THE ROLE OF COGNITIVE BIAS AND EMOTIONAL DRIVE IN THE DISSEMINATION OF FAKE NEWS: A REVIEW AND PROSPECTUS

Ying Luo

Guangxi Economic and Trade Vocational Institute
E-mail: 562498333@qq.coml

Abstract

The rapid proliferation of fake news in digital societies poses significant challenges to information integrity, social trust, and democratic governance. This review examines the role of cognitive bias and emotional drive in shaping the dissemination of fake news across political, health, economic, and cultural domains. Drawing on insights from psychology, sociology, neuroscience, and communication studies, the paper highlights how biases such as confirmation bias, the availability heuristic, and the illusory truth effect interact with emotional triggers including fear, anger, and hope to amplify the virality of false information. The review also analyzes the enabling role of social media platforms and algorithmic systems in reinforcing echo chambers and accelerating misinformation spread, illustrated through case studies in elections, public health crises, and environmental debates.

Empirical evidence underscores that misinformation persists due to both cognitive vulnerabilities and structural features of digital ecosystems. The implications are far-reaching: strengthening media literacy and education, crafting balanced public policies, and redesigning platform architectures are essential but complex tasks. Future research must integrate cognitive science, communication, political science, and data science, leveraging machine learning and big data for detection while also addressing the psychological and emotional drivers of misinformation.

This paper argues that reducing the harmful impact of fake news requires a multi-stakeholder approach, where media users, researchers, policymakers, and technology developers work collectively to foster resilient and trustworthy information environments.

Keywords: Fake news, cognitive bias, emotional drive, misinformation, media literacy, social media, disinformation, information disorder

Introduction

In the digital era, fake news has emerged as one of the most pressing challenges for contemporary society. False information intentionally created to mislead spreads rapidly through social media platforms. The consumption of unverified news undermines not only individual perception but also long-term trust in journalism and institutional credibility (Lazer et al., 2018; Wardle & Derakhshan, 2017). This highlights the importance of critically understanding the phenomenon of fake news as both a communication and societal problem.

Fake news affects not only information ecosystems but also has profound social, political, and economic consequences. In politics, misinformation can distort voter decision-making and undermine democratic legitimacy (Allcott & Gentzkow, 2017). In economics, fake news related to financial markets or public health can trigger significant losses, such as panic selling caused by false investment rumors. On the societal level, fake health-related news—particularly during the COVID-19 pandemic—has led to misinformed decisions, such as vaccine hesitancy, which jeopardize public well-being (Pennycook et al., 2020). These consequences underscore the necessity of investigating the mechanisms that drive the rapid diffusion of false information.

The purpose of this article is to **review the role of cognitive bias and emotional drive** in the dissemination of fake news. It aims to highlight how cognitive biases (e.g., confirmation bias, availability heuristic) and emotional triggers (e.g., anger, fear, and excitement) interact to make false news more likely to be shared than factual information (Vosoughi et al., 2018). Furthermore, the article seeks to propose directions for future research to develop an integrated understanding of the psychological and social mechanisms behind fake news dissemination, as well as to explore policy and technological interventions that may mitigate its long-term effects

Conceptual Framework

Fake news refers to deliberately fabricated or misleading information presented in the format of news with the intention of deceiving audiences. Scholars typically distinguish between three related but distinct categories: misinformation, which is false information shared without intent to harm; disinformation, which is deliberately false or misleading content intended to cause harm; and malinformation, which involves the use of genuine information presented in a misleading context or used to cause harm (Wardle & Derakhshan, 2017).

The typologies of fake news vary across thematic areas. Political fake news often emerges during elections or political campaigns, aiming to manipulate voter opinions or undermine institutional legitimacy. Health-related fake news—such as false claims about vaccines, diseases, or treatments—can significantly influence public health behaviors, as evidenced during the COVID-19 pandemic (Pennycook et al., 2020). Economic fake news, such as fabricated reports about market crashes or corporate bankruptcies, can provoke panic and create large-scale financial instability. Finally, cultural fake news often spreads rumors or stereotypes that reinforce prejudices, social divisions, or cultural misunderstandings. These variations highlight the multifaceted impact of fake news across different domains.

Cognitive biases significantly contribute to the dissemination of fake news, as individuals rely on mental shortcuts in processing information.

• Confirmation bias refers to the tendency to seek, interpret, and recall information in ways that confirm preexisting beliefs (Nickerson, 1998). This bias makes individuals more likely to accept fake news that aligns with their worldview.

