Polarization Rank: A Study on European News Consumption on Facebook

Ana Lucía Schmidt

Dept. of Environmental Sciences, Informatics and Statistics Ca' Foscari University of Venice, Venice, Italy

Fabiana Zollo

Dept. of Environmental Sciences, Informatics and Statistics & Center for the Humanities and Social Change Ca' Foscari University of Venice, Venice, Italy

Antonio Scala

ISC-CNR, Rome, Italy

Walter Quattrociocchi

Dept. of Environmental Sciences, Informatics and Statistics Ca' Foscari University of Venice, Venice, Italy

Abstract

The advent of WWW changed the way we can produce and access information. Recent studies showed that users tend to select information that is consistent with their system of beliefs, forming polarized groups of like-minded people around shared narratives where dissenting information is ignored. In this environment, users cooperate to frame and reinforce their shared narrative making any attempt at debunking inefficient. Such a configuration occurs even in the consumption of news online, and considering that 63% of users access news directly form social media, one hypothesis is that more polarization allows for further spreading of misinformation. Along this path, we focus on the polarization of users around news outlets on Facebook in different European countries (Italy, France, Spain and Germany). First, we compare the pages' posting behavior and the users' interacting patterns across countries and observe different

Email address: analucia.schmidt@unive.it (Ana Lucía Schmidt)

posting, liking and commenting rates. Second, we explore the tendency of users to interact with different pages (i.e., selective exposure) and the emergence of polarized communities generated around specific pages. Then, we introduce a new metric – i.e., polarization rank – to measure polarization of communities for each country. We find that Italy is the most polarized country, followed by France, Germany and lastly Spain. Finally, we present a variation of the Bounded Confidence Model to simulate the emergence of these communities by considering the users' engagement and trust on the news. Our findings suggest that trust in information broadcaster plays a pivotal role against polarization of users online.

Keywords: Facebook, News Consumption, Misinformation, Polarization, Social Media

1. Introduction

The advent of social media changed the way we get informed and shape our opinion. In 2016, *post-truth* was selected by the Oxford Dictionaries as the word of the year. The definition reads "relating to or denoting circumstances in which objective facts are less influential in shaping public opinion than appeals to emotion and personal belief", that is, we select information and interpretations adhering to our system of beliefs (confirmation bias).

This phenomenon is not new, our cognitive abilities have always been limited, and social media and the consequent disintermediated access to an unprecedented amount of information solely exacerbated the process. Recent studies on massive datasets (376 million users) [1] showed that major disintermediated access to information is creating segregation of users into communities where they share a specific worldview and ignore dissenting information. Confirmation bias dominates news consumption and informational cascades foster the emergence of polarized groups around shared narratives [2, 3, 4, 5, 6].

Important results (that served to inform the Global risk report of the World Economic Forum in 2016 and 2017) pointed out the pivotal role of confirmation bias –i.e., the attitude of acquiring information coherently with the individual system of belief– in viral processes as well as in the collective framing of narratives. In particular, one of these works [6], showing the inefficacy of debunking, convinced the Washington Post to close its weekly column dedicated to debunking false rumors [7].

The process of acceptance of a claim (whether documented or not) may be altered by normative social influence or by the coherence with the individual system of beliefs as well-documented in the literature on cognitive and social psychology of communication [8, 9]. At the extreme of the spectrum, conspiracy theorists tend to explain significant social or political aspects as plots conceived by powerful individuals or organizations, and with the so-called *urban legends* they share an important characteristic: the object of the narratives are inevitably threatening the established social order or well-being and are always an indicator of what communities and social groups deeply fear [10]. These phenomena are evidently of great interest and can be considered as a sort of "thermometer" of social mood. Since these kinds of arguments can sometimes involve the rejection of science, alternative explanations are invoked to replace the scientific evidence. For instance, people who reject the link between HIV and AIDS generally believe that AIDS was created by the U.S. Government to control the African American population.

In this paper we focus on the interplay between users and news outlet on Facebook by comparing four European countries: France, Germany, Italy and Spain. First, we compare the pages' posting behavior and the users' interacting patterns across countries and observe different posting, liking and commenting rates. Second, we explore the tendency of users to interact with a variety of pages (i.e., selective exposure) and the polarized communities of pages that emerge from the users' consumption habits. Then, we introduce a new method to calculate the percentage of polarized users when more than two communities are involved and thus rank the four countries accordingly. We find that Italy is the most polarized country, followed by France, Germany and lastly Spain. Finally, we present a variation of the Bounded Confidence Model [11] to simulate the emergence of these communities by considering the users' engagement and trust on the news.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Ethics Statement

The data collection process was carried out using the Facebook Graph API [12], which is publicly available. The pages from which we downloaded data are public Facebook entities and can be accessed by anyone. Users' content contributing to such pages is public unless users' privacy settings specify otherwise, and in that case their activity is not available to us.

2.2. Data Collection

We generated a list of top news sources, in their official language, of France, Germany, Italy and Spain. The list for each country was compiled considering the Reuters Digital News Reports [13][14][15]. We then obtained the official Facebook page of each news outlet and proceeded to download all the posts made from 1st January 2015 to 31st December 2016, as well as all likes and comments that have been made on those posts. The exact breakdown of the data can be seen in Tab. 1, while the complete set of downloaded pages is reported in Tab. 8 in the Supporting Information.

2.3. Preliminaries and Definitions

In this section we provide a brief description of the main concepts and tools used in the analysis.

2.3.1. Projection of Bipartite Graphs

A bipartite graph is a triple $\mathcal{G} = (A, B, E)$ where $A = \{a_i | i = 1 \dots n_A\}$ and $B = \{b_j | j = 1 \dots n_B\}$ are two disjoint sets of vertices, and $E \subseteq A \times B$ is the set of edges, i.e. edges that exist only between vertices of sets A and B. The bipartite graph \mathcal{G} is described by the rectangular matrix M where $M_{ij} = 1$, if an edge exits between a_i and b_j , and $M_{ij} = 0$ otherwise.

