Breaking your bubble, op-ed

Assignment 10

Sociology 204 (Social Networks)

Due: 5/3/17

1. What is one question or issue you would like to discuss in precept? [10pts]

**Filter Bubble Results**

1. Please enter your final filter bubble measurements into the Google Forms (links will be posted on Piazza later). Did you fill out the form? [5pts]
2. Evaluate your precept’s “breaking” strategy – how well did it work? Did you break your bubble? [10 pts]
3. Please take the student-written attitudes survey again: [url will be posted]. Did you take the survey? [5 pts]
4. Have your attitudes changed since the first survey? Did breaking your bubble change your views? Note: we do not expect you to evaluate change at the aggregate (class) level here since you won’t see the survey results yet. Just evaluate your own results. [10 pts]

6) Imagine that you have agreed to speak on a panel about self-experimentation and quantified self. During the discussion, one of your fellow panelists claims that discoveries based on self-experimentation methods cannot be considered scientific evidence and that self-experimentation is a waste of time. Do you agree or disagree? Why or why not?[10pts]

**Communicating the Implications of Your Results**

Write a New York Times Op-ed about the effects of online algorithmic filter bubbles, reflecting on the process and evidence of the Breaking Your Bubble project and the relevant assigned readings. You should also discuss the implications of your conclusion for

Facebook, its users, or the U.S. government -- what actions, if any, should they take?

You should follow the format that the [New York Times requires](https://www.nytimes.com/content/help/site/editorial/op-ed/op-ed.html), in particular the length of your op-ed should be between 400 to 1,200 words. Also, you should read [this article](http://www.nytimes.com/2013/10/14/opinion/op-ed-and-you.html?_r=0) by Trish Hall about the kind of pieces they like. Great op-ed pieces make one point clearly and convincingly [30 points].

If you are having trouble getting started, here are some op-eds that were written about filter bubbles and politics:

<http://www.the-tls.co.uk/articles/public/facebook-trump-brexit/>

<https://www.technologyreview.com/s/522111/how-to-burst-the-filter-bubble-that-protects-us-from-opposing-views/>

<https://arstechnica.com/science/2015/05/dont-just-blame-facebook-we-build-our-own-bubbles/>

<https://www.wired.com/2016/11/filter-bubble-destroying-democracy/>

When evaluating your op-ed we will use the following criteria:

**Does the op-ed make one point clearly and convincingly?**

6: One point is made clearly and convincingly, and this point is related to online filter bubbles on Facebook

4: There is one point but it is not argued strongly or it is not related to online filter bubbles

2: The op-ed has no point or it has so many points that it essentially has no point

**Does the op-ed draw on evidence from your Break Your Bubble assignments and readings? In other words, does it convey what you learned from your research?**

6: The op-ed articulated the purpose of your research project and thoughtfully evaluated your results

4: The results were reported but there is little meaningful interpretation or relation to the larger debate about filter bubbles

2. It is unclear what you learned about filter bubbles

**Is the op-ed factually correct and does it acknowledge the limitations (or potential weaknesses) of your methodology? Obviously, factual errors and overconfident generalizations weaken your credibility.**

6: no factual errors *and* thoughtful evaluation of limitations and scope conditions

4: one major factual error or so many minor factual errors that the op-ed suffers; *or* inadequate discussion of methodology and limitations

2: many major and minor factual errors and no acknowledgement of the implications of the methodology used

**Is the op-ed logically organized and clearly written? There should not be grammatical or spelling errors, and the op-ed should avoid jargon that will not be understood by a general audience (e.g., readers of the New York Times).**

6: writing is clean and crisp, much like one would see in the *New York Times*

4: organization, grammar, spelling and general writing style interfere with the argument

2: writing interferes with the ideas being presented

**Does the op-ed have a clear and punchy headline?**

6: strong headline, captures attention and is clearly related to the op-ed

4: weak relationship to op-ed or does not really capture attention

2: No relationship to op-ed and will not capture attention

8) Did the Break Your Bubble project help you understand the theories and concepts introduced in class? [5 pts]

1. Yes, and it added to my learning experience
2. Yes, but I feel like I would have understood the theories and concepts without it anyways
3. No, I don’t think it helped at all.

9) Would you recommend that future Social Networks students do the Break Your Bubble Project? [5 pts]

1. Yes
2. No

10) What was your overall experience with the Break Your Bubble project? Do you have any suggestions for improving it in the future? [10 pts]