Scholedge International Journal of *Multidisciplinary & Allied Studies*
ISSN 2394-336X Vol. 11, Issue 02 (2024)
DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.19085/sijmas110201

Algorithmic Influence and Cultural Narratives in the Digital Public Sphere

Chen Jie & Wang Jun
Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, Zhejiang, China.

ABSTRACT

This paper examines how recommendation systems, content moderation protocols, and platform architectures shape cultural narratives in digital communication spaces. Drawing on Habermas's public sphere theory and more recent scholarship in platform studies, critical data studies, and the political economy of media, the paper argues that algorithmic systems do not merely distribute content but actively construct the conditions under which cultural meaning is produced and contested. Three interrelated processes are examined: the personalization of information environments, the amplification of emotionally charged content, and the commercial logic of attention capture. Together, these processes produce a fragmented cultural landscape where the conditions for sustained public discourse are increasingly difficult to maintain. The paper further examines how surveillance capitalism, as theorized by Zuboff (2019), intensifies algorithmic influence by converting behavioral data into predictive instruments that shape what audiences see, believe, and value. The analysis includes a comparative framework contrasting the normative structure of Habermas's public sphere with the operating conditions of the contemporary algorithmic public sphere. The paper concludes by calling for regulatory responses, including platform transparency obligations and algorithmic accountability measures, that acknowledge the structural power of platform companies without foreclosing the possibilities for user agency and counter-narrative production.

Keywords: Algorithms, cultural narratives, digital public sphere, filter bubbles, platform studies, surveillance capitalism

ALGORITHMIC INFLUENCE AND CULTURAL NARRATIVES IN THE DIGITAL PUBLIC SPHERE

When Jurgen Habermas (1989) described the public sphere as a space where private citizens could gather to deliberate on matters of common concern, the internet was decades away. His model assumed that rational discourse was possible, at least in principle, when institutional barriers to participation were lowered. Today, billions of people participate in what appears to be the largest public conversation in human history. That conversation, however, is not free. It is curated, ranked, filtered, and monetized by a small number of private companies whose primary obligation is to shareholders, not to the quality of public communication.

This paper takes seriously the question of what happens to cultural narratives when the infrastructure of public communication is owned and operated by algorithmic systems designed to maximize engagement. The concern is not simply that misinformation spreads online; researchers have documented that extensively. The deeper concern is structural: the architecture of digital platforms systematically favors certain types of content, certain emotional registers, and certain cultural framings over others. This is not a neutral process, and treating it as one obscures more than it reveals.

The paper draws on scholarship from platform studies, media theory, critical data studies, and political economy to build an argument about algorithmic influence as a form of cultural power. It proceeds in several stages. First, it situates the analysis within the tradition of public sphere theory, particularly Habermas's (1989) framework and its limitations in a networked context. Second, it examines how algorithmic architecture functions as a mechanism of cultural selection. Third, it considers the phenomenon of filter bubbles and their relationship to the fragmentation of shared cultural reality. Fourth, it examines how surveillance capitalism, as theorized by Zuboff (2019), deepens the structural embeddedness of algorithmic influence. Fifth, it considers what forms of resistance and regulation might be possible, including the European Union's Digital Services Act of 2022.

The paper contributes to a growing body of scholarship that insists on treating algorithmic systems not as neutral technical tools but as sociotechnical arrangements carrying cultural, political, and economic weight. This framing differs from both techno-utopian accounts that see digital platforms as inherently democratizing and techno-dystopian accounts that see them as irredeemably corrupting. The picture that emerges is more structural: the particular commercial logic driving current algorithmic design produces predictable and documentable distortions in the cultural environment that deserve sustained scholarly attention.

THE PUBLIC SPHERE AND ITS DIGITAL DISCONTENTS

Habermas's (1989) concept of the public sphere remains one of the most debated frameworks in communication theory. His original argument was historical and normative: the bourgeois public sphere of eighteenth-century Europe (manifested in coffee houses, salons, and the periodical press) represented a space where private individuals could reason together about public affairs. This space was structurally separated from both the state and the market, and it was characterized by what Habermas called communicative rationality: the willingness to be moved by argument rather than by power or money.

