

## STUDIES DETECTED ON THE IMPACT OF FAKE NEWS AND THE BIAS OF ALGORITHMS

Bibliographic reference	Article title	Findings
<b>Allcott, H.; Gentskow, M. (2017)</b>	“Social Media and Fake News in the 2016 Election”	Analysis of the dissemination of fake news in the 2016 US elections. Social media were not the main source of news in the 2016 elections. Only 14% of the population stated that they were the main source.
<b>BakShy, E.; Messing, S.; Adamic, L. A. (2015)</b>	“Exposure to ideologically diverse news and opinion on Facebook”	Comparison between the role played by Facebook’s algorithmic bias, on the one hand, and the voluntary, intentional choice of Facebook users to access ideologically discordant content. This second variable plays a stronger role in terms of exposure to cross-cutting content.
<b>Dutton, W. et al. (2017)</b>	“Social shaping of the politics of Internet search and networking: Moving beyond filter bubbles, echo chambers and fake news”	Study of the communication systems of Germany, Spain, USA, France, Italy, Poland and the United Kingdom. The results indicate that the risk of echo chambers, fake news and algorithmic bias is mitigated by each country’s media culture.
<b>Fletcher, R. et al. (2018)</b>	“Measuring the Reach of ‘Fake News’ and Online Disinformation in Europe”	Analysis of the dissemination of fake news in France and Italy in 2017. The websites with fake news in these countries reach a minimal audience in the internet ecosystem. The online traditional media reach a lot more of the population and generate a lot more interaction.
<b>Guess, A. et al. (2018)</b>	“Selective Exposure to Disinformation: Evidence from the Consumption of Fake News During the 2016 US Presidential Campaign”	2016 US electoral campaign. During the period of October-November 2016, the consumption of fake news was concentrated in a small group. Almost 6 out of 10 visits to the websites analysed with fake news came from 10% of people with ultraconservative diets of online news.
<b>Nelson, J.; Taneja, H. (2018)</b>	“The Small, Disloyal Fake News Audience: The Role of Audience Availability in Fake News Consumption”	The consumption of fake news is limited to a small, disloyal group of very active internet users.
<b>Newman, n.; Fletcher, R. (2017)</b>	“Bias, Bullshit and Lies: Audience Perspectives on Low Trust in the Media”	Study of eleven countries on attitudes towards social media. Citizens’ trust in social media concerning information is much lower than that in traditional media. Moreover, there is a vague awareness of the bias of news algorithms.
<b>Vargo, C.; Guo, L.; Amazeen, M. (2017)</b>	“The agenda-setting power of fake news: A big data analysis of the online media landscape from 2014 to 2016”	Study of websites with fake news from 2014 to 2016. Although a growing phenomenon, these websites do not have too much effect and are also related to recognisable partisan media.
<b>WatanaBe, k. (2017)</b>	“The spread of the Kremlin’s narratives by a western news agency during the Ukraine crisis”	Study of Russia’s information warfare during the Ukraine conflict. It is not proved that the media controlled by the Russian government managed to project a “Russian narrative” beyond its strict area of influence.

Compiled by SCM (2019) from:

Martí Petit (2018), Towards a Critique of Algorithmic Reason. A state-of-the-art review of artificial intelligence, its influence on politics and its regulation, QUADERNS DEL CAC, 44, vol. XX, 5-1