percentages are different units.** The total point of this course is 1,000 and the total percentage is 100%. Therefore, 10 points are equal to 1 percent. All the following grading criteria (including extra credit) are based on the point system (1,000 points). All assignment due dates can be found in the course schedule attached to this syllabus.

- **Class Participation/Attendance** (100 points/10 percent)
 - Students are expected to come to class prepared to discuss the readings for that day. You may respond to questions posed by me and other students in their response papers and presentations, or ask questions related to the readings. Comments on the topics, theories, and specific research articles are also encouraged. You are expected to participate in the discussions during your presentation week and the weeks in which you have submitted a response paper.
- **Discussion Leader** (200 points/20 percent)
 - Depending on the class size, you will be responsible for leading one or several of the discussions. This is not a formal presentation; instead, your job will be to highlight important issues in the readings and help provide a structure for considering key questions for the week's topic. When you are leading the discussion, please assume that your classmates have done the reading – a brief reminder about the main points or methods used in the articles is appropriate, but an extended summary is not. Instead, your job is to help us have a conversation that brings out important issues raised by the readings.
 - As a discussion leader, you will need to read all the readings assigned for the week, including the additional articles. You will present the core arguments and findings made in the additional articles to the class and solicit comments and questions from the class regarding these articles.

- Please feel free to meet with me the week before you are scheduled to be a discussion leader if you have questions or would like to discuss a strategy for leading the discussion. If you have an additional article that you would like to recommend to the class, or if you would like to suggest switching one of the required articles with one of the additional articles, please let me know at least a week in advance of class.
- You will need to submit a discussion outline to me by **8 pm the Tuesday** before class. (Earlier submission is fine!) If you are paired with a partner for your discussion-leading day, you can submit one outline for both of you.
- You will sign up for the discussion week/topic during the week 1 class, based on your interests. I will do my best to assign everyone to a topic of their choice.
- **Discussion Questions** (150 points/15 percent)
 - From **week 2 to week 13**, you should come up with three (or more) discussion questions. These questions should be posted to the corresponding discussion boards on Canvas no later than **8 pm the Monday** before class. There is no need to submit the discussion questions if you are leading the discussion. However, during the weeks in which you choose to write a response paper, you can summarize the questions proposed in your response paper and submit them as discussion questions.
 - A good discussion question provides a springboard for exploring the issues raised in the articles. For example, are there common themes that run through the readings? Are there differences highlighted by alternative theories or approaches? Other topics for good discussion questions might include critiques of the studies, real-world applications, and links to previous readings or topics.
 - Straightforward clarification questions (e.g., what a technical term means, how to interpret a statistical analysis) are not appropriate discussion questions, but please feel free to ask those kinds of questions in class.
 - Discussion questions will be graded on a weekly basis and each week's discussion questions are worth 20 points. You will receive a 10-point bonus if you completed at least 7 weekly discussion questions.
- **Response Paper** (200 points/20 percent)
 - In keeping with the seminar design, you will be asked to read a considerable amount of original or in-depth materials before each class. To facilitate this, you will write short response papers (2 double-spaced pages max.), raising questions or issues for discussion or responding to questions I may pose. There is no need to cite core readings, but external references should be properly cited. Response papers should NOT simply summarize the readings, but reflect your own thinking based on the readings.
 - Please note that you need to read the readings even if you are not submitting a response paper.
 - Starting week 2, these short papers are due by **8 pm on Canvas the Monday** before the relevant class. You may choose any week during week 3-13 to submit **four response papers** in total.
 - Each response paper is worth 50 points and will be graded based on merit.
- **Research Paper/Proposal** (350 points/30 percent)
 - Throughout the semester, you will develop a research paper or proposal concerning a science or health topic of your choice. The paper/proposal will provide a compelling rationale to study the health/science communication issue, a systematic literature review that

would lead to interesting research questions or hypotheses, and a proposed or applied research method section along with references in APA style. Depending on the feasibility of the research you are proposing, you may conduct the research during the semester or use the assignment as an opportunity to develop the foundation of a research that may serve as your next study or even your thesis. No need to worry if you are unsure about how “feasible” a study has to be – I will go over the processes involved in conducting a research study during the semester. The overall process of the research paper/proposal is broken into three phases.

