

A Systematic Review of Echo Chamber Research: Comparative Analysis of Conceptualizations, Operationalizations, and Varying Outcomes

DAVID HARTMANN, Technische Universität Berlin, Germany and Weizenbaum Institute, Germany

LENA POHLMANN, Technische Universität Berlin, Germany and Weizenbaum Institute, Germany

SONJA MEI WANG, University of Wuppertal, Germany

BETTINA BERENDT, Technische Universität Berlin, Germany, Weizenbaum Institute, Germany, and KU Leuven, Belgium

This systematic review synthesizes current research on echo chambers and filter bubbles to highlight the reasons for the dissent in echo chamber research on the existence, antecedents, and effects of the phenomenon. The review of 112 studies reveals that the lack of consensus in echo chamber research is based on different conceptualizations and operationalizations of echo chambers. While studies that have conceptualized echo chambers with homophily and utilized data-driven computational social science (CSS) methods have confirmed the echo chamber hypothesis and polarization effects in social media, content exposure studies and surveys that have explored the full spectrum of media exposure have rejected it.

Most of these studies have been conducted in the United States, and the review emphasizes the need for a more comprehensive understanding of how echo chambers work in systems with more than two parties and outside the Global North. To advance our understanding of this phenomenon, future research should prioritize conducting more cross-platform studies, considering algorithmic filtering changes through continuous auditing, and examining the causal direction of the association between polarization, fragmentation, and the establishment of online echo chambers. The review also provides the advantages and disadvantages of different operationalizations and makes recommendations for studies in the European Union (EU), which will become possible with the upcoming Digital Services Act (DSA). Overall, this systematic review contributes to the ongoing scholarly discussion on the existence, antecedents, and effects of echo chambers and filter bubbles.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Computational Social Science, Systematic Review, Echo Chamber, Filter Bubble, Measurement Modeling, DSA

1 INTRODUCTION

The impact of social media on public discussions and democratic processes has been a hot topic for more than a decade. With the election year 2024, in which elections take place in more than 50 countries, including the United States, India, and the EU - and the EU regulation on very large online platforms (see the Digital Services Act [75]), this topic remains very current. The emerging shift to the political right, along with declining trust in democratic institutions and science, raises concerns that the advent of social media platforms may have contributed to these phenomena [7, 131, 171].

Many believe that the constructs *echo chamber* and *filter bubble* can explain the decline in democratic exchange, as they cause social media users to become polarized (e.g., Bail et al. [7], Minh Pham et al. [149]) and radicalized. *Echo chambers* – a term first introduced by Sunstein [192] who repeatedly emphasized the dangers of echo chambers – are frequently defined similarly as “environments in which the opinion, political leaning, or belief of users about a topic gets reinforced due to repeated interactions with peers or sources having similar tendencies and attitudes [49].” In the context of social media, this involves the interchangeably used but differing concept of filter bubbles. *Filter bubbles* –

Authors' addresses: David Hartmann, Technische Universität Berlin, Berlin, Germany and Weizenbaum Institute, Berlin, Germany, d.hartmann@tu-berlin.de; Lena Pohlmann, Technische Universität Berlin, Berlin, Germany and Weizenbaum Institute, Berlin, Germany, lpohlmann@tu-berlin.de; Sonja Mei Wang, University of Wuppertal, Wuppertal, Germany, swang@uni-wuppertal.de; Bettina Berendt, Technische Universität Berlin, Berlin, Germany and Weizenbaum Institute, Berlin, Germany and KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium, berendt@tu-berlin.de.

coined by Pariser [165] – are created by personalized recommendation systems that expose users to content similar to their beliefs. These algorithms focus on ranking and content moderation to provide users with a personalized universe of information [165]. As they are often used and conceptualized similarly and as Sunstein included algorithms in the characterization of echo chambers in subsequent publications, we will look at both constructs under the name echo chamber in this work.

Both theoretical constructs – at least the public discussion around them [68, 206] – underscore the need for exposure to diverse viewpoints, which, according to Habermas [100] and Dahlgren [59], is crucial for the public ability to influence politics through a critical exchange of ideas and consensus-building essential for a robust democracy. The fear regarding echo chambers on social media arises from users having a vast range of media environments to choose from on the internet. Thus, users can choose to be exposed to conversations with like-minded users and content that reflects their existing preferences or beliefs [68, 206]. According to the *echo chamber hypothesis* [195]¹, echo chambers in social networks lead to the fragmentation of increasingly polarized groups, which can profoundly impact public debate. There is a growing fear that echo chambers have led or could lead to an epistemological crisis and seriously threaten democratic societies [17].

However, there is conflicting evidence on the existence and effects of echo chambers. Thus, the motivation for conducting this review is the fact that empirical research – especially regarding computation social science – on echo chambers remains inconclusive. The review will address the following research questions:

- (1) What is the evidence for the existence, antecedents, and effects of echo chambers in social networks?
- (2) Which conceptualizations and operationalizations are used in quantitative and mixed-methods echo chamber research?
- (3) What are the reasons for the varying outcomes in echo chamber research?

The systematic review offers an overview of antecedents, properties (like existence), and effects of echo chambers in social networks based on research published until December 31st, 2023. We reviewed 112 peer-reviewed studies. From an initial set of 1.651 studies, we selected these 112 studies based on criteria explained in Section 2.5. We identify a taxonomy of conceptualizations and operationalizations of echo chambers and determine antecedents and effects that organize existing work and support future studies. This analysis aims to highlight certain assumptions and choices in the study design of individual research. We find that echo chamber studies differ in (1) outcomes, (2) focus, (3) construct conceptualization and (4) operationalization, and (5) granularity.

Studies differ in *outcomes*, as some research has found evidence for echo chambers on platforms such as Facebook (e.g., Schmidt et al. [182]), while other studies have not identified evidence on the same platform (e.g., Bakshy et al. [9], Beam et al. [15]). Echo chambers are also repeatedly associated with the spread of misinformation, which poses the risk of poor political decisions or the formation of opinions based on falsehoods [48, 62, 116]. However, scientific findings have also been contrasting with the echo chamber hypothesis. Some studies indicate that social media networks are similar to real-life interpersonal networks (e.g., Dubois and Blank [68], Bastos et al. [12]), thus downplaying the asserted impact of social media or that social networks do not change the political discourse excessively (e.g., Barbera et al. [11], Bruns [36], Guess et al. [97]). Further, some studies claim that echo chambers have no significant impact (e.g., Dubois and Blank [68]) or do not demonstrate increased exposure to dissimilar opinions through social media. According to some studies, societal polarization is not a phenomenon attributable exclusively to social media, but to other forms of media like radio and TV as well (e.g., Jamieson and Hall [114]).

¹Also referred to as the “echo chamber argument,” [29], or the “the echo chamber effect.” [50]

Furthermore, the echo chamber construct is controversial, and researchers claim that it was ill-defined from the beginning and that researchers should abandon it [134]. This is largely because the concept does not represent any observable outcome since “echo chambers” describe a state of absence, namely the absence of an idealized model of a deliberative public sphere such as the Habermasian democratic model [36, 122]. However, there are categories under which different conceptualizations of echo chambers can be classified, and one of the main goals of this review is to categorize these conceptualizations and clarify the confusion.

In addition, studies on echo chambers in social networks have been carried out by researchers from various fields – such as computer science, sociology, political science, law, media, and communication science – using differing methods and thus different *operationalizations* of the echo chamber construct. Some studies have conducted a network analysis based on data from social networks [50], while others have interviewed Twitter/X users after they were exposed to the contents of a social media bot [7]. Data sets differ among studies and different data sets lead to dissimilar findings regarding the existence of echo chambers [195].

The difficulties in operationalizing extend to the *granularity* of echo chamber detection as they can occur on individual users, groups, or entire platforms [125] and related to the research decision to analyze specific groups or platforms, data utilized in the empirical research is subject to sampling bias even if there are attempts to counteract these differences [68, 122]. Previous studies may have analyzed mainly active users and used scarce or incomplete data sets to support their conclusions. This fact may have led to misleading results, as the periphery of networks appears to be essential for the average behavior of social networks [185]. Studies analyzed online platforms either independently (one specific platform) or in aggregate (all of social media), which may make it difficult to determine the link between social aspects, technological characteristics, and information-limiting contexts [122]. If only one medium (e.g. only one platform or one online newspaper) is analyzed, this may not provide relevant information on how political information moves across offline and online media [68]. Moreover, demographics differ across platforms [44, 144].

Like Jacobs and Wallach [112] in the case of fairness, we propose to use measurement modeling from the quantitative social sciences [111] to discuss the echo chamber construct and to compare conceptualizations and operationalizations of echo chambers. We argue that employing measurement modeling can help clarify how research defines and measures the concept of an “echo chamber” and how this is linked to the differences we observe in research outcomes.

Lastly, echo chamber research differs in *focus*. Some research studies are primarily concerned with the echo chamber hypothesis, while others focus on the antecedents, properties, and effects of echo chambers. It is crucial to compare demographics and political environments of studies, as Kitchens et al. [122] claimed that most research that confirms the echo chamber hypothesis has been conducted in the United States.

We therefore argue that a broader perspective on antecedents, properties, and effects of echo chambers as a concept is essential to understanding sociotechnical structure and mechanisms of social media. We understand social media and recommendation technologies as sociotechnical systems embedded in a complex dynamic political and social system which may have multiple feedback loops. A multi-perspective and multi-granular (individual level, structural level) approach to the topic is crucial to promote the understanding of these structures and their reproduction by such systems. This distinguishes this review from existing reviews on echo chambers, echo chamber detection, filter bubbles, and social media.

In 2021, Terren and Borge [195] conducted a systematic review to explore the existence of echo chambers in social networks. Similar to this systematic review, it aimed to provide a better overview of the current research (up to January 2020) and identify differences in research approaches. The authors examined 55 studies related to the existence of echo chambers in social networks. They found that differences in research design impacted whether the studies concluded

that echo chambers exist in social networks. In particular, different data sets on which the research was conducted produced different results. Trace data clearly showed the existence of echo chambers, whereas self-reported data from survey studies did not [195]. While Terren and Borge [195] sorted existing echo chamber literature by data set and foci, referring to foci such as interaction-centric studies and content-centered studies; they only provided a summary of studies that explicitly referred to the echo chamber hypothesis. In contrast, the present study provides a more comprehensive analysis of echo chambers and social media which includes antecedents, properties, and effects of echo chambers.

Furthermore, non-systematic literature reviews on echo chambers, filter bubbles, and thematically related phenomena exist. Arguedas et al. [2] examined social science evidence of online echo chambers' existence, antecedents, and effects. They found no evidence for the echo chamber hypothesis and presented a mixed picture of how news and media affect polarization.

Lorenz-Spreen et al. [131] analyzed nearly 500 articles on the impact of digital media on democracy including examining echo chambers. Findings are mixed: while social media platforms are shown to diversify news consumption, they also contribute to the formation and confirmation of ideologically similar social groups. They suggest a link between the increased knowledge through digital media and the rise of homophilic social structures, which may relate to the spread of hate speech and anti-outgroup sentiments. The systematic review of Interian et al. [110] examined network polarization measures of 78 studies and identified the most used ones in research on online social data.

This systematic review departs from previous work to discuss different echo chamber research outcomes. This review aims to fill the gap by providing a broader perspective on echo chambers while focusing on the antecedents, properties, and effects and analyzing the conceptualizations and operationalization.

2 METHOD

We follow the *PRISMA 2020* [163] guideline to present a transparent account of how we conducted our systematic review. A systematic review following the *PRISMA 2020* guideline involves the following elements [92, 93]: (1) a definition of research questions (see below), a strategy regarding the search for relevant literature to answer these questions (Section 2.1), explicit criteria for inclusion and exclusion of research literature (Section 2.4.3), synthesis of evidence that can be derived from the literature (Appendix, Section 6), and a summary of the results presented in a structured manner (Section 3).

To allow for reproducibility, we make all steps of the reviewing process explicit and describe them in detail. Our research questions are conceptual questions and methodology questions, as we are both interested in how echo chambers are conceptualized and what methods have been used to study them, to find how the varying outcomes in the literature emerge [26].

We use standardized methods for search, evaluation, and selection of studies reduce subjective influences [22]. The search strategy is discussed in more detail in section 2.1. It includes keywords and scientific databases we identified as relevant to the search, which we lay out in section 2.2. The criteria for inclusion and exclusion of papers are presented in section 2.5. The *PRISMA 2020* flow diagram is depicted in Figure 1.

2.1 Search Protocol

The search protocol for the systematic review was designed to be broad in its inclusion of relevant databases and search words, consistent in its use of the same search word strings across databases, and efficient in reducing the number of irrelevant results. Some searches, such as "echo chamber" as a keyword, produced too many results. Other terms, such




Fig. 1. PRISMA 2020

as “echo chamber hypothesis” or “existence” were too limiting and returned only few results. Keywords were refined iteratively. Two main groups of keywords that identified broad and relevant research were merged, reducing irrelevant results. The first group included the keywords “echo chamber” and “filter bubble”. The keywords of group one are presented in Figure 2.

To keep the review focused, terms like “selective exposure”, “content exposure”, “recommendation algorithms” were not included. Using these keywords for searches resulted in more than 10,000 results.

The second group of keywords, presented in Figure 3, exclusively contained all keywords related to social media platforms. Both main groups included the same keywords in English and German (Two studies in German)². The second group included names of the most used social media platforms as of April 2024 [215]. This inclusion guaranteed that individual studies on specific platforms were taken into account. To avoid a search query that was too restricted,

²German is included as the authors speak German.

Echo Chamber* OR Echokammer* OR Filter Bubble* OR Filterblase*

Fig. 2. Keywords for search protocol: Group 1

Soziale Medien* OR Soziales Netzwerk* OR Soziale Plattform* OR Social Media* OR Social Network* OR Social Platform* OR Youtube* OR Twitter* OR X* OR Facebook* OR Instagram* OR Tik Tok* OR Reddit* OR YouTube* OR WeChat* OR Weibo* OR QQ* OR Kuaishou* OR Douyin* OR CSSpchat* OR Pinterest* OR WhatsApp* OR Telegram* OR Signal*

Fig. 3. Keywords for search protocol: Group 2

keywords were searched for in both titles and abstracts.

2.2 Databases

After reviewing the most-used databases for computer science [187] and social science, the following databases were chosen: Web of Science, Scopus, ACM, IEEE, Google Scholar, DBLP.

Although Google Scholar doesn't have a main search system to compile research, it offers extensive coverage and serves as a comprehensive collection of scientific knowledge, including a large amount of grey literature - which refers to literature outside traditional publishing sources, such as dissertations, reports, and pre-prints [133]. This can help counteract publication bias [101]. While we only include peer-reviewed literature in our review, adding Google Scholar articles has expanded our sources.

Search precision for systematic searches in Google Scholar is much lower than one percent[24]. For our query, Google Scholar returned 20,000 results. Therefore, Google Scholar was only used as a supplemental database, and its search query results were trimmed to the point at which they were deemed adequate to discover the most precise amount of relevant literature for a systematic review, which is the first 200-300 results, according to Haddaway et al. [101]. Thus, the first 300 results were included.

2.3 Search Results

Database searches yielded a total of 1,651 results. Each source's bibliographic information and abstract were downloaded into a single Citavi library³. Citavi was used to remove duplicates during the inclusion and exclusion process and to code papers in the screening phase. 514 duplicates were removed. Furthermore, only peer-reviewed work was included as justified in section 2.4. This selection resulted in 996 unique publications that were then screened for eligibility.

2.4 Identification and Screening scope

2.4.1 Peer-reviewed Work and Publication Bias. The likelihood of publication bias is one of the possible drawbacks of systematic reviews [22]. The tendency of researchers, reviewers, and editors to submit or accept articles for publication based on the direction or intensity of the study findings is known as publication bias. Consequently, journals may only publish data that reveal a substantial finding upsetting the findings balance in favor of positive results [65]. This can impact systematic reviews that only include peer-reviewed papers to reduce research volume and potential small-study biases. However, retrieving unpublished trial data takes considerable time and work and is not always accurate.

Although this method can provide important supplementary information for individuals reviewing published literature, it is not very effective at preventing publication bias Dickersin [65]. Considering publication bias, it is

³See <https://www.citavi.com/en>

Table 1. Criteria for exclusion

Criterion	Definition
C1	Is not about the existence, antecedents, and effects nor any other properties of echo chambers
C2	Papers are excluded if their methodology does not employ quantitative research designs, such as surveys, experiments, CSS methods like social media data analysis, or if they solely use qualitative methods without incorporating quantitative elements.
C3	Is not about social media in relation to echo chambers

conceivable that scientific papers with negative results concerning the echo chamber hypothesis or echo chamber effects may have more difficulties in becoming published than the other way around. In this respect, this work also significantly emphasizes negative results.

2.4.2 Other Potential Biases in Systematic Reviews. This part briefly discusses potential biases affecting systematic reviews in general, specifically this systematic review. Location bias refers to the publication of research findings in journals with varying accessibility and levels of indexing in standard databases, which can impact systematic reviews due to authors' inability to access all published studies. For this systematic review, we excluded studies that were inaccessible through the Berlin University research access, affecting 42 studies.

Language bias occurs when research findings are published in a specific language based on the type and direction of the results. In this review, keywords were only provided in English or German, which led to a minimal amount of studies that were outside of English or German. As we also did not include them in our review, a language bias is possible in our review. However, this bias can be limited due to the large corpus size. However, this bias must be taken into account, especially with regard to results relating to certain countries and results relating to research in the global South.

Outcome reporting bias involves selectively reporting some outcomes while omitting others based on the kind and direction of the findings [67]. Outcome reporting and citation bias were addressed by collecting the results of all studies in a final table (see Appendix 6) to compensate for any omissions in the text. However, given the large corpus size, omissions in the text are unfortunately inevitable, which is why the table displays diverse methodologies, results, and conceptualizations.

2.4.3 Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria. Exclusion criteria were applied in the search for evidence; the inclusion criteria were the negations of the exclusion criteria. To display the number of excluded papers per criterion in the PRISMA format, three exclusion criteria (C1-C3) are presented below and in Table 1.

C1, inclusions and exclusions concerning the thematic scope. As a result of criterion C1, it is evident that publications containing research on the properties, antecedents, and effects was included in the review. Additionally, if synonyms such as selective exposure or content exposure are used, these were also included. Research that mentions echo chambers but has no quantitative or mixed-methods approach focusing on the properties, antecedents, or effects of echo chambers was not included.

C2, inclusions and exclusions with respect to methodologies. Based on the systematic review's research questions, we focus on studies that provide echo chamber measurements in a quantitative form, whether through the use of a survey, experiment, simulation, assessment or intervention, or secondary data analysis. Thus, research methodologies such as those employing quantitative methods with observational data, surveys, mixed methods, and experiments were

included in the review. Qualitative research was excluded due to the difficulty of comparing qualitative and quantitative research, which is beyond the scope of this work.

C3, inclusions and exclusions in relation to the underlying medium of research. This systematic review focuses on echo chambers on social media, as the scope would be too broad otherwise, and operationalizations would be too difficult to compare. Different media, such as television and newspapers, were excluded. Research that explored characteristics of echo chambers across various types of media, if these include social media, were included.

2.5 Screening of Search Results

The identification of studies and the screening process in the PRISMA 2020 format can be seen in Figure 1. The eligibility criteria were applied in a hierarchical cascade method, with each source being verified first against criterion C1, then against criterion C2, and so on. The source was included for cases in which the available information was insufficient. A total of 758 studies were screened based on title, excluding 540 studies that did not meet the three criteria. Most papers were excluded based on criterion C1. In the first coding round, we decided if an article was eligible based on its title. This step was conducted through one coder who flagged articles that are to be discussed with the second coder. We only excluded clearly out-of-scope articles, like articles on physical echo chambers (see criteria). In the subsequent coding round, articles were excluded based on abstract; 20 % of articles were coded by a second coder. The Inter-coder reliability (IRR) – an agreement between coders – turned out to be moderate, was discussed after the coding process, and coding was adjusted accordingly (Cohens' $\kappa = 0.583$ after adjustment⁴).

2.6 Analysis and Synthesis

The final full-text coding followed an inductive approach to content analysis, as research on echo chambers is dispersed and inconclusive [72]. Codes were established without a preconceived theoretical framework and then grouped into categories concerning conceptualizations and operationalizations of echo chambers, as well as findings concerning antecedents, properties, and effects [108]. After the codebook was established (see Appendix 6), the second coder used the scheme to independently code 12 random studies (roughly 10 % sample). Here, IRR was substantial (Cohen's $\kappa = 0.65$ ⁵). We used MAXQDA for coding⁶.