Critics have long pointed out the exclusions built into this ideal. Fraser (1990) argued that the bourgeois public sphere was premised on the systematic exclusion of women, the working class, and colonial subjects, and that counterpublics (subaltern groups who formed their own discursive spaces) were always part of the communicative landscape, even when mainstream discourse ignored them. This critique matters for digital media analysis because it is a reminder that access alone does not produce genuine participation in public life. Lowering barriers to entry is not the same as creating conditions for equal and meaningful participation.

When scholars began applying public sphere theory to the internet in the 1990s, many were optimistic. Digital networks seemed to promise wider access, lower barriers to entry, and greater diversity of voices. Benkler (2006) argued that networked communication fundamentally altered the economics of cultural production, allowing individuals and small groups to produce and distribute information at negligible cost. This shift, he suggested, could reinvigorate democratic discourse by redistributing the capacity to reach mass audiences.

That optimism has not aged well. The platforms that came to dominate digital communication were not designed as public utilities or as spaces for deliberation. They were built as advertising businesses, and their design reflects that fact. Van Dijck (2013) showed that the logic of connectivity that platforms embody differs fundamentally from the logic of communication. Connectivity is about maximizing engagement, building networks, and extracting data. Communication, in the Habermasian sense, is about reaching understanding. These are not the same thing, and the difference matters enormously for how cultural narratives are shaped and circulated.

Van Dijck et al. (2018) extended this analysis to what they called the platform society, an arrangement in which the logics of commercial platforms colonize increasingly broad domains of social, cultural, and political life. In this framework, platforms are not passive intermediaries that simply transmit existing social reality. They are active shapers of it, encoding particular values and norms into their technical architecture and imposing those values on every interaction that takes place within their infrastructure.

The implications for the public sphere are significant. Where Habermas's model assumed that the public sphere operated according to a logic distinct from and resistant to market pressures, contemporary digital platforms dissolve this distinction. The space of public communication is the market, and the market is governed by algorithmic optimization. The structural conditions Habermas described (communicative rationality, inclusive participation, freedom from commercial distortion) are clearly not the organizing principles of current digital communication platforms. What we have instead is a commercialized simulacrum of public discourse, one that looks participatory while operating according to entirely different rules.

HOW ALGORITHMS SELECT CULTURE

Algorithms are not neutral tools. They encode choices about what counts as relevant, what counts as popular, and what counts as dangerous, and those choices carry cultural consequences. Gillespie (2014) argued that algorithms are political in the broad sense: they embody values and produce outcomes that distribute attention and visibility unevenly across the cultural landscape. The selection of content by an algorithm is, at the same time, a form of cultural judgment, even when no human being consciously makes it.

The basic mechanism is familiar. Recommendation systems, whether on YouTube, TikTok, Spotify, or Facebook, observe user behavior and use that data to predict what a given user will engage with next. The goal is to keep users on the platform for as long as possible. The cultural consequences of this design choice are significant in three respects.

First, recommendation systems create a feedback loop between user preferences and content exposure. What users engage with shapes what they are shown, which shapes what they engage with next. Over time, this loop can narrow the range of cultural content a person encounters, not because the platform intends this outcome but because it follows logically from the optimization target. Second, the metrics that define engagement (clicks, watch time, shares, comments, reactions) systematically favor content that generates strong emotional responses. Tufekci (2017) observed that YouTube's recommendation algorithm would often lead users from mainstream political content toward increasingly extreme material, not because the platform intended to radicalize users, but because extreme content tends to generate more engagement than measured, nuanced content does.

