

University of Groningen

Accessing, evaluating and engaging with news.

Swart, Joelle

Published in:
6+1 proposals for journalism

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2022

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Swart, J. (2022). Accessing, evaluating and engaging with news. The value of a user-centric approach for rethinking media literacy. . In S. Iordanidou, & C. Dagoula (Eds.), *6+1 proposals for journalism: Safeguarding the field in the digital era* (pp. 174-186). Intellect.

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Accessing, Evaluating and Engaging with News: The Value of a User-Centric Approach for Rethinking Media Literacy

Joëlle Swart

Introduction

Educational institutions are increasingly paying attention to media literacy. Concerns around misinformation, privacy and filter bubbles (Pariser 2011) have sparked a variety of programmes, tailored toward turning young people into critical, mindful and active news users who can confidently navigate the media-saturated society they live in (Mihailidis 2012). These curricula are based on the premise that by training students to become more critical toward the information they receive and the technologies they use, they become less susceptible to the potential dangers that media pose, such as fake news or privacy invasions (Bulger and Davison 2018; Lewandowsky et al. 2017). However, recent work has shown that such media literacy interventions might also backfire (boyd 2017). First, schools have struggled to find the delicate balance between promoting healthy scepticism and turning youth into cynical citizens who come to distrust any source of information (Mihailidis 2018; Vraga and Tully 2019). Second, studies show that a high awareness of the importance of privacy online may translate into passive media users who no longer dare to engage publicly with news at all, especially if it concerns sensitive topics (Marwick and boyd 2014; Thorson 2014). Finally, the current focus of media literacy initiatives on the evaluation of content, while undoubtedly important, means the way platforms and algorithms may impact such information remains largely neglected. This is reflected in people's varying levels of algorithmic awareness (Fletcher and Kleis Nielsen 2019; Powers 2017). Such findings challenge current approaches to media education, raising the question of how media literacy could be facilitated in a way that *empowers* users to

access, analyse, evaluate and engage with news and media (Hobbs 2011; Maks et al. 2015; Mihailidis 2018).

This chapter explores these questions by departing from the practices and experiences of media users themselves. What skills, competences and knowledge do *they* perceive as helpful to build up an understanding of the public world? How and under what circumstances does media literacy become useful? What is the actual impact of media literacy – and reversely, what are the problematic consequences of being media illiterate – for people in everyday life? This chapter shows how such an emic approach to media literacy helps to create more nuanced and layered understandings of how to foster people's abilities to use media in a thoughtful, deliberate manner.

Its research draws upon a series of semi-structured, in-depth interviews I conducted in the first half of 2019 with 36 Dutch young people (between 16 and 22 years old) about their social media use and media literacy, focusing on students in lower vocational education (MBO) in particular. This is both the lowest and most common level of tertiary education in the Dutch education system. Despite previous work that shows level of education is one of the strongest predictors of young people's level of news and media literacy (Kleemans and Eggink 2016), most media literacy research still remains focused at college or university students. This study addresses this underrepresented group. Its sample included young people of different gender, ages and ethnicity, recruited via their teachers at schools in three different regions in The Netherlands, who were enrolled in a mix of programmes (from automotive engineering to personal healthcare to administrative assistance) and in different phases of their studies (first-, second- and third-year students). Students from journalism-related programmes were excluded from the sample. Prior to the interview, students were asked to sign an informed consent form; for underage participants, parents were asked to give permission and sign the form in advance. The interviews discussed four major themes: young people's (1) everyday media habits (2) use of social media (3) (social) media literacy and (4) their civic engagement on social media platforms. Students did not receive a reward for participation but could participate in the research as a substitute activity during class. Inductive, thematic analysis (Corbin and Strauss 2015) was used to analyse the interview data (see Swart 2021 for a full description of the study's methodology).

Based on its findings, this chapter discusses the value of taking a user-centric approach to studying media literacy, in relation to three issues in particular. First, it explores the topic of trustworthiness of news content on social media and how to help young media users to critically evaluate (mis)information in these spaces. Second, the chapter delves into the issue of teaching students how to engage with news while simultaneously managing their privacy online, at a time when their digital news consumption is continuously subject to surveillance. Finally, it

explores how an emic approach may expand our understandings of how to enable young people to follow their news interests in an increasingly algorithmically tailored news environment.