	France	Germany	Italy	Spain
Pages	65	49	54	57
Posts	1,008,018	749,805	1,554,817	1,372,805
Likes	419, 371, 366	183, 599, 003	409, 243, 176	333, 698, 985
Likers	21, 647, 888	14, 367, 445	14,012,658	32, 812, 007
Comments	47, 225, 675	31,881,407	51, 515, 121	34, 336, 356
Commenters	5,755,268	5, 338, 195	4,086,351	6,494,725
Users	22,560,889	15,564,360	14,587,622	34, 383, 820
Population	66M	81M	62M	46M

Table 1: **Dataset Breakdown.** Population according to the Reuters Digital News Report (2017) [15]. Likers is the number of people that gave at least one like. Commenters is the number of people that gave at least one comment. Users is the number of people that gave at least a like or comment.

We consider bipartite networks in which the two disjointed set of nodes are users and Facebook pages. That is $\mathcal{G}^{\kappa} = (P_{\kappa}, U, E)$ where P_{κ} is the set of Facebook pages of country κ and U is the set of users active on pages belonging to P_{κ} . Edges represent interactions among users and pages, that is, either likes or comments.

As an example, a like given to a post on page p constitutes a link between the user u and the page p so $M_{p,u} = 1$. We can then build the co-occurrence matrices $C^{P_{\kappa}} = MM^T$ and $C^U = M^T M$ that quantify, respectively, the number of common neighbors between two vertices of P_{κ} or U.

Only two graphs per country will be relevant for the analyses, \mathcal{G}_L^{κ} and \mathcal{G}_C^{κ} . These are the result from the projection $C^{P_{\kappa}}$ of two bipartite graphs: one considering the users' liking activity (\mathcal{G}_L^{κ}) and another considering the comments (\mathcal{G}_C^{κ}) .

2.3.2. Community Detection Algorithms

Community detection algorithms serve to identify groups of nodes in a network. In this work we apply three different community detection algorithms.

- 1. FastGreedy (FG). It takes an agglomerative bottom-up approach: initially each vertex belongs to a separate community and, at each iteration, the communities are merged in a way that yields the largest increase in the current value of modularity [16]. The algorithm stops when it is no longer possible to further increase the modularity. Due to its speed and its lack of parameters in need of tuning, this algorithm will be the main reference to compare against the partitions resulting from the application of other community detection algorithms.
- 2. *Multilevel* (ML). It uses a multi-level optimization procedure for the modularity score [17]. It takes a bottom-up approach where each vertex initially belongs to a separate community and in each step, unlike FastGreedy, vertices are reassigned in order to achieve the highest modularity.
- 3. Spinglass (SG). It interprets the problem of community detection as one of finding the ground state of an infinite range spin-glass. In this algorithm, the community structure of the network would be the spin configuration that minimizes the energy of the spin glass, with the spin states being the community indices [18][19].

To compare the various community partitions and the similarity between different clustering methods, we use the Rand index [20], where a comparison between two partitions yields a value between 0 and 1, such that 0 indicates that there is no agreement on any vertex between the two partitions, whereas 1 indicates that the partitions are exactly the same.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Attention Patterns

As a first step we characterize how different countries consume news on Facebook. We focus particularly on the allowed users' actions through the entire period of the data collection: *likes, shares* and *comments*. Naturally, each action has a prescribed meaning. A *like* represents a positive feedback to a post; a *share* expresses the user's desire to increase the visibility of a given piece of information; and a *comment* is the way in which online collective debates take form. Therefore, comments may contain negative or positive feedback with respect to a post.

In Fig. 1 we show the distribution of the number of likes, comments and shares received by the posts belonging to each country. As seen from the plots, all the distributions are heavy-tailed, that is, they are best fitted by power laws (as shown in Tab. 2) and possess similar scaling parameters with some notable differences when looking at the number of comments and likes (Tab. 3).

	Action	Poisson	Log-Normal	Exponential	PowerLaw
FR	comment	-81,474,887	-4,094,569	-5,042,908	-10,467
DE	comment	-53,857,610	-3,208,655	-3,692,816	-124,780
IT	comment	-92,959,791	-5,353,204	-7, 158, 219	-9,815
ES	comment	-64, 633, 469	-4, 192, 227	-5,896,527	-28,449
FR	like	-716, 163, 037	-6,463,931	-7, 135, 298	-9,793
DE	like	-336, 233, 651	-4,429,366	-4,906,736	-243,938
IT	like	-732, 132, 678	-9,034,577	-10,276,500	-12,514
ES	like	-625, 371, 478	-7,905,112	-8,978,996	-34,532
FR	share	-302, 119, 999	-5,029,592	-6, 102, 954	-68,981
DE	share	-100,787,846	-2,972,740	-3,809,317	-37,466
IT	share	-399, 573, 409	-6,760,982	-8,902,324	-24,265
ES	share	-456, 628, 686	-5,852,126	-7,960,407	-128,667

Table 2: Maximum-Likelihood fit of the actions received by the posts of eachcountry. FR: France, DE: Germany, IT: Italy, ES: Spain.

	Comments		Like	Likes		Shares	
	\hat{X}_{min}	$\hat{\alpha}$	\hat{X}_{min}	$\hat{\alpha}$	\hat{X}_{min}	$\hat{\alpha}$	
FR	1,929	3.44	23,338	3.09	2,498	2.63	
DE	315	2.63	1,132	2.25	1,084	2.45	
IT	1,736	3.63	15,519	3.71	5,753	2.79	
ES	733	3.10	8,491	2.89	1,508	2.47	

Table 3: Powerlaw fit of the actions received by the posts of each country.



Figure 1: Complementary Cumulative Distribution Function of the comments, likes and shares received by the posts of each country.