- **Phase 1: Theory Overview and Literature Review (50 points/5 percent)** – This is a 5-to-8-page (double-spaced) systematic exploration of the literature relevant to the research question you are exploring.
- **Phase 2: Draft Paper (50 points/5 percent)** – This is a 10-to-12-page draft in which you will make the transition from conceptualization to operationalization. Make sure to incorporate Dr. Chu’s comment on your literature review.
- **Phase 4: Research Presentation (50 points/5 percent)** – You will make a 10-to-15-minute presentation about your research proposal followed by a short Q&A session. Feedback will be provided for your paper revision before final submission. The style of the presentation will be similar to conference presentations.
- **Phase 5: Final Paper (200 points/20 percent)** – after receiving Dr. Chu’s and your fellow students’ comments on the complete draft and presentation, you will need to turn in a 12-to-15-page final paper/proposal. You may schedule an individual meeting with me to discuss the final proposal.

COURSE GRADING SCALE AND PERCENTAGES

Grading Items	Points	Percentage Allocation
Class Participation/Attendance	100	10%
Discussion Leader	200	20%
Discussion Questions	150	15%
Response Papers	200	20%
Research Proposal	350	35%
Total point	1,000	100%

Letter Grades:

93.5-100%	A	83.5-87%	B	73.5-77%	C	63.5-67%	D
90-93.4%	A-	80-83.4%	B-	70-73.4%	C-	60-63.4%	D-
87.1-89.9%	B+	77.1-79.9%	C+	67.1-69.9%	D+	0-59.9%	E

LATE/MISSED SUBMISSION

Late submission in general will not be accepted. Discuss with me in advance if you are not able to submit an assignment on time due to exceptional reasons.

USE OF GENERATIVE AI

In the context of academic integrity, it's essential to highlight that while we will be discussing and exploring the role of new media and AI in health and science communication, the use of generative AI tools for the creation of course assignments is strictly prohibited. This includes but is not limited to, AI-driven content generation, automated essay writing, and other related technologies. All assignments for this course must be the original work of the student. You are expected to complete all assignments independently, with due diligence and respect for academic standards. Any suspected use of AI in assignment creation will be thoroughly investigated and may result in academic penalties.

QUESTIONS ABOUT YOUR GRADES

I am more than happy to talk with you about your grade and discuss the strengths and weaknesses of your graded work. That said, I require a 24-hour “cool off” period. We will not discuss your grade until we both have time gather our thoughts and have a productive conversation. After the initial 24 hours, students have one week to meet with the instructor to discuss the grade. If the student does not meet with the instructor **within a week**, then the instructor considers the matter closed. All discussions regarding grades are conducted in person, in my office.

EFFORT VS. EXCELLENCE

You do not receive a grade for how hard you worked, only on the final product. Instructor grades your work on the degree of excellence it demonstrates. Make no mistake about the relationship between the two, as hard work often results in solid evaluations. That said, just because you spent “10 hours in the library” before a test or a group project doesn’t guarantee you a good grade. You have to study properly, address assignment requirements, and the like in order to assure a solid grade. I will help out in every way I can along the way and ALWAYS want you to do well. Don’t hesitate for a second to reach out to me (just don’t do it at the last second!).

UNIVERSITY HONESTY POLICY

UF students are bound by The Honor Pledge which states, “We, the members of the University of Florida community, pledge to hold ourselves and our peers to the highest standards of honor and integrity by abiding by the Honor Code. On all work submitted for credit by students at the University of Florida, the following pledge is either required or implied: “On my honor, I have neither given nor received unauthorized aid in doing this assignment.” The Honor Code (<https://www.dso.ufl.edu/sccr/process/student-conducthonor-code/>) specifies a number of behaviors that are in violation of this code and the possible sanctions. Furthermore, you are obligated to report any condition that facilitates academic misconduct to appropriate personnel.

COURSE EVALUATION

Students are expected to provide professional and respectful feedback on the quality of instruction in this course by completing course evaluations online via GatorEvals. Guidance on how to give feedback in a professional and respectful manner is available at <https://gatorevals.ua.ufl.edu/students/>. Students will be notified when the evaluation period opens, and can complete evaluations through the email they receive from

GatorEvals, in their Canvas course menu under GatorEvals, or via <https://ufl.bluera.com/ufl/>. Summaries of course evaluation results are available to students at <https://gatorevals.ua.ufl.edu/public-results/>.