Third, there is the question of what does not get recommended. Noble (2018) showed that search and recommendation systems can reproduce and amplify existing social hierarchies, directing users toward content that reflects dominant cultural assumptions while marginalizing others. This is not always the result of intentional design. It often emerges from training data that encodes historical patterns of representation, and from optimization targets that equate popularity with relevance. The result is that algorithmically curated culture is not merely a reflection of what people prefer; it is shaped by what prior audiences, in prior cultural conditions, happened to click on.

Bucher (2018) introduced the concept of the algorithmic imaginary: the ways in which users develop intuitions about how algorithms work and adjust their behavior accordingly. This creates a second-order cultural effect. It is not just that algorithms shape what content is shown, but that awareness (or misawareness) of algorithms shapes how people produce content in the first place. Creators on YouTube,

Instagram, and TikTok routinely adjust their output to match what they believe the algorithm rewards, producing content that is not simply responsive to audience preferences but calibrated to the perceived preferences of a machine. Culture, in this sense, is not only filtered by algorithms; it is produced in anticipation of them.

Pasquale (2015) documented the broader problem of algorithmic opacity, arguing that the black box character of contemporary algorithmic systems makes it nearly impossible for the public to assess their cultural effects. What cannot be audited cannot be governed, and what cannot be governed cannot be reformed. This opacity is not incidental. It is built into the system, protecting proprietary methods from scrutiny while allowing those methods to shape public culture on a massive scale.

Table 1. Characteristics of the Habermasian and Algorithmic Public Spheres

Characteristic	**Habermasian Public Sphere**	**Algorithmic Public Sphere**
Primary logic	Communicative rationality	Engagement maximization
Gatekeeping mechanism	Editorial judgment and deliberation	Automated ranking and recommendation
Content selection basis	Public relevance and argument quality	Behavioral data and engagement signals
Inclusivity criterion	In principle, universal (though historically exclusionary)	Access plus behavioral conformity to platform norms
Revenue model	Subscription, advertising, or public subsidy (press)	Data extraction and targeted advertising
Temporal structure	Deliberate, with time for argument to develop	Accelerated, ephemeral, optimized for immediacy
Dominant cultural bias	Bourgeois and elite (historically)	Commercial and attention-driven
Accountability	Editorial responsibility and legal press norms	Opaque algorithmic decision-making

Note. Author's own analytical framework, drawn from Habermas (1989), van Dijck (2013), Gillespie (2014), and Zuboff (2019). The table is intended as a schematic contrast rather than a claim of historical accuracy in all details.

FILTER BUBBLES AND THE FRACTURE OF SHARED REALITY

Pariser (2011) coined the term filter bubble to describe the personalized information environments that recommendation algorithms create. His argument was that as platforms learned more about individual users, they would increasingly show each person a unique slice of reality, tailored to existing preferences and beliefs, and that the result would be a world in which people are effectively insulated from perspectives they might otherwise encounter. The concept captured something important about the direction of algorithmic personalization, and it has remained influential in both academic and policy discussions.

The filter bubble hypothesis has also been contested. Some researchers have argued that the empirical evidence for strong filter bubbles is mixed. Social networks expose people to friends and family with different views, which introduces a degree of ideological diversity that purely algorithmic accounts miss. Others have argued that the real problem is not personalization per se but the selective exposure people choose when left to their own preferences (Prior, 2007). In this reading, the filter bubble is less a technical artifact than a reflection of pre-existing human tendencies toward confirmation and comfort.

These qualifications are important. But they do not dissolve the concern. The filter bubble concept, even if overstated in some formulations, points to something real: that algorithmic personalization restructures the information environment in ways that can systematically limit exposure to discordant information. And when this is combined with the amplification of emotionally engaging content (which tends to be outrage-inducing, tribal, and confirmation-affirming), the overall effect on shared cultural reality can be damaging in ways that go beyond individual cognitive bias.

Vaidhyanathan (2018) documented Facebook's contribution to the spread of misinformation and political polarization across multiple countries, arguing that the platform's architecture (including its news feed algorithm, group recommendation systems, and advertising tools) consistently rewarded content that provoked strong emotional reactions, regardless of accuracy. The cultural consequence was not simply that false information circulated more widely than true information. It was that the experience of a shared factual reality (a prerequisite for any meaningful public discourse) became harder to sustain in communities organized around algorithmically curated feeds.