We continue our analysis by examining how users from each country interact with the pages. In Fig. 2, we show the distribution of the number of likes and comments given by the users according to each country. Once again, all the distributions are heavy-tailed, as seen in Tab. 4, with some notable differences in their scaling parameters when considering the commenting activity of the users of the different countries (Tab. 5).



Figure 2: Complementary Cumulative Distribution Function of the users' likes and comments of each country.

	Action	Poisson	Log-Normal	Exponential	PowerLaw
FR	comment	-96, 157, 561	-13,916,586	-17,869,083	-2,433
DE	comment	-57,870,795	-11,951,470	-14,878,272	-1,268,430
ІТ	comment	-114,865,937	-10,972,733	-14,442,076	-81,786
ES	comment	-62, 141, 913	-13, 638, 119	-17,309,835	-11,920,701
FR	like	-1,042,576,644	-63,945,214	-85,808,958	-643, 618
DE	like	-377,979,910	-40,766,648	-50,972,666	-13,788
ІТ	like	-985,441,955	-45,609,241	-61, 296, 249	-26,385
ES	like	-720, 112, 905	-83, 156, 334	-108,917,647	-48,326

Table 4: Maximum-Likelihood fit of the users' different actions by country.FR:France, DE: Germany, IT: Italy, ES: Spain.

	Comments		Likes	
	\hat{X}_{min}	$\hat{\alpha}$	\hat{X}_{min}	$\hat{\alpha}$
FR	2,378	4.07	648	2.45
DE	18	2.17	3,156	3.02
IT	529	2.70	5,473	3.26
ES	1	1.90	1,876	3.24

Table 5: Power law fit of users' attention patterns.

3.2. Selective Exposure

The overall number of likes given by each user is a good proxy for their level of *engagement* with the Facebook news pages. The *lifetime* of a user, meaning the period of time where the user started and stopped interacting with our set of pages, can be approximated by the time difference between the timestamp of their latest and earliest liked post. These measures could provide important insights about news consumption patterns, specifically, the variety of news sources consumed over time.

We say that a user has consumed a page in a given time window, if the user has at least one positive interaction with that page in that period, that is, the user liked a post made by that page. We do not consider comments as a valid interaction for regular consumption because they have very diverse meanings and, dissimilar from the likes, they do not unambiguously represent positive feedback. Thus, we can measure the collection of pages consumed in a weekly, monthly and quarterly basis while taking into account the activity (total number of likes) and lifetime time difference of their first and last liked post) of the users of each country.

Fig. 3 shows the number of news sources a user interacts with considering their lifetime and for increasing levels of engagement for each country. For a comparative analysis, we standardized between 0 and 1 the number of pages present in each country, as well as the lifetime and engagement over the entire user set. The results were calculated considering the quarterly (right), monthly (middle) and weekly (left) rates.



Figure 3: Selective Exposure. Maximum number of unique news sources that users with increasing levels of standardized lifetime (top) or standardized activity (bottom) interact with weekly, monthly and quarterly for each country. The user's lifetime corresponds to the normalized time difference between the time-stamp of their latest and earliest liked post. The user's activity corresponds to the number of likes given in their lifetime.

Note that, for all countries, users usually interact with a small number of news outlets and that higher levels of activity and longer lifetime correspond to a smaller variety of news sources being consumed. We can also observe clear differences between the countries. When considering the users' lifetime, France has clearly a more varied news consumption diet than the rest; and when considering the users' activity users in Germany consume consistently the less diverse set of news sources. We can conclude that there is a natural tendency of the users to confine their activity to a limited set of pages, news consumption on Facebook is indeed dominated by selective exposure [1] and users from different countries display different rates for the decreasing variety of news outlets they consume.

3.3. Emerging Communities

User tendency to interact with few news sources might elicit page clusters. To test this hypothesis, we first characterize the emergent community structure of pages according to the users' activity for each country κ with $\kappa = \{FR, DE, IT, ES\}$. We project the users' page likes to derive the weighted graph \mathcal{G}_L^{κ} (and \mathcal{G}_C^{κ}) in which nodes are pages and two pages are connected if a user likes (or comments on) both of them. The weight of a link on a projected graph is determined by the number of users the two pages have in common.

G	κ - Country	Type	ML	SG
\mathcal{G}_L^{FR}	France	Likes	0.795	0.796
\mathcal{G}_L^{DE}	Germany	Likes	0.771	0.838
\mathcal{G}_L^{IT}	Italy	Likes	0.982	0.851
\mathcal{G}_L^{ES}	Spain	Likes	0.923	0.981
\mathcal{G}_C^{FR}	France	Comments	0.918	0.969
\mathcal{G}_{C}^{DE}	Germany	Comments	0.836	0.925
\mathcal{G}_{C}^{IT}	Italy	Comments	0.871	0.903
\mathcal{G}_{C}^{ES}	Spain	Comments	0.828	0.817

Table 6: Algorithm comparison. Comparison between the FastGreedy (FG) communities against the MultiLevel (ML) and SpinGlass (SG) communities for both likes and comments projections for every country.

We then apply the FastGreedy community detection algorithm to see if there are well-defined communities for each case. To validate the community partitioning, we then compare the membership of other community detection algorithms using the Rand method [20] and find high level of similarity for all four countries (see Tab. 6).

We also compared the communities of \mathcal{G}_L^{κ} and \mathcal{G}_C^{κ} against each other using different community detection algorithms and find, overall, low levels of similarity (see Tab. 7). This indicates that, for all four countries, the set pages users generally approve of (like), differ from the set of pages where they debate (comment).