• Availability heuristic occurs when people assess the likelihood of events based on how easily examples come to mind. This leads to overestimating the validity of frequently encountered fake news stories (Tversky & Kahneman, 1973).

• Anchoring effect reflects the reliance on initial information as a reference point when evaluating subsequent information. Fake headlines can anchor perceptions even when later corrected, leaving lasting impressions.

• Bandwagon effect describes the tendency to adopt beliefs because others hold them. On social media, the popularity of fake news (e.g., likes, shares, retweets) can reinforce its perceived credibility (Bikhchandani et al., 1992).

• Illusory truth effect demonstrates that repeated exposure to information increases perceived truthfulness, regardless of accuracy (Fazio et al., 2015). Fake news becomes normalized when repeatedly encountered, even if known to be false.

Beyond cognitive biases, emotional responses play a powerful role in shaping how individuals consume and share news.

• Emotions such as fear, anger, disgust, and hope can amplify the salience of fake news. For instance, anger and fear are particularly effective in motivating rapid

sharing, while hope-based messages may generate virality in health or cultural narratives (Brady et al., 2017).

• Emotional contagion on social media refers to the phenomenon where emotions expressed in online interactions spread across networks. Negative emotions, in particular, are more likely to cascade and accelerate the reach of fake news (Ferrara & Yang, 2015).

• Emotional arousal and virality suggest that high-arousal emotions—whether positive or negative—are more likely to drive content sharing (Berger & Milkman, 2012). Fake news designed to evoke outrage or shock often achieves greater visibility than neutral or factual content (Vosoughi et al., 2018).

Together, these cognitive and emotional mechanisms provide a robust framework for understanding why fake news spreads more widely than factual information

Mechanisms of Fake News Dissemination

Interaction Between Cognitive Bias and Emotional Drive

The dissemination of fake news is not solely the result of deliberate misinformation campaigns but emerges from the interplay between cognitive biases and emotional drives. Cognitive biases, such as confirmation bias and the illusory truth effect, predispose individuals to accept and share content that aligns with their beliefs or has been repeatedly encountered (Nickerson, 1998; Fazio et al., 2015). When combined with strong emotional responses—such as anger, fear, or moral outrage—individuals are more likely to engage with and disseminate such content (Brady et al., 2017). This interaction creates a self-reinforcing cycle: emotional arousal amplifies the salience of biased information, while biases legitimize emotionally charged but inaccurate content, fueling its virality.

The Role of Social Media Platforms and Algorithms

Social media platforms serve as the primary vectors of fake news dissemination due to their structural reliance on algorithmic curation. Algorithms prioritize engagement-based metrics—likes, shares, and comments—thereby amplifying content that provokes strong emotional reactions regardless of its accuracy (Bakshy et al., 2015). The design of these platforms fosters echo chambers and filter bubbles, where users are exposed predominantly to information that reinforces their preexisting worldviews (Pariser, 2011). Such environments magnify the effects of cognitive bias and emotional drive by reducing exposure to corrective or diverse perspectives. Moreover, coordinated disinformation campaigns exploit these algorithmic systems, using bots and fake accounts to artificially inflate the popularity of false content, further legitimizing it in the eyes of ordinary users (Ferrara, 2017).

Case Studies

Elections. During the 2016 U.S. presidential election, false stories on social media were shared more widely than factual ones, particularly those that aligned with partisan identities (Allcott & Gentzkow, 2017; Vosoughi et al., 2018). Fake news fueled political polarization, demonstrating the combined influence of confirmation bias, partisan emotional investment, and algorithmic amplification.

Public health crises. The COVID-19 pandemic highlighted how fake health-related news spreads rapidly online. Misinformation about treatments, vaccines, and the origins of the virus circulated globally, leading to vaccine hesitancy and undermining public health measures (Pennycook et al., 2020). Emotional triggers such as fear and distrust in authorities, combined with the illusory truth effect from repeated exposure, made these narratives especially persuasive.

Environmental debates. Climate change discourse illustrates another domain where fake news thrives. Disinformation campaigns funded by interest groups have strategically

exploited cognitive biases—such as the tendency to discount long-term risks—and emotional appeals that sow doubt or fear about economic consequences (Oreskes & Conway, 2010). These strategies have delayed policy action by polarizing public opinion and obscuring scientific consensus.

