

Internet Policy

Graduate Course 28841, Summer Semester 2021

1. ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

1.1. Time and Place

Wednesday; 14.00–16.00

1.2. Seminar description

The seminar offers an overview of the different aspects of internet policy. By this we mean the political shaping of digitalisation, i.e. digital infrastructures as well as the applications and information flows based on them. The current debate on Internet policy focuses on the power of platforms and their sources. This includes business models, enormous data collections, and data analytics, which increasingly relies on machine learning methods. From an internet policy perspective, the challenges posed by state regulation of platforms are particularly interesting. In this context, we will also discuss corresponding legislative initiatives. Furthermore, the seminar will deal with the right to privacy and the monitoring of data traffic in the context of fighting cybercrime. We will also take a critical look at the current discussion on digital sovereignty.

The seminar has three learning objectives. The first one concerns a basic understanding of internet politics and its lines of conflict: What exactly do the actors in this field argue about and which (normative) positions can be distinguished? Secondly, we will use discourse analyses to examine internet policy controversies. Thirdly, in the course of the semester we expand our ability to recognise the contingency, i.e. the open-endedness of internet policy developments: Everything could have turned out differently!

1.3. Format

Since the summer semester will again be exclusively digital, we are going to experiment a little with the format, combining elements of a project and a literature seminar. During the semester, students will work in small working groups on a research project to be presented at the beginning of June. Throughout the weekly classes, we will focus on recent academic contributions to internet policy issues.

1.4. Registration

Via Campus Management. Students of related subjects, especially political science, are welcome but must register in person.

1.5. Literature & Assignments

Via Blackboard

1.6. Performance requirements

The seminar does without presentations; instead, all participants prepare themselves for each individual session:

- Regular and active participation in a working group and in the online sessions
- Reading the compulsory texts
- Detailed written preparation:
 - Preparation of one essay (2-3 pages; expository or persuasive essay) and one summary (1-2 pages) related to one different session topic each (based on the compulsory literature).
 - Submission via Blackboard at the latest Tuesday before the session
- The working groups present their research projects in plenary in early June
- Term papers on one of the seminar topics can be written according to the requirements of the respective examination regulations. However, a short research proposal in consultation with us is obligatory for submitting a term paper.

1.7. Poster Sessions

The goal of the poster session is to develop the poster' content to be presented in early June. Following discourse analysis method, students will work in groups on topics related to social media and public interest.

- Group A: Media law (Australia)
- Group B: Digital Services Act (Europe)
- Group C: Section 230 (USA)

1.8. Poster Presentation. Requirements and possible guiding questions

- Topic
 - Introduction (What is your research topic about?)
- Method
 - What is your understanding of discourse?
 - What kind of material do you analyse?
 - According to which criteria do you select your material?
- Results
 - What is the discourse about?
 - What kind of meaning does the discourse produce?
 - What concerns do actors in the discourse articulate?
 - What is the relationship between the involved actors?
 - What sources or forms of power could be identified?

1.9. Useful tools and Links

- How to write an academic essay (<https://essaypro.com/blog/academic-essay>)
- How to write an academic summary (<https://inside.tru.ca/2017/01/18/how-to-write-an-academic-summary/>)

2. ROADMAP

2.1. Thematic focus 1: Backbone

This section provides you with some basics required for the ongoing course. Following a short overview of this seminar's different topics and its performance requirements, we will practice critical discourse analysis, which will be used within the poster preparation. Furthermore, session three and four will focus on the internet's digital infrastructure. Central questions will be: Which actors have digital infrastructures at their disposal? What conflicts of interest are involved? Using the example of Facebook's expansion strategy in India, this section's final session deals with net neutrality and zero-rating.

- Session 1 (14.04.): Introduction
- Session 2 (21.04.): Doing Discourse Analysis
- Session 3 (28.04.): Digital Infrastructure
- Session 4 (05.05.): Internet Shutdowns
- Session 5 (12.05.): Net Neutrality and Zero-Rating

2.2. Thematic focus 2: Regulation

In session six and seven, students will do critical discourse analysis on the topic assigned to their research group at the very beginning of this seminar and prepare the poster to be presented in session eight. Afterwards, we will consider cybersecurity as another example of regulative practices in the internet context. We close this section with copyright and content filtering.