Evaluating news and discerning misinformation

Recent debates about ‘fake news’ and fears around young people’s vulnerability to misinformation have resulted in a rise of media literacy initiatives. The underlying argument for these programmes is that the ability to recognize accurate, credible and reliable news is vital to people’s practices of informed citizenship and to democracy more generally. Klurfeld and Schneider (2014) argue that citizens’ ability to discern quality journalism is crucial to its survival. This applies to both its economic endurance and to journalism’s symbolic role as a primary sense-making institution in society, whose relevance depends on users’ collective attention to its content (Hartley 1996; Swart 2018). Distinguishing news, however, requires an ever-increasing level of skills. People need to make sense of a variety of sources that are not necessarily produced by professional journalists. Moreover, the mixture of different information genres in social media feeds raises questions about what ‘news’ or ‘journalism’ actually is (Edgerly 2017). Given this complexity, it is unsurprising that much research on media literacy highlights the importance of training critical thinking skills for encouraging media literacy (e.g., Kahne and Bowyer 2017; Vraga and Tully 2019).

However, as has been widely noted (boyd 2017; Broersma 2018; Mihailidis 2018), the focus on possible deficits of news media that comes with the scrutiny of critically evaluating news content can have the unintended side-effect of fostering distrust for *all* media. The interviews reflect such scepticism by default. In particular, young people who had grown up in households where news was not (or only sporadically) consumed or discussed were cynical about classic notions of objectivity. Unlike their classmates, when I asked what they thought was news, they did not refer to any classical news values (Harcup and O’Neill 2016), such as the story’s public magnitude, the timeliness of the issue or its contribution to wider public debate. For them, anything that was novel and recent could potentially be news. Because they automatically equated such classifications of ‘newness’ with judgments about reliability and credibility (see Edgerly and Vraga 2020), this made trusting news or media problematic. When the boundaries of what counts as reliable information are not clearly delineated, for example, Lisa¹ (18) argued this also implies exactly the opposite: that any content you come across may be inaccurate or even a deliberate attempt to mislead you.

In general, confirming earlier findings (Craft et al. 2016), these young people knew little about how news is produced, who makes editorial decisions in reporting, or the economics behind news production, even when they came from news-rich backgrounds. Although most interviewees had a good overview of the national media landscape and could name major news brands, they rarely referred to political leanings of media organizations or whether such a source might be sponsored and influenced by commercial logics. This was exemplary of students' broader lack of knowledge about news production and about processes of framing, bias and gatekeeping. Without such a frame of reference to rely upon, even with a toolkit of potential ways to verify and cross-check information up your sleeve, it is easy to become cynical about journalism as a whole.

Moreover, the findings suggest that the problem lies not so much with young people not being aware of any verification strategies they can use but with the perceived *usefulness* and practicality of these strategies (see also Vraga et al. 2021). Regardless of their level of media education, most could list at least one strategy for validating information, such as cross-checking with another source or looking up the author of a piece or the organization that had published the story. Also, students' awareness that content might be misinformation was high. With platform rather than source functioning as the major cue for reliability (cf. Sterrett et al. 2019), they were particularly hesitant to trust news on Facebook, which had a notoriously bad reputation among young people for presenting fabricated stories. In practice, however, such verification strategies were seldomly employed. They were considered cumbersome, time-consuming and difficult to align with students' everyday news routines. Students' most common practice of consuming news was scrolling, that is, navigating through their social media news feeds continuously. Users were already hesitant to break this flow to click on a story to read it in full, confirming previous findings (Groot Kormelink and Costera Meijer 2019), let alone to seek confirmation from other news sources. Taking everything with a grain of salt, therefore, was considered a far less laborious alternative. Less cynical students solved the issue of judging the trustworthiness of news stories by relying on a variety of shortcuts. For instance, Sanne (18) used the news brand as a cue for reliability, whereas Daan (21) checked the comments below a news story to verify it. While such tactics were perceived as imperfect rough estimations, rather than full assessments of trustworthiness, they were simultaneously experienced as far more practical in everyday life. Therefore, they were also applied more frequently. Thus, equipping students with a broad set of authentication strategies and tactics, while indicating strengths and pitfalls, might help to counter young people's lack of agency regarding misinformation.