To organize the results of our synthesis, we follow a narrative synthesis approach, which is suitable to show relationships in and between different studies to identify factors that can explain differences [169]. We discuss these differences by giving an overview of the type of data and datasets used and the context of the studies, such as the country. Due to the large number of studies in our final sample, we only textually describe some studies that demonstrate specific outcomes and responses to research questions. We group studies by conceptualization, methodology, and outcome.

3 RESULTS

Initially, the systematic review begins with an overview and a bibliometric analysis of the corpus, detailed in Section 3.1. Following this, Section 3.2 focuses on the conceptualizations and operationalizations of echo chambers, which were developed inductively through coding and theoretical considerations grounded in measurement modeling. Finally, Section 3.4 presents a comprehensive discussion on the properties, antecedents, and effects of echo chambers.

⁴For explanation and categories see Cohen [52]

⁵For explanation and categories see Cohen [52]

⁶See <https://www.maxqda.com/>




Fig. 4. Publication years of studies included in the systematic review




Fig. 5. The distribution of platforms that were analyzed in the corpus

Table 2. Publication Source

<i>a. Publication Source</i>		<i>d. Focus</i>	
Source	# Paper	Focus	# Paper
PLoS One	11	Echo chamber hypothesis	48
Social Media + Society	9	News sharing and consuming	9
Scientific Reports	9	Recommender systems and echo chambers	8
Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences	5	Cognitive states, emotions, personality traits and EC	8
New Media & Society	5	Opinion dynamics on social media	5
International Journal of Communication	4	COVID-19, vaccines and echo chambers	5
International Journal of Press-Politics	3	Misinformation and echo chambers	5
Information, Communication & Society	3	Extremism, radicalization and echo chambers	4
Social Network Analysis and Mining	3	Elections and echo chambers	4
Royal Society Open Science	2	Climate change and echo chambers	4
Policy and Internet	2	Mitigation of echo chambers	3
Internet Policy Review	2	Parliaments discussions and echo chambers	2
<i>b. Discipline</i>		<i>c. Document Type</i>	
Area	# Paper	Type	# Paper
Computer Science	31	Journal	92
Social Science	23	Conference Paper	11
Communication Science	21		
Political Science	14		
Psychology and Medicine	9		
Economy	5		

3.1 Corpus Overview

The 112 studies included in the systematic review were all published between 2014 and 2024, as Figure 4 illustrates. The year of publication was not restricted in the search query for this review. There are three possible reasons for these results. First, echo chamber as a term and a topic is relatively new, although some theoretical works were written before 2014. Second, the methodological decisions for inclusions and exclusions did not involve theoretical frameworks published before 2014. Third, before 2012, there was little research on social media and the impact of social networks on society [188].

The distribution of the identified studies demonstrates the interdisciplinarity of this topic but also represents the need to systemize operationalizations.

Figure 6 shows the distribution of countries where the studies were conducted or in which countries the data sets originated. It indicates that the majority of the studies took place in the US (49), Italy (10), and the UK (8). These findings were expected for the US and the UK due to the presence of research institutes and the predominant language of the studies. Italy stands out due to a research group that has conducted numerous studies on echo chambers.

It is important to note the significant proportion of studies conducted in the USA and consider that this may introduce bias, especially when analyzing two-party systems. This bias may be less relevant for multi-party systems.




Fig. 6. Countries that were covered in the corpus of the review





Fig. 7. Contingency table of coded conceptualizations and operationalizations of the corpus literature. The colors indicate the total number of occurrences. It is important to note that the number of conceptualization occurrences is higher than the sum of included studies because studies can define echo chambers in multiple ways.

Fig. 8. Heatmap of coded outcomes in echo chamber studies per researched platform. The colors indicate the total number of occurrences. It is important to note that most survey studies and experiments did not research one platform in particular (granularity of conceptualization) and are therefore not considered in this plot.

3.2 Conceptualizations

From the lens of measurement modeling, “echo chamber” itself is a theoretical construct. An echo chamber relates to a specific phenomenon about communities online and offline that we can observe. However, an echo chamber is not directly measurable. What we can measure are other measurable concepts that argue to be an indirect measure of echo chambers. The conceptualization is the process of defining an echo chamber through other direct measurable concepts. We identified four concepts that are part of echo chamber conceptualizations: (1) *homophily*, (2) *content exposure*, (3) *user behavior* like selective exposure, confirmation bias, or fear, and (4) *group behavior* like excluding and outsiders and collective unfriending. Another dimension in the definition and then measurement of echo chambers is the granularity of the echo chamber, meaning how granular we define and measure echo chambers. We will explore how these concepts intersect with theoretical frameworks, providing an overview of the predominant conceptualizations within the corpus.

3.2.1 Content Exposure. Although both concepts, echo chamber and filter bubble, were established due to concern that social media and other information-gathering platforms could influence people's decisions about what they consume, what they think, and how they interact, the study field has conceptualized them in different ways. According to Pariser [165], personalization technology is the underlying mechanism of echo chambers, and he contends that this technology will show them information that confirms their own opinions at the expense of information that challenges them. The isolation of the individual has negative effects, as it leads to epistemic bubbles where personal ideas go unchallenged and untested [159]. This is why many studies put more focus on the content that an individual sees through their news feed curated by recommendation systems. We call this conceptualization *content exposure*.

3.2.2 Homophily. Both in 2001 [192] and then again in 2017 [193], Sunstein emphasized that technology has the potential to increase fragmentation on a larger scale, with people no longer living separately but rather forming groups where those with similar ideological preferences associate exclusively with one another. Studies that focus on groups, interactions, and communication between users relate to the phenomenon of individuals selecting like-minded people as communication partners and information sources [143]. This conceptualization of echo chambers that focuses more on the social structures than on media and information diet is captured by the term *homophily*. Research exploring homophily relies heavily on data-driven CSS methods for practical reasons. Given the logistical challenges in tracking social media interactions through surveys or broad experiments, CSS provides a viable alternative. We will present homophily operationalizations in Section 3.3.1.

3.2.3 User behavior. A term frequently used in the context of echo chambers is selective exposure, which is said to be one of the main antecedents and mechanisms driving echo chambers. This is based on the many choices of media environments on the Internet. Users of social media platforms can choose to be exposed to conversations with like-minded users and content that reflects their thinking, thus reinforcing their existing preferences or beliefs [68, 206]. This tendency is accompanied by the avoidance of cognitive dissonance through avoiding challenging information and is also known under the term *confirmation bias*. Selective exposure and other user-specific behaviors or attributes partially conceptualized by the corpus literature. These user attributes that are linked to echo chambers include – besides selective exposure – personality traits (e.g., Boulianne et al. [29]), fear of isolation and anger (e.g., Wollebaek et al. [220]), openness (e.g., Matz [140]), and reflectiveness (e.g., Mosleh et al. [155]). Since the focus here is on the user, echo chambers were primarily researched using surveys and experiments. The results are mixed but tend to show that echo chambers are related to certain demographics, personality trait, and selective exposure. However, the effect of these concepts is not substantial. We will discuss this in Section 3.5.2.

3.2.4 Group behavior. Recent philosophical debates on social epistemology have built on the work of Jamieson and Hall [114] and approach the understanding of echo chambers differently, as they strictly separate them from epistemic bubbles. Nguyen [159] argues that an echo chamber is “a social epistemic structure in which other relevant voices have been actively discredited,” meaning that people who do not share the opinions of that group are discredited as sources of information in general. The overall structure of echo chambers in his account is built on creating a substantial trust imbalance between members and non-members so outsiders are no longer taken seriously [159]. However, such an echo chamber conceptualization is hardly reflected in the corpus, although there is research that examines particular *group behavior* and presents it as echo chamber-specific. This conceptualization was found in studies that analyzed collective unfriending which will be shortly presented in Section 3.5.1.

3.2.5 Granularity. Granularity is an essential dimension of an echo chamber operationalization. How granular are echo chambers analyzed, and from what perspective? We differentiate between single-user, group, platform, cross-platform, and holistic. While single-user studies examine whether echo chambers originate from single individuals and how the individual influences echo chambers, group studies examine specific groups on specific platforms. Platform studies generally examine an entire platform to see whether it has an affinity for echo chambers or whether echo chambers occur there. In contrast, cross-platform studies compare platforms regarding their echo chamber behavior. Holistic studies look at the entire media diet of users, i.e., not only certain social media but also newspapers, television, and other media simultaneously.

Most studies examined specific groups or communities on platforms, such as climate change deniers, vaccination opponents and advocates, and Trump supporters. However, few papers looked at the specific group behavior of these groups but mainly examined homophily over time and information flow to the group as opposed to outside the group. Some research conceptualizing specific user behavior also looked at specific users on platforms and how their behavior can create echo chambers. Some papers examined entire platforms and whether they correlate with echo chambers.

Only five studies compared platforms in cross-platform studies. However, if specific platforms were researched, CSS was usually utilized as surveys mostly observed the whole media diet but not particular on specific platforms. Accordingly, a direct comparison of Cinelli et al. [50] of the news consumption and ties between users on Facebook and Reddit reveals that Facebook shows more segregated communities and less cross-cutting content. Significant disparities in homophilic tendencies in network structure and biases in information diffusion toward like-minded people exist across these platforms [50].

At the same time, observation of the platforms studied shows that, generally, too few platforms are studied. This is related to available APIs – which could change with the DSA – but leads to the fact that not the most popular platforms were studied; most studies analyzed Twitter/X or Facebook.

Two studies on Weibo found that the retweeting mechanism on Weibo generates polarization while commenting fosters consensus and that online users' information-seeking behavior is associated with incivility [213]. Additionally, Weibo discussions about genetically modified organisms saw cross-cutting linkages between communities that could reduce the possibility of viewpoint polarization [211].

Studies that analyzed the whole media diet of users like Dubois et al. [69] conclude that echo chambers are either not present or are overstated. We go deeper into this research in Section 3.4.1.

In summary, Facebook, Twitter/X, and Weibo are found to have segregated communities or echo chambers on their platforms. Research on Weibo and Reddit, especially, had intriguing results. However, most of the research is to be found on Twitter/X, as the data is easily accessible. There is no evidence for echo chambers on Reddit and research that analyzes the whole media diet finds no evidence for echo chambers.

That fits the more general findings in the corpus: Reddit shows less evidence of echo chambers than Facebook. As Cinelli et al. [50] argue, this could be related to Reddit's ability to allow users to customize the recommendation algorithm. Another cross-platform study found that Twitter/X users are more exposed to diverse viewpoints than Facebook users [136]. The results obtained cannot be generalized to the entire dataset, and it is difficult to establish a clear pattern as there are both positive and negative findings for Twitter/X. However, Facebook was studied less and had fewer negative findings. However, this is also a result of the examined data basis. We will come back to this in Section 3.5.3.

3.3 Operationalizations of Echo Chambers

In the following, we will look at the operationalizations of echo chambers. In the present corpus, data-driven CSS methods that analyze platforms via API, scraping, plug-ins, or social bots are primarily present. Furthermore, we divide operationalizations into surveys, experiments, and mixed methods. In the following, we will present general procedures for measuring the previous conceptualizations and the investigation's granularity. The advantages and disadvantages of these operationalizations are Discussed in the discussion section (Section 5)

3.3.1 Social Media Data Analysis. In the following, the general procedure of echo chamber detection and evaluation via CSS methods, used in 78 studies, will be presented.

The underlying data sets can be classified into API and scraping data, crowdsourced or donated data, and tracking data. The latter also includes sock puppet studies – bots that impersonate users to analyze platforms or algorithmic systems from the user's perspective [180]. They also differ in their central research focus and granularity. API and scraping studies are predominantly platform-centered, while data donations and tracking data are mainly user-centered [113]. In the case of this corpus of echo chamber research, most of the data sets were API-gathered data sets (Facebook API, and the Twitter/X API back when it still offered free academic access). Some used scraping or tracking via plugins (e.g. Bing toolbar, YouGov). Most data sets were collected from digital traces of users collected on specific platforms, not donated by users.

We find another distinction between the underlying observational trace data sets for echo chamber research: purely structural data (interaction-based) and content-considering data sets. The former data sets consist of interactions between users such as 'likes,' 'posts,' 'comments,' 'friendship,' 'shares,' etc.; the latter use the content of 'posts' and 'comments' to gain insights into the users political leaning, polarization, radicalism or other attributes.

In general, most CSS studies used a form of social network analysis and followed this procedure:

- (1) Gathering social media data through an API or scraping
- (2) Building an undirected graph from this data
- (3) Transforming the undirected graph into a bipartite graph
- (4) Calculating network attributes from this bipartite graph
- (5) Using community detection algorithms to detect clusters of homophilic relationships or use latent space models to find higher order dependencies between users
- (6) Using a specific metric to determine a threshold t which indicates whether there is an echo chamber/multiple echo chambers

API and Scraping Trace data: Interaction and Content Networks. The size of the data sets varied by platform and by study as Figure 9 and Figure 10 show. Data consisted of posts, comments, likes, and other digital traces. Different amounts of users and data were used for the analysis, with interaction-based methods having the advantage that larger data sets could often be examined, whereas content-considering data sets either had to be labeled, cleaned or had to apply resource-intensive Machine Learning (ML) algorithms to make sense of their data. The differences by platform could be related to the platforms' API access restrictions. Studies that included data donated by users included additional information to the traces, but were smaller in size⁷ Data gathering periods differ among studies as well, and most of the studies look at a certain event, such as an election to investigate emerging echo chambers around that event. There

⁷This could make them more prone to selection bias [113].

source	interaction-based data sets	content-considering data sets
Twitter/X API	retweet graph [3, 11, 12, 102, 125, 178, 198, 218], retweet cascades on rumors [4, 48], follower-followee network [30, 36, 53, 139], followers and mentions of political parties [33, 60, 61, 73], hashtags and mentions on specific events with two or more opposite opinions [56, 82, 95, 172], followers [86], hashtags [173] or mentions [98] of candidates of an election process	evaluated shared content [41], shared keywords on political talk shows [45], term frequency in political tweets for a specific event like an election or topic (e.g. climate change, vaccines) [4, 53, 179], shared news URLs with news outlets leaning scores [78, 185, 218], sentiments of posts in a specific group [198] or for a specific topic [203], following specific affiliated accounts of elites and non-elites [11], hashtags for political leaning estimation [12]
Facebook API	activity of users on specific Facebook pages [13, 138, 183], likes, posts, and comments in two labeled groups of Facebook pages 'scientific' and 'conspiracy' [20, 21, 35, 62, 63] and their relation to misinformation [226] debunking posts [225]	sentiments of tweets and their personalities [20], shared news URLs with news outlets leaning scores [9, 49, 64], term / keyword clustered groups [21], users' reactions to ad-hoc articles published on the Corriere della Sera Facebook page [182]
Cross-platform comparison through API trace data	posts, comments, and retweets from Facebook, Twitter/X, Reddit, and Gab [50]	classified tweets (reliable vs. questionable) on Twitter/X and Gab [74], prediction of users polarization on Facebook with YouTube content exposure [19], hate-speech scored posts on Reddit, Twitter/X and Gab [88]
Tracking and sock puppet data sets	desktop and laptop web tracking data (collected by YouGov) [80]	web-browsing records collected via Bing toolbar [79], comparison between TV panel and a second-level laptop/desktop Web browsing panel [156]
Vkontakte scraping	friendship ties and page followers [204]	
Reddit API	subreddits of Clinton and Trump supporters [153]	posts and upvotes in the Men's Rights Movement [174], climate change related subreddit posts [200], subreddit r/news communities interaction, sentiment and demographic data [152], 101 popular subreddits on politics and non-politics [25]
YouTube API	node-centric analysis of recommendations from specific topics [177]	vaccine video comments
Gab API		shared news URLs with news outlets leaning scores [128]
Weibo API		Coded posts addressing genetically modified organisms [211], COVID-19 related content [212, 213].

Table 3. Trace data sets included in the corpus clustered by interaction-based or content based and data source

were also works that examined longer time spans. An overview of interaction-based data sets and content considering data sets can be seen in Table 3.

Graph construction and User attribute estimation. Based on these two types of data sets, the general procedure was to build a graph for every time-dependent sample as social networks are dynamic networks [127] and use interaction (structural data sets) or semantic networks (content-considering data sets)⁸. In the identified studies, nodes often represent users and edges denote interactions between users and interaction of users with content such as posts or hyperlinks to news pages (e.g. [3]). Thus, users can be connected in a graph through edges if they are friends (e.g. [204]) or have shared content. At the same time, the user is connected to posts or news pages that they has shared, thus also creating a semantic network. Each user can be characterized by a vector of node attributes⁹, such as demographic

⁸Graph is represented by $G = (V, E)$ with a node set $V = \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ and edge set $E \subseteq V \times V$.

⁹For a user u in V this vector is denoted by $u_i = (x_{1, \dots, j})^T$




Fig. 9. Trace data set user size per platform (logarithmic scale)




Fig. 10. Trace data set data point (retweets, posts, likes,...) size per platform (logarithmic scale)

information, interests, or activity patterns. The edges can be weighted by the strength of the social tie between users, such as the frequency, intensity of interactions, or a friendship tie.

Some of the content-considering data sets first transformed the network into a weighted, undirected network by computing the pairwise similarities between nodes of the same type (e.g., similarity between users based on their shared interactions with content or friendship ties). They estimated the user attributes like political leaning by calculating ideology scores or political preference ¹⁰ based on the users attributes with an ideology score ranging from -1 (conservative) to 1 (liberal) (e.g. [30]), by shared news pages which were sorted by their political affiliation (e.g. [3], Bakshy et al. [9]), averaging over user’s produced content scores with the number of posts ranging as well from -1 to 1 (e.g. Cinelli et al. [50]) or by their shared content by using sentiment analysis (e.g. [21]).

These user-attribute estimation techniques are, as their name suggests, used to estimate user attributes, such as political leaning, based on the content they consume, share, or interact with. They enable the analysis of interactions between specific groups of attributes. User leaning was also estimated by activity in specific groups (e.g. [21, 51, 174]), by semantics in the posts (e.g. Asatani et al. [4], Cann et al. [41], Colleoni et al. [53], calculation of political slant of visited websites by the user [185], shared news URLs with news outlets leaning score (e.g. [9, 49, 64]).

Then, some content-considering studies introduced a second set of nodes representing content items, such as posts, articles, or tweets. From that a new set of edges between users and content items is defined, such that each user is connected to the content items that they have interacted with or consumed. The resulting two-mode graph has two distinct sets of nodes, such that edges only connect nodes of different sets. This can be done by doing a monopartite or unipartite projection like Radicioni et al. [173] and Cann et al. [41], by using multiple bipartite graphs (e.g. [64]) or just having users connected if they interact through posts and have stronger weights depending on the strength of interactions through posts, retweets or friendship ties (e.g. [9]). Others just used polarization or homophily measures with the interaction network and the estimated user attributes.

¹⁰Calculated through: $f : (x_1, \dots, x_j)^T \rightarrow \{-1, \dots, 1\}$

Community Detection. The next methodological step for most of the social data methods was to use a community detection algorithm, such as the Louvain algorithm¹¹, Leiden algorithm¹² (e.g. [4]), random walk modelling (e.g. [3], [21]), greedy algorithms (e.g. [41]), latent space models¹³ (e.g. [48], Cinelli et al. [49]), flow stability (e.g. [31]) or hierarchical clustering algorithms (e.g. [12]) are used in most cases of the included studies to detect communities in the bipartite graph¹⁴.

In the context of the bipartite graph B , these algorithms are used to detect communities of users who are more likely to interact with content items within their community than with content items outside their community. These communities can be interpreted as echo chambers, where users are exposed to information that reinforces their existing beliefs and opinions, if these communities are communities of like-minded people with similar attributes. To assess the similarity between different users in communities, different metrics are used.

Data-driven CSS Echo Chamber Metrics. Various metrics were used for political leaning estimation of users and correspondingly in the next step for echo chamber detection. Metrics differ based on the underlying data set: interaction-based vs. content-considering and in their granularity. As content-considering methods are used either to measure cross-cutting content exposure of users to detect content-based echo chambers or to estimate user attributes like political leaning for interaction analysis between specific groups of these attributes, metrics for both research directions differ, too. One other distinction can be made between connectionist and positional approaches, where the former concentrate on the network of connections between nodes and how they act as a pathway for diffusion, and the latter concentrate more on how patterns of relations define roles inside networks and less on how the path structure connects nodes throughout a population [127]. Thus, the following categories of metrics are obtained: interaction metrics, cross-cutting content metrics, centrality measures for node-level granularity, polarization, and homophily metrics for group and network levels.