STUDENTS REQUIRING ACCOMODATIONS

Students with disabilities who experience learning barriers and would like to request academic accommodations should connect with the disability Resource Center by visiting <https://disability.ufl.edu/students/get-started/>. It is important for students to share their accommodation letter with their instructor and discuss their access needs, as early as possible in the semester

COPYRIGHT STATEMENT

Materials in this course—unless otherwise indicated—are protected by United States copyright law [Title 17, U.S. Code]. Materials are presented in an educational context for personal use and study and should not be shared, distributed, or sold in print—or digitally—outside the course without permission. Students may not record, reproduce, screenshot, photograph, or distribute any video, audio, or visual content from this course. This restriction includes but is not limited to live discussions, discussion boards, posted course materials, course evaluation form, visual materials that accompany lectures/discussions, such as slides and whiteboard notes, etc.

VIDEO RECORDING

Students are allowed to record video or audio of class lectures. However, the purposes for which these recordings may be used are strictly controlled. The only allowable purposes are (1) for personal educational use, (2) in connection with a complaint to the university, or (3) as evidence in, or in preparation for, a criminal or civil proceeding. All other purposes are prohibited. Specifically, students may not publish recorded lectures without the written consent of the instructor.

A “class lecture” is an educational presentation intended to inform or teach enrolled students about a particular subject, including any instructor-led discussions that form part of the presentation, and delivered by any instructor hired or appointed by the University, or by a guest instructor, as part of a University of Florida course. A class lecture does not include lab sessions, student presentations, clinical presentations such as patient history, academic exercises involving solely student participation, assessments (quizzes, tests, exams), field trips, private conversations between students in the class or between a student and the faculty or lecturer during a class session.

Publication without permission of the instructor is prohibited. To “publish” means to share, transmit, circulate, distribute, or provide access to a recording, regardless of format or medium, to another person (or persons), including but not limited to another student within the same class section. Additionally, a recording, or transcript of a recording, is considered published if it is posted on or uploaded to, in whole or in part, any media platform, including but not limited to social media, book, magazine, newspaper, leaflet, or third party note/tutoring services. A student who publishes a recording without written consent may be subject to a civil cause of action instituted by a person injured by the publication and/or discipline under UF Regulation 4.040 Student Honor Code and Student Conduct Code.

MISCELLANEOUS

- The instructor reserves the right to make any changes to the syllabus, schedule, assignments, readings, forms, lecture topics, assessments, and any other course content if deemed necessary to facilitate classroom management and to achieve the learning objectives for the course. Students are responsible to stay aware of these changes.
- Only students enrolled in this course may attend (and receive credit for) this class.
- I take plagiarism very seriously. Any evidence of plagiarism or cheating will result in an “E” for the course and disciplinary action. Do not submit the same work to more than one class. Do not adapt work from another class for this class. Do not adapt someone else’s work and submit it as your own. This course requires original work, created at this time, for this purpose.

COURSE SCHEDULE

*This is a *tentative* schedule.

Class Date	Topics, Readings, & Assignments
Week 1	
8/23	Introduction to the class Readings: Syllabus
Week 2	
8/30	What is science and science/health communication? Readings: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Kerlinger, F. N., & Lee, H. B. (2000). Science and the scientific approach. In F. N. Kerlinger & H. B. Lee (Eds.) <i>Foundations of behavioral research</i> (pp. 3-21). Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt College Publishers. 2. Guetzkow, J., Lamont, M., & Mallard, G. (2004). What is Originality in the Humanities and the Social Sciences? <i>American Sociological Review</i>, 69(2), 190-212. 3. Burns, T. W., O'Connor, D. J., & Stockmayer, S. M. (2003). Science communication: a contemporary definition. <i>Public understanding of science</i>, 12(2), 183-202. 4. Schiavo, R. (2013). <i>Health communication: From theory to practice</i> (Vol. 217). John Wiley & Sons. Chapter 1: What is health communication?
Week 3	
9/6	Scientists and communicators' roles in science and health communication Readings: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Besley, J. C., Dudo, A., & Yuan, S. (2018). Scientists' views about communication objectives. <i>Public Understanding of Science</i>, 27(6), 708-730. 2. Baram-Tsabari, A., & Lewenstein, B. V. (2017). Science communication training: what are we trying to teach?. <i>International Journal of Science Education, Part B</i>, 7(3), 285-300. 3. Koivumäki, K., Karvonen, E., & Koivumäki, T. (2021). Challenges in the collaboration between researchers and in-house communication professionals in the digital media landscape. <i>Journal of Science Communication</i>, 20(3), A04. 4. Braddock III, C. H., Edwards, K. A., Hasenberg, N. M., Laidley, T. L., & Levinson, W. (1999). Informed decision making in outpatient practice: time to get back to basics. <i>Jama</i>, 282(24), 2313-2320. 5. Fishbein, M., & Cappella, J. N. (2006). The role of theory in developing effective health communications. <i>Journal of communication</i>, 56(suppl_1), S1-S17.
Week 4	
9/13	The public and science/health communication <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Besley, J. C., & Nisbet, M. (2013). How scientists view the public, the media and the political process. <i>Public understanding of science</i>, 22(6), 644-659. 2. Brossard, D., & Nisbet, M. C. (2007). Deference to scientific authority among a low information public: Understanding US opinion on agricultural biotechnology. <i>International Journal of Public Opinion Research</i>, 19(1), 24-52. 3. Sharon, A. J., & Baram-Tsabari, A. (2020). Can science literacy help individuals identify misinformation in everyday life?. <i>Science Education</i>, 104(5), 873-894.