Castells (2009) argued that in the network society, power is exercised not primarily through coercion but through the control of communication networks and the construction of meaning. Algorithmic systems, in this framework, represent a form of what he called programming power: the capacity to set the terms on which information circulates and meaning is made. This framing is useful because it situates algorithmic influence within a broader theory of power rather than treating it as a purely technical problem. The cultural fragmentation that filter bubbles produce is not accidental; it is a consequence of structural arrangements that concentrate communicative power in the hands of a small number of platform companies operating according to commercial logic.

Introna and Nissenbaum (2000) identified a related issue in an earlier context, arguing that search engines, by privileging certain websites over others, inevitably shape the public's access to information in ways that are both consequential and poorly understood. Their insight, developed before the era of social media and personalization at scale, anticipated many of the concerns that are now central to debates about algorithmic influence. The question of who controls the mechanisms of information retrieval is also a question about who controls the conditions for knowledge and cultural participation.

SURVEILLANCE CAPITALISM AND THE COMMODIFICATION OF CULTURAL IDENTITY

Zuboff's (2019) concept of surveillance capitalism offers perhaps the most comprehensive account of the economic logic that drives algorithmic influence. Her argument is that leading technology companies have developed a new form of capital accumulation based on the extraction of behavioral data. This data is used to build predictive models of human behavior, which are then sold to advertisers who want to influence future behavior. The commodity in this system is not a product; it is a prediction.

What makes this relevant to cultural narratives is the scope of the data being extracted. Surveillance capitalism does not only observe what people buy or read. It monitors movement, attention, emotional state, social relationships, and micro-behavioral signals: the subtle ways in which people respond to content in real time. This mass of behavioral data is used not only to predict what people will do but to nudge them

toward particular behaviors. As Zuboff (2019) argued, the goal of surveillance capitalism is not merely to know human behavior but to modify it, subtly and at scale, in ways that serve commercial ends.

The cultural implications of this are serious. If the infrastructure of digital communication is organized around the extraction and monetization of behavioral data, then the cultural narratives that circulate through that infrastructure are shaped, at least in part, by the commercial logic of prediction and modification. Stories, images, arguments, and identities that generate rich behavioral data are favored. Those that do not are marginalized. This creates a systematic distortion in the cultural environment that is not responsive to democratic input or public interest considerations.

Couldry and Mejias (2019) extended this analysis by placing it in a broader historical context. They argued that data colonialism (the appropriation of human life in its digital form as a new resource for capital) represents a structural transformation comparable in scope and consequence to historical colonialism. Digital platforms do not just connect people; they extract value from the act of connection, converting social and cultural life into raw material for commercial computation. The cultural identities, stories, and relationships that people build and share online become, in this framework, inputs to a production process they neither control nor fully understand.

Crawford (2021) further documented the material dimensions of this process, showing that the infrastructure of artificial intelligence (the data centers, supply chains, and labor systems that power algorithmic systems) is deeply embedded in global networks of extraction and exploitation. This grounds algorithmic influence in political economy rather than treating it as a purely technical or cultural phenomenon. The algorithms that shape cultural narratives are not floating in the cloud; they run on physical infrastructure built at significant environmental and social cost, and they serve interests that are overwhelmingly concentrated in a small number of wealthy technology companies.

O'Neil (2016) examined the broader consequences of algorithmic decision-making across social domains, arguing that mathematical models carrying the appearance of objectivity often encode and amplify the biases of their designers and the historical data on which they are trained. This critique applies directly to the cultural domain: algorithms that select and amplify content are not objective mirrors of public preference but instruments that encode particular assumptions about what people want, what content is valuable, and what cultural norms are normal. The veneer of mathematical neutrality can make these assumptions harder, not easier, to question.