Engaging with news and managing privacy

Second, we turn to the value of a user-centric perspective for understanding youth's privacy practices. Students of programmes where media education was part of the curriculum (typically embedded in broader 'Citizenship' courses) described the importance of managing privacy online as one of the most prominent focal points of these programmes. A frequently used exercise, for instance, was having students google their own names to give them insight into the digital traces of their online behaviour. The interviewees also mentioned how privacy management was being emphasized by their parents, in stories by peers and in the mass media, for example, in the popular MTV show *Catfish*. These messages tended to stress users' individual responsibility for shaping their online visibility and image.

However, as Hargittai and Marwick (2016) note, '[T]he ability of individuals to control the spread of their personal information is compromised by both technological and social violations of privacy' (3572). Youth don't see privacy online as personally constructed, but as networked (De Wolf 2020; Marwick and boyd 2014). This is reflected in their experiences of media education. On the individual level, these educational programmes might seem highly effective. Most interviewees could reflect in detail on what information they shared on which social media platform, what results searching for their name in Google would yield and showed in-depth knowledge of social media's privacy settings. However, students simultaneously experienced privacy as, at least partially, out of their control. The interviews showcase a sense of what De Wolf (2020) has been labelled as 'networked defeatism', that is, a perceived lack of individual control over one's privacy on social media. Some students, therefore, in addition to personal privacy management, had social safeguards in place, such as having an agreement with their friends to always ask for permission prior to uploading group pictures. As previous work has suggested (Choi et al. 2018), the application of such tactics was motivated by a sense of fatalism, as for instance Romy (20) explains:

I've closed off my Insta, but I'm easy with accepting people. On Facebook there's what school I go to, what school I went to before, where I work, in which city I live, just my street isn't on there. You know what it is? If you're a bit Big Brother, if you want to, you'll find out anyway. It's very difficult to close everything off.

Reflecting social norms expressed by parents, popular media and educators, students were much more concerned about social privacy (i.e., hiding information from people they know) than with risks of institutional surveillance (cf. Sujon 2018). Remarkably, only two students mentioned the topic of digital surveillance and the harvesting of personal data by commercial companies, giving the

Cambridge Analytica scandal as an example. With the context collapse on many social media platforms jeopardizing users' ability to restrict information to particular subgroups (Marwick and boyd 2014), youth were much more concerned with what information family members, classmates and employers could view. Young people's perceptions of these privacy risks were strongly gendered: while girls often referred to the peril of sharing nude pictures and being 'exposed', boys were more likely to mention how drunk photos could lead to missed employment opportunities.

Young people deal with their lack of control over who can see what they post in various ways, employing both individual and intrapersonal privacy management tactics (De Wolf 2020). Romy (20) operated a complex system of multiple social media accounts and even SIM cards. Where she was mainly 'lurking' while using accounts under her own name, she frequently engaged in online debates with the accounts she had registered under a pseudonym. Pablo (18) likewise used a fake name to comment on YouTube videos about public issues, but simultaneously noted that others considered such behaviour 'odd' and risky. For most young people, however, their need for online privacy indeed meant they would rarely post or even share content, especially in relation to news and politics (Thorson 2014).

The challenge for media educators, thus, is to promote mindful media use that acknowledges the permanence of content that is posted while still encouraging youth to craft their own story and shape their online image. For example, Ashley (17), an avid photographer, experienced the current emphasis of her peers and school on individual privacy management as very restrictive. She told how her desire to express herself creatively through pictures on Instagram would often prompt negative responses by her classmates who were concerned about the digital traces she left. One possible way forward, suggested by youth themselves and supported by earlier research (e.g., Hobbs et al. 2013), could be to offer more best practices of how social media technologies can be employed in a beneficial manner. For example, young people expressed they would like to learn how they employ social media to keep up to date on personal interests, engage with public issues they find important, or to present themselves to future employers. Such empowering examples may help to make youth aware of, as Tim (18) put it, 'not just its bad features, but also its functional side'.