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Abel, T., & McQueen, D. (2020). Critical health literacy and the COVID-19 crisis. <i>Health promotion international</i>, 35(6), 1612-1613. 5. Stilgoe, J., Lock, S. J., & Wilsson, J. (2014). Why should we promote public engagement with science?. <i>Public understanding of science</i>, 23(1), 4-15.
Week 5	
9/20	<p>Trust & credibility in science and health communication</p> <p>Readings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Iyengar, S., & Massey, D. S. (2019). Scientific communication in a post-truth society. <i>Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences</i>, 116(16), 7656-7661. 2. Millstone, E., & Van Zwanenberg, P. (2000). A crisis of trust: for science, scientists or for institutions?. <i>Nature Medicine</i>, 6(12), 1307-1308. 3. Fiske, S. T., & Dupree, C. (2014). Gaining trust as well as respect in communicating to motivated audiences about science topics. <i>Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences</i>, 111(supplement_4), 13593-13597. 4. Chinn, S., & Hart, P. S. (2022). Can't you all just get along? Effects of scientific disagreement and incivility on attention to and trust in science. <i>Science Communication</i>, 44(1), 108-129.
Week 6	
9/27	<p>News coverage and public debates on science and health issues</p> <p>Readings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Hart, P. S., Chinn, S., & Soroka, S. (2020). Politicization and polarization in COVID-19 news coverage. <i>Science communication</i>, 42(5), 679-697. 2. Druckman, J. N., & McGrath, M. C. (2019). The evidence for motivated reasoning in climate change preference formation. <i>Nature Climate Change</i>, 9(2), 111-119. 3. Chu, H., Yang, J. Z., & Liu, S. (2021). Not my pandemic: Solution aversion and the polarized public perception of COVID-19. <i>Science Communication</i>, 43(4), 508-528. 4. Nguyen, A., & Catalan, D. (2020). Digital mis/disinformation and public engagement with health and science controversies: Fresh perspectives from Covid-19. <i>Media and communication</i>, 8(2), 323-328.
Week 7	
10/4	<p>Science and health communication through different communication channels</p> <p>Literature Review due on 10/6</p> <p>Readings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Peters, H. P., Dunwoody, S., Allgaier, J., Lo, Y. Y., & Brossard, D. (2014). Public communication of science 2.0: Is the communication of science via the “new media” online a genuine transformation or old wine in new bottles?. <i>EMBO reports</i>, 15(7), 749-753. 2. Yuan, S., Kanthawala, S., & Ott-Fulmore, T. (2022). “Listening” to Science: Science Podcasters’ View and Practice in Strategic Science Communication. <i>Science Communication</i>, 44(2), 200-222. 3. James, V. (2020). Science communication efforts and identity at popular culture conventions. <i>Science Communication</i>, 42(3), 395-418. 4. Cheng, Y., & Jiang, H. (2020). AI-Powered mental health chatbots: Examining users’ motivations, active communicative action and engagement after mass-shooting disasters. <i>Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management</i>, 28(3), 339-354.
Week 8	