Comparing	κ - Country	FG	\mathbf{ML}	\mathbf{SG}
\mathcal{G}_{L}^{FR} - \mathcal{G}_{C}^{FR}	France	0.514	0.522	0.545
\mathcal{G}_{L}^{DE} - \mathcal{G}_{C}^{DE}	Germany	0.528	0.537	0.518
\mathcal{G}_{L}^{IT} - \mathcal{G}_{C}^{IT}	Italy	0.562	0.560	0.619
\mathcal{G}_{L}^{ES} - \mathcal{G}_{C}^{ES}	Spain	0.555	0.554	0.625

Table 7: Likes and comments projections comparison. Comparison of the communities detected in \mathcal{G}_{L}^{κ} and \mathcal{G}_{C}^{κ} of each country with FastGreedy (FG), MultiLevel (ML) and SpinGlass (SG).

3.4. User Polarization

By examining the activity of users across the various clusters and measuring how they span across news outlets, we find that most users remain confined within specific groups of pages. To understand the relationship between page groupings and user behavior, we measure the polarization of users with respect to the communities found for each country κ where $\kappa = \{FR, DE, IT, ES\}$.

For a user with K likes with $\sum_i k_i = K$ such that each k_i belongs to the i^{th} community (i = 1...N), where N equals the number of communities). The probability ϕ_i that the user belongs to the *i*-th community will then be $\phi_i = k_i/K$. We can define the localization order parameter L as:

$$L\left[\phi\right] = \frac{\left(\sum_{i} \phi_{i}^{2}\right)^{2}}{\sum_{i} \phi_{i}^{4}} \tag{1}$$

Thus, in the case in which the user only has likes in one community, L = 1. If a user, on the other hand, interacts equally with all the communities $(\phi_i = 1/N)$ then L = N; hence, L counts the communities. Since we are considering many users, each with their likes k_i and their frequency ϕ_i , we can plot the probability distribution and the complementary cumulative distribution function of L_{κ} along the user set of each country κ . This would allow for a fair comparison of the polarization of the users between countries.



Figure 4: **Probability Density Function of** L **for each country.** The dotted vertical line indicates the median value.

For each country, Fig. 5 shows the Complementary Cumulative Distribution Function of the localization L, and Fig. 4 shows the Probability Density Function. Both figures consider only users with at least 10 likes.

As we can see in Fig. 4, the densities are well behaved, that is, present a single



Figure 5: Complementary Cumulative Distribution Function of L for each country.

peak around 1. By looking at the CCDF of each country, we can rank the four countries from the one with least polarized users to the one with the most: Spain (median = 1.01653), Germany (median : 1.00274), France (median : 1.00222) and Italy (median : 1.00001).

3.5. The Model.

In this section we provide a simple model of users' preferential attachment to specific sources that considers the users' *trust* on the media as a parameter and reproduces the observed community structure.

The entities of our model are pages $p \in P$ and users $u \in U$. Each page p is characterized by a set of opinions (an editorial line) modelled as a real number c_p that ranges [0, 1]. We assume that the c_p values are uniformly distributed. Each user u has an initial opinion that is modelled as a real number θ_u , which ranges between [0, 1] and it is uniformly distributed. Each users u also has a measure of trust in the media modelled by the real number τ_u , which ranges between [0, 1]. User's trust will follow a truncated normal distribution.

We suppose c_p and θ_u to be homogeneous such that the quantity $|c_p - \theta_u|$ is the distance between the opinion of user u and the editorial line of page p. We mimic confirmation bias by assuming that if user u interacts with a page p and the opinion distance $|c_p - \theta_u|$ is less than a given tolerance parameter Δ , the preference of user u will converge toward the editorial line of page p according to the modified BCM [11] equation:

$$\theta'_u = (1 - \tau_u) \cdot \theta_u + \tau_u \cdot c_p \tag{2}$$

To mimic user activity we give each user u an activity coefficient a_u that represents the number of pages a user can visit. Thus, the final opinion of a user will average the editorial lines of the pages the user likes. If Ω is the set of $|\Omega|$ pages that matches the preferences of user u, then the average opinion will be:

$$\overline{\theta}_{u} = (1 - \tau_{u}) \overline{\theta}_{u} + \tau_{u} |\Omega|^{-1} \sum_{p \in \Omega} c_{p}$$
$$= |\Omega|^{-1} \sum_{p \in \Omega} c_{p}$$

To mimic the long tail distribution of our data we set the activity distribution to be power law distributed $p(a) \sim a^{-\gamma}$ with exponent $\gamma = 3$.

We use numerical simulation to study our model. A user randomly selects a subset of P with which to interact. The user likes a page only when $|c_p - \theta_u| < \Delta$. When this occurs, the feedback mechanism reinforces the user's page preference using the trust parameter τ_u to control the extent of the feedback. Thus the final opinion of a user will be the average of the editorial lines of the pages the user likes.

When a user's opinion converges, we build in the bipartite graph $\mathcal{G}_{\text{sim}} = (I, P, E_{\text{sim}})$ where the set of edges E_{sim} are the couplings (u, p) with which user u likes page p. Hence, \mathcal{G}_{sim} represents users interacting with their favorite pages, and from \mathcal{G}_{sim} we can build the projected graph G_{sim}^p that links the pages according their common users.

Figure 6 shows an analysis of $G_{\rm sim}^p$ as a function of the mean values used for the truncated normal distribution that models the trust τ , with different



Figure 6: Analysis of the synthetic pages-to-pages graph G_{sim}^p . It shows the number of communities as a function of the mean user trust.

standard deviations and tolerance. Each point of the simulation is averaged over 100 iterations.

We can see that increasing the tolerance Δ leads to a reduction of the num-

ber of communities, that is, agreement is reached faster and polarization takes place. Very low and very high values of user trust also display similar behavior. Absolute trust or no trust in the media leads to fast polarization, either the user will trust what they read fully and change their opinion accordingly, or they won't.

The simulation displays an interesting behavior at $\tau = 0.1$ where the number of communities formed by the users' consumption habits seem to peak. This indicates that some skepticism might actually factor against polarization. Users' who distrust the news they interact with, even when their opinions were similar, are more reluctant to further change their own beliefs. Perhaps a solution for the issue of false and misleading narratives could be found by fostering critical readers.