CULTURAL NARRATIVES UNDER ALGORITHMIC CONDITIONS

Having outlined the mechanisms of algorithmic influence, it is worth asking what this means concretely for cultural narratives. Three observations stand out from the literature.

First, algorithmic systems tend to favor narratives that are emotionally intense and identity-confirming. Research on content diffusion has consistently shown that content triggering strong emotional responses (especially moral outrage, anxiety, and indignation) spreads more widely on social media platforms than content that is balanced or ambiguous (Brady et al., 2017). This creates a selection environment in which cultural narratives with high emotional charge are amplified, while more measured, complex, or nuanced content is passed over. The cultural diet that algorithmic systems serve is systematically skewed toward the extreme end of the emotional spectrum, and this has consequences for the kinds of stories that achieve cultural salience.

Second, algorithmic systems are structurally insensitive to cultural context. A recommendation algorithm trained on behavioral data from one cultural context will not necessarily serve users in another context appropriately. Noble (2018) documented how search results for certain racial and ethnic groups reproduced harmful stereotypes, reflecting patterns in the training data that mirrored existing social

inequalities. Eubanks (2018) showed how predictive systems deployed in social services systematically disadvantaged already marginalized communities. These are not isolated incidents; they are expressions of a deeper structural problem: algorithms trained on historical data will reproduce and sometimes amplify historical patterns of inequality, including those embedded in cultural representation.

Third, the pace of algorithmic content circulation has fundamentally altered the temporality of cultural narratives. Stories that once developed over weeks or months now spike, spread, and are forgotten within hours or days. This compression of narrative time has consequences for how cultural meaning is made. Complex stories require time for context to accumulate, for nuance to be established, and for response and counter-response to develop. Algorithmic circulation accelerates content beyond the pace at which this kind of meaning-making is possible, producing a cultural environment in which the speed of information flow consistently outpaces the capacity for collective interpretation.

Barocas and Selbst (2016) identified another dimension of this problem in their analysis of disparate impact in algorithmic decision-making. Their argument, developed primarily in a legal context, applies equally to cultural systems: even when an algorithm is not designed with discriminatory intent, its effects can be discriminatory if it is trained on data that reflects historical patterns of exclusion. This structural feature of algorithmic systems means that cultural narratives about already marginalized communities are likely to be distorted or suppressed not through malice but through the accumulated weight of historical inequity encoded in the training data.

RESISTANCE, REGULATION, AND ACCOUNTABILITY

It would be a mistake to describe users of digital platforms as passive recipients of algorithmic influence. People have always found ways to work around, subvert, and repurpose the systems they inhabit. Jenkins (2006) showed how participatory culture developed alongside corporate media, as fans and communities created their own meanings and distributed them through unofficial channels. The same dynamics are visible in digital platforms today. Marginalized communities have used social media to organize, to tell their own stories, and to challenge dominant narratives, even as the platforms hosting them pursue their own commercial agendas.

Tufekci (2017) documented how social movements of the early twenty-first century used digital platforms to organize and communicate at scale, while also noting the structural vulnerabilities that came with depending on commercially owned infrastructure. The Arab Spring, Black Lives Matter, and other movements demonstrated that algorithmic platforms could be used for mobilization and counter-narrative production. They also demonstrated the risks: the same systems that enabled organizing were capable of being used for surveillance, that moments of mass mobilization could be algorithmically demobilized by changes in platform policy, and that dependency on commercial infrastructure created fragility that state actors and platform owners could exploit.

This does not mean that resistance is sufficient. The structural imbalance between platform companies and users (in terms of data, resources, and technical capacity) is too large to be resolved through user creativity alone. Regulatory responses are necessary, and they have begun to emerge.