These mechanisms illustrate that fake news dissemination is not accidental but deeply rooted in the psychological vulnerabilities of individuals, amplified by technological infrastructures that privilege engagement over accuracy. Understanding these interactions is essential for developing interventions that address both the human factors (cognitive and emotional) and the technological systems that enable the virility of fake news.

Empirical Evidence from Previous Studies

Psychology of Misinformation

Research in psychology has demonstrated that misinformation exerts persistent effects on memory, judgment, and decision-making, even after corrections are issued. One well-documented phenomenon is the continued influence effect, whereby individuals continue to rely on false information despite being aware that it has been debunked (Lewandowsky et al., 2012). The illusory truth effect further reveals that repeated exposure to false claims increases their perceived accuracy, regardless of prior knowledge (Fazio et al., 2015). Experimental studies show that cognitive biases—such as confirmation bias—make individuals more likely to accept fake news that aligns with their preexisting beliefs, reinforcing political or ideological polarization (Nickerson, 1998). Together, these findings highlight the resilience of misinformation once it is embedded in cognitive structures.

Sociological and Communication Studies

From a sociological and communication perspective, fake news dissemination is shaped by social dynamics, network structures, and media environments. Studies have found that social media networks amplify misinformation through echo chambers and selective exposure, where individuals preferentially consume information that reinforces their identities (Bakshy et al., 2015; Sunstein, 2018). Research by Vosoughi et al. (2018) showed that false news spreads more rapidly, broadly, and deeply than true news on Twitter, particularly because it elicits strong emotional reactions. Communication studies also emphasize the role of media trust and institutional legitimacy, finding that communities with low trust in mainstream media are more susceptible to fake news (Tsfati & Cappella, 2003). This body of work underscores the interplay between structural factors and individual behavior in the social life of misinformation.

Neuroscience and Behavioral Studies

Neuroscientific approaches provide insights into the biological underpinnings of misinformation susceptibility. Brain imaging studies indicate that emotionally charged misinformation activates the amygdala and other regions associated with fear and reward processing, thereby enhancing memory retention and likelihood of sharing (Kaplan et al., 2016). Behavioral experiments reveal that emotionally arousing misinformation is more likely to be shared, even when individuals are aware of its questionable veracity (Martel et al., 2020). Moreover, findings from neurocognitive studies suggest that cognitive load and limited attentional resources make individuals more prone to accept misinformation without critical evaluation (Pennycook & Rand, 2019). These findings support the claim that both affective and cognitive mechanisms jointly contribute to the virality of fake news.

Comparative Insights: Cross-Cultural and Regional Perspectives

Cross-cultural studies reveal that susceptibility to fake news is influenced by cultural norms, media systems, and political contexts. For instance, research in Western democracies has shown that partisan bias strongly predicts the acceptance of political misinformation

(Guess et al., 2019). In contrast, studies in Asia and Africa suggest that social hierarchies, trust in community leaders, and varying media literacy levels significantly shape misinformation consumption (Oyeyemi et al., 2014; Chen et al., 2015). Comparative research on vaccine misinformation demonstrates regional variations: while in the United States political ideology predicts vaccine hesitancy, in countries like India and Nigeria, misinformation is often tied to religious or cultural beliefs (Wilson & Wiysonge, 2020). These insights highlight the importance of context-sensitive strategies for combating fake news at both local and global levels.

The empirical evidence across psychology, sociology, communication, neuroscience, and cross-cultural research converges on a central conclusion: fake news dissemination is the product of intertwined cognitive, emotional, and structural factors. The robustness of misinformation across domains underscores the need for interdisciplinary approaches to fully understand and address the phenomenon.

Implications and Challenges

Media Literacy and Education

One of the most significant implications of fake news dissemination is the urgent need to strengthen media literacy. Research indicates that individuals with higher levels of critical thinking and digital literacy are less likely to fall victim to misinformation (Guess et al., 2020). Educational interventions that emphasize source evaluation, fact-checking skills, and awareness of cognitive biases can help mitigate susceptibility. However, challenges remain in implementing scalable and context-specific media literacy programs, particularly in regions with limited access to quality education or diverse media environments (Mihailidis & Viotty, 2017). Moreover, media literacy cannot be seen as a one-time intervention; it requires continuous updating to adapt to evolving technologies and misinformation tactics.

