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Research questions

How prevalent was “fake news” during the 2016 U.S. presidential election?

- Who visited “fake news” websites?
- How did they end up there?
- Did fact checks reach “fake news” consumers?
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Do we live in echo chambers that reinforce not just our opinions but our factual beliefs?
The rise of “fake news”
“Fake news” distribution

Total Facebook Engagements for Top 20 Election Stories

Engagement refers to the total number of shares, reactions, and comments for a piece of content on Facebook. Source: Facebook data via BuzzSumo

(Silverman 2016)
Data overview

- **YouGov Pulse panel** \((n = 3251)\)
  - Sample period: October 21–31, 2016

- **Passive web tracking data**
  - Sample period: October 7–November 14 \((n = 2525)\)
  - Laptop/desktop only (mobile data partial/limited)
  - Captures fact-checking and fake news consumption

- **Fake news definition**
  - Fact-checked “fake news” + top shared (Allcott & Gentzkow 2017)
  - Excluding “hard news” domains (Bakshy et al. 2015)
  - Classify domains if \(> 1\) article and \(\geq 80\%\) pro-Trump/Clinton
Prevalence of fake news

- 27.4% read an article from a fake news site
- Mean of 5 pro-Trump articles (out of 5.45 total)
- Total: 2.6% of pages visited on hard news topics

![Visited at least one article](chart1)
![% of online news consumption](chart2)
Fake news consumption by media diet (binary)
Fake news consumption by media diet (%)
Visits in 30 seconds prior to fake news exposure

Type of article
- fake news
- hard news
- neither
Fact-checking vs. fake news
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Conclusions

- Substantial fake news consumption
- Convincing evidence of selective exposure
- Facebook key vector of transmission
- Fact checks almost entirely ineffective