Interaction-based methods use centrality metrics. On a node level, different centrality metrics such as degree centrality, closeness centrality, betweenness centrality, and eigenvector centrality can be used to capture different aspects of a node. These metrics are used to identify influential users within echo chambers [27, 198]. Higher in-degree nodes (used by e.g. [95] and Torregrosa et al. [198]), for example, have a greater number of edges connecting them to adjacent nodes. In the context of echo chamber detection, this can be observed in networks such as retweet networks, where certain accounts receive a larger number of direct retweets, indicating their higher in-degree centrality [198]. Nodes with higher eigenvector centrality (used by Torregrosa et al. [198]) scores are closely connected to other network members who themselves possess high eigenvector centrality scores (used by e.g. [125] and Torregrosa et al. [198]). These nodes can be seen as authorities within the network, exerting influence over other members [125]. Closeness centrality measures the distance from one node to the rest of the nodes in the network. Nodes with high closeness centrality scores are considered disseminators. They have the ability to reach all other accounts in the network more easily [198]. Nodes with higher betweenness centrality are crucial for the flow of information within the network.

¹¹The Louvain algorithm is a greedy agglomerative cluster algorithm that optimizes a modularity score by iteratively merging nodes into communities that maximize the increase in modularity. The modularity score measures the degree to which nodes within a community are more densely connected than nodes outside the community [199].

¹²The Leiden algorithm is an extension of the Louvain algorithm that improves its community quality and scalability by employing a refinement step that further partitions communities into sub-communities [199].

¹³Assumes that nodes in the network belong to one of K latent communities and that the probability of an edge between two nodes depends on their community membership [121]. In latent space models, the goal is to learn a low-dimensional embedding of the nodes in the network, where nodes that are close in the latent space are likely to have similar connectivity patterns.

¹⁴Let $A = \{A_1, \dots, A_q\}$ be a set of node groups defined over V , that is, each $A_i \subseteq V$ for any $i = 1, \dots, q$. Then A_i is a community of G based on some node and edge attributes.

They act as bridges or intermediaries, facilitating the transfer of messages between different nodes. This is particularly interesting for the flow of misinformation and echo chamber mitigation strategies [198]

In summary, centrality measures provide valuable insights into the influential nodes and support a user-based, individual analysis of echo chamber properties. However, larger structures of user interaction behavior is not obtained by centrality measures as user attributes are essential for that. Like centrality measures, modularity as a measure provides a structural perspective by capturing the organization and segregation of communities within the network, offering insights into the potential presence of echo chambers (e.g. [125]).

Many content-considering studies used polarization or homophily measures (used interchangeably), whereby the individual political homophily Boutyline and Willer [30], individual polarity (e.g. [9] Choi et al. [48]) or a polarization score [20, 35, 79] was calculated¹⁵. This measure was sometimes called polarity score and calculated through the distance between two users by their user attributes (e.g. [48]) if group membership could not be used.

Homophily measures capture the tendency of individuals to associate or connect with others who are similar to themselves in terms of attributes, characteristics, or interests [110]. These measures focus on the similarity of attributes among connected nodes in a network. In our corpus echo chamber research, homophily measures, such as ideological homophily – homophily based on political leaning or ideology (e.g. [4, 30, 73]) and demographic homophily – homophily based on demographic user attributes like age, gender, nation, and income – (e.g. [189]), were used to assess the extent to which individuals within echo chambers share similar ideological or demographic characteristics. Not only node-level homophily is interesting for this, but also group-level and network-level homophily [127]. Group-level homophily or group polarization can be calculated by the sum of the homophily of their group members¹⁶[110]. Network-level homophily includes the one network¹⁷ [110] and was used for determining homophily of a whole network (e.g. Asatani et al. [4], Enjolras and Salway [73]). The EI-index is related to that and calculates the difference between out-group ties and in-group ties whereby using a relative homophily measure to other groups (e.g. [36, 120]). Homophily generally emphasizes the preference-based similarities between individuals and captures thereby one of the basic characteristics of echo chambers.

While the measures can also indirectly represent structural trends in a network, homophily studies the propensity for people to connect with those who share their qualities or traits and does not directly capture the structural organization of these groups. This is why it is often combined with community detection. The strong association of homophily and polarization measures used in the corpus, especially in connection to conceptualizations of echo chambers as homophily demonstrates the importance and advantages of using homophily measures in CSS echo chamber research.

3.3.2 Survey. Out of all the analyzed studies, 20 were surveys. Most of these surveys were longitudinal, meaning they collected data over a period of time, whereas a few were cross-sectional. About half of the surveys were conducted in the USA (a total of 8), and only 5 of these studies addressed the echo chamber hypothesis directly. The rest of the studies examined elective exposure of social media users, news consumption and sharing behavior, extremism, and voting patterns. As Figure 7 demonstrates, most survey studies conceptualized echo chambers with content exposure. These studies mostly researched how much cross-cutting content users self-report via their media usage. User behavior survey studies researched specific user behavior that is associated with echo chambers.

¹⁵ $h_i(v) = \frac{d_i(v)}{d(v)}$ for any $v \in A_i$ and for d_i being the degree of a node v , where A_i is a specific group (e.g. following conservative party members vs. all the followers [30] or number of liberal friends vs. number of all friends [204])

¹⁶ $H_i = \frac{\sum_{v \in A_i} d_i(v)}{\sum_{v \in A_i} d(v)}$

¹⁷ $H_i = \frac{\sum_{v \in V} d_s(v)}{\sum_{v \in V} d(v)}$

Self-reported survey data sets. In both cross-sectional and longitudinal studies, some surveys were conducted around election periods. This means that panels were usually surveyed before and after the elections or a three-wave panel was used. In cross-sectional studies, participants were surveyed either shortly before or after an election. The longitudinal studies are all panels that were either built around elections or drawn from existing panels such as household panels (e.g. [39]), panels about migration (e.g. [222]) or social media and internet panels (e.g. [161]).

Out of all survey studies, 17 looked at general social media usage or the whole media diet, while only two looked at specific platforms. Masip et al. [136], e.g., analyzed social media usage on Facebook, Instagram, and Twitter/X, focusing on news sharing behavior in Spain. Similarly, Beam et al. [15] examined news polarization on Facebook before and after the 2016 US elections. Interestingly, both studies found no echo chambers or polarization through social media, contrary to homophily studies.

18 surveys that focused on content exposure have examined the entire media landscape and compared the content exposure of social media with other media outlets. Dubois and Blank [68], for instance, studied the use of other media and found that social media is only one part of the users' media diet and argued that echo chamber research has to include a wide variety of media usage.

Some survey studies ($n = 14$) examine the role of user attitudes in shaping online behavior and mitigating the effects of echo chambers. For example, the study by Dubois et al. [69] examines the effects of fact-checking, political interest, and opinion leadership on individuals' exposure to different viewpoints and their susceptibility to echo chamber effects. Similarly, studies by Koivula et al. [123] and Zerback and Kobilke [222] examine the role of political activity, extreme attitudes, and interpersonal communication in reinforcing or counteracting echo chambers in online communities. Studies by Chan et al. [46], Boulianne et al. [29], and Neely [157] explore how factors like internal political efficacy, personality, and social network structures influence individuals' interactions with political content and their susceptibility to echo chamber effects. The focus is placed on user behavior and thus also conceptualized and operationalized by investigating how specific user attributes, such as political interest, change content exposure. There is little focus here on the social environment of the users but instead on what content they are exposed to with certain behaviors or specific attributes, such as fear of isolation or personality traits.

Measures. Survey research involves a broad set of measures like political engagement, media consumption, and specific topics like climate change, misinformation, COVID-19, vaccines, news dissemination, and other forms of media use such as TV and newspapers. The studies use between 5 and 41 items to gather data from a participant pool of 198 to 11052 individuals. Control variables are mainly demographics and political ideology. To evaluate the broader societal implications of echo chamber behavior, researchers use dependent variables that we group into four categories: (1) political engagement and behavior, (2) media consumption and exposure, (3) homophily and polarization measures, (4) trust in specific information and misinformation sharing. Political engagement and behavior measures include political engagement (e.g., following political news, expressing political views), social media behavior and impact (e.g., reliance on Facebook, unfriending/unfollowing due to political posts) polarization, satisfaction with democracy, political ideology, party affiliation, and affective polarization, news consumption habits (e.g., interest in hard news, news trust). Media consumption and exposure metrics include exposure to various news sources (e.g., news websites, TV news) and engagement with news, social media usage and attitudes, and perception of the public sphere, universal news access, and privacy concerns. Homophily and other echo chamber measures include like-minded discussion, perceived

viewpoint diversity exposure, and cognitive attitude extremity¹⁸. Trust in information and misinformation measures include trust in news sources, traditional media use for COVID-19, and vaccine hesitancy.

3.3.3 Experiments. Ten experiments are part of the corpus. Such experiments include observing test subjects while they follow a bot that shares certain types of political content, experiments with their own newsfeeds or self-constructed platforms, or even sock puppet studies, where bots generate online content and collect what content they encounter. Most experiments focus on user behavior (e.g. [155]), recommender systems' influence on echo chamber creation (mostly through sock puppet studies like e.g. [149, 217]), on extremism and misinformation (e.g. [219]). Like surveys, these experiments used operationalizations that isolated the effects of echo chambers by controlling for variables like demographics and political ideology.

Figure 11 demonstrates that most experimental studies find echo chambers. These findings point mostly to individual behavior like selective exposure, extremism, and anger. Data sets for experiments vary from 102 to 1652 users. They can be categorized into (1) sock puppet data, (2) user-centric data, and (3) trace data experiments. Sock puppet experiments (Minh Pham et al. [149], Mosleh et al. [155], Whittaker et al. [217]) used bots that mimic user behavior on Twitter/X, YouTube, and Weibo. In contrast to trace data, bots enable real-world experiments on platforms which comes with the advantage of controlled experiments but is limited to a certain number of bots and has to be ethically evaluated. Sock puppet studies used measures like the directed clustering coefficient, connection density, strong and weak co-partisanship and counter-partisanship¹⁹, social attentiveness, attitude consistency, algorithmic polarization, and extremist media index. User-centric data sets were used e.g. in an eye-tracking study by Suelflow et al. [191] which used measures like political affiliation, affective polarization, perceived polarization, contact to immigrants, and political interest. trace data experiments like the experiment by Bail et al. [8] measure the change of affiliation after the experiment through a survey.

3.3.4 Mixed Methods. Six of the included studies used a mixed methods approach. The main idea of mixed methods approaches is to have different perspectives and granularities in echo chamber research and platform research. Most mixed methods approaches studied a particular platform; some did a cross-platform analysis (e.g., Kitchens et al. [122]). Most mixed-method studies focused either on user behavior, recommender systems' influence on echo chamber creation (mainly through sock puppet studies), or extremism and misinformation. Most link survey data with trace data, and some link experiments or surveys with trace data. As Figure 11 suggests, mixed methods approaches have mixed results. Here again, studies using homophily as a conceptualization tend to have affirming results on the echo chamber hypothesis, and studies using context exposure tend to have negative findings. All but two mixed method studies used trace data and analyzed user groups ranging from 2000 to 42600 users (e.g., Matz [140]). The other two studies mixed impression data with surveys (e.g., Hilbert et al. [105]). The survey and trace data linking approaches used categories of accounts: media elite, political elite, and non-elite (Eady et al. [70]), distinct news sites, slant dispersion, reverse Gini index, audience variety, mean slant, cross-cutting proportion (Kitchens et al. [122]), Big Five Personality Traits (Matz [140]), and a combination of cognitive reflection and co-follower network (Mosleh et al. [155]). The two studies that combined impression data and surveys used attitude polarization, anger, and emotional valence (Hilbert et al. [105]).

¹⁸Meaning an attitude that is cognitively explainable and is not less emotionally based as affective attitudes Zerback and Kobilke [222].

¹⁹This means that users with ties on social media share partisanship for a party or not [?]. Particularly important and tied to two-party systems.




Fig. 11. Overview of positive, negative, and mixed findings from echo chamber research, categorized by operationalization. The heatmap shows a high percentage of positive outcomes in CSS and negative outcomes in surveys, with a balanced distribution in experimental and mixed methods.




Fig. 12. Heatmap of coded outcomes in echo chamber studies, categorized by properties, antecedents, and effects, across varying research methods. Darker colors indicate higher occurrence rates, with polarization effect dominating in CSS.

3.4 Findings on Echo Chambers Properties

The following sections will present outcomes about echo chamber properties, which include results on the echo chamber hypothesis and echo chamber properties.

3.4.1 Echo chamber hypothesis.

Positive Findings. Overall, the range of outcomes in echo chamber research points to a significant divergence of findings and their evaluations by researchers. Despite this dissent, the prevailing trend in the findings leans towards the affirmation of the echo chamber hypothesis.

It has been found in multiple studies that social media activity is characterized by attitude-based homophily. These phenomena occur among segregated networks of like-minded individuals in distinct groups such as “scientific” and “conspiracy” communities ([20], [62], [183] [225]), “Democrats” and “Republicans”, or groups centered around specific events like the Polish elections in 2015 [13], the impeachment of the Brazilian President Dilma Rousseff [56], the French presidential elections in 2017 [86], or the 2016 U.S. elections [98].

This association aligns with the results depicted in Figure 7 and Figure 12, which suggests a correlation between conceptualization, operationalization and outcomes of studies. Research framing echo chambers through homophily and measuring it by user interactions within specific communities frequently support the hypothesis. However, many studies concentrate on inherently polarized groups or particular events. In contrast, studies conceptualizing echo chambers as epistemic communities where users engage with a narrow spectrum of content that aligns with their beliefs often find less support for the hypothesis, presenting primarily negative results. While these definitions are associated with their respective operationalization, the trend is evident across various studies.

Mixed Findings, No effect or Overstated. 21 studies had mixed findings. They found segregated communities or tendencies for echo chambers, but only under certain limitations, assumptions, or in partial communities.

These studies found segregated communities in the Catalan parliamentary relations network on Twitter/X but not in the retweet network [60], on specific events where users tend to group themselves around authority hubs [95], in the

Hungarian Twitter/X follower-followee network but not in the Polish one [138], and in the Subreddit on the Men's Rights Movement Online [174].

For example, Flaxman et al. [79] find that individuals tend to engage with publications that align closely with their ideologies. Interestingly, despite this, there is a somewhat counterintuitive discovery that these echo chambers are linked to increased exposure to opposing viewpoints and mirror offline reading habits. As a result, this research presents evidence supporting both sides of the debate on echo chambers, emphasizing that the observed effects are relatively modest in magnitude.

Others find that specific platforms tend to show echo chambers. Kitchens et al. [122] have found that increased Facebook usage is connected with higher information source variety and a move toward more partisan news sites; increased Reddit use is associated with increased diversity and a shift toward more moderate sites. Increased Twitter/X usage is only associated with little to no change in either [122]. Nikolov et al. [160] found that popularity and homogeneity bias occur in all Internet activities, but they vary greatly depending on the platform used to be exposed to content [160].

Dubois et al. [69] found that political involvement and media variety reduce the risk of being in an echo chamber. They find that the amount of media a person consumes is anti-proportional to their chance of being trapped in an echo chamber. Users who consume more media are less likely to become members of an echo chamber. However, Dubois et al. [69] found only minimal indication of echo chambers when examining the complete multi-media environment [69]. Justwan et al. [119] found a small echo chamber effect for Republicans, but none for Democrats in their survey in the aftermath of the 2016 US election [119].

Negative Findings. 23 studies found no evidence of echo chambers and rejected the echo chamber hypothesis. Beam et al. [15] found no evidence of echo chambers on Facebook. Users of Facebook news who were less polarized after the initial wave of data collection were more likely to depolarize further due to less cross-partisan exposure [15]. Accordingly, Eady et al. [70] found that ideological distributions of media accounts followed by the most liberal and conservative quintiles showed more significant overlap than separation. Like Barbera et al. [11] they find that social media could expose users to the content of weak ties and thereby diversify their exposure [70]. Nordbrandt [161] found that if a user begins to use social media, their usage does not impact their level of affective polarization, which is dependent on their sympathy for specific parties over time. Interestingly, affective polarization affects social media usage depending on the history of previous usage of social media [161].

Dubois and Blank [68] found that the amount of media a person chooses to include in their routine is proportional to their risk of getting trapped in an echo chamber. Having varied media allows exposure to various information and viewpoints. Thus, Dubois and Blank [68] found no evidence of echo chambers when they analyzed politically interested users [68]. Bail et al. [7]'s found that social media consumption increases exposure to non-partisan content.

Most of the studies that reject the echo chamber hypothesis have analyzed cross-cutting content and conceptualized echo chambers as content exposure. Thus, there is little evidence for content exposure on social media; communities where users are only exposed to a few cross-cutting contents, often called filter bubbles, do not emerge as users are exposed to a broad media environment. However, echo chambers seem to be associated with political interest and activity.

3.4.2 User Engagement and Echo Chambers. The papers that examine echo chambers report various additional effects and properties of echo chambers alongside their findings on the echo chamber hypothesis. In connection with the echo chamber hypothesis, it was found that the more active a user is on social media, the more likely they are to be in like-minded or partisan groups. This observation occurs in a variety of research papers. It suggests that social networks

have a compelling feature wherein the loudest and most present voice usually gets heard the most. However, research must be cautious about active users, who are the ones who engage on the platform significantly often. If research studies restrict their studies to active users, it can lead to biases. In the following, we will briefly present research concerning echo chambers on active and core users, who are influential users in the network.

Aruguete et al. [3] showed that ideological congruence and issue salience correlate; users on the left and right of the political spectrum are more politically engaged about topics and more inclined to share news consistent with their ideologies. This may explain why users with extreme ideologies are overrepresented in observational trace data and may lead to biases when observing the polarization of platforms. Fitting with the active users who are more prone to be in echo chambers, core users have been found to have specific characteristics in contrast to peripheral users [185]. Core users are active users who are densely connected to other users by communication or friendship ties, whereas peripheral users are less densely connected. Guarino et al. [95] call these nodes hub and authority nodes. They are said to play an essential role in the development of echo chambers, and it has been discovered that core users are more likely to participate in the early stages of the information cascade [4]²⁰. This could be a decision in a social network like “liking a post” which influences the virality of that post. Thus, core users are more influential in producing viral posts than peripheral users [62]. Furthermore, early user involvement with information is a reliable indicator of favored community affiliation and, thus, the creation of echo chambers [20]. The relationship between these users and top influencers raises the potential that the latter group’s radical beliefs impact the whole community [4]. Furthermore, in several works, the initial connections and initial content of the networks shown by recommendation systems were found to be essential for further graph progression and the further embedding of the user in specific subgroups of the social network ([173], [168], [194], [76]). In summary, a few very dense connected users were found to have a significant influence on the emergence of echo chambers, and the initial conditions of a network and the initialization of information cascades are essential for further network change and behavior.

3.5 Antecedents of echo chambers

The following will present outcomes about echo chamber antecedents, such as certain groups and user behavior, selective exposure, content moderation and recommender systems, as well as polarization and fragmentation.

3.5.1 Group behavior. We have introduced group behavior as a conceptualization for echo chambers. According to this, certain group behaviors or attributes are responsible for or define the existence of echo chambers. A few studies ($n = 10$) have looked at how certain group behaviors, such as discrediting other people and groups²¹, contribute to the emergence of echo chambers and polarisation. We will take a brief look at some of these studies. They are operationalized through avoidance, unfriending, affective polarisation, discreditation, and silencing²².

Neely [157] provides some insight into how individual political leanings and perceptions of information credibility influence avoidance behaviors on social media platforms. They demonstrate a correlation between reliance on social media for political content and the tendency towards politically motivated unfriending, notably through the discreditation of opposing views. Particularly during the polarized atmosphere of the 2020 U.S. election, such behaviors were observed more frequently among Republicans, potentially due to their heightened engagement with social media for political information. Despite partisan affiliation not being a direct predictor of avoidance, a significant relationship was

²⁰An information cascade is a user’s observance of other users’ behavior, mostly a binary decision, followed by copying that behavior and thus producing a sequence of these actions similar to herd behavior [71].

²¹Related to Nguyen [159]’s definition of echo chambers as an epistemic social structure where other relevant voices were actively discredited or excluded.

²²Very similar to exclusion and discreditation. Related to the spiral of silence meaning that social media could lead to a vocal minority overshadowing the silent majority [39].

found between intensity of partisanship and the likelihood of engaging in avoidance behaviors. Accordingly, Powers et al. [170] notes that college students often view the expression of political opinions online as a potential threat to their civic identity, leading to a reticence in sharing personal political views. This tendency to self-censor is rooted in a desire to avoid conflict within ideologically congruent social networks, indicating a strategic approach to maintaining social harmony.

