On the topic of 'Recalling Newsom", politicians and involved parties want public visibility for their messages; "being seen" has currency over the matter, and it's made possible by algorithmic designs of search engines. When typing a query in the search engine, users can retrieve many different content sources. The search engine is in a position of power because it controlled the distribution and visibility of information. *"Search engines act more like advisors to the user, responsive to the query and suggesting which results are most relevant."* (64 T. GILLESPIE)

These top 3 non-ads search results are on the same searching request, we will look at the biases and their's effects from the following aspects:

Time period and impact on audience:
1. <u>Right Wire Report post</u>: Posted two months ago, it seems like this website pulls a particular paragraph from the original website (the Ballorpedia.org website). It chooses a part of the information for its audience to access and deliberately decides not to include the others.
   a. **General audience**: Provides a brief overview of the subject matters, not enough data or diversity of inputs for a first-time viewer on the topic. Most commenters on this website are supporters of the recall action, therefore it's easier for the general public to pick the existed side instead of forming their own opinions.
   b. **Opinionated audience**: reaffirming their stance since it's not showing any contrasting opinions or debates. It's more natural for them to share in the comment section, which might bias(reinforce/persuade) others. *"those interested in having their information selected as relevant will tend to orient themselves toward these algorithmic systems, to make themselves algorithmically recognizable."* (Gillespie, 2014)
2. <u>Ballotpedia.org</u>: ongoing updates, the news coverages update weekly Tues and Thurs, while the latest update is within the past 24h.
   a. **General audience**: The public will be more beneficial by the amount of information on this website since they don't have a presumption of user preferences but shows a holistic, ad-hoc way of diverse information on the subject.
   b. **Opinionated audience**: They are likely to gain more inputs on the topics, however, it might acts as irrelevant/extra information for some of them; no public comments sections so there's no identity shift between "listener" and "speaker".
3. Abc news: 2021, April 1
   a. **General audience**: Background information about the incentive on why the recall begins in a more personalized tone. Not provide action-driven information, but can get a more balanced input from the comment section.
   b. **Opinionated audience**: More public discussions available on the topic, easier to output one's idea and engage in a way that potentially "creates" more content for the website. "*All who obtain access have the option of making information available to all other users on the network; thus, the*

> *sources of information available are limited only by the number of users who seek access.*" (Gillespie (2017))

Website Aspects:

- **Backlinks:**
  - <u>Ballotpedia.org</u> has linked its Website to several related databases and news reports. A user can instantly jump from its page to the associated databases simply by clicking on a link.
  - <u>Right Wire</u> has incorporated hyperlinks for source citation only. Other backlinks that are part of the text are the originals from the source articles.
  - <u>ABC news</u> only has links on the election, referring to the articles collected about the 2020 election on its internal website.
- **URLs for authoritative sources**:
  - *.org* and *.com*: It seems like information gatekeepers' presence; it might be the case that the network architecture demands all programming be collected at a central point for redistribution of information. I'm assuming the .org website would have more access and expectations to collect and gather a wide range of knowledge since its purpose is for educating and information presentation.
  - Since the **expectations and goals** for .org and .com are different, I assume .org presents their information in a more data-driven and more accessible manner, not only consists different data sources but also different forms of representations, like charts, texts, tables, videos, and Q&A forum. These formats are more interpretable to the general public, no matter one has a political/technical background or not.
  - Different parties adopt a mix of mechanisms to try to achieve their conflicting goals. "*Tussle" describes the ongoing contention among parties with conflicting interests.*"(Clark, Wroclawski, Sollins, Braden)
- **Open forums and comment sections:** Comment section only present on <u>ABC News and the Right Wire website</u>. The technology underlying the internet creates the different forms of Internet communication and allows a hybrid of speakers to co-exist on the page. A user of the Internet may speak or listen interchangeably, blurring the distinction between "speakers" and "listeners" on the Internet. Once the user has entered the space created by the provider, one may engage in the dialogue that occurs there. The receiver can and does become the content provider and vice-versa.
- **Scarcity of communications pathways:** Even though they're hundreds of pathways online, some viewpoints will not be heard. The prominent media will be used for only showing the top contents. Even in this small sample, we see duplicating information (2 out of 3). The information channels will be used by the system that brings the stakeholders the most revenue. It's most likely that the channels are not offering different content, though that's what we would like to see. Therefore, the lack of diversity problem remains even there are various channels available.

Citations:

Abundance and User Control: Renewing the Democratic Heart of the First Amendment in the Age of Interactive Media(Yale Law Journal, Vol, 104, No.7. May 1995)
http://dig.csail.mit.edu/2008/02/abundance-control-yale.pdf
Tarleton Gillespie (2017) Algorithmically recognizable: Santorum's Google problem, and Google's Santorum problem, Information, Communication & Society, 20:1, 63-80,
*Algorithmically recognizable: Santorum's Google problem, and Google's Santorum problem (microsoft.com)

Tussle in Cyberspace: Defining Tomorrow's Internet, David D. Clark, John Wroclawski, Karen R. Sollins, and Robert Braden
http://blogs.ischool.berkeley.edu/i205s11/files/2011/01/tussle.pdf

https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/wireStory/california-cop-leads-gop-dream-newsom-recall-76813264
 (Links to an external site.)

https://ballotpedia.org/Gavin_Newsom_recall,_Governor_of_California_(2019-2021)
 (Links to an external site.)

https://rightwirereport.com/2021/02/24/gavin-newsom-recall-governor-of-california-2019-2021-ballotpedia/