Public Policy

Fake news also poses challenges for public policy and governance. Policymakers face the dilemma of balancing misinformation regulation with the protection of free speech and democratic principles. Several governments have enacted laws targeting the spread of fake news, but these measures have raised concerns about censorship and the misuse of power (Bradshaw et al., 2021). Effective policy responses require multi-stakeholder collaboration involving governments, civil society, academic institutions, and technology companies. Furthermore, policies must address the global nature of misinformation, as fake news transcends national borders, complicating enforcement and regulation. Without nuanced and transparent approaches, anti-fake news policies risk undermining democratic trust while failing to address the root psychological and structural drivers of misinformation.

Technology and Platform Design

Social media platforms play a central role in both enabling and potentially mitigating fake news dissemination. The current algorithmic design of platforms prioritizes engagement, inadvertently amplifying emotionally charged misinformation (Bakshy et al., 2015). To counter this, platforms have begun experimenting with interventions such as fact-check labels, accuracy nudges, and limiting the virality of flagged content (Pennycook et al., 2020). However, these efforts remain partial and face challenges, including user resistance, accusations of bias, and the adaptability of disinformation campaigns. Designing technology that promotes information integrity without undermining user autonomy requires integrating insights from psychology, communication studies, and computer science. Future challenges include ensuring transparency in algorithmic decision-making, developing scalable detection systems for emerging misinformation formats (e.g., deepfakes), and embedding ethical safeguards into platform governance (Gillespie, 2018).

The implications of fake news dissemination extend beyond individual cognition into societal, political, and technological domains. Strengthening media literacy, crafting balanced public policies, and redesigning platform architectures represent crucial pathways forward. Yet, each of these approaches faces significant challenges that require interdisciplinary collaboration and continuous adaptation to the evolving dynamics of the digital information ecosystem.

Future Directions and Research Prospectus

Future research should aim to bridge the gap between cognitive science, communication studies, and artificial intelligence. While cognitive and emotional theories explain why individuals are susceptible to fake news, AI-based detection tools can provide scalable technological solutions. Integrating these fields can help design interventions that both anticipate human vulnerabilities and automatically filter harmful content (Shu et al., 2020). For instance, cognitive models of bias can inform the development of AI systems that detect not only linguistic signals of misinformation but also emotional triggers that increase virality.

Advances in machine learning (ML) and big data analytics provide powerful tools to detect fake news at scale. Techniques such as natural language processing, network analysis, and multimodal learning (text, images, video) have been successfully applied to identify coordinated misinformation campaigns (Zhou & Zafarani, 2020). However, challenges remain in ensuring transparency, avoiding algorithmic bias, and countering adversarial tactics like deepfakes. Future research must therefore focus on explainable AI models that provide clear reasoning for their classifications, thereby fostering trust among users and policymakers.

While detection technologies are necessary, they are insufficient without addressing cognitive and emotional vulnerabilities. A future research priority is the development of intervention frameworks that reduce the influence of biases and emotions in news consumption. These could include accuracy prompts (nudges that encourage users to consider accuracy before sharing), de-biasing educational modules, and emotional regulation strategies to mitigate high-arousal reactions that drive misinformation spread (Pennycook et al., 2020; Lewandowsky et al., 2017). Such frameworks must be adaptable to diverse cultural and political contexts, recognizing that susceptibility to fake news is not uniform across populations.

Fake news is a multidimensional problem that cannot be fully understood within the boundaries of a single discipline. Psychology offers insights into cognitive heuristics and emotional processing, communication studies illuminate media ecosystems and framing effects, political science highlights the democratic and policy implications, and data science provides computational tools for detection and intervention. Cross-disciplinary collaboration is therefore essential for developing holistic solutions that combine theoretical rigor with practical applications. Building such collaborations will not only enhance the academic understanding of fake news but also generate actionable insights for policymakers, educators, and platform designers (Lazer et al., 2018).

The future of misinformation research lies in interdisciplinary integration and the fusion of human-centered and machine-centered approaches. By combining insights from cognitive science, communication, political science, and AI, researchers can build frameworks that address both the psychological roots and the technological vectors of fake news. This prospectus underscores the need for ongoing, global research efforts to anticipate emerging threats and build resilient information ecosystems.

Conclusion

The dissemination of fake news in the digital age cannot be understood solely as a technological phenomenon; rather, it reflects the interplay between cognitive biases and emotional drives that shape human information processing. Cognitive shortcuts such as confirmation bias, the availability heuristic, and the illusory truth effect predispose individuals to accept and share misleading content. When combined with emotions such as fear, anger, or hope, these biases amplify the virality of fake news, making it more likely to spread than factual information (Fazio et al., 2015; Brady et al., 2017; Vosoughi et al., 2018).