Conversely, Beam et al. [15] observes an increased exposure to counter-attitudinal news among Facebook users seeking news, suggesting a potential pathway to depolarization on social media. This contrasts the anticipated effect of consonant news exposure, which was expected to amplify affective polarization but did not manifest as such. Burnett et al. [39] applies the spiral of silence theory to social media, suggesting that the platform dynamics might invert traditional silencing mechanisms, leading to a vocal minority overshadowing the silent majority. This study underscores significant ideological variances in self-censorship practices and fears of isolation, illuminating the complex interplay between political identity and the willingness to engage in public discourse.

In general, while we see a tendency here that certain groups collectively unfriend each other before elections, and these tend to be more conservative groups, few research papers have used this conceptualization of echo chambers, and few have examined them as antecedents.

3.5.2 User Attributes and behavior . Several studies find user behavior an important factor contributing to echo chambers, as illustrated in Figure 12. Researchers have investigated this mechanism and identified selective exposure as a major cause of echo chambers. However, it remains unclear how selective exposure and recommendation systems interact with each other, given that previous studies have focused on one or the other. Interestingly, despite selective exposure, many users still choose various media. This can even amplify the echo chamber effect since exposure to counter-opinions may reinforce one's own opinion when combined with anger and discreditation. Consequently, some studies analyzed demographics, emotions, and personality traits as antecedents of echo chambers.

For example, Barbera et al. [11]'s study finds liberals are more likely to engage in cross-ideological interactions on social media platforms than conservatives. Bodo et al. [23] introduces the concept of producer-focused news personalization, highlighting a demographic divide where younger, less educated users are less exposed to non-personalized news content and show minimal concern for news diversity. This underscores the role of personalization algorithms in shaping news consumption patterns, potentially contributing to the echo chamber effect. Chan et al. [46] and Dubois et al. [69] further discuss the role of political efficacy and interest, noting that media diversity and political interest correlate with a reduced likelihood of being in an echo chamber. These findings suggest that political engagement and exposure to a broad spectrum of media can reduce the risk of falling into echo chambers.

Boulianne and Koc-Michalska [28], Matz [140] analyze personality traits as antecedents of echo chambers, finding that openness to experience and extraversion are associated with a higher likelihood of engaging in political discourse and encountering diverse viewpoints. Conversely, those who are older, less educated, introverted, and conscientious may be more prone to participating in like-minded discussions, indicating that personality and demographics predict engagement in political talk across both online and offline settings. This suggests that echo chambers are not solely the product of ideological segregation but are significantly influenced by individual differences in personality and social behaviors.

Thus, some studies find that users are responsible for choosing the content that corresponds most with their own opinions, demonstrating selective exposure or confirmation bias. Alternatively, some studies find that personality, demographics, and party-affiliation are correlated with a user being in an echo chamber.

3.5.3 Content Moderation and Recommender Systems. Much of the theoretical research suggests that content moderation and recommender systems are the main drivers of echo chambers, and particularly as conceptualized as content exposure. Especially, Pariser [165] claims that recommender systems could be responsible for reduced content exposure and increasing opinion polarization. However, while only 23 studies in the corpus have explored the relationship between recommender systems and echo chambers, research still needs to examine the connection between content moderation and echo chambers. It is worth noting that social media platforms rely heavily on both content moderation and recommender systems to shape the content users interact with online. Given this, it is surprising that the link between content moderation and echo chambers has not been researched. This is, however, related to the lack of research access to content moderation practices Gorwa et al. [91], Hartmann et al. [103].

We will briefly discuss the research on recommender systems.

First, as mentioned earlier in the section on granularity, self-adjustable algorithmic recommendation systems have been found to reduce echo chamber effects and polarization in Reddit networks this indicates the influence of recommendation systems and providing a rare opportunity to observe and test the impact of changes in recommendation algorithms live on a social network. For example, during the 2016 elections, Morales et al. [153] concluded that echo chambers are not present on Reddit because they did not observe homophilic behavior or polarization. They suggest that this may be due to the possibility for users to adjust the recommendation algorithm. Moreover, in a direct comparison of news consumption on Facebook and Reddit by Cinelli et al. [50], significant disparities were found across platforms regarding homophilic tendencies in network structure and biases in information diffusion toward like-minded people.

Accordingly, Whittaker et al. [217] observed that an account mainly engaged with far-right materials was twice as likely to be shown extreme content and 1.3 times more likely to be suggested fringe content on YouTube. When consumers connect with far-right content on YouTube, it is magnified to them in the future. On the other hand, Reddit's recommendation algorithm does not appear to promote extreme content. Thus, the differences in the recommendation systems of Reddit and YouTube suggest that there is indeed an influence of recommendation systems on the emergence of echo chambers [217].

Other research has also found that the YouTube algorithm promotes echo chambers. Kaiser and Rauchfleisch [120] and Whittaker et al. [217] have found that the algorithm influences echo chamber formation for YouTube. Kaiser and Rauchfleisch [120] argue that YouTube's algorithms foster far-right communities in the US and Germany. They clarify that this does not imply that users will unquestioningly accept these recommendations, but instead that there is a risk of users being pushed into problematic isolated communities and show that there is a causal influence of echo chamber emergence on YouTube and the recommendation system [120].

Furthermore, some studies suggest that recommendation systems significantly influence a user's initial creation of the network. This influence is significant because the nature of the initial network is essential for the overall development of the network and the creation of echo chambers as we have discussed before. Hilbert et al. [105]'s findings imply that algorithmic recommendations are responsive to users' initial emotions – conveyed to the algorithm in the user's search and watch choices – and express statistically significant positive and negative effects on users.

The initial connections and initial content of the networks shown by recommendation systems are generally essential for further graph progression and embedding of the user in specific subgroups of the social network as shown by Radicioni et al. [173], Perra and Rocha [168], and Taylor et al. [194].

Finally, some studies that found echo chambers to be overstated observed that recommendation systems do not significantly influence the creation of echo chambers. Correspondingly, Donkers and Ziegler [66] found that randomly selected users and tweets can assist in breaking down echo chamber boundaries. However, they also find that bridging

between communities becomes noticeably more difficult when there is pre-emptive skepticism of external sources, as it was described by discreditation.

In general, it is not easy to assess the degree of responsibility of recommendation algorithms on the emergence of echo chambers. Most studies find that they are responsible; others see echo chambers' causes as the user's confirmation bias or the projected fragmentation of society on the social platform. However, direct comparisons between social platforms show differences in echo chamber formation. Reddit, which has a user-modifiable recommendation algorithm, shows no evidence of echo chambers. On the other hand, other platforms that do not have such features show evidence of echo chambers. Thus, there is more evidence that recommendation algorithms cause the emergence of echo chambers.

The limited access to platform data and the lack of transparency in how recommendation systems work on different platforms make it difficult to understand their effects. We anticipate that upcoming legislation provisions, such as mandatory audits and vetted researcher access, will offer new opportunities to evaluate and scrutinize the impact of recommendation algorithms on the creation of echo chambers. It will also be beneficial to compare platforms and study a variety of them, especially since most platforms have closed their APIs. We suggest that researchers conduct cross-platform studies, compare platforms with similar research methods, and use mixed-methods approaches to understand how recommendation algorithms affect the creation of echo chambers.

3.5.4 Polarization and Fragmentation of the Public Sphere. Although the echo chamber hypothesis predicts that echo chambers exist and lead to polarisation and subsequent fragmentation of society, most of the research is correlational and not causal. Thus, the direction of causation is unclear, and it could be that the polarisation and fragmentation of society are reflected on social media. Therefore, we look at research that examines these two as antecedents of echo chambers.

For example, Bright [33] found indications that a political party's status within the political system influences how the parties interact with technology: Bigger parties appeared to contact other organizations less frequently. Remarkably, parties who are more politically successful outside of social media are also more detached online. This is crucial because it demonstrates that online fragmentation is not only the product of individual online decisions; the offline environment also has an influence.

Bastos et al. [12] found echo chambers in the Brexit campaign. Even after adjusting for highly engaged users and seasonal fluctuations, echo chamber communication remained widespread in the Brexit discussion. They identified a spatial reliance on echo-chamber communication by studying the complete network as well as out- and cross-bubble subgraphs. They separated the amount of geographic proximity related to consonant information from exposure to diverse information by separating in-, out-, and cross-bubble communication. They found a correlation between the offline and the online community. According to them, these findings cast doubt on the notion that echo chambers are solely a communication effect brought on by online conversation.

Nordbrandt [161] found no support for the hypothesis that social media use contributes to the level of affective polarization. Instead, Nordbrandt [161]'s results support the idea that the level of affective polarization affects subsequent use of social media. The results also revealed heterogeneous patterns among individuals, depending on their previous social media usage and across different social media platforms. This study calls into question the predominating assumption of the other research that social media is a significant driver of societal polarization.

Some studies show tendencies that offline communities also influence the network topology of online networks. However, the extent of this influence has been under-researched. These considerations have not been integrated enough and should be given more attention in the future.

3.6 Effects of echo chambers

The following sections will present outcomes about echo chamber effects, such as polarization, belief and proliferation of misinformation, and extremism.

3.6.1 Polarization and Fragmentation of the public sphere. Figure 12 presents the number of papers that affirm an effect of echo chambers. We see that nearly a third of the included studies find polarization to be associated with echo chambers. We discussed the problem of directions of associations. However, most studies only analyzed the direction of echo chambers, increasing polarization and increased fragmentation – as the echo chamber hypothesis claims. Polarization is a phenomenon where individuals with similar beliefs tend to agree stronger. At the same time, individuals identified with groups with contrary beliefs tend to disagree more deeply [110].

Most research operationalized the analysis for the effect by observing specific communities that have opposing views on a political case or agenda with CSS and observing if the polarization increases with increased social media use. Polarization is mainly measured as the distance between mean political leanings in these communities. However, other operationalizations include affective polarization (operationalized through surveys and experiments), bimodality coefficients, and various polarization metrics related to homophily. Fragmentation was measured through the size and density of communities when the whole platform was observed. However, fragmentation—contrary to polarization—is understudied in the corpus. The results of these studies are similar to those discussed in the section on the echo chamber hypothesis. Although various studies suggest that polarization could be caused by other media or factors other than social media, most studies find that polarization and fragmentation of society are effects of echo chambers present on social media. Thus, real-world polarization on topics is, to a certain extent, caused by the emergence of echo chambers online. However, most of the corpus research did not study the association’s causal direction.

3.6.2 Misinformation. A theme often discussed in connection with echo chambers is misinformation. 23 corpus works touch upon the belief or spread of misinformation as an effect of echo chambers, and seven specifically focus on misinformation concerning echo chambers.

One of the most influential studies regarding the relationship between echo chambers and spread in misinformation is that of Del Vicario et al. [62]. The authors argue that for two groups of Facebook pages, “conspiracy” and “scientific”, users tended to select and distribute content related to a single narrative while ignoring the rest. Although the echo chamber hypothesis was not the primary emphasis of the study, the authors make a significant attempt to demonstrate that homophily is the primary driver of the spread of content. According to the authors, polarization and echo chambers are these communities’ root causes of misinformation. An intriguing finding is that the cascade for both clusters peaks in the first two hours, indicating that the start of information cascades is critical for developing opinion clusters [62].

As discussed in the section on active users, specific hub nodes are pivotal in disseminating information within networks, influencing the emergence of echo chambers [4]. Here, a solid connection between the emergence of echo chambers and the spread of misinformation can be found. Choi et al. [48] find that a few very well-connected users are responsible for a lot of the misinformation spread and the creation of echo chambers. Ten percent of the hub communities are responsible for 36 % of retweets of misinformation. These results, combined with the finding that the beginning of a misinformation cascade is critical for the development of opinion clusters [62], allow an essential insight into the relationship between echo chambers and misinformation. It is necessary to analyze and understand only specific users and communities with similar attributes and strong network connections to comprehend the spread

of particular misinformation. This awareness has already been implemented by various organizations concerned with understanding radical right-wing and conspiracy ideological misinformation on the Internet and its dissemination.

In addition, Schmidt et al. [182] have shown the connection of anti-vaccination communities to misinformation as a result of user consumption behaviors as well as the fact that users are highly polarized; that is, the majority of users exclusively consume and generate content that is either pro or anti vaccinations [182]. This topic has received general interest since the emergence of COVID-19 and has produced many studies about misinformation and echo chambers.

To summarize the corpus literature on misinformation, spreading false information is closely related to the formation of echo chambers. The influential and highly connected users mentioned earlier, who are key factors in the emergence of these echo chambers, also have a hand in creating and spreading misinformation. It is, therefore, imperative to give special attention to these densely connected nodes when delving into research on echo chambers and misinformation.

3.6.3 Populism and Extremism. Fourteen studies analyzed the relationship between extremism and echo chambers. The results of these studies are examined briefly below. In a study by Wolfowicz et al. [219], survey data was collected from Facebook users who had never used Twitter/X in 2019. The study also analyzed trace data from ego-centric network of Twitter/X to analyze the effects on the justification for suicide bombings. The results indicate new Twitter/X users are more likely to receive recommendations and ideas from celebrities, organizations, influencers, and political personalities and groups. The Twitter/X algorithms select accounts congruent with a user's profile and tastes, creating "weak ties" that could increase the probability of radicalization. However, despite their ideological similarity, these profiles are unlikely to reciprocate with a "follow" and are classified as external ties at the network level. Accordingly, Torregrosa et al. [198] find that user relevance in the network is associated with extremist content. These findings align with those on misinformation; as both topics are related, this is not unexpected.

Boutyline and Willer [30] have found that conservatives in the US tend to be more homophilic than liberals on Twitter/X and, thus, are more prone to radicalization. Their results show that the conservative homophily rates are 3.8 times higher than the liberal ones. They find a correlation between ideologically extreme individuals and homophily, as these individuals tend to be more homophilic than non-extreme users. These results suggest that homophily might provide a structural advantage to mobilizing right-wing or politically extreme groups [30]. These findings are noteworthy, as they demonstrate the presence of homophily in social networks and its impact on creating echo chambers. This could potentially lead to radicalization among existing homophilic communities on social media. However, Boulianne et al. [29] find no evidence that social media is associated with more right-wing populism but reflects the offline communities.

Additionally, a study conducted by Bright [33] indicates that while there is considerable communication between groups with differing ideologies, there is a tendency for those who hold radical beliefs to engage in fewer conversations with individuals who hold opposing viewpoints or more moderate versions of their radical position. This might imply that the degree of conviction with which people hold opinions, rather than ideological distinctions between individuals, is the most crucial component for echo chambers [33].

Whittaker et al. [217] use sock puppet accounts to analyze the recommendation systems of three online platforms in their interaction with far-right content. The findings reveal that YouTube's algorithm amplifies extreme and fringe content, while Reddit and Gab's algorithms do not. The study also highlights the lack of policy instruments for dealing with algorithmic amplification and emphasizes the need for more transparency in existing policies. [217] To sum up the findings, the research corpus has established a correlation between radicalization and the phenomenon of echo chambers. Homophilic communities have been identified as key drivers of radicalization. However, causal evidence for this effect is missing and as the study by Boulianne et al. [29] suggest the direction of association could be vice versa.

4 DISCUSSION AND LIMITATIONS

4.1 Discussion

The results of our systematic review indicated that different conceptualizations and operationalizations yielded varying outcomes. The majority of studies that conceptualized echo chambers as homophily - the tendency of people to engage with like-minded individuals - found that echo chambers do exist and have significant impacts on fragmentation in social media, belief and spread of misinformation, and potential for radicalization. This conceptualization was often based on e.g. friendship or follower/followee networks. Additionally, there was a trend towards more evidence supporting selective exposure as another conceptualization. On the other hand, echo chambers - which are exclusive spaces with the omission of external voices - produced mixed results, and content exposure studies related to surveys predominantly found no evidence for echo chambers.

The studies included in this review lack evidence of content exposure echo chambers, despite studies that have conceptualized echo chambers as such. These studies have primarily focused on the amount of cross-cutting content users are exposed to and their additional media consumption. However, numerous studies have shown that cross-cutting content is still present outside of social networks and search engines. The results concerning Reddit indicate that a free choice of the functionality of the recommender system points to a reduction of echo chambers.

The findings are valuable for further research on echo chambers, their causes and effects, and for understanding topics like opinion dynamics, recommendation systems, confirmation bias, and the spread of misinformation on the internet. It's important to note that content exposure or filter bubbles are not the primary issue, but rather the influence of homophily and specific user behavior like selective exposure. This understanding can lead to significant policy decisions and a deeper understanding of associations with radicalization and misinformation. While techniques like nudges or bubble-bursting techniques may not be effective for mitigating echo chambers, future research may uncover more evidence to support their use. Further research, however, is required to delve into the correlation between group behavior and echo chambers. Although Nguyen [159] theoretical explication of echo chambers is clear and useful, there exists only little quantitative research that has implemented this definition.

Moreover, the various operationalizations of echo chambers have yielded differing outcomes. The majority of CSS studies using trace data affirmed the echo chamber hypothesis, whereas surveys relying on self-reported data tend to reject them as non-existent or exaggerated. These findings are consistent with research by Terren and Borge [195], which highlight the inherent difficulties of both methods and their connection to the concept of echo chambers. CSS studies tend to focus on homophily, while surveys typically explore content exposure and selective exposure. Experiments put group and user behavior into focus.

These distinctions also reflect the methodological limitations of each approach. Research methods have their own set of advantages and disadvantages that need to be considered. For example, CSS allows researchers to unobtrusively observe behavioral choices - of potentially non-representative groups - in the natural environment of social media over time without social-desirability bias and measurement error [11] and is easy to access. This is true, in particular, for European researchers with the upcoming Digital Services Act in the EU and was true before API closures.

Surveys have precisely these problems, also about homophily, as Boutyline and Willer [30] show. Measures derived solely from respondents capture only perceived homophily, which may greatly exaggerate its actual levels. If studies can infer the characteristics (e.g., by content analysis or follower/followee networks) of individuals who engage in such behavior by generating valid estimates of the ideological positions of social media users, that can help researchers identify key individuals or groups that play a central role in shaping the structure of social networks and influencing

the flow of information [11] provides a powerful tool for analyzing large-scale social networks and understanding the dynamics of polarization and exposure [125]²³. However, homophily measures and CSS also have problems regarding methods and validity.

First, the presence of bots in social media is a concern for trace data [178], and while Gallwitz and Kreil [83] argue that the role of social bots is overestimated, other studies (e.g. [158]) suggest that right-wing parties may benefit from them. For example, when Twitter/X deleted millions of bots in 2017, radical right parties' European MPs lost the most followers [186]. One solution to this issue is the use of ML estimators for bot detection, as suggested by Rusche [178] and used by e.g. [48], Bastos et al. [12], and Gaumont et al. [86].

One major limitation of social network analysis with observational data is that causal inference from observational data is challenging. While CSS can identify relationships and connections between individuals or groups, it cannot prove that one factor directly causes another. The associations identified through CSS may be due to other underlying factors or may have another direction [81, 207]. This is because there may be other underlying factors that are responsible for the observed patterns in the data. The possibility that for example fragmentation or polarization in society causes polarization in social media instead of the other way around, as it was discussed above²⁴.

Selection bias is one major challenge in connection to echo chamber research with CSS. Not only that user attributes have to be estimated and are prone to errors, demographics of users are often unknown. Rusche [178] further argues that small groups of active users can multiply their influence online and Aruguete et al. [3] showed that ideological congruence and issue salience are correlated, users on the left and right of the political spectrum are more politically engaged about topics and more inclined to share news that is consistent with their ideologies. This may explain why ideologues are overrepresented in observational trace data and thus may lead to selection bias when observing the polarization of platforms. Additionally, approaches such as those used in studies by Bessi et al. [21], Bessi et al. [20], Del Vicario et al. [63], Del Vicario et al. [62], and Brugnoli et al. [35] that rely on self-selected samples of partisan individuals like 'scientific' and 'conspiracy' have limited explanatory value for the whole social network as they only describe behavior in a small subset without making causal claims [11]²⁵.

Besides selection bias, most works that infer causal claims from observational data as the counterfactual framework or potential outcomes framework have a "no interference assumption" [207], meaning that an individual's treatment should not be affected by another individual's treatment.²⁶ Nonetheless, some attempts to overcome these issues were made. The use of longitudinal data for example can help to separate network influence from selection and has

²³If data-driven CSS does not rely on text-processing techniques for ideological position estimation, it is not subject to the methodological limitations associated with textual or content analysis. Although content-based identification is more accurate than e.g. latent space models which on the other hand can be subject to biases concerning the choice of model parameters and assumption Barbera [10] or subject to circularity (e.g. infer political position by network structure and then explain the network structure by the political positions), it is also more time-consuming and sometimes requires a significant amount of labeled training data (e.g. [62]), which is rarely present or must be carefully collected and labeled. Therefore, content-considering methods perform well for historical events with sample data but struggle to adjust to novel situations (such as the Russia-Ukraine war) [125].