4. Discussion

In this paper we use quantitative analysis to understand and compare the news consumption patterns of four European countries: France, Germany, Italy and Spain. We show that while there are similarities in the consumption behaviours between the four countries, the posting and consumption behavior is not universal.

The results also show that all users, regardless of country, display selective exposure, that is, the more active a user is on Facebook the less variety of news sources they tend to consume. This behavior is seen in all four countries, with different rates of selective exposure for each case. News consumption on Facebook is dominated by selective exposure.

Additionally, we studied the cluster of news pages that emerge from the user's activity, and found that users, regardless of their nationality, are polarized. We then measure the polarization of the users of each country, and ranked them accordingly, finding that Italy presents the most polarized users, followed by France, Germany and finally Spain. Further studies might gain insights into the reasons behind the slight variations in consumption habits. Finally, we introduce a variation on the Bonded Confidence Model [11] that mimics the users' behavior of selective exposure taking into account user trust. The simulation seems to indicate that users' who have some distrust of the news they interact with, even when the narrative presented conforms to their beliefs, are more reluctant to further change their own beliefs. Thus, a tentative solution to mitigate user polarization might be found by fostering critical readers.

References

References

- A. L. Schmidt, F. Zollo, M. Del Vicario, A. Bessi, A. Scala, G. Caldarelli, H. E. Stanley, W. Quattrociocchi, Anatomy of news consumption on facebook, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences (2017) 201617052.
- [2] W. Quattrociocchi, A. Scala, C. R. Sunstein, Echo chambers on facebook, Available at SSRN.
- M. Del Vicario, A. Bessi, F. Zollo, F. Petroni, A. Scala, G. Caldarelli,
 H. E. Stanley, W. Quattrociocchi, The spreading of misinformation online,
 Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 113 (3) (2016) 554–559.
- [4] M. Del Vicario, F. Zollo, G. Caldarelli, A. Scala, W. Quattrociocchi, Mapping social dynamics on facebook: The brexit debate, Social Networks 50 (2017) 6–16.
- [5] W. Quattrociocchi, Inside the echo chamber, Scientific American 316 (4) (2017) 60–63.
- [6] F. Zollo, A. Bessi, M. Del Vicario, A. Scala, G. Caldarelli, L. Shekhtman, S. Havlin, W. Quattrociocchi, Debunking in a world of tribes, PloS one 12 (7) (2017) e0181821.
- [7] C. Dewey, What was fake on the internet this week: Why this is the final column, The Washington Post.URL https://www.washingtonpost.com

- [8] A. Nowak, J. Szamrej, B. Latané, From private attitude to public opinion: A dynamic theory of social impact., Psychological Review 97 (3) (1990) 362.
- [9] S. Moscovici, The coming era of representations, in: Cognitive analysis of social behavior, Springer, 1982, pp. 115–150.
- [10] B. Franks, A. Bangerter, M. Bauer, Conspiracy theories as quasi-religious mentality: an integrated account from cognitive science, social representations theory, and frame theory, Frontiers in psychology 4 (2013) 424.
- [11] G. Deffuant, D. Neau, F. Amblard, G. Weisbuch, Mixing beliefs among interacting agents, Advances in Complex Systems 3 (01n04) (2000) 87–98.
- [12] Facebook, Using the graph api, Website, last checked: 20.12.2017 (8 2013). URL https://developers.facebook.com/docs/graph-api/ using-graph-api/
- [13] N. Newman, D. A. Levy, R. K. Nielsen, Reuters institute digital news report 2015, Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism.
- [14] N. Newman, D. Levy, R. K. Nielsen, Reuters institute digital news report 2016, Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism.
- [15] N. Newman, R. Fletcher, A. Kalogeropoulos, D. A. Levy, R. K. Nielsen, Reuters institute digital news report 2017, Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism.
- [16] A. Clauset, M. E. Newman, C. Moore, Finding community structure in very large networks, Physical review E 70 (6) (2004) 066111.
- [17] V. D. Blondel, J.-L. Guillaume, R. Lambiotte, E. Lefebvre, Fast unfolding of communities in large networks, Journal of statistical mechanics: theory and experiment 2008 (10) (2008) P10008.
- [18] M. E. Newman, M. Girvan, Finding and evaluating community structure in networks, Physical review E 69 (2) (2004) 026113.

- [19] J. Reichardt, S. Bornholdt, Statistical mechanics of community detection, Physical Review E 74 (1) (2006) 016110.
- [20] W. M. Rand, Objective criteria for the evaluation of clustering methods, Journal of the American Statistical association 66 (336) (1971) 846–850.

Supporting Information

_

In this section we provide the list of all the downloaded pages. Table 8 contains the 225 news pages that form the dataset. Pages are identified by their name, website and Facebook ID, followed by the country code of their corresponding country. The countries are indicated with their ISO Alpha-2 international code (FR: France, DE: Germany, IT: Italy, ES: Spain).

	Name and Website	Facebook ID	Community
1	ARD - ard.de	48219766388	DE
2	Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung - augsburger-allgemeine.de	121104385783	DE
3	Badische Zeitung - badische-zeitung.de	177670301122	DE
4	Berliner Morgenpost - morgenpost.de	46239931235	DE
5	Berliner Zeitung - berliner-zeitung.de	137267732953826	DE
6	Bild - <u>bild.de</u>	25604775729	DE
7	B.Z <u>bz-berlin.de</u>	57187632436	DE
8	Das Erste - <u>daserste.de</u>	176772398231	DE
9	Der Spiegel - spiegel.de	38246844868	DE
10	Der Tagesspiegel - tagesspiegel.de	59381221492	DE
11	Der Westen - <u>derwesten.de</u>	243001859426137	DE
12	Die Tageszeitung - <u>taz.de</u>	171844246207985	DE
13	Die Welt - welt.de	97515118114	DE
14	Die Zeit - zeit.de	37816894428	DE
15	Express - express.de	172718036608	DE
16	Focus - <u>focus.de</u>	37124189409	DE

Table 8: List of pages of each country in the dataset.