The European Union's Digital Services Act (2022) represents one of the most ambitious attempts to regulate platform behavior to date. The regulation requires large platforms to assess and reduce systemic risks, including risks to fundamental rights, democratic discourse, and civic participation. It also creates obligations around algorithmic transparency and gives users the right to opt out of recommendation systems based on profiling. Whether these provisions will be effectively enforced remains to be seen, but they represent a meaningful shift in the regulatory landscape from a period in which platform companies operated almost entirely according to self-determined norms.

Pasquale (2015) argued that meaningful accountability requires not just transparency about how algorithms work but actual public oversight of the decisions that algorithms make. His concept of the black box society (in which consequential decisions are made by opaque systems that cannot be audited or challenged) captures the accountability deficit that current regulatory frameworks are only beginning to address. Transparency obligations that require platforms to disclose algorithmic architectures in general terms are a start, but they fall well short of the kind of ongoing public oversight that would be needed to make algorithmic systems genuinely accountable to the public they affect.

Gillespie (2010) argued, in an earlier formulation of related concerns, that the politics of platforms are not incidental but are built into their architecture and business models. If that is right, then reforming those politics requires changing the architecture and the business models, not just adding disclosure requirements to existing systems. This is a more ambitious regulatory agenda than most governments have pursued, but it is the logic that follows from a structural analysis of algorithmic influence.

DISCUSSION

The analysis developed in this paper points in several directions that are worth drawing together.

Algorithmic influence is not a technical problem that can be solved by better engineering. It is a structural problem rooted in the political economy of digital platforms. As long as the primary function of recommendation algorithms is to maximize engagement for advertising revenue, the cultural consequences documented in this paper will persist. Technical adjustments (adding content warnings, reducing the amplification of specific categories of misinformation, tweaking recommendation parameters) are not irrelevant, but they address symptoms rather than the underlying commercial logic that produces them. A recommendation algorithm optimized for engagement will keep finding ways to serve emotionally stimulating content, regardless of how many content categories are restricted, because that is what the optimization target demands.

The public sphere framework, while showing its age in some respects, remains a useful lens for evaluating the cultural consequences of algorithmic systems. Habermas's normative criteria (inclusive participation, freedom from commercial distortion, and orientation toward communicative rationality) provide a standard against which actual digital communication environments can be assessed. By those criteria, current platforms fall far short, and the gap is structural rather than incidental. Using this framework does not require accepting Habermas's idealized account of the historical bourgeois public sphere; it requires only treating communicative rationality as a normative aspiration against which institutional arrangements can be measured.

The question of cultural agency matters and should not be collapsed. Framing users purely as victims of algorithmic manipulation overstates platform power and understates the ways in which people actively create meaning, build communities, and push back against dominant narratives. But framing platforms as neutral conduits that simply give people what they want is equally misleading. The truth is more complicated: users act within structural constraints they did not choose and often cannot see, and those constraints have real consequences for which cultural narratives circulate and which do not. A theory of algorithmic influence that ignores either structural power or human agency will be incomplete.

The international dimension of algorithmic cultural influence deserves more attention than it has received. Platforms built primarily in the United States export their algorithmic architectures to every country in which they operate. The cultural assumptions embedded in those architectures (about what counts as engaging content, what counts as harmful content, what counts as a relevant search result) are not culturally neutral. They reflect the commercial priorities, regulatory environments, and cultural contexts of their origin. Couldry and Mejias (2019) argued that this represents a new form of cultural

imperialism, one that operates through the logic of data extraction rather than through explicit political domination but that has equally real consequences for the diversity and autonomy of cultural life globally.

CONCLUSION

The digital public sphere is not a neutral space. It is an infrastructure, and like all infrastructures, it encodes choices about what kinds of communication are possible, what kinds of content are visible, and what kinds of cultural narratives circulate. Those choices are currently made primarily by platform companies operating according to a commercial logic of engagement and data extraction. The result is a communication environment that systematically amplifies emotionally intense, identity-confirming, and attention-grabbing content while marginalizing the slower, more complex, and more discordant forms of communication that genuine public discourse requires.