²⁴For example, a study might find that people who have many connections in a social network are more likely to adopt a certain behavior. However, this does not necessarily mean that having many connections directly causes the behavior. People who are more likely to adopt the behavior in the first place may be also more likely to have many connections in the network.

²⁵There could be an over-reliance on network metrics, such as homophily, degree centrality or betweenness centrality, too. These metrics may not capture the full complexity of social networks, and they may not be relevant or meaningful for all types of networks. This can lead to oversimplification and misinterpretation of results. For example, the political leaning measure (e.g. [9, 138, 153]) could be a too low dimensional scale for a political reality. In a more-dimensional model of political leaning echo chambers may not be present as their may be a multi-faceted nature of political beliefs. The political leaning measure may not fully capture the diversity of opinions and perspectives within a given network and most of the time some inference from either content analysis, group membership (e.g. [153]) or other user features or interactions which are projected on the conservative-liberal scale which is already a reduction.

²⁶This is challenging for CSS and although there is progress with extending the potential outcomes framework in order to allow such interference, it is generally presumed that individuals being studied are grouped into clusters, which ensures that the exposure of an individual in one cluster does not affect the outcome of an individual in a different cluster [207]. As every individual could be connected to every other individual through various social ties in a social media social network, this assumption generally fails. It is nearly impossible to distinguish whether the association of user outcomes in cross-sectional social network data is due to social influence, homophily, or environmental confounding [207].

been shown to provide estimates similar to randomized experiments in several studies and settings [81]. Surveys – especially with longitudinal data – have other advantages, including the fact that they make it possible to explore the media and information diet of users and communities beyond platforms. This is why we also find a different level of research in the corpus here. Survey studies do not find content exposure echo chambers if they include the entire media landscape, not just one platform. Furthermore, there exists the phenomenon of *lurkers*, i.e. users who write very few or no posts themselves. Through examining only trace data it is not possible to find out their opinions which can be done through survey studies [90]. However, surveys have far smaller sample sizes, are subject to measurement errors, and have social desirability bias [11]. Furthermore, the dependent variable in studies of echo chambers is frequently defined as whether or not subjects are exposed to opposing viewpoints and struggle to remember specific instances when they were exposed to various concepts, which makes survey research challenging [68]. Similarly, a possible bias might be seen in survey respondents' propensity to overreport "positive" activities while underreporting "poor" or unpleasant ones [195]

Randomized experiments can be used to manipulate network structures and observe their effects on individual behavior [32]. Experiments provide the highest level of certainty in identifying causality by allowing researchers to control all aspects of the process and reducing data collection costs. In addition, with the help of computers, the Internet, and crowdsourcing platforms, it is possible to collect highly reliable data from online samples [32] and sock puppet studies can be used to conduct quasi-experimental studies. However, such crowdsourcing and sock puppet studies were not used a lot in our corpus literature. One of the main challenges is that randomized experiments can be laborious to carry out due to ethical concerns – conducting experiments on social platforms has real-world impacts – and logistical and financial constraints [32]. Such operationalizations could be expanded in future work on echo chambers. Especially with the DSA, where experimental methods are also included as part of the vetted researcher access. Future research should focus on finding ways to conduct these experiments while addressing ethical concerns and providing strong evidence for cause-and-effect relationships.

Additionally, CSS studies are often limited to a single platform – we described this conceptual choice as granularity – which restricts their generalizability. Moreover, CSS measures of echo chambers have been inadequate in capturing how individuals gather information across the full media landscape, which may involve cross-cutting content²⁷. In general, there is a limited ability to capture context with CSS as it typically focuses on identifying patterns and relationships between nodes in a network, but it may not capture the larger social, cultural, or political context in which those connections exist.

This is why we recommend including a mixed methods study and leveraging the described advantages of methods, especially studies that combine trace data and surveys, as we have also seen these successfully in the corpus of this review. However, experimental studies in combination with surveys can also show causal effects. At the same time, we recommend continuing to work on causal inference in conjunction with social network analysis.

Concurrent with other research, we find that most studies affirming the echo chamber hypothesis are conducted in the United States or use data concerning the United States population, and are not representative of other regions. While it is true that the majority of studies on this topic have been conducted in the United States, there are substantial findings for echo chambers in the UK, some EU-countries, and China. However, the problem remains that echo chambers have mostly been demonstrated in countries or discourse spaces that are already highly fragmented. That is, in countries that have two-party systems and are considered divided, or in polarized groups, such as conspiracy and science or

²⁷Someone may, for example, hear about an issue on Facebook and then fact-check it using search as Dubois and Blank [68] point out

vaccination and anti-vaccination. It is necessary to find out whether there is a reverse causality fallacy present in this context and whether fragmentation in society ultimately leads to the formation of echo chambers in social networks. There is a lack of research, particularly about countries outside the Global North. This may be due to the limited systematic review search or the difficult data situation. This will probably only change with publicly accessible data. The DSA only applies to systemic risks in the EU, so only European data can be analyzed. Nevertheless, it will shape a new research landscape, as there will now be more opportunities in the EU to research echo chambers in EU social networks.

One criticism of social media studies is that they often need to consider algorithmic filtering changes. Although a few studies have conducted continuous audit studies (e.g. [189, 196]) to focus on these changes, most studies still need to address this issue. This is because social networks do not make their algorithms publicly accessible, and even if they did, they are so complex that they can only be understood through live observation. Therefore, there is a need for further insight into these algorithms and continuous auditing by research institutes, as included in the DSA.

Additionally, more evidence for echo chambers is needed across different platforms and media types. While surveys are often used across various media types, they do not specify the platforms used. When platforms are analyzed, it is usually only Facebook and Twitter/X. Instant messengers have yet to be examined in any studies, and the same is true for bot and web-scraping research, despite these promising methods, which combine the advantages of CSS and surveys. Future research should focus on conducting more cross-platform studies.

4.2 Limitations

Some issues related to the limitations of systematic reviews have already been addressed. On the one hand, IRR was addressed in Section 2. Although the IRR falls into a good range, there is still room for improvement. Most systematic reviews do not perform an IRR measurement, nor do they transparently show how the codings were executed [16]. This study has tried to counteract this by some procedures like the publication of the codebook, the presentation of how the code variables were arrived at, and an IRR measurement.

The possible biases which can occur in systematic reviews are the already mentioned publication bias, time lag bias, multiple (duplicate) publication bias, location bias, citation bias, language bias and the outcome reporting bias [67]. In Section 2.4.1 and Section 2.4.2 these biases were mentioned as well as their potential to occur in this work.

Furthermore, it would also have been possible to expand the keywords even more. Here, among other things, it would be important to add the conceptualizations as their own keywords. However, this expansion would have led to a significant increase in search results (>2500). To process this amount of literature in time would have been beyond the scope of the work without adding much to the results, as possibly the results for 200 studies would not have taken completely different paths in the end. The inclusion of different methods in the screening or eligibility process would also be an interesting expansion and can be seen as a limitation of the present work.

5 CONCLUSION

We systematically surveyed a corpus of 112 works examining the antecedents, properties, and effects of echo chambers in social media. Our focus was specifically on how echo chambers were conceptualized and operationalized using a measurement modeling lens. The results of our systematic review indicated that different conceptualizations and operationalizations lead to different findings.

While the majority of studies that have conceptualized echo chambers with homophily and utilized data-driven CSS methods have affirmed the echo chamber hypothesis and polarization effects in social media, content exposure studies and surveys that have explored the full spectrum of media exposure have rejected it.

Most of these studies have been conducted in the United States, and there is a need for a more comprehensive understanding of how echo chambers work in non-two-party systems. To advance our understanding of this phenomenon, future research should prioritize conducting more cross-platform studies, considering changes in algorithmic filtering (continuous auditing), and examining the causal direction of the association between polarization, fragmentation, and the establishment of online echo chambers.

Furthermore, research should ensure that their conceptualizations and operationalizations are transparent. A more granular perspective on the conceptualizations of echo chambers may be necessary to advance our understanding of this topic.

6 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Funded by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF)—Nr. 16DII113f. Special thanks to PD Dr. Merja Mahrt for her valuable feedback, which was above and beyond the usual. Special thanks also to our research group leader, Dr. Milagros Miceli, for her continuous support.

REFERENCES

- [1] Kathrin Ackermann and Isabelle Stadelmann-Steffen. 2022. Voting in the Echo Chamber? Patterns of Political Online Activities and Voting Behavior in Switzerland. *Swiss Political Science Review* 28, 2 (2022), 377–400.
- [2] Amy Ross Arguedas, Craig Robertson, Richard Fletcher, and Rasmus Kleis Nielsen. 2022. Echo chambers, filter bubbles, and polarisation: a literature review. *Reuter Institute for the Study of Journalism* (2022). <https://reutersinstitute.politics.ox.ac.uk/echo-chambers-filter-bubbles-and-polarisation-literature-review>
- [3] Natalia Aruguete, Ernesto Calvo, and Tiago Ventura. 2023. News by Popular Demand: Ideological Congruence, Issue Salience, and Media Reputation in News Sharing(1). *International Journal of Press-Politics* (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1177/19401612211057068>
- [4] Kimitaka Asatani, Hiroko Yamano, Takeshi Sakaki, and Ichiro Sakata. 2021. Dense and influential core promotion of daily viral information spread in political echo chambers. *Scientific Reports* 11, 1 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-86750-w>
- [5] Brooke E. Auxier and Jessica Vitak. 2019. Factors Motivating Customization and Echo Chamber Creation Within Digital News Environments. *Social Media + Society* 5, 2 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305119847506>
- [6] Franco Bagnoli, Guido de Bonfioli Cavalcabo, Banedetto Casu, and Andrea Guazzini. 2021. Community Formation as a Byproduct of a Recommendation System: A Simulation Model for Bubble Formation in Social Media. *Future Internet* 13, 11 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.3390/fi13110296>
- [7] Christopher A. Bail, Lisa P. Argyle, Taylor W. Brown, John P. Bumpus, Haohan Chen, M. B. Fallin Hunzaker, Jaemin Lee, Marcus Mann, Friedolin Merhout, and Alexander Volfovsky. 2018. Exposure to opposing views on social media can increase political polarization. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 115, 37 (2018), 9216–9221. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1804840115>
- [8] Christopher A Bail, Lisa P Argyle, Taylor W Brown, John P Bumpus, Haohan Chen, MB Fallin Hunzaker, Jaemin Lee, Marcus Mann, Friedolin Merhout, and Alexander Volfovsky. 2018. Exposure to opposing views on social media can increase political polarization. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 115, 37 (2018), 9216–9221.
- [9] Eytan Bakshy, Solomon Messing, and Lada A. Adamic. 2015. Political science. Exposure to ideologically diverse news and opinion on Facebook. *Science (New York, N.Y.)* 348, 6239 (2015), 1130–1132. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaa1160>
- [10] Pablo Barbera. 2013. Birds of the Same Feather Tweet Together: Bayesian Ideal Point Estimation Using Twitter Data. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 23 (01 2013). <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2108098>
- [11] Pablo Barbera, John T. Jost, Jonathan Nagler, Joshua A. Tucker, and Richard Bonneau. 2015. Tweeting From Left to Right: Is Online Political Communication More Than an Echo Chamber? *Psychological Science* 26, 10 (2015), 1531–1542. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797615594620>
- [12] Marco Bastos, Dan Mercea, and Andrea Baronchelli. 2018. The geographic embedding of online echo chambers: Evidence from the Brexit campaign. *PLOS ONE* 13, 11 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0206841>
- [13] Dominik Batorski and Ilona Grzywinska. 2018. Three dimensions of the public sphere on Facebook. *Information, Communication & Society* 21, 3 (2018), 356–374. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2017.1281329>
- [14] Fabian Baumann, Philipp Lorenz-Spreen, Igor M. Sokolov, and Michele Starnini. 2020. Modeling Echo Chambers and Polarization Dynamics in Social Networks. *Physical Review Letters* 124, 4 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.124.048301>

- [15] Michael A. Beam, Myiah J. Hutchens, and Jay D. Hmielowski. 2018. Facebook news and (de)polarization: reinforcing spirals in the 2016 US election. *Information, Communication & Society* 21, 7 (2018), 940–958. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2018.1444783>
- [16] Jyoti Belur, Lisa Tompson, Amy Thornton, and Miranda Simon. 2021. Interrater Reliability in Systematic Review Methodology: Exploring Variation in Coder Decision-Making. *Sociological Methods & Research* 50, 2 (2021), 837–865. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0049124118799372>
- [17] Yochai Benkler, Robert Faris, and Hal Roberts. 2018. *Network Propaganda: Manipulation, Disinformation, and Radicalization in American Politics*. Oxford University Press, Oxford. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190923624.001.0001>
- [18] Bettina Berendt, Özgür Karadeniz, Stefan Mertens, and Leen d’Haenens. 2021. Fairness beyond “Equal”: The Diversity Searcher as a Tool to Detect and Enhance the Representation of Socio-Political Actors in News Media. In *Companion Proceedings of the Web Conference 2021* (Ljubljana, Slovenia) (WWW ’21). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 202–212. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3442442.3452303>
- [19] Alessandro Bessi. 2016. Personality traits and echo chambers on facebook. *COMPUTERS IN HUMAN BEHAVIOR* 65 (2016), 319–324. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.08.016>
- [20] Alessandro Bessi, Fabiana Zollo, Michela Del Vicario, Michelangelo Puliga, Antonio Scala, Guido Caldarelli, Brian Uzzi, and Walter Quattrociocchi. 2016. Users Polarization on Facebook and Youtube. *PLOS ONE* 11, 8 (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0159641>
- [21] Alessandro Bessi, Fabiana Zollo, Michela Del Vicario, Antonio Scala, Guido Caldarelli, and Walter Quattrociocchi. 2015. Trend of Narratives in the Age of Misinformation. *PLOS ONE* 10, 8 (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0134641>
- [22] G Biondi-Zoccai, M Lotrionte, G Landoni, and M G Modena. 2011. The rough guide to systematic reviews and meta-analyses. 3, 3 (2011), 161–173. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3484632/>
- [23] Balazs Bodo, Natali Helberger, Sarah Eskens, and Judith Moller. 2019. Interested in Diversity: The role of user attitudes, algorithmic feedback loops, and policy in news personalization. *Digital Journalism* 7, 2 (2019), 206–229. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2018.1521292>
- [24] Martin Boeker, Werner Vach, and Edith Motschall. 2013. Google Scholar as replacement for systematic literature searches: good relative recall and precision are not enough. *BMC medical research methodology* 13, 1 (2013), 131. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-13-131>
- [25] Robert M. Bond and Matthew D. Sweitzer. 2022. Political Homophily in a Large-Scale Online Communication Network. *Communication Research* 49, 1 (2022), 93–115. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650218813655> arXiv:<https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650218813655>
- [26] Andrew Booth, Diana Papaioannou, and Anthea Sutton. 2012. *Systematic Approaches to a Successful Literature Review*.
- [27] Stephen P. Borgatti and Martin G. Everett. 2021. Three Perspectives on Centrality. In *The Oxford Handbook of Social Networks*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190251765.013.22> arXiv:https://academic.oup.com/book/0/chapter/290741437/chapter-ag-pdf/44521705/book_34294_section_290741437.ag.pdf
- [28] Shelley Boulianne and Karolina Koc-Michalska. 2022. The Role of Personality in Political Talk and Like-Minded Discussion. *International Journal of Press-Politics* 27, 1 (2022), 285–310. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1940161221994096>
- [29] Shelley Boulianne, Karolina Koc-Michalska, and Bruce Bimber. 2020. Right-wing populism, social media and echo chambers in Western democracies. *New Media & Society* 22, 4 (2020), 683–699. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444819893983>
- [30] Andrei Boutyline and Robb Willer. 2017. The Social Structure of Political Echo Chambers: Variation in Ideological Homophily in Online Networks. *Political Psychology* 38, 3 (2017), 551–569. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12337>
- [31] Alexandre Bovet and Peter Grindrod. 2022. Organization and evolution of the UK far-right network on Telegram. *APPLIED NETWORK SCIENCE* 7, 1 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41109-022-00513-8>
- [32] Matthew E. Brashears and Eric Gladstone. 2021. Social Network Experiments. In *The Oxford Handbook of Social Networks*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190251765.013.12> arXiv:https://academic.oup.com/book/0/chapter/290740320/chapter-ag-pdf/44521710/book_34294_section_290740320.ag.pdf
- [33] Jonathan Bright. 2018. Explaining the Emergence of Political Fragmentation on Social Media: The Role of Ideology and Extremism. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 23, 1 (2018), 17–33. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jcmc/zmx002>
- [34] Heather Z. Brooks and Mason A. Porter. 2020. A model for the influence of media on the ideology of content in online social networks. *Physical Review RESEARCH* 2, 2 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevResearch.2.023041>
- [35] Emanuele Brugnoni, Matteo Cinelli, Walter Quattrociocchi, and Antonio Scala. 2019. Recursive patterns in online echo chambers. *Scientific Reports* 9 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-56191-7>
- [36] Axel Bruns. 2017. Echo chamber? What echo chamber? Reviewing the evidence. In *6th Biennial Future of Journalism Conference (FOJ17)*.
- [37] Axel Bruns. 2019. It’s not the technology, stupid: How the ‘Echo Chamber’ and ‘Filter Bubble’ metaphors have failed us. *International Association for Media and Communication Research* (2019).
- [38] Hubertus Buchstein. 1997. Bytes that Bite: The Internet and Deliberative Democracy. *Constellations* 4, 2 (1997), 248–263. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8675.00052>
- [39] A. Burnett, D. Knighton, and C. Wilson. 2022. The Self-Censoring Majority: How Political Identity and Ideology Impacts Willingness to Self-Censor and Fear of Isolation in the United States. *Social Media + Society* 8, 3 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1177/20563051221123031>
- [40] Nina Buscemi, Lisa Hartling, Ben Vandermeer, Lisa Tjosvold, and Terry P. Klassen. 2006. Single data extraction generated more errors than double data extraction in systematic reviews. *Journal of clinical epidemiology* 59, 7 (2006), 697–703. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2005.11.010>
- [41] Tristan J. B. Cann, Iain S. Weaver, and Hywel T. P. Williams. 2021. Ideological biases in social sharing of online information about climate change. *PLOS ONE* 16, 4 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0250656>