- Session 6 (19.05.): Evaluation/Social Media and Public Interest [poster session]
- Session 7 (26.05.): Social Media and Public Interest [poster session]
- Session 8 (02.06.): Poster presentation
- Session 9 (09.06.): Cybersecurity
- Session 10 (16.06.): Copyright and content filtering

2.3. Thematic focus 3: Data Governance

In this section, we will deal with topics related to data governance. Using the European data strategy example, students will practice the metaphor analysis approach in session eleven. Following this, we will take a closer look at privacy issues in session twelve and surveillance during the Covid-19 pandemic in session 13. We finish the seminar with a presentation of your exposé in session 14, where you get feedback from the lecturer and fellow students.

- Session 11 (23.06.): Metaphors of Data [metaphor analysis]
- Session 12 (30.06.): Right to privacy
- Session 13 (07.07.): Surveillance During Covid-19
- Session 14 (14.07.): Exposé

3. THEMATIC FOCUS 1: BACKBONE

3.1. Session 1 (14.04.): Introduction

3.2. Session 2 (21.04.): Doing Discourse Analysis

Compulsory Literature:

Hoffmann, A. L., Proferes, N., & Zimmer, M. (2018). “Making the world more open and connected”: Mark Zuckerberg and the discursive construction of Facebook and its users. *New Media & Society*, 20(1), 199–218. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444816660784>

Optional Literature:

Bouvier, G., & Machin, D. (2018). Critical Discourse Analysis and the challenges and opportunities of social media. *Review of Communication*, 18(3), 178–192. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15358593.2018.1479881>

Brock, A. (2018). Critical technocultural discourse analysis. *New Media & Society*, 20(3), 1012–1030. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444816677532>

Diaz-Bone, R., Bührmann, A. D., Gutiérrez Rodríguez, E., Schneider, W., Kendall, G., & Tirado, F. (2008). The Field of Foucaultian Discourse Analysis: Structures, Developments and Perspectives. *Historical Social Research / Historische Sozialforschung*, 33(1), 7–28.

Foucault, M. (1971). Orders of discourse. *Soc. sci. inform.*, 10(2), 7–30.

Foucault, M. (1982). *The archaeology of knowledge*. Pantheon Books.

Hajer, M. A. (1993). Discourse Coalitions and the Institutionalization of Practice: The Case of Acid Rain in Great Britain. In F. Fischer & J. Forester (Hrsg.), *The Argumentative Turn in Policy Analysis and Planning* (S. 43–76). Duke University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822381815-003>

Lynggaard, K. (2012). Discursive Institutional Analytical Strategies. In T. Exadaktylos & C. M. Radaelli (Hrsg.), *Research Design in European Studies: Establishing Causality in Europeanization* (S. 85–104). Palgrave Macmillan.

Mullet, D. R. (2018). A General Critical Discourse Analysis Framework for Educational Research. *Journal of Advanced Academics*, 29(2), 116–142. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1932202X18758260>

Johnstone, B. (2018). *Discourse analysis* (Third edition). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

3.3. Session 3 (28.04.): Digital Infrastructure

Compulsory Literature:

Flensburg, S., & Lai, S. S. (2020). Mapping digital communication systems: Infrastructures, markets, and policies as regulatory forces. *Media, Culture & Society*, 42(5), 692–710. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0163443719876533>

Optional Literature:

Bowker, G. C., & Star, S. L. (1999). *Sorting things out: Classification and its consequences*. MIT Press.

Freeman, J., Park, S., & Middleton, C. (2020). Technological literacy and interrupted internet access. *Information, Communication & Society*, 23(13), 1947–1964. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2019.1623901>

Gerli, P., Van der Wee, M., Verbrugge, S., & Whalley, J. (2018). The involvement of utilities in the development of broadband infrastructure: A comparison of EU case studies. *Telecommunications Policy*, 42(9), 726–743. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tel-pol.2018.03.001>

Kleinhans, J.-P. (2019). 5G vs. National Security. A European Perspective. Stiftung Neue Verantwortung. https://www.stiftung-nv.de/sites/default/files/5g_vs._national_security.pdf

Plantin, J.-C., Lagoze, C., Edwards, P. N., & Sandvig, C. (2018). Infrastructure studies meet platform studies in the age of Google and Facebook. *New Media & Society*, 20(1), 293–310. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444816661553>

Rahman, K. S. (2018). Infrastructural Regulation and the New Utilities. *Yale Journal on Regulation*, 35.