Accessing news and personalizing news environments

Finally, we explore how an emic approach can give more insight into people's experiences of and practices around the algorithmic selection of news. While most media education programmes pay limited attention to the topic of 'algorithmic

literacy' (D'Ignazio and Bhargava 2015; Head et al. 2020), the increased use of personalized platforms for news suggests that users' ability to understand and intervene in algorithmic selection is becoming increasingly important. Like most young people (Newman et al. 2020), the interviewees strongly depended on algorithmically tailored news, with Facebook, YouTube and news widgets on their smartphones (like Apple News and Google News) featuring as the most prominent sources in their media diets. This represents a major shift in how users come to encounter news. Much audience research has conceptualized people's news use as either directed practices, influenced by users' individual characteristics and needs – in line with uses and gratifications theory (Katz et al. 1973) – or as heavily shaped by the context of people's daily habits and routines (e.g., Couldry et al. 2016). For the interviewees, however, the selection of news they consumed was usually neither purposeful nor a ritual but predominantly driven by algorithmic recommendations. Convinced that the news they needed to know would find them when it was really important (for similar folk theories, see Toff and Kleis Nielsen 2018), most participants were very passive in their search for news. While a few checked a news app on their smartphone or watched the TV news along with their parents, most of them strongly relied on social media highlighting stories that were relevant for them. Moreover, actively tailoring these platforms to their personal interests by liking specific news brands or setting up filters was rare. News, for the interviewees, was something that would simply 'come along', making the consumption of a news story fortuitous.

Given young people's dependence on algorithms for news, one might expect them to develop algorithmic imaginaries (Bucher 2017) folk theories (DeVito et al. 2017) about these mechanisms. In some cases, however, youth did not realize that the content they encountered was personalized. Youth's algorithmic awareness (or the lack of it) varied considerably between platforms. The fact that Facebook would not simply display posts of the friends and pages they followed chronologically was relatively well-known, although some interviewees were still under the impression that they would see all content their friends had posted if they would only scroll down far enough (cf. Powers 2017; Eslami et al. 2015). Similarly, many were familiar with YouTube's mechanism of prolonging users' attention via its Suggested Videos feature. For example, Mariam (20) complained how YouTube's algorithm tended to consider her interests too narrow and would show her videos that she considered too similar to each other, if she did not intervene actively with the content selection herself. However, most interviewees were unaware of algorithmic curation on other platforms they used, in particular with regard to Instagram, Twitter and Snapchat. Likewise, students had difficulty to describe what news was shown by Apple News and Google News on their smartphones' home screens, or even who supplied the content of these widgets, despite

checking them daily. After they had updated their operating system one day, they explained, such news was ‘simply there’. Some had noticed that particular news brands did show up often, but in general, they did not question how such content was selected.

The findings above are indicative of a broader lack of insight into what algorithms are and do (cf. Eslami et al. 2015; Head et al. 2020). Even when interviewees they were aware that the news they consumed on a particular platform was personalized, they tended to imagine these algorithms as neutral gatekeepers. Some theorized such mechanisms were fed by what content they clicked and viewed; most interviewees, however, contrary to previous findings (cf. Monzer et al. 2020), were unaware how their own online behaviour and supplied user data shaped the content displayed on their timelines. Algorithmic selection was also rarely connected to broader societal issues like fragmentation.

Given the interviewees’ gaps in algorithmic literacy, it is unsurprising that hardly any young people in the sample tried to actively engage with or intervene in the algorithmic personalization of news. One of these exceptions was Daan (21), who deliberately followed a variety of political parties on Twitter to ensure he would get a multifaceted view on public issues. This is an example of how users might try to reverse-engineer algorithms and influence news selection (see Rader and Gray 2015). The interview data suggest that young people like Daan, with higher levels of algorithmic literacy, who might feel more empowered to tailor their social media feeds to their personal interests, could be more likely to apply such knowledge to challenge algorithms’ decisions (for instance with the aim to create more diverse news feeds) and might have more satisfactory experiences using news on social media. More work from a user-centric perspective could provide insight into the impact of algorithmic literacy on users’ practices and experiences around personalized news.