- [42] Manuel Cargnino and German Neubaum. 2022. Is it better to strike a balance? How exposure to congruent and incongruent opinion climates on social networking sites impacts users' processing and selection of information. *New Media & Society* (2022), 14614448221083914.
- [43] Manuel Cargnino, German Neubaum, and Stephan Winter. 2023. We're a good match: Selective political friending on social networking sites. *Communications* 48, 2 (2023), 202–225.
- [44] Pew Research Center. 2021. Social Media Fact Sheet. <https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/fact-sheet/social-media/>
- [45] Andrea Ceron and Sergio Splendore. 2019. 'Cheap Talk'? Second screening and the irrelevance of TV political debates. *Journalism* 20, 8 (2019), 1108–1123. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1464884919845443>
- [46] Michael Chan, Hsuan-Ting Chen, and Francis L. F. Lee. 2019. Examining the Roles of Political Social Network and Internal Efficacy on Social Media News Engagement: A Comparative Study of Six Asian Countries. *International Journal of Press-Politics* 24, 2 (2019), 127–145. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1940161218814480>
- [47] Zicheng Cheng, Hugo Marcos-Marne, and Homero Gil de Zúñiga. 2023. Birds of a Feather Get Angrier Together: Social Media News Use and Social Media Political Homophily as Antecedents of Political Anger. *Political Behavior* (2023), 1–17.
- [48] Daejin Choi, Selin Chun, Hyunchul Oh, Jinyoung Han, and Ted "Taekyoung" Kwon. 2020. Rumor propagation is amplified by echo chambers in social media. *Scientific reports* 10, 1 (2020), 310.
- [49] Matteo Cinelli, Emanuele Brugnoli, Ana Lucia Schmidt, Fabiana Zollo, Walter Quattrociocchi, and Antonio Scala. 2020. Selective exposure shapes the Facebook news diet. *PLOS ONE* 15, 3 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0229129>
- [50] Matteo Cinelli, Gianmarco De Francisci Morales, Alessandro Galeazzi, Walter Quattrociocchi, and Michele Starnini. 2021. The echo chamber effect on social media. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 118, 9 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2023301118>
- [51] Matteo Cinelli, Andraz Pelicon, Igor Mozetic, Walter Quattrociocchi, Petra Kralj Novak, and Fabiana Zollo. 2021. Dynamics of online hate and misinformation. *Scientific Reports* 11, 1 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-01487-w>
- [52] Jacob Cohen. 1960. A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. *Educational and psychological measurement* 20, 1 (1960), 37–46.
- [53] Elanor Colleoni, Alessandro Rozza, and Adam Arvidsson. 2014. Echo Chamber or Public Sphere? Predicting Political Orientation and Measuring Political Homophily in Twitter Using Big Data. *Journal of Communication* 64, 2 (2014), 317–332. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcom.12084>
- [54] Kathleen MT Collins, Anthony Onwuegbuzie, and Qun Jiao. 2006. Prevalence of Mixed-methods Sampling Designs in Social Science Research. *Evaluation & Research in Education* 19 (05 2006), 83–101. <https://doi.org/10.2167/eri421.0>
- [55] Michael Conover, Jacob Ratkiewicz, Matthew Francisco, Bruno Gonçalves, Filippo Menczer, and Alessandro Flammini. 2011. Political Polarization on Twitter. *Fifth International AAAI Conference on Weblogs and Social Media*.
- [56] Wesley Cota, Silvio C. Ferreira, Romualdo Pastor-Satorras, and Michele Starnini. 2019. Quantifying echo chamber effects in information spreading over political communication networks. *EPJ Data Science* 8, 1 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjds/s13688-019-0213-9>
- [57] Juan Cotejo, F. Javier Ortega, José Troyano, Fernando Enriquez, and Fermin Cruz. 2020. Known by Who We Follow: A Biclustering Application to Community Detection. *IEEE Access* 8 (01 2020), 192218–192228. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2020.3032015>
- [58] Lincoln Dahlberg. 2007. The Internet, deliberative democracy, and power: Radicalizing the public sphere. *International Journal of Media & Cultural Politics* 3 (01 2007). https://doi.org/10.1386/macp.3.1.47_1
- [59] Peter Dahlgren. 2005. The Internet, Public Spheres, and Political Communication: Dispersion and Deliberation. *Political Communication* 22, 2 (2005), 147–162.
- [60] Marc Esteve Del Valle and Rosa Borge Bravo. 2018. Echo Chambers in Parliamentary Twitter Networks: The Catalan Case. *International Journal of Communication* 12 (2018), 1715–1735.
- [61] Marc Esteve Del Valle, Marcel Broersma, and Arnout Ponsioen. 2022. Political Interaction Beyond Party Lines: Communication Ties and Party Polarization in Parliamentary Twitter Networks. *SOCIAL SCIENCE COMPUTER REVIEW* (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1177/0894439320987569>
- [62] Michela Del Vicario, Alessandro Bessi, Fabiana Zollo, Fabio Petroni, Antonio Scala, Guido Caldarelli, H. Eugene Stanley, and Walter Quattrociocchi. 2016. The spreading of misinformation online. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 113, 3 (2016), 554–559. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1517441113>
- [63] Michela Del Vicario, Gianna Vivaldo, Alessandro Bessi, Fabiana Zollo, Antonio Scala, Guido Caldarelli, and Walter Quattrociocchi. 2016. Echo Chambers: Emotional Contagion and Group Polarization on Facebook. *Scientific Reports* 6 (06 2016). <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep37825>
- [64] Michela Del Vicario, Fabiana Zollo, Guido Caldarelli, Antonio Scala, and Walter Quattrociocchi. 2017. Mapping social dynamics on Facebook: The Brexit debate. *SOCIAL NETWORKS* 50 (2017), 6–16. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socnet.2017.02.002>
- [65] Kay Dickersin. 1990. The Existence of Publication Bias and Risk Factors for Its Occurrence. *JAMA : the journal of the American Medical Association* 263 (04 1990), 1385–9. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.263.10.1385>
- [66] Tim Donkers and Jürgen Ziegler. 2021. The Dual Echo Chamber: Modeling Social Media Polarization for Interventional Recommending. In *Fifteenth ACM Conference on Recommender Systems*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 12–22. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3460231.3474261>
- [67] Aaron M. Drucker, Patrick Fleming, and An-Wen Chan. 2016. Research Techniques Made Simple: Assessing Risk of Bias in Systematic Reviews. *Journal of Investigative Dermatology* 136, 11 (2016), e109–e114. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jid.2016.08.021>
- [68] Elizabeth Dubois and Grant Blank. 2018. The echo chamber is overstated: the moderating effect of political interest and diverse media. *Information Communication & Society* 21, 5, SI (2018), 729–745. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2018.1428656>

- [69] Elizabeth Dubois, Sara Minaeian, Ariane Paquet-Labelle, and Simon Beaudry. 2020. Who to Trust on Social Media: How Opinion Leaders and Seekers Avoid Disinformation and Echo Chambers. *Social Media + Society* 6, 2 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305120913993>
- [70] Gregory Eady, Jonathan Nagler, Andy Guess, Jan Zilinsky, and Joshua A. Tucker. 2019. How Many People Live in Political Bubbles on Social Media? Evidence From Linked Survey and Twitter Data. *SAGE OPEN* 9, 1 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019832705>
- [71] David Easley, Jon Kleinberg, et al. 2010. *Networks, crowds, and markets: Reasoning about a highly connected world*. Vol. 1. Cambridge university press Cambridge, Cambridge.
- [72] Satu Elo and Helvi Kyngäs. 2008. The qualitative content analysis process. *Journal of advanced nursing* 62, 1 (2008), 107–115.
- [73] Bernard Enjolras and Andrew Salway. 2022. Homophily and polarization on political twitter during the 2017 Norwegian election. *SOCIAL NETWORK ANALYSIS AND MINING* 13, 1 (2022), 10. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13278-022-01018-z>
- [74] Gabriele Etta, Matteo Cinelli, Alessandro Galeazzi, Carlo Michele Valensise, Walter Quattrociocchi, and Mauro Conti. 2022. Comparing the Impact of Social Media Regulations on News Consumption. *IEEE Transactions on Computational Social Systems* (2022), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TCSS.2022.3171391>
- [75] European Commission. 2022. Regulation (EU) 2022/2065 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 19 October 2022 on a Single Market For Digital Services and amending Directive 2000/31/EC (Digital Services Act) (Text with EEA relevance). <http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2022/2065/oj/eng> Legislative Body: EP, CONSL.
- [76] Tucker Evans and Feng Fu. 2018. Opinion formation on dynamic networks: identifying conditions for the emergence of partisan echo chambers. *Royal Society Open Science* 5, 10 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.181122>
- [77] Leon Festinger. 1957. *A theory of cognitive dissonance*. Stanford University Press, Stanford, Calif.
- [78] James Flamino, Alessandro Galeazzi, Stuart Feldman, Michael W. Macy, Brendan Cross, Zhenkun Zhou, Matteo Serafino, Alexandre Bovet, Hernan A. Makse, and Boleslaw K. Szymanski. 2023. Political polarization of news media and influencers on Twitter in the 2016 and 2020 US presidential elections. *NATURE HUMAN BEHAVIOUR* (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-023-01550-8>
- [79] Seth Flaxman, Sharad Goel, and Justin M. Rao. 2016. Filter Bubbles, Echo Chambers, and Online News Consumption. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 80 (2016), 298–320. <https://doi.org/10.1093/poq/nfw006>
- [80] Richard Fletcher, Antonis Kalogeropoulos, and Rasmus Kleis Nielsen. 2021. More diverse, more politically varied: How social media, search engines and aggregators shape news repertoires in the United Kingdom. *New Media & Society* 0, 0 (2021), 14614448211027393. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14614448211027393> arXiv:<https://doi.org/10.1177/14614448211027393>
- [81] Kenneth A. Frank and Ran Xu. 2021. Causal Inference for Social Network Analysis. In *The Oxford Handbook of Social Networks*. Oxford University Press, Oxford. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190251765.013.21> arXiv:https://academic.oup.com/book/0/chapter/290741185/chapter-ag-pdf/44521717/book_34294_section_290741185.ag.pdf
- [82] Ivo Furman and Asli Tunc. 2020. The End of the Habermasian Ideal? Political Communication on Twitter During the 2017 Turkish Constitutional Referendum. *Policy and Internet* 12, 3 (2020), 311–331. <https://doi.org/10.1002/poi3.218>
- [83] Florian Gallwitz and Michael Kreil. 2021. The Rise and Fall of 'Social Bot' Research. SSRN (2021).
- [84] Efrain Garcia-Sanchez, Pedro Rolo Benetti, Gustavo Lucas Higa, Marcos Cesar Alvarez, and Erick Gomez-Nieto. 2023. Political discourses, ideologies, and online coalitions in the Brazilian Congress on Twitter during 2019. *New Media & Society* (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1177/14614448211017920>
- [85] R. Kelly Garrett. 2009. Politically Motivated Reinforcement Seeking: Reframing the Selective Exposure Debate. *Journal of Communication* 59, 4 (2009), 676–699. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2009.01452.x>
- [86] Noe Gaumont, Maziyar Panahi, and David Chavalarias. 2018. Reconstruction of the socio-semantic dynamics of political activist Twitter networks-Method and application to the 2017 French presidential election. *PLOS ONE* 13, 9 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0201879>
- [87] Matthew Gentzkow and Jesse M Shapiro. 2010. *Ideological Segregation Online and Offline*. Working Paper 15916. National Bureau of Economic Research. <https://doi.org/10.3386/w15916>
- [88] Vasu Goel, Dhruv Sahnan, Subhabrata Dutta, Anil Bandhakavi, and Tammy Chakraborty. 2023. Hatemongers ride on echo chambers to escalate hate speech diffusion. *PNAS Nexus* 2, 3 (02 2023). <https://doi.org/10.1093/pnasnexus/pgad041> arXiv:<https://academic.oup.com/pnasnexus/article-pdf/2/3/pgad041/49703225/pgad041.pdf> pgad041.
- [89] David Goldie, Matthew Linick, Huriya Jabbar, and Christopher Lubienski. 2014. Using Bibliometric and Social Media Analyses to Explore the "Echo Chamber" Hypothesis. *EDUCATIONAL POLICY* 28, 2 (2014), 281–305. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904813515330>
- [90] Wei Gong, Ee-Peng Lim, and Feida Zhu. 2015. Characterizing silent users in social media communities. In *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*, Vol. 9. 140–149.
- [91] Robert Gorwa, Reuben Binns, and Christian Katzenbach. 2020. Algorithmic content moderation: Technical and political challenges in the automation of platform governance. *Big Data & Society* 7, 1 (Jan. 2020), 205395171989794. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951719897945>
- [92] David Gough. 2007. Weight of Evidence: a framework for the appraisal of the quality and relevance of evidence. 22, 2 (2007), 213–228. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02671520701296189>
- [93] Maria J. Grant and Andrew Booth. 2009. A typology of reviews: an analysis of 14 review types and associated methodologies. 26, 2 (2009), 91–108.
- [94] Quentin Grossetti, Cedric Du Mouza, Nicolas Travers, and Camelia Constantin. 2021. Reducing the filter bubble effect on Twitter by considering communities for recommendations. *International Journal OF Web Information Systems* 17, 6 (2021), 728–752. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJWIS-06-2021-0065>

- [95] Stefano Guarino, Noemi Trino, Alessandro Celestini, Alessandro Chessa, and Gianni Riotta. 2020. Characterizing networks of propaganda on twitter: a case study. *Applied Network Science* 5, 1 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41109-020-00286-y>
- [96] Frederic Guerrero-Sole. 2018. Interactive Behavior in Political Discussions on Twitter: Politicians, Media, and Citizens' Patterns of Interaction in the 2015 and 2016 Electoral Campaigns in Spain. *Social Media + Society* 4, 4 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305118808776>
- [97] Andrew Guess, Benjamin Lyons, Brendan Nyhan, and Jason Reifler. 2018. Avoiding the echo chamber about echo chambers: Why selective exposure to like-minded political news is less prevalent than you think. (01 2018).
- [98] Lei Guo, Jacob A. Rohde, and H. Denis Wu. 2020. Who is responsible for Twitter's echo chamber problem? Evidence from 2016 US election networks. *Information, Communication & Society* 23, 2 (2020), 234–251. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2018.1499793>
- [99] Michael Gusenbauer and Neal Haddaway. 2020. Which Academic Search Systems are Suitable for Systematic Reviews or Meta-Analyses? Evaluating Retrieval Qualities of Google Scholar, PubMed and 26 other Resources [OPEN ACCESS]. *Research Synthesis Methods* 11 (03 2020), 181–217. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jrsm.1378>
- [100] Jürgen Habermas. 2010. Hat die Demokratie noch eine epistemische Dimension? In *Kleine politische Schriften 11. Ach Europa*. Suhrkamp Verlag AG, Frankfurt, 138–191.
- [101] Neal Robert Haddaway, Alexandra Mary Collins, Deborah Coughlin, and Stuart Kirk. 2015. The Role of Google Scholar in Evidence Reviews and Its Applicability to Grey Literature Searching. 10, 9 (2015), e0138237. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0138237>
- [102] Loni Hagen, Ashley Fox, Heather O'Leary, DeAndre Dyson, Kimberly Walker, Cecile A. Lengacher, and Raquel Hernandez. 2022. The Role of Influential Actors in Fostering the Polarized COVID-19 Vaccine Discourse on Twitter: Mixed Methods of Machine Learning and Inductive Coding. *JMIR infodemiology* 2, 1 (2022), e34231–e34231. <https://doi.org/10.2196/34231>
- [103] David Hartmann, José Renato Laranjeira de Pereira, Chiara Streitböcker, and Bettina Berendt. 2024. Addressing the Regulatory Gap: Moving Towards an EU AI Audit Ecosystem Beyond the AIA by Including Civil Society. arXiv:2403.07904
- [104] Tsahi Hayat and Tal Samuel-Azran. 2017. "You too, Second Screeners?" Second Screeners' Echo Chambers During the 2016 US Elections Primaries. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* 61, 2 (2017), 291–308. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08838151.2017.1309417>
- [105] Martin Hilbert, Saifuddin Ahmed, Jaeho Cho, Billy Liu, and Jonathan Luu. 2018. Communicating with Algorithms: A Transfer Entropy Analysis of Emotions-based Escapes from Online Echo Chambers. *COMMUNICATION METHODS AND MEASURES* 12, 4 (2018), 260–275. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19312458.2018.1479843>
- [106] Lichan Hong, Gregorio Convertino, and Ed Chi. 2011. Language matters in twitter: A large scale study. In *Proceedings of the international AAAI conference on web and social media*, Vol. 5. 518–521.
- [107] Albert Sydney Hornby. 1995. *Oxford advanced learner's dictionary of current English / [by] A.S. Hornby ; editor Jonathan Crowther*. Fifth edition. Oxford, England : Oxford University Press, 1995. <https://search.library.wisc.edu/catalog/999766027502121>
- [108] Hsiu-Fang Hsieh and Sarah E Shannon. 2005. Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative health research* 15, 9 (2005), 1277–1288.
- [109] Luca Iandoli, Simonetta Primario, and Giuseppe Zollo. 2021. The impact of group polarization on the quality of online debate in social media: A systematic literature review. *TECHNOLOGICAL FORECASTING AND SOCIAL CHANGE* 170 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2021.120924>
- [110] Ruben Interian, Ruslan G. Marzo, Isela Mendoza, and Celso C. Ribeiro. [n. d.]. Network polarization, filter bubbles, and echo chambers: an annotated review of measures and reduction methods. *INTERNATIONAL TRANSACTIONS IN OPERATIONAL RESEARCH* ([n. d.]). <https://doi.org/10.1111/itor.13224>
- [111] Simon Jackman. 2008. 119 Measurement. In *The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199286546.003.0006> arXiv:https://academic.oup.com/book/0/chapter/215132509/chapter-ag-pdf/44586777/book_28340_section_215132509.ag.pdf
- [112] Abigail Z. Jacobs and Hanna Wallach. 2021. Measurement and Fairness. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency* (Virtual Event, Canada) (*FAccT '21*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 375–385. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3442188.3445901>
- [113] Laura Boeschoten Deen Freelon Nilam Ram Byron B. Reeves Jakob Ohme, Theo Araujo and Thomas N. Robinson. 2023. Digital Trace Data Collection for Social Media Effects Research: APIs, Data Donation, and (Screen) Tracking. *Communication Methods and Measures* 0, 0 (2023), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19312458.2023.2181319> arXiv:<https://doi.org/10.1080/19312458.2023.2181319>
- [114] Kathleen Jamieson and Capella Hall. 2008. *Echo chamber : Rush Limbaugh and the conservative media establishment*. Oxford University Press, Oxford New York.
- [115] Davy Janssen and Raphael Kies. 2005. Online Forums and Deliberative Democracy. *Acta Politica* 40 (09 2005). <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.ap.5500115>
- [116] Lorian Jasny, Joseph Waggle, and Dana R. Fisher. 2015. An empirical examination of echo chambers in US climate policy networks. 5, 8 (2015), 782–786.
- [117] S Mo Jones-Jang and Myojung Chung. 2022. Can we blame social media for polarization? Counter-evidence against filter bubble claims during the COVID-19 pandemic. *new media & society* (2022), 14614448221099591.
- [118] Pascal Juergens and Birgit Stark. 2017. The Power of Default on Reddit: A General Model to Measure the Influence of Information Intermediaries. *Policy and Internet* 9, 4 (2017), 395–419. <https://doi.org/10.1002/poi3.166>
- [119] Florian Justwan, Bert Baumgaertner, Juliet E. Carlisle, April K. Clark, and Michael Clark. 2018. Social media echo chambers and satisfaction with democracy among Democrats and Republicans in the aftermath of the 2016 US elections. *Journal of Elections Public Opinion and Parties* 28, 4