17	Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung - <u>faz.net</u>	346392590975	DE
18	Frankfurter Rundschau - <u>fr.de</u>	134100583282150	DE
19	Freie Presse - freiepresse.de	375109771472	DE
20	Freitag - freitag.de	313744767921	DE
21	GMX - gmx.net	187741777922914	DE
22	Hamburger Abendblatt - <u>abendblatt.de</u>	121580125458	DE
23	Hamburger Morgenpost - mopo.de	196072707519	DE
24	Handelsblatt - <u>handelsblatt.com</u>	104709558232	DE
25	Hannoversche Allgemeine Zeitung - <u>haz.de</u>	198530121257	DE
26	Huffington Post DE - huffingtonpost.de	366193510165011	DE
27	Junge Freiheit - jungefreiheit.de	13479664941	DE
28	Kölner Stadt-Anzeiger - <u>ksta.de</u>	141063022950	DE
29	Leipziger Volkszeitung - <u>lvz.de</u>	114360055263804	DE
30	Mitteldeutsche Zeitung - <u>mz-web.de</u>	141558262607	DE
31	n-tv online - <u>n-tv.de</u>	126049165307	DE
32	Ostsee-Zeitung - ostsee-zeitung.de	374927701107	DE
33	ProSieben Newstime - prosieben.de/tv/newstime	64694257920	DE
34	Rheinische Post - rp-online.de	50327854366	DE
35	RTL aktuell - <u>rtluell.de</u>	119845424729050	DE
36	SAT1 Nachrichten - <u>sat1.de/news</u>	171663852895480	DE
37	Schleswig-Holsteinischer Zeitungsverlag - $\underline{\mathtt{shz.de}}$	248528847673	DE
38	Stern - <u>stern.de</u>	78766664651	DE
39	Stuttgarter Nachrichten - stuttgarter-nachrichten.de	144537361776	DE
40	Stuttgarter Zeitung - stuttgarter-zeitung.de	129349103260	DE

41	Süddeutsche Zeitung - <u>sueddeutsche.de</u>	215982125159841	DE
42	tagesschau - tagesschau.de	193081554406	DE
43	t-online - <u>t-online.de</u>	24897707939	DE
44	WAZ - <u>waz.de</u>	117194401183	DE
45	WEB.DE - web.de	56488242934	DE
46	Wirtschafts Woche - <u>wiwo.de</u>	93810620818	DE
47	Yahoo News DE - de.machrichten.yahoo.com	166721106679241	DE
48	ZDF - <u>zdf.de</u>	154149027994068	DE
49	ZDF heute - <u>heute.de</u>	112784955679	DE
50	20 MINUTOS - <u>20minutos.es</u>	38352573027	ES
51	ABC - <u>abc.es</u>	7377874895	ES
52	Antena 3 - <u>antena3.com</u>	55353596297	ES
53	Cadena Ser - <u>cadenaser.com</u>	15658775846	ES
54	Canarias 7 - <u>canarias7.es</u>	85160277321	ES
55	Cinco Días - cincodias.elpais.com	36280712574	ES
56	COPE - cope.es	15829535820	ES
57	Cuatro news - <u>cuatro.com/noticias</u>	96876562265	ES
58	Diario de Cádiz - <u>diariodecadiz.es</u>	128335533904779	ES
59	Diario de Ibiza - <u>diariodeibiza.es</u>	255177630236	ES
60	Diario de Mallorca - <u>diariodemallorca.es</u>	155352736257	ES
61	Diario de Navarra - <u>diariodenavarra.es</u>	103384039711468	ES
62	El Comercio - <u>elcomercio.es</u>	64673887657	ES
63	El Confidencial - <u>elconfidencial.com</u>	63830851925	ES
64	El Confidencial Digital - elconfidencialdigital.com	202726949863885	ES

65	El Correo - <u>elcorreo.com</u>	280982578099	ES
66	El Correo Gallego - elcorreogallego.es	152802838075123	ES
67	El Día - <u>eldia.es</u>	165210860204301	ES
68	ElDiario.es - eldiario.es	417471918268686	ES
69	El Diario Montañés - eldiariomontanes.es	109434489075314	ES
70	El Diario Vasco - <u>diariovasco.com</u>	91085818678	ES
71	El Economista - <u>eleconomista.es</u>	56760767000	ES
72	El Español - elespanol.com	693292367452833	ES
73	El Mundo - <u>elmundo.es</u>	10407631866	ES
74	El Norte de Castilla - <u>elnortedecastilla.es</u>	98474974005	ES
75	El País - elpais.com	8585811569	ES
76	El Periódico - elperiodico.com	93177351543	ES
77	Expansión - expansion.com	93983931918	ES
78	Faro de Vigo - <u>farodevigo.es</u>	123746764304270	ES
79	Heraldo de Aragón - <u>heraldo.es</u>	130012437016272	ES
80	Hoy - hoy.es	85593393832	ES
81	Ideal - <u>ideal.es</u>	64258697112	ES
82	Información - <u>diarioinformacion.com</u>	410523955526	ES
83	La Gaceta de Salamanca - lagacetadesalamanca.es	319669591452311	ES
84	La Nueva España - <u>lne.es</u>	51837272861	ES
85	La Opinión de Málaga - laopiniondemalaga.es	80999977105	ES
86	La Opinión de Murcia - laopiniondemurcia.es	106647502704110	ES
87	La Opinión de Tenerife - <u>laopinion.es</u>	112238345503995	ES
88	La Provincia - laprovincia.es	124641092828	ES