Conclusion

Changing practices of news use force us to rethink what skills, competences and knowledge are necessary for users to confidently and critically navigate the current media landscape. This chapter has considered these questions from the perspective of young people themselves, advocating for a user-centric approach to media literacy. It has shown how starting from the perspective of media users themselves can offer further direction to media educators how to guide students regarding the complexities of contemporary media use. Consequently, it proposes three suggestions on how to align media literacy programmes more closely to young people’s everyday news practices and experiences.

First, while current approaches appeared successful in equipping students with a variety of news verification strategies and tactics, interviewees generally had little insight into the broader context of media production, media effects and the political, economic and societal role of journalism (see also Craft et al. 2016). Providing young people with such a broader frame of reference could not only help them to discern misinformation and judge the accuracy and trustworthiness of news more effectively but might also be beneficial to decrease cynicism as a potential by-effect of media education (boyd 2017), preventing young people from tuning out from news. Such higher level literacy is difficult to attain autodidactically or through peers, leaving a key role for media educators.

Second, the interviews show the importance of going beyond merely teaching knowledge and skills and giving concrete illustrations of how such media literacy can successfully be applied in practice, considering young people's everyday contexts of media use and the social norms and dynamics these might be subject to. One clear example is public engagement around news, a civic expectation that young people perceived as contradictory with standards around privacy management that promote cautionary, passive online behaviour. A more empowering approach here, aligning with the contemporary role of media in young people's everyday life, might be to focus on how youth can actually employ digital technologies for purposes of 'personal branding' (Peters 1997), show examples of how and when they might employ more open (public timelines) and relatively closed (chat apps, private groups) platforms for different purposes and help them take ownership over the way they present themselves online.

Third, the interviews show the value of a user-centric approach to algorithmic selection for understanding the growing role of algorithms in shaping young people's news use. It highlights the necessity of not only focusing on media content but also on facilitating students' knowledge of the contexts in which such information is consumed. The gaps found in young people's algorithmic literacy, for instance, are concerning given their heavy dependence on algorithmically tailored news sources. As Powers (2017) has argued, without basic insight into what algorithms are and do, it becomes difficult to assess the balance and the completeness of one's news feeds or to engage in tactics to intervene in such selections.

Overall, the chapter argues that if we aim to equip young people with the necessary tools to use media critically, mindfully and effectively, this requires rethinking media literacy from the perspective of the practices and experiences of users themselves. After all, facilitating people's skills, competences and knowledge around media only matters if these are actually applied in practice. The user-centric approach proposed in this study offers a way forward regarding how media literacy might be studied in a way that highlights its usefulness and impact

in everyday life and how scholars may generate insights into how to empower citizens to navigate today's complex media landscape.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Laurence Guérin, Paulo Moekotte and Daan van Riet for their valuable feedback during the set-up of the research project and their help with recruiting participants. I would also like to express my gratitude to the teachers participating in the project (in alphabetical order): Anneloes Haagsman, Edwin Bollema, Elske Mooijman, Houda Al Abouti, Ingeborg Kertesz, Kübra Gögen, Lidy Winters, Marc Visscher, Marit Montsanto, Monique Greefhorst, Menno de Waal, Michel Dalen and Natasha Meijer.

NOTE

1. All participants are mentioned by pseudonyms to protect their privacy.

REFERENCES

- boyd, danah (2017), 'Did media literacy backfire?', *Journal of Applied Youth Studies*, 1:4, pp. 83–89.
- Broersma, Marcel (2018), 'Epilogue: Situating journalism in the digital: A plea for studying news flows, users, and materiality', in S. Eldridge and B. Franklin (eds), *The Routledge Handbook of Developments in Digital Journalism Studies*, Routledge, pp. 515–26.
- Bucher, Taina (2017), 'The algorithmic imaginary: Exploring the ordinary effects of Facebook algorithms', *Information, Communication & Society*, 20:1, pp. 30–44.
- Bulger, Monica and Davison, Patrick (2018), 'The promises, challenges, and futures of media literacy', Data & Society Research Institute, https://digital.fundacionceibal.edu.uy/jspui/bitstream/123456789/227/1/DataAndSociety_Media_Literacy_2018.pdf. Accessed 3 October 2019.
- Choi, Hanbyul, Park, Jongwha and Jung, Yoonhyuk (2018), 'The role of privacy fatigue in online privacy behavior', *Computers in Human Behavior*, 81, pp. 42–51.
- Corbin, Juliet and Strauss, Anselm (2015), *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory*, Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Couldry, Nick, Livingstone, Sonia and Markham, Tim (2010), *Media Consumption and Public Engagement: Beyond The Presumption Of Attention*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Craft, Stephanie, Ashley, Seth and Maksl, Adam (2016), 'Elements of news literacy: A focus group study of how teenagers define news and why they consume it', *Electronic News*, 10:3, pp. 143–60.