- (2018), 424–442. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17457289.2018.1434784>
- [120] Jonas Kaiser and Adrian Rauchfleisch. 2020. Birds of a Feather Get Recommended Together: Algorithmic Homophily in YouTube’s Channel Recommendations in the United States and Germany. *Social Media + Society* 6, 4 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305120969914>
- [121] Bomin Kim, Kevin Lee, Lingzhou Xue, and Xiaoyue Niu. 2017. A Review of Dynamic Network Models with Latent Variables. *Statistics Surveys* 12 (11 2017). <https://doi.org/10.1214/18-SS121>
- [122] Brent Kitchens, Steven L. Johnson, and Peter Gray. 2020. Understanding Echo Chambers and Filter Bubbles: The Impact of Social Media on Diversification and Partisan Shifts in News Consumption. *MIS Quarterly* 44, 4 (2020), 1619–1649. <https://doi.org/10.25300/MISQ/2020/16371>
- [123] Aki Koivula, Markus Kaakinen, Atte Oksanen, and Pekka Rasanen. 2019. The Role of Political Activity in the Formation of Online Identity Bubbles. *Policy and Internet* 11, 4 (2019), 396–417. <https://doi.org/10.1002/poi3.211>
- [124] Balazs Kovacs and Adam M. Kleinbaum. 2020. Language-Style Similarity and Social Networks. *Psychological Science* 31, 2 (2020), 202–213. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797619894557>
- [125] Nane Kratzke. 2023. How to Find Orchestrated Trolls? A Case Study on Identifying Polarized Twitter Echo Chambers. *Computers* 12, 3 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.3390/computers12030057>
- [126] Daniel Kreiss and Shannon C McGregor. 2024. A review and provocation: On polarization and platforms. *New Media & Society* (2024), 14614448231161880. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14614448231161880> arXiv:<https://doi.org/10.1177/14614448231161880>
- [127] Ryan Light and James Moody. 2021. 16Network Basics: Points, Lines, and Positions. In *The Oxford Handbook of Social Networks*. Oxford University Press, Oxford. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190251765.013.2> arXiv:https://academic.oup.com/book/0/chapter/290739653/chapter-ag-pdf/44521719/book_34294_section_290739653.ag.pdf
- [128] Lucas Lima, Julio C. S. Reis, Philippe Melo, Fabricio Murai, Leandro Araújo, Pantelis Vikatos, and Fabrício Benevenuto. 2018. Inside the Right-Leaning Echo Chambers: Characterizing Gab, an Unmoderated Social System. In *Proceedings of the 2018 IEEE/ACM International Conference on Advances in Social Networks Analysis and Mining (ASONAM '18)*. IEEE Press, 515–522.
- [129] Longzhao Liu, Xin Wang, Yi Zheng, Wenyi Fang, Shaoting Tang, and Zhiming Zheng. 2020. Homogeneity trend on social networks changes evolutionary advantage in competitive information diffusion. *New Journal of Physics* 22, 1 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1088/1367-2630/ab623c>
- [130] Rui Liu, Kevin T. Greene, Ruibo Liu, Mihovil Mandic, Benjamin A. Valentino, Soroush Vosoughi, and V. S. Subrahmanian. 2021. Using impression data to improve models of online social influence. *Scientific Reports* 11, 1 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-96021-3>
- [131] Philipp Lorenz-Spreen, Lisa Oswald, Stephan Lewandowsky, and Ralph Hertwig. 2023. A systematic review of worldwide causal and correlational evidence on digital media and democracy. *NATURE HUMAN BEHAVIOUR* 7, 1 (2023), 74–101. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-022-01460-1>
- [132] Katharina Ludwig, Alexander Grote, Andreea Iana, Mehwish Alam, Heiko Paulheim, Harald Sack, Christof Weinhardt, and Philipp Müller. 2023. Divided by the algorithm? the (limited) effects of content-and sentiment-based news recommendation on affective, ideological, and perceived polarization. *Social Science Computer Review* 41, 6 (2023), 2188–2210.
- [133] Quenby Mahood, Dwayne Van Eerd, and Emma Irvin. 2014. Searching for grey literature for systematic reviews: challenges and benefits. *Research synthesis methods* 5, 3 (2014), 221–234.
- [134] Merja Mahrt. 2019. *Beyond Filter Bubbles and Echo Chambers: The Integrative Potential of the Internet*. Digital Communication Research, Vol. 5. Digital Communications Research, Berlin. 246 pages. <https://doi.org/10.17174/dcr.v5.0>
- [135] Moritz Markgraf and Manfred Schoch. 2019. Quantification of echo chambers: A methodological framework considering multi-party systems. *Proceedings of the 27th European Conference on Information Systems (ECIS)* (2019).
- [136] Pere Masip, Jaume Suau, and Carlos Ruiz-Caballero. 2020. Incidental Exposure to Non-Like-Minded News through Social Media: Opposing Voices in Echo-Chambers’ News Feeds. *MEDIA AND COMMUNICATION* 8, 4 (2020), 53–62. <https://doi.org/10.17645/mac.v8i4.3146>
- [137] Antonis Matakos, Evimaria Terzi, and Panayiotis Tsaparas. 2017. Measuring and moderating opinion polarization in social networks. *DATA MINING AND KNOWLEDGE DISCOVERY* 31, 5 (2017), 1480–1505. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10618-017-0527-9>
- [138] Pawel Matuszewski. 2019. Selective Exposure on Polish Political and News Media Facebook Pages. *Polish Sociological Review* 206 (2019), 177–197. <https://doi.org/10.26412/psr206.04>
- [139] Pawet Matuszewski and Gabriella Szabo. 2019. Are Echo Chambers Based on Partisanship? Twitter and Political Polarity in Poland and Hungary. *Social Media + Society* 5, 2 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305119837671>
- [140] S. C. Matz. 2021. Personal echo chambers: Openness-to-experience is linked to higher levels of psychological interest diversity in large-scale behavioral data. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 121, 6 (2021), 1284–1300. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000324>
- [141] Philipp Mayring. 2014. Qualitative content analysis: theoretical foundation, basic procedures and software solution. (2014).
- [142] Lee McIntyre. 2018. *Post-truth*. The MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- [143] Miller McPherson, Lynn Smith-Lovin, and James M Cook. 2001. Birds of a Feather: Homophily in Social Networks. *Annual Review of Sociology* 27, 1 (2001), 415–444. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.27.1.415>
- [144] Jonathan Mellon and Christopher Prosser. 2017. Twitter and Facebook are not representative of the general population: Political attitudes and demographics of British social media users. *Research & Politics* 4, 3 (2017), 205316801772000. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2053168017720008>
- [145] Meredith Broadbent. 2020. *The Digital Services Act, the Digital Markets Act, and the new competition tool*. <https://apo.org.au/node/309351>
- [146] Melissa Merry. 2016. Making friends and enemies on social media: the case of gun policy organizations. *Online Information Review* 40, 5 (2016), 624–642. <https://doi.org/10.1108/OIR-10-2015-0333>

- [147] Yong Min, Tingjun Jiang, Cheng Jin, Qu Li, and Xiaogang Jin. 2019. Endogenetic structure of filter bubble in social networks. *Royal Society Open Science* 6, 11 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.190868>
- [148] Min Yong, Zhou Yuying, Liu Yuhang, Zhang Jian, Xuan Qi, Jin Xiaogang, and Cai He. 2021. The role of degree correlation in shaping filter bubbles in social networks. *PHYSICA A-STATISTICAL MECHANICS AND ITS APPLICATIONS* 584 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physa.2021.126366>
- [149] Tuan Minh Pham, Imre Kondor, Rudolf Hanel, and Stefan Thurner. 2020. The effect of social balance on social fragmentation. 17, 172 (2020), 7–52.
- [150] Amin Mirlohi, Jalehsadat Mahdavi Moghaddam, Jelena Jovanovic, Feras N Al-Obeidat, Mehdi Khani, Ali A Ghorbani, and Ebrahim Bagheri. 2022. Social Alignment Contagion in Online Social Networks. *IEEE Transactions on Computational Social Systems* (2022).
- [151] David Moher, Alessandro Liberati, Jennifer Tetzlaff, and Douglas G. Altman. 2009. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. 62, 10 (2009), 1006–1012. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2009.06.005>
- [152] Corrado Monti, Jacopo D'Ignazi, Michele Starnini, and Gianmarco De Francisci Morales. 2023. Evidence of Demographic Rather than Ideological Segregation in News Discussion on Reddit. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2023 (Austin, TX, USA) (WWW '23)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2777–2786. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3543507.3583468>
- [153] Gianmarco De Francisci Morales, Corrado Monti, and Michele Starnini. 2021. No echo in the chambers of political interactions on Reddit. *Scientific Reports* 11, 1 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-81531-x>
- [154] Mohsen Mosleh, Cameron Martel, Dean Eckles, and David G. Rand. 2021. Shared partisanship dramatically increases social tie formation in a Twitter field experiment. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 118, 7 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2022761118>
- [155] Mohsen Mosleh, Gordon Pennycook, Antonio A. Arechar, and David G. Rand. 2021. Cognitive reflection correlates with behavior on Twitter. *Nature Communications* 12, 1 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-20043-0>
- [156] Daniel Muise, Homa Hosseinmardi, Baird Howland, Markus Mobius, David Rothschild, and Duncan J. Watts. 2022. Quantifying partisan news diets in Web and TV audiences. *Science Advances* 8, 28 (2022), eabn0083. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.abn0083> arXiv:<https://www.science.org/doi/pdf/10.1126/sciadv.abn0083>
- [157] Stephen R. Neely. 2021. Politically Motivated Avoidance in Social Networks: A Study of Facebook and the 2020 Presidential Election. *Social Media + Society* 7, 4 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1177/20563051211055438>
- [158] L Neudert, Bence Kollanyi, and Philip N Howard. 2017. Junk news and bots during the German parliamentary election: What are German voters sharing over Twitter? (2017).
- [159] C. Thi Nguyen. 2020. Echo Chambers and Epistemic Bubbles. *Episteme* 17, 2 (2020), 141–161. <https://doi.org/10.1017/epi.2018.32>
- [160] Dimitar Nikolov, Mounia Lalmas, Alessandro Flammini, and Filippo Menczer. 2019. Quantifying Biases in Online Information Exposure. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology* 70, 3 (2019), 218–229. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.24121>
- [161] Maria Nordbrandt. 2019. Affective polarization in the digital age: Testing the direction of the relationship between social media and users' feelings for out-group parties. *New Media & Society* (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1177/14614448211044393>
- [162] R. Németh. 2023. A scoping review on the use of natural language processing in research on political polarization: trends and research prospects. *Journal of Computational Social Science* 6 (2023), 289–313. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42001-022-00196-2>
- [163] Matthew J. Page, Joanne E. McKenzie, Patrick M. Bossuyt, Isabelle Boutron, Tammy C. Hoffmann, Cynthia D. Mulrow, Larissa Shamseer, Jennifer M. Tetzlaff, Elie A. Akl, Sue E. Brennan, Roger Chou, Julie Glanville, Jeremy M. Grimshaw, Asbjørn Hróbjartsson, Manoj M. Lalu, Tianjing Li, Elizabeth W. Loder, Evan Mayo-Wilson, Steve McDonald, Luke A. McGuinness, Lesley A. Stewart, James Thomas, Andrea C. Tricco, Vivian A. Welch, Penny Whiting, and David Moher. 2021. The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. 18, 3 (2021), e1003583. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1003583> Publisher: Public Library of Science.
- [164] Diana Papaioannou, Anthea Sutton, and Andrew Booth. 2016. Systematic approaches to a successful literature review. *Systematic approaches to a successful literature review* (2016), 1–336.
- [165] Eli Pariser. 2011. *The Filter Bubble: What the Internet Is Hiding from You*. Penguin Group, The.
- [166] Jaram Park, Vladimir Barash, Clay Fink, and Meeyoung Cha. 2013. Emoticon style: Interpreting differences in emoticons across cultures. In *Proceedings of the international AAAI conference on web and social media*, Vol. 7. 466–475.
- [167] John H. Parmelee and Nataliya Roman. 2020. Insta-echoes: Selective exposure and selective avoidance on Instagram. *Telematics and Informatics* 52 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2020.101432>
- [168] Nicola Perra and Luis E. C. Rocha. 2019. Modelling opinion dynamics in the age of algorithmic personalisation. *Scientific Reports* 9 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-43830-2>
- [169] Jennie Popay, Helen Roberts, Amanda Sowden, Mark Petticrew, Lisa Arai, Mark Rodgers, Nicky Britten, Katrina Roen, Steven Duffy, et al. 2006. Guidance on the conduct of narrative synthesis in systematic reviews. *A product from the ESRC methods programme Version 1*, 1 (2006), b92.
- [170] Elia Powers, Michael Koliska, and Pallavi Guha. 2019. "Shouting Matches and Echo Chambers": Perceived Identity Threats and Political Self-Censorship on Social Media. *International Journal of Communication* 13 (2019), 3630–3649.
- [171] Walter Quattrociocchi. 2017. Social and political challenges: Western Democracy in Crisis?. In *Global Risks Report 2017* (2017).
- [172] Tommaso Radicioni, Fabio Saracco, Elena Pavan, and Tiziano Squartini. 2021. Analysing Twitter semantic networks: the case of 2018 Italian elections. *Scientific Reports* 11, 1 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-92337-2>
- [173] Tommaso Radicioni, Tiziano Squartini, Elena Pavan, and Fabio Saracco. 2021. Networked partisanship and framing: A socio-semantic network analysis of the Italian debate on migration. *PLOS ONE* 16, 8 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0256705>

- [174] Patrick Rafail and Isaac Freitas. 2019. Grievance Articulation and Community Reactions in the Men's Rights Movement Online. *Social Media + Society* 5, 2 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305119841387>
- [175] Hardik Rajpal, Fernando E. Rosas, and Henrik J. Jensen. 2019. Tangled Worldview Model of Opinion Dynamics. *FRONTIERS IN PHYSICS* 7 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fphy.2019.00163>
- [176] Dean Rickles, Penelope Hawe, and Alan Shiell. 2007. A simple guide to chaos and complexity. *Journal of epidemiology and community health* 61, 11 (2007), 933–937. <https://doi.org/10.1136/jech.2006.054254>
- [177] Camille Roth, Antoine Mazieres, and Telmo Menezes. 2020. Tubes and bubbles topological confinement of YouTube recommendations. *PLOS ONE* 15, 4 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0231703>
- [178] Felix Rusche. 2022. Few voices, strong echo: Measuring follower homogeneity of politicians' Twitter accounts. *New Media & Society* (2022), 14614448221099860. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14614448221099860> arXiv:<https://doi.org/10.1177/14614448221099860>
- [179] Abhishek Samantray and Paolo Pin. 2019. Credibility of climate change denial in social media. *Palgrave Communications* 5 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-019-0344-4>
- [180] Christian Sandvig, Kevin Hamilton, Karrie Karahalios, and Cedric Langbort. 2014. Auditing Algorithms: Research Methods for Detecting Discrimination on Internet Platforms. *Data and Discrimination: Converting Critical Concerns into Productive Inquiry* (2014).
- [181] Fernando P. Santos, Yphatch Lelkes, and Simon A. Levin. 2021. Link recommendation algorithms and dynamics of polarization in online social networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 118, 50 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2102141118>
- [182] Ana L. Schmidt, Antonio Peruzzi, Antonio Scala, Matteo Cinelli, Peter Pomerantsev, Anne Applebaum, Sophia Gaston, Nicole Fusi, Zachary Peterson, Giuseppe Severgnini, Andrea F. de Cesco, Davide Casati, Petra Kralj Novak, H. Eugene Stanley, Fabina Zollo, and Walter Quattrociocchi. 2020. Measuring social response to different journalistic techniques on Facebook. *Humanities & Social Sciences Communications* 7, 1 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-020-0507-3>
- [183] Ana Lucia Schmidt, Fabiana Zollo, Antonio Scala, Cornelia Betsch, and Walter Quattrociocchi. 2018. Polarization of the vaccination debate on Facebook. *VACCINE* 36, 25 (2018), 3606–3612. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2018.05.040>
- [184] Yotam Shmargad and Samara Klar. 2019. How Partisan Online Environments Shape Communication with Political Outgroups. *International Journal of Communication* 13 (2019), 2287–2313.
- [185] Jesse Shore, Jiye Baek, and Chrysanthos Dellarocas. 2018. Network Structure and Patterns of Information Diversity on Twitter. *Management Information Systems Quarterly* 42, 3 (2018), 849–972. <https://aisel.laisnet.org/misq/vol42/iss3/10>
- [186] BRUNO CASTANHO SILVA and SVEN-OLIVER PROKSCH. 2021. Fake It 'Til You Make It: A Natural Experiment to Identify European Politicians' Benefit from Twitter Bots. *American Political Science Review* 115, 1 (2021), 316–322. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055420000817>
- [187] Rodrigo Silva and Fran Neiva. 2016. Systematic Literature Review in Computer Science - A Practical Guide. (11 2016). <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.35453.87524>
- [188] Chareen L. Snelson. 2016. Qualitative and Mixed Methods Social Media Research: A Review of the Literature. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 15, 1 (2016), 1609406915624574. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406915624574>
- [189] Ivan Srba, Robert Moro, Matus Tomlein, Branislav Pecher, Jakub Simko, Elena Stefancova, Michal Kompan, Andrea Hrcakova, Juraj Podrouzek, Adrian Gavornik, and Maria Bielikova. 2023. Auditing YouTube's Recommendation Algorithm for Misinformation Filter Bubbles. 1, 1, Article 6 (Jan 2023), 33 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3568392>
- [190] Saatviga Sudhahar, Gianluca De Fazio, Roberto Franzosi, and Nello Cristianini. 2015. Network analysis of narrative content in large corpora. *Natural Language Engineering* 21, 1 (1 Jan. 2015), 81–112. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1351324913000247>
- [191] Michael Suelflow, Svenja Schaefer, and Stephan Winter. 2019. Selective attention in the news feed: An eye-tracking study on the perception and selection of political news posts on Facebook. *New Media & Society* 21, 1 (2019), 168–190. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444818791520>
- [192] Cass Sunstein. 2001. *Republic.com*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J.
- [193] Cass Sunstein. 2017. *Republic : divided democracy in the age of social media*. Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- [194] Cameron E. Taylor, Alexander V. Mantzaris, and Ivan Garibay. 2018. Exploring How Homophily and Accessibility Can Facilitate Polarization in Social Networks. *Information* 9, 12 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.3390/info9120325>
- [195] Ludovic Terren and Rosa Borge. 2021. Echo Chambers on Social Media: A Systematic Review of the Literature. *REVIEW OF COMMUNICATION RESEARCH* 9 (2021), 99–118. <https://doi.org/10.12840/ISSN.2255-4165.028>
- [196] Matus Tomlein, Branislav Pecher, Jakub Simko, Ivan Srba, Robert Moro, Elena Stefancova, Michal Kompan, Andrea Hrcakova, Juraj Podrouzek, and Maria Bielikova. 2021. An Audit of Misinformation Filter Bubbles on YouTube: Bubble Bursting and Recent Behavior Changes. In *Fifteenth ACM Conference on Recommender Systems*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3460231.3474241>
- [197] Petter Tornberg. 2018. Echo chambers and viral misinformation: Modeling fake news as complex contagion. *PLOS ONE* 13, 9 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0203958>
- [198] Javier Torregrosa, Angel Panizo-Lledot, Gema Bello-Orgaz, and David Camacho. 2020. Analyzing the relationship between relevance and extremist discourse in an alt-right network on Twitter. *Social Network Analysis and Mining* 10, 1 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13278-020-00676-1>
- [199] V. A. Traag, L. Waltman, and N. J. van Eck. 2019. From Louvain to Leiden: guaranteeing well-connected communities. 9, 1 (2019), 5233. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-41695-z> Number: 1 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group.
- [200] Kathie Treen, Hywel Williams, Saffron O'Neill, and Travis G. Coan. 2022. Discussion of Climate Change on Reddit: Polarized Discourse or Deliberative Debate? *Environmental Communication* 16, 5 (2022), 680–698. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17524032.2022.2050776>

- arXiv:<https://doi.org/10.1080/17524032.2022.2050776>
- [201] Alan Tsang and Kate Larson. 2016. The Echo Chamber: Strategic Voting and Homophily in Social Networks. In *Proceedings of the 2016 International Conference on Autonomous Agents & Multiagent Systems (AAMAS '16)*. International Foundation for Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems, Richland, SC, 368–375.
- [202] Kate M. Turetsky and Travis A. Riddle. 2018. Porous Chambers, Echoes of Valence and Stereotypes: A Network Analysis of Online News Coverage Interconnectedness Following a Nationally Polarizing Race-Related Event. *Social Psychological and Personality Science* 9, 2 (2018), 163–175.
- [203] Aman Tyagi, Joshua Uyheng, and Kathleen M. Carley. 2021. Heated conversations in a warming world: affective polarization in online climate change discourse follows real-world climate anomalies. *Social Network Analysis and Mining* 11, 1 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13278-021-00792-6>
- [204] Aleksandra Urman. 2019. News Consumption of Russian Vkontakte Users: Polarization and News Avoidance. *International Journal of Communication* 13 (2019), 5158–5182.
- [205] Cristian Vaccari, Augusto Valeriani, Pablo Barbera, John T. Jost, Jonathan Nagler, and Joshua A. Tucker. 2016. Of Echo Chambers and Contrarian Clubs: Exposure to Political Disagreement Among German and Italian Users of Twitter. *Social Media + Society* 2, 3 (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305116664221>
- [206] Peter Van Aelst, Jesper Strömbäck, Toril Aalberg, Frank Esser, Claes De Vreese, Jörg Matthes, David Hopmann, Susana Salgado, Nicolas Hubé, and Agnieszka Stepińska. 2017. Political communication in a high-choice media environment: a challenge for democracy? 41, 1 (2017), 3–27. ISBN: 2380-8985 Publisher: Taylor & Francis.
- [207] Tyler J. VanderWeele and An Weihua. 2014. Social Networks and Causal Inference. In *Handbook of causal analysis for social research*. Springer, Dordrecht, 353–374. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-6094-3>
- [208] Michael Veale and Frederik Zuiderveen Borgesius. 2021. Demystifying the Draft EU Artificial Intelligence Act – Analysing the good, the bad, and the unclear elements of the proposed approach. *Computer Law Review International* 22, 4 (2021), 97–112. <https://doi.org/doi:10.9785/cr-2021-220402>
- [209] Giacomo Villa, Gabriella Pasi, and Marco Viviani. 2021. Echo chamber detection and analysis A topology- and content-based approach in the COVID-19 scenario. *Social Network Analysis and Mining* 11, 1 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13278-021-00779-3>
- [210] Siw Waffenschmidt, Marco Knellingen, Wiebke Sieben, Stefanie Bühn, and Dawid Pieper. 2019. Single screening versus conventional double screening for study selection in systematic reviews: a methodological systematic review. *BMC medical research methodology* 19, 1 (2019), 132. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-019-0782-0>
- [211] Dandan Wang and Yuxing Qian. 2021. Echo Chamber Effect in Rumor Rebuttal Discussions About COVID-19 in China: Social Media Content and Network Analysis Study. *Journal of Medical Internet Research* 23, 3 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.2196/27009>
- [212] Dandan Wang, Yadong Zhou, and Feicheng Ma. 2022. Opinion Leaders and Structural Hole Spanners Influencing Echo Chambers in Discussions About COVID-19 Vaccines on Social Media in China: Network Analysis. *J Med Internet Res* 24, 11 (18 Nov 2022), e40701. <https://doi.org/10.2196/40701>
- [213] Xin Wang, Antonio D. Sirianni, Shaoting Tang, Zhiming Zheng, and Feng Fu. 2020. Public Discourse and Social Network Echo Chambers Driven by Socio-Cognitive Biases. *Physical Review X* 10, 4 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevX.10.041042>
- [214] Xiaohui Wang and Yunya Song. 2020. Viral misinformation and echo chambers: the diffusion of rumors about genetically modified organisms on social media. *INTERNET RESEARCH* 30, 5 (2020), 1547–1564. <https://doi.org/10.1108/INTR-11-2019-0491>
- [215] We Are Social, DataReportal, and Meltwater. 2024. Most Popular Social Networks Worldwide as of April 2024, Ranked by Number of Monthly Active Users (in millions) [Graph]. In Statista. Retrieved April 25, 2024, from <https://www.statista.com/statistics/272014/global-social-networks-ranked-by-number-of-users/>.
- [216] Jacob Westfall, Leaf Van Boven, John R. Chambers, and Charles M. Judd. 2015. Perceiving Political Polarization in the United States: Party Identity Strength and Attitude Extremity Exacerbate the Perceived Partisan Divide. *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 10, 2 (2015), 145–158. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691615569849> arXiv:<https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691615569849> PMID: 25910386.
- [217] Joe Whittaker, Sean Looney, Alastair Reed, and Fabio Votta. 2021. Recommender systems and the amplification of extremist content. *INTERNET POLICY REVIEW* 10, 3 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.14763/2021.2.1565>
- [218] Maranke Wieringa, Daniela van Geenen, Mirko Tobias Schafer, and Ludo Gorzeman. 2018. Political topic-communities and their framing practices in the Dutch Twittersphere. *INTERNET POLICY REVIEW* 7, 2 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.14763/2018.2.793>
- [219] Michael Wolfowicz, David Weisburd, and Badi Hasisi. 2023. Examining the interactive effects of the filter bubble and the echo chamber on radicalization. *Journal of Experimental Criminology* (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-021-09471-0>
- [220] Dag Wollebaek, Rune Karlsen, Kari Steen-Johnsen, and Bernard Enjolras. 2019. Anger, Fear, and Echo Chambers: The Emotional Basis for Online Behavior. *Social Media + Society* 5, 2 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305119829859>
- [221] Stan Hok-Wui Wong and Mathew Y. H. Wong. 2020. "Distant Participation" and Youth Political Attitudes: Evidence from a Natural Experiment. *SOCIAL SCIENCE QUARTERLY* 101, 4 (2020), 1489–1512. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ssqu.12812>
- [222] Thomas Zerback and Lara Kobilke. 2022. The role of affective and cognitive attitude extremity in perceived viewpoint diversity exposure. *New Media & Society* (2022), 14614448221117484. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14614448221117484> arXiv:<https://doi.org/10.1177/14614448221117484>
- [223] Xinzhi Zhang and Jeffrey C. F. Ho. 2022. Exploring the Fragmentation of the Representation of Data-Driven Journalism in the Twittersphere: A Network Analytics Approach. *Social Science Computer Review* (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1177/0894439320905522>
- [224] Jianming Zhu, Peikun Ni, Guangmo Tong, Guoqing Wang, and Jun Huang. 2021. Influence Maximization Problem With Echo Chamber Effect in Social Network. *IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON COMPUTATIONAL SOCIAL SYSTEMS* 8, 5 (2021), 1163–1171. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TCSS.2021.3073064>