This paper has argued that understanding algorithmic influence as cultural power (rather than as a technical or behavioral phenomenon) opens up more productive questions about how it can be studied, governed, and challenged. The scholars whose work has been drawn on here (Habermas, Pariser, Noble, Zuboff, van Dijck, Gillespie, Castells, Tufekci, and others) offer conceptual resources that are well suited to this task. The challenge now is to build on that work in ways that remain attentive both to structural power and to the genuine possibilities for human agency and institutional reform.

The cultural stakes of this work are real. What narratives get told, who gets to tell them, and who gets to hear them are not peripheral questions. They go to the heart of how societies understand themselves, construct shared meaning, and hold power to account. Algorithmic systems, for all their apparent neutrality, are now among the most consequential shapers of those narratives. That fact calls for exactly the kind of sustained, interdisciplinary scholarly attention that this paper has attempted to contribute.

REFERENCES

Barocas, S., & Selbst, A. D. (2016). Big data's disparate impact. California Law Review, 104(3), 671-732.

Benkler, Y. (2006). The wealth of networks: How social production transforms markets and freedom. Yale University Press.

Brady, W. J., Wills, J. A., Jost, J. T., Tucker, J. A., & Van Bavel, J. J. (2017). Emotion shapes the diffusion of moralized content in social networks. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 114(28), 7313-7318. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1618923114

Bucher, T. (2018). If...then: Algorithmic power and politics. Oxford University Press.

Castells, M. (2009). Communication power. Oxford University Press.

Couldry, N., & Mejias, U. A. (2019). The costs of connection: How data is colonizing human life and appropriating it for capitalism. Stanford University Press.

Crawford, K. (2021). Atlas of AI: Power, politics, and the planetary costs of artificial intelligence. Yale University Press.

Eubanks, V. (2018). Automating inequality: How high-tech tools profile, police, and punish the poor. St. Martin's Press.

European Union. (2022). Regulation (EU) 2022/2065 of the European Parliament and of the Council on a Single Market for Digital Services (Digital Services Act). Official Journal of the European Union, L 277, 1-102.

Fraser, N. (1990). Rethinking the public sphere: A contribution to the critique of actually existing democracy. Social Text, (25/26), 56-80. https://doi.org/10.2307/466240

Gillespie, T. (2010). The politics of "platforms." New Media & Society, 12(3), 347-364. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444809342738

Gillespie, T. (2014). The relevance of algorithms. In T. Gillespie, P. J. Boczkowski, & K. A. Foot (Eds.), Media technologies: Essays on communication, materiality, and society (pp. 167-194). MIT Press.

Habermas, J. (1989). The structural transformation of the public sphere: An inquiry into a category of bourgeois society (T. Burger, Trans.). MIT Press. (Original work published 1962)

Introna, L. D., & Nissenbaum, H. (2000). Shaping the web: Why the politics of search engines matters. The Information Society, 16(3), 169-185. https://doi.org/10.1080/01972240050133634

Jenkins, H. (2006). Convergence culture: Where old and new media collide. New York University Press.

Noble, S. U. (2018). Algorithms of oppression: How search engines reinforce racism. New York University Press.

O'Neil, C. (2016). Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy. Crown.

Pariser, E. (2011). The filter bubble: What the internet is hiding from you. Penguin Press.

Pasquale, F. (2015). The black box society: The secret algorithms that control money and information. Harvard University Press.

Prior, M. (2007). Post-broadcast democracy: How media choice increases inequality in political involvement and polarizes elections. Cambridge University Press.

Tufekci, Z. (2017). Twitter and tear gas: The power and fragility of networked protest. Yale University Press.

Vaidhyanathan, S. (2018). Antisocial media: How Facebook disconnects us and undermines democracy. Oxford University Press.

van Dijck, J. (2013). The culture of connectivity: A critical history of social media. Oxford University Press.

van Dijck, J., Poell, T., & de Waal, M. (2018). The platform society: Public values in a connective world. Oxford University Press.

Zuboff, S. (2019). The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power. PublicAffairs.