**5. Dubois & Blank (2018) The echo chamber is overstated**

echo chamber = metaphorical way to describe a situation where only certain ideas, information and beliefs are shared (Jamieson & Cappella, 2008; Sunstien, 2009)

People inside this setting will only encounted things they already agree with

opportunities to select information and communities or through algorithmic personalization, some worry that the Internet may make it easier for citizens to find themselves in an echo chamber

Internet creates a high-chice media environment where individuals may access news and political information from diverse array of media and sources (Van Aelst et al., 2017)

Two possible outcomes from a diverse media environment:

1. Individuals may be exposed to information and perspectives which are also diverse
2. Individuals may select varied media in a way that produce the echo chamber effect

🡪 Evidence is conflicting:

1. Individuals tend to expose themselves to information and ideas they agree with more often (Iyengar & Hahn, 2009)
2. But they do not tend to avoid information and ideas which are conflicting (Garrett, 2009)

Filter bubble = algorithmic filtering which personalize content presented on social media, and through search engines, could exacerbate the tendency for people to select media and content which reinforce their existing preferences (Pariser, 2011)

Political information and news is rarely sought from a single platform in a high-choice media environment

🡪 Political information can be sourced through many media channels

**6. Trevisan et al. (2018) The Google voter**

Some scholars have expressed concerns about personalized information feeds and tailored messages, which could create information cocoons that restrict pluralism

This affords Internet uses opportunities to gather unprecedented amounts of content and, at least in theory, escape the information ‘hegemony’ of legacy media. Yet, because the Internet data must be arranged, the power of arrangement, and thus the power of authority, typically rests with the database operator or designer **= Search engines**

Search engines are important players in the new media ecology, but so far their use has not been studied in conjunction with traditional media

Search engines remain the primary channel through which Internet users access online information in democratic countries (Dutton & Blank, 2013; Purcell, Brenner & Rainie, 2012)

Internet users appear to trust search egine – especially Google- almost blindly

focusing exclusively on search results generates a partial understanding of this phenomenon

🡪 **Focus on search ‘inputs” as well as ‘outputs”**

‘purposive behavior’ = audience filter and interpret information obtained from the media according to their own priorities and interests

🡪 Internet search expands the purposive nature of information gathering by providing citizens with tools that they trust to sort through virtually limitless amounts of content to fulfill specific information needs and interests.

**7. Metaxa et al. (2019) Search Media and Elections**

Concerns about algorithmically-curated content and its impact on democracy is reaching a fever pitch worldwide (…) the role of search results has received less public attention.

political information-seeking users and the opaque nature of their production by search engines

we focus our study on Google as it almost completely dominates the US web search market

Search media are an important gateway to news online (political search media)

2 majors challenges:

1. *ephemerality*: appear in real time in response to search query, but are not persistent or archived for later review
2. *reconstitutive*: liable to change based on the media environment, in response to user feedback, or as a result of time or location, among other factors.

**8. Courtois, Slechten and Coenen (2018) Challenging Googe Search filter bubbles**

Sear engines and especially filtering algorithms work to relieve users from the information overload and anxiety (Bawden and Robinson 2009) by selecting and prioritizing information into personally tailored selections of relevant information (Bozdag, 2013)

personalization process is usually based on the automated analysis of a broad array of personal data, which allows inferring user preferences, contexts and interests

Search engine play a pivotal role in the construction of reality as tailors of frames of references for their users (Just and Latzer, 2016)

*filter bubble*= algorithmically produced recommendations bear the potential to narrow the scope of accessible online information

the opaqueness of how search results are compiled is perhaps the most troublesome

algorithms are all but neutral devices

Web users are known to trust Google search results (Pan et al., 2007) to neutrally filter and rank information according to its relevance (Penna and Quaresma, 2015)

**8. Cardenal et al. (2019) Digital technologies and selective exposure**

2/3 of online media users prefer to use a side door of some king (eg. search engines) to access news outlets (Newman et al. 2017)

even if from current research we can conclude that there is very little evidence of selective exposure in online news consumption, we still do not know whether this is the outcome primarily of “choice” (voluntary exposure) or of “algorithmic filtering” (or involuntary exposure)

Selective exposure is a core concept in communication and media studies, which states that given the chance, individuals will choose to consume media that reinforces their previous beliefs (Klapper 1960)

Technology may exacerbate selective exposure through two mechanism (Dubois and Blank 2018):

1. choice filtering
2. algorithmic filtering = refers to systems of information selection that are automatized and beyond individual control (Bakshy et al. 2015)

Zuiderveen Borgesius et al. (2016) refer to choice as “self-selected personalization” and to algorithmic curation as “pre-selected personalization”

Research has found no evidence of substantial personalization in Google searches (Hannak et al. 2013; Haim et al. 2018; Fletcher and Nielsen 2018; Nechushtai and Lewis 2019; Puschmann 2017)

🡪 In contrast several factors might help to explain **cross-cutting exposure** in Google:

1. People see search engines as a fair and unbiased source of information
2. As a neutral and ideologically blind
3. As fair and associated with higher source credibility

🡪 **turn into increase likelihood of exposure to cross-ideological information by making users less defensive about media content (Druckman et al. 2012)**

Google might help users find sources that are not mainstream and contribute to diversifying people’s news media diets

Direct navigation should increase selective exposure compared to referred-based navigation (eg. Google)

Results:

Google reduce selective exposure (in line with Fletcher and Nielsen 2018). Google not only does not lock people into filter bubbles but increases media consumption across ideological lines