- DeVito, Michael, Gergle, Darren and Birnholtz, Jeremy (2017), 'Algorithms ruin everything: #RIPTwitter, folk theories, and resistance to algorithmic change in social media', in *Proceedings of the 2017 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, Denver, 6–11 May, Denver: ACM, pp. 3163–74.
- De Wolf, Ralf (2020), 'Contextualizing how teens manage personal and interpersonal privacy on social media', *New Media & Society*, 22:6, pp. 1058–75.
- D'Ignazio, Catherine and Bhargava, Rahul (2015), 'Approaches to big data literacy', in *Proceedings of the Bloomberg Data for Good Exchange Conference*, New York, 28 September.
- Edgerly, Stephanie (2017), 'Making sense and drawing lines: Young adults and the mixing of news and entertainment', *Journalism Studies*, 18:8, pp. 1052–69.
- Edgerly, Stephanie and Vraga, Emily (2020), 'That's not news: Audience perceptions of "newsness" and why it matters', *Mass Communication & Society*, 23:5, pp. 730–54.
- Eslami, Motahhare, Rickman, Aimee, Vaccaro, Kristen, Aleyasen, Amirhossein, Vuong, Andy, Karahalios, Kyratso George, Hamilton, Kevin and Sandvig Christian (2015), '"I always assumed I wasn't really that close to [her]": Reasoning about invisible algorithms in news feeds', in *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, Seoul, Korea, 18–23 April, pp. 153–62.
- Fletcher, Richard and Kleis Nielsen, Rasmus (2019), 'Generalised scepticism: How people navigate news on social media', *Information, Communication & Society*, 22:12, pp. 1751–69.
- Groot Kormelink, Tim and Costera Meijer, Irene (2019), 'Material and sensory dimensions of everyday news use', *Media, Culture & Society*, 41:5, pp. 637–53.
- Harcup, Tony and O'Neill, Deirdre (2016), 'What is news? Galtung and Ruge revisited (again)', *Journalism Studies*, 18:12, pp. 1470–88.
- Hargittai, Eszter and Marwick, Alice (2016), '"What can I really do?" Explaining the privacy paradox with online apathy', *International Journal of Communication*, 10, pp. 3737–57.
- Hartley, John (1996), *Popular Reality: Journalism, Modernity, Popular Culture*, London: Arnold.
- Head, Alison, Fister, Barbara and MacMillan, Margy (2020), 'Information literacy in the age of algorithms: Student experiences with news and information, and the need for change', Project Information Literacy, <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED605109.pdf>. Accessed 25 May 2020.
- Hobbs, Renee, (2011), 'The state of media literacy: A response to Potter', *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 55:3, pp. 419–30.
- Hobbs, Renee, Donnelly, Katie, Friesem, Jonathan and Moen, Mary (2013), 'Learning to engage: How positive attitudes about the news, media literacy and video production contribute to adolescent civic engagement', *Educational Media International*, 50:4, pp. 231–46.
- Kahne, Joseph and Bowyer, Benjamin (2017), 'Educating for democracy in a partisan age: Confronting the challenges of motivated reasoning and misinformation', *American Educational Research Journal*, 54:1, pp. 3–34.
- Katz, Elihu, Blumler, Jay and Gurevitch, Michael (1973), 'Uses and gratifications research', *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 37:4, pp. 509–23.