89	La Razón - <u>larazon.es</u>	113080018770027	ES
90	La Sexta - <u>lasexta.com</u>	39172614918	ES
91	Las Provincias - lasprovincias.es	20810574989	ES
92	La Vanguardia - <u>lavanguardia.com</u>	156552584408339	ES
93	La Verdad - <u>laverdad.es</u>	120857625399	ES
94	La Voz de Asturias - <u>lavozdeasturias.es</u>	101351926940208	\mathbf{ES}
95	La Voz De Galicia - lavozdegalicia.es	350393845757	\mathbf{ES}
96	Levante-EMV - <u>levante-emv.com</u>	106329485190	\mathbf{ES}
97	Libertad Digital - <u>libertaddigital.com</u>	141423087721	\mathbf{ES}
98	MSN España - msn.com/es-es	35966491049	\mathbf{ES}
99	Onda Cero - <u>ondacero.es</u>	99040469027	\mathbf{ES}
100	Público - <u>publico.es</u>	75084861845	\mathbf{ES}
101	QUE! - que.es	97090259641	\mathbf{ES}
102	RTVE - <u>rtve.es</u>	133623265400	\mathbf{ES}
103	Sur - <u>diariosur.es</u>	52107727250	\mathbf{ES}
104	Telecinco - <u>telecinco.es</u>	50353113909	\mathbf{ES}
105	Última Hora - <u>ultimahora.es</u>	114680095225282	\mathbf{ES}
106	Yahoo News ES - es.noticias.yahoo.com	284428852938	\mathbf{ES}
107	20 Minutes - <u>20minutes.fr</u>	51555073310	\mathbf{FR}
108	Agence France-Presse - <u>afp.com/fr</u>	114100038626559	\mathbf{FR}
109	BFMTV - <u>bfmtv.com</u>	43896752783	\mathbf{FR}
110	Canal+ - canalplus.fr	144056732332683	\mathbf{FR}
111	Challenges - challenges.fr	79566127213	\mathbf{FR}
112	Charente Libre - charentelibre.fr	144375072241306	\mathbf{FR}

113	Charlie Hebdo - <u>charliehebdo.fr</u>	106626879360459	\mathbf{FR}
114	CNES Matin - <u>cnewsmatin.fr</u>	181111805243991	\mathbf{FR}
115	CNEWS - <u>cnews.fr</u>	76952916976	\mathbf{FR}
116	Corse Matin - <u>corsematin.com</u>	107249929306302	\mathbf{FR}
117	Courrier international - <u>courrierinternational.com</u>	142114104887	\mathbf{FR}
118	Dernieres Nouvelles d'Alsace - <u>dna.fr</u>	19004867327	\mathbf{FR}
119	FranceInfo - <u>francetvinfo.fr</u>	135112586936434	\mathbf{FR}
120	France Soir - <u>francesoir.fr</u>	53638966652	\mathbf{FR}
121	France Télévisions - <u>francetelevisions.fr</u>	179086202130933	\mathbf{FR}
122	Huffington Post FR - huffingtonpost.fr	284129444969978	\mathbf{FR}
123	La Croix - <u>la-croix.com</u>	108828257010	\mathbf{FR}
124	La Dépêche du Midi - <u>ladepeche.fr</u>	271219815470	\mathbf{FR}
125	L'Alsace - Le Pays - <u>lalsace.fr</u>	181480351879611	\mathbf{FR}
126	La Montagne - lamontagne.fr	146949065315655	\mathbf{FR}
127	La Nouvelle République du Centre Ouest - lanouvellerepublique.fr	87693933163	FR
128	La Provence - laprovence.com	119213845538	\mathbf{FR}
129	La République des Pyrennées - larepubliquedespyrenees.fr	148446219817	\mathbf{FR}
130	La République du Centre - <u>larep.fr</u>	211082695569481	\mathbf{FR}
131	La Tribune - <u>latribune.fr</u>	18950434380	\mathbf{FR}
132	La Voix du Nord - <u>lavoixdunord.fr</u>	76635774021	\mathbf{FR}
133	Le Bien Public - bienpublic.com	106094599409	\mathbf{FR}
134	Le Courrier Picard - <u>courrier-picard.fr</u>	58080584133	\mathbf{FR}
135	Le Dauphiné Libéré - <u>ledauphine.com</u>	122601757780987	\mathbf{FR}

		1	
136	Le Figaro - lefigaro.fr	61261101338	\mathbf{FR}
137	Le Journal du Dimanche - <u>lejdd.fr</u>	246577183385	\mathbf{FR}
138	Le Monde - <u>lemonde.fr</u>	14892757589	\mathbf{FR}
139	Le Monde Diplomatique - monde-diplomatique.fr	34398236687	\mathbf{FR}
140	Le Nouvel Observateur - tempsreel.nouvelobs.com	198508090036	\mathbf{FR}
141	Le Parisien - leparisien.fr	36550584062	\mathbf{FR}
142	Le Point - lepoint.fr	49173930702	\mathbf{FR}
143	Le Populaire du Centre - lepopulaire.fr	240500052515	\mathbf{FR}
144	Le Progrès - leprogres.fr	104985642868265	\mathbf{FR}
145	Le Républicain Lorrain - republicain-lorrain.fr	142638581774	\mathbf{FR}
146	Les Échos - <u>lesechos.fr</u>	123440511000645	\mathbf{FR}
147	L'Est Républicain - estrepublicain.fr	190366851765	\mathbf{FR}
148	Le Télégramme - letelegramme.fr	97539957978	\mathbf{FR}
149	L'Express - lexpress.fr	9359316996	\mathbf{FR}
150	L'Humanité - <u>humanite.fr</u>	254585183694	\mathbf{FR}
151	Libération - <u>liberation.fr</u>	147126052393	\mathbf{FR}
152	L'Indépendant - lindependant.fr	52697519148	\mathbf{FR}
153	L'internaute - <u>linternaute.com</u>	156569814356922	\mathbf{FR}
154	L'Opinion - <u>lopinion.fr</u>	445890365491209	FR
155	L'Union - <u>lunion.fr</u>	100163350071823	FR
156	Marianne - marianne.net	369717525444	\mathbf{FR}
157	Mediapart - mediapart.fr	116070051527	FR
158	Metro France - <u>lci.fr</u>	411124728976705	FR
159	Midi Libre - <u>midilibre.fr</u>	183518182558	FR