Winseck. (2017). The Geopolitical Economy of the Global Internet Infrastructure. *Journal of Information Policy*, 7, 228–267. <https://doi.org/10.5325/jinfopoli.7.2017.0228>

Star, S. L. (2010). This is Not a Boundary Object: Reflections on the Origin of a Concept. *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, 35(5), 601–617. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0162243910377624>

Star, S. L., & Ruhleder, K. (2005). Steps Toward an Ecology of Infrastructure: Design and Access for Large Information Spaces. 2–39. <https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.7.1.111>

3.4. Session 4 (05.05.): Internet shutdowns

Compulsory Literature:

Keremoğlu, E., & Weidmann, N. B. (2020). How Dictators Control the Internet: A Review Essay. *Comparative Political Studies*, 53(10–11), 1690–1703. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414020912278>

Optional Literature:

Ayalew, Y. E. (2019). The Internet shutdown muzzle(s) freedom of expression in Ethiopia: Competing narratives. *Information & Communications Technology Law*, 28(2), 208–224. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13600834.2019.1619906>

De Gregorio, G., & Stremlau, N. (2020). Internet Shutdowns and the Limits of Law. *International Journal of Communication*, 14, 4224–4243.

Freyburg, T., & Garbe, L. (2018). Blocking the Bottleneck: Internet Shutdowns and Ownership at Election Times in Sub-Saharan Africa. *International Journal of Communication*, 12, 3896–3916.

Wagner, B. (2018). Understanding Internet Shutdowns: A Case Study from Pakistan. *International Journal of Communication*, 12(1), 3917–3938.

3.5. Session 5 (12.05.): Net neutrality and Zero-Rating

Compulsory Literature:

Shahin, S. (2019). Facing up to Facebook: How digital activism, independent regulation, and mass media foiled a neoliberal threat to net neutrality. *Information, Communication & Society*, 22(1), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2017.1340494>

Optional Literature:

Frias, Z., & Pérez Martínez, J. (2018). 5G networks: Will technology and policy collide? *Telecommunications Policy*, 42(8), 612–621. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.telpol.2017.06.003>

Krivokapić, Đ., & Minović, A. (2019). Regulatory Challenges of Zero-Rating. *University of Pittsburgh Law Review*, 80(4). <https://doi.org/10.5195/lawreview.2019.655>

Nothias, T. (2020). Access granted: Facebook's free basics in Africa. *Media, Culture & Society*, 42(3), 329–348. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0163443719890530>

Vogelsang, I. (2019). Net Neutrality Regulation: Much Ado about Nothing? *Review of Network Economics*, 17(3), 225–243. <https://doi.org/10.1515/rne-2018-0051>

4. THEMATIC FOCUS 2: REGULATION

4.1. Session 6 (19.05.): Evaluation/Social media and public interest [Poster Session]

Compulsory Literature: /

Optional Literature:

McGregor, S. C. (2019). Social media as public opinion: How journalists use social media to represent public opinion. *Journalism*, 20(8), 1070–1086.

Napoli, P. M. (2015). Social media and the public interest: Governance of news platforms in the realm of individual and algorithmic gatekeepers. *Telecommunications Policy*, 39(9), 751–760. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.telpol.2014.12.003>

Sander, B. (2020). Freedom of Expression in the Age of Online Platforms: The Promise and Pitfalls of a Human Rights-Based Approach to Content Moderation. *Fordham International Law Journal*, i.E.

4.2. Session 7 (26.05.): Social media and public interest [Poster Session]

Compulsory Literature: /

Optional Literature:

McGregor, S. C. (2019). Social media as public opinion: How journalists use social media to represent public opinion. *Journalism*, 20(8), 1070–1086.

Napoli, P. M. (2015). Social media and the public interest: Governance of news platforms in the realm of individual and algorithmic gatekeepers. *Telecommunications Policy*, 39(9), 751–760. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.telpol.2014.12.003>

Sander, B. (2020). Freedom of Expression in the Age of Online Platforms: The Promise and Pitfalls of a Human Rights-Based Approach to Content Moderation. *Fordham International Law Journal*, i.E.

4.3. Session 8 (02.06.): Poster presentation

Compulsory Literature: /

Optional Literature: /

4.4. Session 9 (09.06.): Cybersecurity

Compulsory Literature:

Cheng, L., Pei, J., & Danesi, M. (2019). A sociosemiotic interpretation of cybersecurity in U.S. legislative discourse. *Social Semiotics*, 29(3), 286–302. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10350330.2019.1587843>

Miao, W., Xu, J., & Zhu, H. (2019). From Technological Issue to Military-Diplomatic Affairs: Analysis of China's Official Cybersecurity Discourse (1994–2016). In J. Hunsinger, M. M. Allen, & L. Klastrup (Hrsg.), *Second International Handbook of Internet Research* (S. 1–13). Springer Netherlands. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-024-1202-4_61-1

Optional Literature:

Lavorgna, A. (2019). Cyber-organised crime. A case of moral panic? *Trends in Organized Crime*, 22(4), 357–374. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12117-018-9342-y>