- Kleemans, Mariska and Eggink, Gonnie, (2016), 'Understanding news: The impact of media literacy education on teenagers' news literacy', *Journalism Education*, 5:1, pp. 74–88.
- Klurfeld, James and Schneider, Howard (2014), 'News literacy: Teaching the internet generation to make reliable information choices', Brookings Institution Research Paper, https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/Klurfeld-Schneider_News-Literacy_June-2014.pdf. Accessed 3 October 2019.
- Lewandowsky, Stephan, Ecker, Ullrich and Cook, John (2017), 'Beyond misinformation: Understanding and coping with the “post-truth” era', *Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition*, 6:4, pp. 353–69.
- Maksl, Adam, Ashley, Seth and Craft, Stephanie (2015), 'Measuring news media literacy', *Journal of Media Literacy Education*, 6:3, pp. 29–45.
- Marwick, Alice and boyd, danah (2014), 'Networked privacy: How teenagers negotiate context in social media', *New Media & Society*, 16:7, pp. 1051–67.
- Mihailidis, Paul (2012), *News Literacy: Global Perspectives for the Newsroom and the Classroom*, New York: Peter Lang.
- Mihailidis, Paul (2018), 'Civic media literacies: re-Imagining engagement for civic intentionality', *Learning, Media and Technology*, 43:2, pp. 152–64.
- Monzer, Cristina, Moeller, Judith, Helberger, Natali and Eskens, Sarah (2020), 'User perspectives on the news personalisation process: Agency, trust and utility as building blocks', *Digital Journalism*, 8:9, pp. 1142–62.
- Newman, Nic, Fletcher, Richard, Schulz, Anne, Andi, Smige and Kleis Nielsen, Rasmus (2020), 'Reuters Institute Digital News Report 2020', Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism, https://reutersinstitute.politics.ox.ac.uk/sites/default/files/2020-06/DNR_2020_FINAL.pdf. Accessed 2 July 2020.
- Pariser, Eli (2011), *The Filter Bubble: What the Internet Is Hiding from You*, London: Penguin.
- Peters, Tom (1997), 'The brand called you', *Fast Company Magazine*, <https://www.fastcompany.com/28905/brand-called-you>. Accessed 3 October 2019.
- Powers, Elia (2017), 'My news feed is filtered? Awareness of news personalization among college students', *Digital Journalism*, 5:10, pp. 1315–35.
- Rader, Emilee and Gray, Rebecca (2015), 'Understanding user beliefs about algorithmic curation in the Facebook news feed', in *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, Seoul, Korea, 18–23 April, Seoul, Korea: CHI, pp. 173–82.
- Sujon, Zoetanya (2018), 'The triumph of social privacy: Understanding the privacy logics of sharing behaviors across social media', *International Journal of Communication*, 12, pp. 3751–71.
- Sterrett, David, Malato, Dan, Benz, Jennifer, Kantor, Liz, Tompson, Trevor, Rosenstiel, Tom, Sonderman, Jeff and Loker, Kevin (2019), 'Who shared it? Deciding what news to trust on social media', *Digital Journalism*, 7:6, pp. 783–801.
- Swart, Joëlle (2018), 'Haven't you heard? The connective role of news and journalism in everyday life', Ph.D. thesis, Groningen, The Netherlands: University of Groningen.

- Swart, Joëlle (2021), 'Tactics of news literacy. How young people access, evaluate, and engage with news on social media', *New Media & Society*, online-first, pp. 1–17.
- Thorson, Kjerstin (2014), 'Facing an uncertain reception: Young citizens and political interaction on Facebook', *Information, Communication & Society*, 17:2, pp. 203–16.
- Toff, Benjamin and Kleis Nielsen, Rasmus (2018), "'I just Google it': Folk theories of distributed discovery", *Journal of Communication*, 68:3, pp. 636–57.
- Vraga, Emily and Tully, Melissa (2019), 'News literacy, social media behaviors, and skepticism toward information on social media', *Information, Communication & Society*, 24:2, pp. 150–66.
- Vraga, Emily, Tully, Melissa, Maksl, Adam, Craft, Stephanie and Ashley, Seth (2021), 'Theorizing news literacy behaviors', *Communication Theory*, 031:1, pp. 1–21.