160	MSN France - msn.com/g00/fr-fr	136932803018290	\mathbf{FR}
161	Nice-Matin - <u>nicematin.com</u>	388223307574	\mathbf{FR}
162	Nord-Littoral - <u>nordlittoral.fr</u>	344969675415	\mathbf{FR}
163	Ouest France - <u>ouest-france.fr</u>	270122530294	\mathbf{FR}
164	Paris Match - <u>parismatch.com</u>	117714667328	\mathbf{FR}
165	Paris Normandie - paris-normandie.fr	195238257180091	\mathbf{FR}
166	Révolution Permanente - revolutionpermanente.fr	732277203520737	\mathbf{FR}
167	Sud Oest - <u>sudouest.fr</u>	58305334711	\mathbf{FR}
168	Télérama - <u>telerama.fr</u>	109520835773096	\mathbf{FR}
169	TF1 news - tf1.fr/news	34610502574	\mathbf{FR}
170	Var Matin - <u>varmatin.com</u>	365009223614	\mathbf{FR}
171	Yahoo News FR - <u>fr.news.yahoo.com</u>	138207559575213	\mathbf{FR}
172	Alto Adige - altoadige.gelocal.it	447795960541	IT
173	Ansa - <u>ansa.it</u>	158259371219	IT
174	Avvenire - <u>avvenire.it</u>	128533807252295	IT
175	Corriere Adriatico - <u>corriereadriatico.it</u>	431943793507773	IT
176	Corriere della Sera - <u>corriere.it</u>	284515247529	IT
177	Corriere del Mezzogiorno -	84805991975	IT
178	Gazzetta di Modena - gazzettadimodena.gelocal.it	131613613524326	IT
179	Gazzetta di Reggio - gazzettadireggio.gelocal.it	102328739818445	IT
180	Giornale di Brescia - giornaledibrescia.it	352193836938	IT
181	Giornale di Sicilia - gds.it	211307618890745	IT
182	Huffington Post IT - huffingtonpost.it	276376685795308	IT

18	Il Blog di Beppe Grillo - beppegrillo.it	56369076544	IT
184	Il Centro - <u>ilcentro.gelocal.it</u>	261504285205	IT
18	Il Fatto Quotidiano - <u>ilfattoquotidiano.it</u>	132707500076838	IT
180	Il Foglio - <u>ilfoglio.it</u>	61703722992	IT
18'	Il Gazzettino - ilgazzettino.it	154142713068	IT
188	Il Giornale - <u>ilgiornale.it</u>	323950777458	IT
189	Il Giornale di Vicenza - ilgiornaledivicenza.it	154836331469	IT
190	Il Manifesto - <u>ilmanifesto.info</u>	61480282984	IT
193	Il Mattino - <u>ilmattino.it</u>	210639995470	IT
192	Il Mattino di Padova - mattinopadova.gelocal.it	189556995002	IT
193	Il Messaggero - <u>ilmessaggero.it</u>	124918220854917	IT
194	Il Messaggero Veneto - messaggeroveneto.gelocal.it	195905383236	IT
198	Il Piccolo - <u>ilpiccolo.gelocal.it</u>	341809745380	IT
190	Il Resto del Carlino - <u>ilrestodelcarlino.it</u>	200174860861	IT
19'	Il Secolo XIX - <u>ilsecoloxix.it</u>	36493277214	IT
198	Il Sole 24 Ore - <u>ilsole24ore.com</u>	38812693516	IT
199	Il Tirreno - <u>iltirreno.gelocal.it</u>	75980429042	IT
200	LA7 - <u>la7.it</u>	252449503661	IT
203	L'Adige - ladige.it	134572506600855	IT
202	La Gazzetta del Mezzogiorno -	184749620911	IT
	lagazzettadelmezzogiorno.it		
203	La Gazzetta di Mantova - gazzettadimantova.gelocal.it	62769612287	IT
204	La Gazzetta di Parma - gazzettadiparma.it	309928567597	IT
205	La Nazione - <u>lanazione.it</u>	87812020989	IT

206	La Nuova di Venezia e Mestre - <u>nuovavenezia.gelocal.it</u>	338049475695	IT
207	La Nuova Sardegna - lanuovasardegna.gelocal.it	226626114877	IT
208	La Provincia Pavese - laprovinciapavese.gelocal.it	57687391957	IT
209	L'Arena - <u>larena.it</u>	108431819182401	IT
210	La Repubblica - repubblica.it	179618821150	IT
211	La Stampa - <u>lastampa.it</u>	63873785957	IT
212	La Tribuna di Treviso - tribunatreviso.gelocal.it	243933437208	IT
213	L'Eco di Bergamo - ecodibergamo.it	197197145813	IT
214	L'Espresso - espresso.repubblica.it	259865949240	IT
215	Libero Quotidiano - <u>liberoquotidiano.it</u>	188776981163133	IT
216	L'Unione Sarda - <u>unionesarda.it</u>	231465552656	IT
217	L'Unità - <u>unita.tv</u>	292449724097	IT
218	MSN Italia - <u>msn.com/it-it</u>	232690009759	IT
219	Nuovo Quotidiano di Puglia - quotidianodipuglia.it	119992291359480	IT
220	RAI News - <u>rainews.it</u>	124992707516031	IT
221	Rai.TV - raiplay.it	88988179171	IT
222	Sky TG24 - tg24.sky.it	215275341879427	IT
223	TgCom24 - tgcom24.mediaset.it	40337124609	IT
224	Trentino - trentinocorrierealpi.gelocal.it	82383189226	IT
225	Yahoo News IT - <u>it.notizie.yahoo.com</u>	81262596234	IT