10/11	<p>Message framing in health and science communication</p> <p>Readings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Druckman, J. N., & Lupia, A. (2017). Using frames to make scientific communication more effective. <i>The Oxford handbook of the science of science communication</i>, 243-252. 2. Trumbo, C. (1996). Constructing climate change: Claims and frames in US news coverage of an environmental issue. <i>Public understanding of science</i>, 5(3), 269. 3. Nisbet, E. C., Hart, P. S., Myers, T., & Ellithorpe, M. (2013). Attitude change in competitive framing environments? Open-/closed-mindedness, framing effects, and climate change. <i>Journal of Communication</i>, 63(4), 766-785. 4. Nisbet, M. C., & Mooney, C. (2007). Framing science. <i>Science</i>, 316(5821), 56-56. 5. DeFoster, R., & Swalve, N. (2018). Guns, culture or mental health? Framing mass shootings as a public health crisis. <i>Health communication</i>, 33(10), 1211-1222.
Week 9	
10/18	<p>Narrative and entertainment education in health and science communication</p> <p>Readings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dahlstrom, M. F. (2014). Using narratives and storytelling to communicate science with nonexpert audiences. <i>Proceedings of the national academy of sciences</i>, 111(supplement_4), 13614-13620. 2. Moyer-Gusé, E., & Nabi, R. L. (2010). Explaining the effects of narrative in an entertainment television program: Overcoming resistance to persuasion. <i>Human communication research</i>, 36(1), 26-52. 3. Slater, M. D., & Rouner, D. (2002). Entertainment—education and elaboration likelihood: Understanding the processing of narrative persuasion. <i>Communication theory</i>, 12(2), 173-191.
Week 10	
10/25	<p>Science & health communication topics: Vaccine hesitancy & COVID-19</p> <p>Readings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dubé, E., Laberge, C., Guay, M., Bramadat, P., Roy, R., & Bettinger, J. A. (2013). Vaccine hesitancy: an overview. <i>Human vaccines & immunotherapeutics</i>, 9(8), 1763-1773. 2. Pența, M. A., & Băban, A. (2018). Message framing in vaccine communication: a systematic review of published literature. <i>Health communication</i>, 33(3), 299-314. 3. Dror, A. A., Eisenbach, N., Taïber, S., Morozov, N. G., Mizrahi, M., Zigron, A., ... & Sela, E. (2020). Vaccine hesitancy: the next challenge in the fight against COVID-19. <i>European journal of epidemiology</i>, 35, 775-779. 4. Bradshaw, A. S., Shelton, S. S., Wollney, E., Treise, D., & Auguste, K. (2021). Pro-vaxxers get out: Anti-vaccination advocates influence undecided first-time, pregnant, and new mothers on Facebook. <i>Health Communication</i>, 36(6), 693-702.
Week 11	
11/1	<p>In-person or virtual individual meetings</p> <p>First Draft due on 11/3</p>
Week 12	
11/8	<p>Science & health communication topics: climate change and sustainability</p> <p>Readings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Hart, P. S., & Nisbet, E. C. (2012). Boomerang effects in science communication: How motivated reasoning and identity cues amplify opinion polarization about climate mitigation policies. <i>Communication research</i>, 39(6), 701-723.

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Kahan, D. M., Peters, E., Wittlin, M., Slovic, P., Ouellette, L. L., Braman, D., & Mandel, G. (2012). The polarizing impact of science literacy and numeracy on perceived climate change risks. <i>Nature climate change</i>, 2(10), 732-735. 3. Schuldt, J. P., Konrath, S. H., & Schwarz, N. (2011). “Global warming” or “climate change”? Whether the planet is warming depends on question wording. <i>Public opinion quarterly</i>, 75(1), 115-124. 4. Brügger, A., Dessai, S., Devine-Wright, P., Morton, T. A., & Pidgeon, N. F. (2015). Psychological responses to the proximity of climate change. <i>Nature climate change</i>, 5(12), 1031-1037.
Week 13	
11/15	<p>Science & health communication topics: AI, gene-editing, and new technologies</p> <p>Readings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lu, H., & Chu, H. (2023). Let the dead talk: How deepfake resurrection narratives influence audience response in prosocial contexts. <i>Computers in Human Behavior</i>, 145, 107761. 2. Yuan, S., Ma, W., & Besley, J. C. (2019). Should scientists talk about GMOs nicely? Exploring the effects of communication styles, source expertise, and preexisting attitude. <i>Science Communication</i>, 41(3), 267-290. 3. Carr, S. (2020). ‘AI gone mental’: engagement and ethics in data-driven technology for mental health. <i>Journal of Mental Health</i>, 29(2), 125-130. 4. Vosoughi, S., Roy, D., & Aral, S. (2018). The spread of true and false news online. <i>science</i>, 359(6380), 1146-1151.
Week 14	
11/22	No class (Thanksgiving break)
Week 15	
11/29	Final Proposal Presentations (11/30)
Week 16	
12/6	Final Paper due by 11:59 pm, 12/7