- [225] Fabiana Zollo, Alessandro Bessi, Michela Del Vicario, Antonio Scala, Guido Caldarelli, Louis Shekhtman, Shlomo Havlin, and Walter Quattrociocchi. 2017. Debunking in a world of tribes. *PLOS ONE* 12, 7 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0181821>
- [226] Fabiana Zollo, Petra Kralj Novak, Michela Del Vicario, Alessandro Bessi, Igor Mozetic, Antonio Scala, Guido Caldarelli, and Walter Quattrociocchi. 2015. Emotional Dynamics in the Age of Misinformation. *PLOS ONE* 10, 9 (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0138740>

APPENDIX

A Codebook

CODEBOOK			
Code	Subcode	Value Range	Code Description
FOCUS AND GRANULARITY: The foci of the publication and which factors / conceptualizations of echo chambers did the publication use?	Focus	EC hypothesis, News sharing and consumig, Recommender Systems and EC, "Cognitive states, personality traits, and EC", Opinion dynamics on social media, "COVID-19, vaccines and EC", Misinformation and EC, "Extremism, radicalization and EC", Elections and EC, Climate change and EC, Migitation of EC, Parliament discussions and EC	What is the primary focus of the publication regarding echo chamber research on social media?
	Group	"Yes" / "No"	Does the publication analyze a specific group for echo chamber properties?
	Platform	"Yes" / "No"	Does the publication explore echo chambers on specific social media platforms?
	Cross-Platform	"Yes" / "No"	Does the publication examine echo chambers across multiple social media platforms?
	Holistic	"Yes" / "No"	Does the publication take a holistic approach to studying echo chambers, considering various platforms and media simultaneously?
EC CONSTRUCT AND CONCEPTUALIZATION: which factors / conceptualizations of echo chambers did the publication use to analyze echo chambers?	Well-defined conceptualization?	"Yes" / "No"	Is the definition of an echo chamber well-defined in the publication?
	Homophily	"Yes" / "No"	Does the publication consider homophily as a conceptualization of echo chambers?
	Content Exposure	"Yes" / "No"	Does the publication conceptualize echo chambers through content exposure, i.e. which content is circulating in a network or group?
	User Behaviour	"Yes" / "No"	Did the authors use specific user behavior like confirmation bias or selective exposure as a factor for defining an echo chamber?
	Group Behaviour	"Yes" / "No"	Did the authors use a specific group behavior like discrediting of non-members of the group and active exclusion as a factor of echo chambers?
SOCIAL MEDIA DATA: The type of social media data that was used by the publication.	Recommender Systems	"Yes" / "No"	Did the publication incorporate specific recommender system behavior as a factor for an echo chamber?
	Platform(s)	String of Platform analyzed, one variable for each data set that was analyzed in the publication	Which social media platform(s) were analyzed in the publication?

	Data set	String of the data set that was used. Similar data sets were matched. Table 3 presents the corpus' data sets.	
	Countries	String	Which countries came the data from?
	Number of Users	One Integer for one data set, not rounded and mean for several data sets on the same platform	How many users were analyzed?
	Number of Data Points	One Integer for one data set, not rounded and mean for several data sets on the same platform	How many data points were considered (e.g. comments, posts, likes)?
METHOD: Which methods, operationalization, and metrics are used by the authors to analyze echo chambers on social media	Method(s)	One of the following: Social Media Data Analysis, Survey, Experiments, Mixed Methods	Which method is used by the authors to research echo chambers?
	Metrics and Measures	String(s) of the used metrics and measures (the operationalization) of EC in the paper. See Table 5 for metrics and measures in EC research.	Which metrics and measures are utilized in the study's analysis of echo chambers?
RESULTS ANTECEDENTS: Which mechanisms or antecedents are associated with echo chamber formation in the study at hand?	Political Institutions	"Yes" / "No"	Does the paper discuss the influence of political institutions in the context of echo chambers creation?
	Populism	"Yes" / "No"	Does the publication link its findings to the concept of populism to the creation of echo chamber?
	Fragmented Society	"Yes" / "No"	Does the publication consider a fragmented society as one antecedent of echo chambers?
	Content Moderation and Recommender Systems	"Yes" / "No"	Does the publication explore aspects of content moderation, algorithmic curation, and recommender systems as antecedents or mechanisms for the establishment of echo chambers?
	User Behaviour	"Yes" / "No"	Is specific user behavior like cognitive dissonance, selective exposure, or confirmation bias associated with echo chambers?
RESULTS ATTRIBUTES: Which attributes are associated with echo chamber formation in the study at hand?	Active Users	"Yes" / "No"	Does the paper discuss the role of active users in shaping the outcomes related to social media data and echo chambers?
	Around Events?	"Yes" / "No"	Does the publication consider echo chamber creation around specific events?
	Mitigation?	"Yes" / "No"	Does the publication address potential mitigation strategies for echo chambers?
	Found EC	"Yes" / "No"	Did the publication find evidence for echo chamber(s)?
	Found No EC	"Yes" / "No"	Did the publication find evidence against echo chamber(s)?
RESULTS EFFECTS: Which effects are associated with echo chamber formation in the study at hand?	Toxicity	"Yes" / "No"	Is an increase of toxicity associated with echo chambers?

Emotional Contagion	"Yes" / "No"	Is an emotional contagion associated with echo chambers?
No Effect	"Yes" / "No"	Does the publication suggest that there is no significant effect of echo chambers on social media?
Polarization	"Yes" / "No"	Does the publication find evidence for polarization as an effect in the context of echo chambers?
Extremism	"Yes" / "No"	Does the publication find evidence for extremism as an effect in the context of echo chambers?
Trust-loss	"Yes" / "No"	Does the publication find evidence for trust-loss as an effect in the context of echo chambers?
Misinformation	"Yes" / "No"	Does the publication find evidence for misinformation as an effect in the context of echo chambers?

Table 4. Table of the codes from the detailed analysis

B Results

Authors	Country	Method	Focus	Platform	Result
Ackermann et al. 2022	Swiss	Surveys	Elections and EC	Social Media in General	Mixed
Aruguete et al. 2021	Argentina, Brasil, US	CSS	News sharing behavior	Twitter	Positive
Asatani et al. 2021	Japan	CSS	EC hypothesis	Twitter	Positive
Auxier et al. 2019	US	Surveys	Cognitive states, emotions, personality traits	Social Media in General, mobile news applications	Mixed
Bail et al. 2018	US	Experiment	EC hypothesis	Twitter	Negative
Bakshy et al. 2015	US	CSS	EC hypothesis	Facebook	Positive
Barbera et al. 2015	US	CSS	EC hypothesis	Twitter	Mixed
Bastos et al. 2018	UK	CSS	Geographic embedding of Echo Chambers	Twitter	Positive
Batorski et al. 2018	Poland	CSS	EC hypothesis	Facebook	Positive
Beam et al. 2018	US	Surveys	EC hypothesis	Facebook	Negative
Bessi 2016	US	CSS	cognitive associations with EC	Facebook	Positive
Bessi et al. 2016	US	CSS	EC hypothesis	Facebook, Youtube	Positive
Bessi et al. 2015	Italy	CSS	Misinformation	Facebook	Positive
Bodo et al. 2019	Netherlands	Surveys	News sharing and consuming	Social Media in General	Positive
Bond et al. 2018		CSS	EC hypothesis	bluedit	Positive
Boulianne et al. 2022	France, UK, US	Surveys	Extremism, radicalization and echo chambers	Social Media in General	Negative
Boulianne et al. 2020	France, UK, US	Surveys	Cognitive states, emotions, personality traits	Social Media in General	Negative
Boutyline et al. 2017	US	CSS	EC hypothesis	Twitter	Positive
Bovet et al. 2022	UK	CSS	Extremism and echo chambers		Mixed
Bright 2018	EU	CSS	EC hypothesis	Twitter	Mixed
Brugnoli et al. 2019	Italy	CSS	EC hypothesis	Facebook	Positive
Bruns 2017	Australia	CSS	EC hypothesis	Twitter	Negative
Burnett et al. 2022	US	Surveys	News sharing and consuming	Social Media in General	Negative
Cann et al. 2021	US, UK	CSS	Climate change and echo chambers	Twitter	Positive
Cargnino et al. 2022	Germany	Experiment	Cognitive states, emotions, personality traits	Twitter	Negative
Cargnino et al. 2021		Experiment	Echo chamber hypothesis		Positive
Ceron et al. 2019	Italy	CSS	TV, social media and echo chambers	Twitter	Positive

Authors	Country	Method	Focus	Platform	Result
Chan et al. 2019	Taiwan, Japan, Korea	Surveys	News sharing and consuming	Social Media in General	Mixed
Cheng et al. 2023		Surveys	Cognitive states, emotions, personality traits		Negative
Choi et al. 2020	US	CSS	Misinformation	Twitter	Positive
Cinelli et al. 2020	EU	CSS	EC hypothesis	Facebook	Positive
Cinelli et al. 2021	US	CSS	recommendation algorithms	Twitter, Facebook, Reddit	Mixed
Cinelli et al. 2021	Italy	CSS	Misinformation	YouTube	Positive
Colleoni et al. 2014	US	CSS	EC hypothesis	Twitter	Mixed
Cota et al. 2019	Brasli	CSS	EC hypothesis	Twitter	Positive
Del Valle et al. 2018	Spain	CSS	Parliamentary discussions and echo chambers	Twitter	Positive
Del Valle et al.	Netherlands	CSS	Parliamentary discussions and echo chambers	Twitter	Negative
Del Vicario et al. 2016	US	CSS	Misinformation	Facebook	Positive
Del Vicario et al. 2016	US	CSS	Emotions and echo chambers	Facebook	Positive
Del Vicario et al. 2017	UK	CSS	EC hypothesis	Facebook	Positive
Dubois et al. 2018	UK	Surveys	EC hypothesis	Social Media in General	Negative
Dubois et al. 2020	France	Surveys	EC hypothesis	Social Media in General	Mixed
Eady et al. 2019	US	Mixed Methods	EC hypothesis	Twitter	Negative
Enjolras et al. 2022	Norway	CSS	Echo chamber hypothesis	Twitter	Mixed
Etta et al. 2022	US	CSS	EC hypothesis	Twitter, Gab	Positive
Flamino et al. 2023	US	CSS	EC hypothesis	Twitter	Mixed
Flaxman et al. 2016		CSS	EC hypothesis		Mixed
Fletcher et al. 2021	UK	CSS	News sharing behavior	Browser	Mixed
Furman et al. 2020		CSS	EC hypothesis	Twitter	Negative
Gaumont et al. 2018	France	CSS	Opinion dynamics	Twitter	Positive
Goel et al. 2023	US	CSS	Echo chamber hypothesis	Reddit, Twitter, Gab	Mixed
Guarino et al. 2020	Italy	CSS	EC hypothesis	Twitter	Positive
Guerrero-Sole 2018	Spain	CSS	EC hypothesis	Twitter	Positive
Guo et al. 2020	US	CSS	EC hypothesis	Twitter	Mixed
Hagen et al. 2022	US	Mixed Methods	Vaccines, misinformation, and echo chambers	Twitter	Mixed
Hilbert et al. 2018	US	Mixed Methods	Recommender systems and EC	YouTube	Positive

Authors	Country	Method	Focus	Platform	Result
Jones-Jang et al. 2022	US	Surveys	Vaccines, misinformation and echo chambers	Social Media in General	Negative
Justwan et al. 2018	US	Surveys	Cognitive states, emotions, personality traits	Social Media in General	Negative
Kaiser et al. 2020	Germany, US	CSS	Recommender systems and EC	YouTube	Positive
Kitchens et al. 2020		Mixed Methods	sda: tracking	Facebook, Twitter, Reddit	Mixed
Koivula et al. 2019	Finland	Surveys	News sharing and consuming	Social Media in General	Positive
Kratzke 2023	Germany	CSS	EC hypothesis	Twitter	Positive
Lima et al. 2018	US	CSS	Echo chamber hypothesis	Gab	Positive
Liu et al. 2021	US	Experiment	Recommender systems and EC	self-constructed platform	Positive
Ludwig et al. 2023	Germany	Experiment	Recommender systems and EC		Negative
Masip et al. 2020	Spain	Surveys	EC hypothesis	Facebook, Twitter, Instagram	Negative
Matuszewski 2019	Poland	CSS	EC hypothesis	Facebook	Positive
Matuszewski et al. 2019	Poland, Hungary	CSS	EC hypothesis	Twitter	Negative
Matz 2021	US	Mixed Methods	Cognitive states, emotions, personality traits	Facebook	Mixed
Min et al. 2019	China	Experiment	EC hypothesis	Weibo	Positive
Mirlohi et al. 2022		CSS	Contagion and echo chambers	Twitter, Forsquare	Mixed
Monti et al. 2023	US	CSS	EC hypothesis	Reddit	Negative
Morales et al. 2021	US	CSS	EC hypothesis	Reddit	Negative
Mosleh et al. 2021	US	Experiment	EC hypothesis	Twitter	Positive
Mosleh et al. 2021	US	mixed Methods	Cognitive states, emotions, personality traits	Twitter	Mixed
Muise et al. 2022	US	CSS	TV, social media and echo chambers	Browser	Mixed
Neely 2021	US	Surveys	Elections and EC	Facebook	Mixed
Nikolov et al. 2019	US	CSS	Elections and EC	Social Media in General	Positive
Nordbrandt	Netherlands	Surveys	EC hypothesis	Social Media in General	Negative
Powers et al. 2019	US	Surveys	Elections and EC	Social Media in General	Negative
Radicioni et al. 2021	Italy	CSS	TV, social media and echo chambers	Twitter	Mixed

Authors	Country	Method	Focus	Platform	Result
Radicioni et al. 2021	Italy	CSS	EC hypothesis	Twitter	Mixed
Rafail et al. 2019	US	CSS	EC hypothesis	Reddit	Positive
Roth et al. 2020	EU	CSS	EC hypothesis	YouTube	Mixed
Rusche 2022	Germany	CSS	EC hypothesis	Twitter	Mixed
Samantray et al. 2019		CSS	Climate change	Twitter	Mixed
Schmidt et al. 2020	Italy	CSS	EC hypothesis	Facebook	Positive
Schmidt et al. 2018	Italy	CSS	COVID-19, vaccines and echo chambers	Facebook	Positive
Shmargad et al. 2019	US	Experiment	News sharing and consuming	Social Media in General	Positive
Shore et al. 2018	US	CSS	EC hypothesis	Twitter	Mixed
Srba et al. 2023		CSS	Misinformation	YouTube	Mixed
Suelflow et al. 2019	US	Experiment	Recommender systems and EC	Facebook	Positive
Sun et al. 2022	US	CSS	Covid-19	YouTube	Mixed
Tomlein et al.		CSS	Misinformation	YouTube	Mixed
Torregrosa et al. 2020	US	CSS	Extremism and echo chambers	Twitter	Positive
Treen et al. 2022	US	CSS	Climate change and EC	Reddit	Mixed
Turetsky et al. 2018	US	CSS	News sharing behavior		Negative
Tyagi et al. 2021	US	CSS	climate change and echo chambers	Twitter	Positive
Urman 2019	Russia	CSS	EC hypothesis	Vkontakte	Positive
Vaccari et al. 2016	Italy, Germany	Surveys	EC hypothesis	Twitter	Positive
Villa et al. 2021	EU	CSS	Covid-19 and Echo chambers	Twitter	Positive
Wang et al. 2021	China	CSS	Vaccines, misinformation and echo chambers	Weibo	Positive
Wang et al. 2022	China	CSS	EC hypothesis	Weibo	Positive
Wang et al. 2020	China	CSS	Misinformation	Weibo	Negative
Whittaker et al. 2021		Experiment	extremism	YouTube, Gab, Reddit	Mixed
Wieringa et al. 2018	Netherlands	CSS	EC hypothesis	Twitter	Positive
Wolfowicz et al. 2023	Israel, Palestine	Mixed Methods	extremism	Twitter	Mixed
Wollebaek et al. 2019	Norway	Surveys	Cognitive states, emotions, personality traits	Social Media in General	Mixed
Zerback et al. 2022	Germany	Surveys	Extremism, radicalization and echo chambers	Social Media in General	Mixed
Zollo et al. 2017	US	CSS	EC hypothesis	Facebook	Positive
Zollo et al. 2015	US	CSS	Emotions and echo chambers	Facebook	Positive

C Measures and Metrics

Category	Metrics
Ideological Congruence & Content Alignment	Ideological congruence Issue salience TF-IDF Content alignment Cross-cutting content Campaign affiliation: Frequency of one-sided shared hashtags per user Activity of users and mentions of parties
Polarization & Homophily	Political homophily Fragmentation metric F Homophily similarity score Bimodality coefficient Shares in a given timeframe Preferences of users and political leaning User activity per subreddit Heterogeneity in communities
Selective Exposure & User Preferences	Selective exposure Preferences of users Average nearest-neighbors degree User leaning Power distributions Cross-cutting content Homogeneous social network intergroup dynamics test Ideological bias
Network Structure & Centrality	Assortativity Linguistic intergroup bias Modularity Centrality measures Flow stability Socio-demographic features The cluster's modularity and density PageRank of nodes within clusters
Emotion & Opinion Dynamics	Emotion opinion polarization Information spreading Political slant Framing and social conformity

Table 5. List of CSS Echo Chamber Operationalization Metrics