Lee, J. K., Chang, Y., Kwon, H. Y., & Kim, B. (2020). Reconciliation of Privacy with Preventive Cybersecurity: The Bright Internet Approach. *Information Systems Frontiers*, 22(1), 45–57. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10796-020-09984-5>

Losavio, M. M., Chow, K. P., Koltay, A., & James, J. (2018). The Internet of Things and the Smart City: Legal challenges with digital forensics, privacy, and security. *Security and Privacy*, 1(3), e23. <https://doi.org/10.1002/spy2.23>

Malik, J. K., & Choudhury, S. (2019). Privacy and surveillance: The Law relating to Cyber Crimes in India. *Journal of Engineering, Computing and Architecture*, 9(12), 74–98.

Mirea, M., Wang, V., & Jung, J. (2019). The not so dark side of the darknet: A qualitative study. *Security Journal*, 32(2), 102–118. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41284-018-0150-5>

Yar, M. (2018). A Failure to Regulate? The Demands and Dilemmas of Tackling Illegal Content and Behaviour on Social Media. *International Journal of Cybersecurity Intelligence and Cybercrime*, 1(1), 5–20.

4.5. Session 10 (16.06.): Copyright and content filtering

Compulsory Literature:

Gorwa, R., Binns, R., & Katzenbach, C. (2020). Algorithmic content moderation: Technical and political challenges in the automation of platform governance. *Big Data & Society*, 7(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951719897945>

Optional Literature:

Elkin-Koren, N. (2020). Contesting algorithms: Restoring the public interest in content filtering by artificial intelligence. *Big Data & Society*, 7(2), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951720932296>

Romero Moreno, F. (2020). ‘Upload filters’ and human rights: Implementing Article 17 of the Directive on Copyright in the Digital Single Market. *International Review of Law, Computers & Technology*, 34(2), 153–182. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13600869.2020.1733760>

Schroff, S., & Street, J. (2018). The politics of the Digital Single Market: Culture vs. competition vs. copyright. *Information, Communication & Society*, 21(10), 1305–1321. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2017.1309445>

5. THEMATIC FOCUS 3: DATA GOVERNANCE

5.1. Session 11 (23.06.): Metaphors of data

Compulsory Literature:

Schultze, U., & Orlikowski, W. J. (2001). Metaphors of virtuality: Shaping an emergent reality. *Information and Organization*, 11(1), 45–77. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1471-7727\(00\)00003-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1471-7727(00)00003-8)

Optional Literature:

Charteris-Black, J. (2004). *Corpus approaches to critical metaphor analysis*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Esbrí-Blasco, M., Girón-García, C., & Renau Renau, M. L. (2019). Metaphors in the digital world: The case of metaphorical frames in ‘Facebook’ and ‘Amazon’. In I. Navarro i Ferrando (Hrsg.), *Current Approaches to Metaphor Analysis in Discourse* (S. 131–154). De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110629460-007>

Redden, S. M. (2017). *Metaphor Analysis*. In J. Matthes, C. S. Davis, & R. F. Potter (Hrsg.), *Metaphor Analysis* (1. Aufl.). Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118901731>

5.2. Session 12 (30.06.): Right to Privacy

Compulsory Literature:

Aho, B., & Duffield, R. (2020). Beyond surveillance capitalism: Privacy, regulation and big data in Europe and China. *Economy and Society*, 49(2), 187–212. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03085147.2019.1690275>

Optional Literature:

Barassi, V. (2019). Datafied Citizens in the Age of Coerced Digital Participation. *Sociological Research Online*, 24(3), 414–429. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1360780419857734>

Houser, K., & Voss, W. G. (2018). GDPR: The End of Google and Facebook or a New Paradigm in Data Privacy? *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3212210>

5.3. Session 13 (07.07.): Surveillance during Covid-19

Compulsory Literature:

Newlands, G., Lutz, C., Tamò-Larrieux, A., Villaronga, E. F., Harasgama, R., & Scheitlin, G. (2020). Innovation under pressure: Implications for data privacy during the Covid-19 pandemic. *Big Data & Society*, 7(2), 205395172097668. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951720976680>

Optional Literature:

Guinchard, A. (2021). Our digital footprint under Covid-19: Should we fear the UK digital contact tracing app? *International Review of Law, Computers & Technology*, 35(1), 84–97. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13600869.2020.1794569>

Ventrella, E. (2020). Privacy in emergency circumstances: Data protection and the COVID-19 pandemic. *ERA Forum*, 21(3), 379–393. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12027-020-00629-3>

5.4. Session 14 (14.07.): Exposé