The persistence of fake news underscores the need for continued interdisciplinary research. Future studies should integrate cognitive science, communication, political science, and data science to build frameworks that address both psychological vulnerabilities and the structural features of digital platforms. Practical strategies—such as media literacy interventions, accuracy nudges, and explainable AI systems—offer promising pathways, but their effectiveness requires rigorous empirical testing and adaptation to diverse cultural and political contexts (Pennycook et al., 2020; Lewandowsky et al., 2017).

Ultimately, mitigating the impact of fake news demands a multi-stakeholder effort. Media users must cultivate critical consumption habits; researchers should advance interdisciplinary knowledge and evidence-based interventions; and policymakers must design balanced regulations that safeguard both information integrity and democratic freedoms. By addressing fake news through these combined efforts, societies can move toward more resilient and trustworthy information ecosystems

References

Allcott, H., & Gentzkow, M. (2017). Social media and fake news in the 2016 election. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 31(2), 211–236. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.31.2.211

Bakshy, E., Messing, S., & Adamic, L. A. (2015). Exposure to ideologically diverse news and opinion on Facebook. Science, 348(6239), 1130–1132. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaa1160

Berger, J., & Milkman, K. L. (2012). What makes online content viral? Journal of Marketing Research, 49(2), 192–205. https://doi.org/10.1509/jmr.10.0353

Bikhchandani, S., Hirshleifer, D., & Welch, I. (1992). A theory of fads, fashion, custom, and cultural change as informational cascades. Journal of Political Economy, 100(5), 992–1026. https://doi.org/10.1086/261849

Bradshaw, S., Bailey, H., & Howard, P. N. (2021). Industrialized disinformation: 2020 global inventory of organized social media manipulation. Computational Propaganda Project. https://comprop.oii.ox.ac.uk/research/industrialized-disinformation-2020

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. PNAS, 114(28), 7313–7318. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1618923114

Chen, X., Sin, S. J., Theng, Y. L., & Lee, C. S. (2015). Why students share misinformation on social media: Motivation, gender, and study-level differences. Journal of Academic Librarianship, 41(5), 583–592. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2015.07.003

Fazio, L. K., Brashier, N. M., Payne, B. K., & Marsh, E. J. (2015). Knowledge does not protect against illusory truth. Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 144(5), 993–1002. https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0000098

Ferrara, E. (2017). Disinformation and social bot operations in the run up to the 2017 French presidential election. First Monday, 22(8). https://doi.org/10.5210/fm.v22i8.8005

Ferrara, E., & Yang, Z. (2015). Measuring emotional contagion in social media. PLoS ONE, 10(11), e0142390. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0142390

Gillespie, T. (2018). Custodians of the Internet: Platforms, content moderation, and the hidden decisions that shape social media. Yale University Press.

Guess, A. M., Lerner, M., Lyons, B., Montgomery, J. M., Nyhan, B., Reifler, J., & Sircar, N. (2020). A digital media literacy intervention increases discernment between mainstream and false news in the United States and India. PNAS, 117(27), 15536–15545. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1920498117

Guess, A. M., Nagler, J., & Tucker, J. (2019). Less than you think: Prevalence and predictors of fake news dissemination on Facebook. Science Advances, 5(1), eaau4586. https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aau4586

Kaplan, J. T., Gimbel, S. I., & Harris, S. (2016). Neural correlates of maintaining one's political beliefs in the face of counterevidence. Scientific Reports, 6, 39589. https://doi.org/10.1038/srep39589

Lazer, D. M. J., Baum, M. A., Benkler, Y., Berinsky, A. J., Greenhill, K. M., Menczer, F., ... & Zittrain, J. L. (2018). The science of fake news. Science, 359(6380), 1094–1096. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aao2998

Lewandowsky, S., Ecker, U. K. H., & Cook, J. (2017). Beyond misinformation: Understanding and coping with the "post-truth" era. Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition, 6(4), 353–369. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jarmac.2017.07.008

Lewandowsky, S., Ecker, U. K. H., Seifert, C. M., Schwarz, N., & Cook, J. (2012). Misinformation and its correction: Continued influence and successful debiasing. Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 13(3), 106–131. https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100612451018

Martel, C., Pennycook, G., & Rand, D. G. (2020). Reliance on emotion promotes belief in fake news. Cognitive Research: Principles and Implications, 5(1), 47. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41235-020-00252-3

Mihailidis, P., & Viotty, S. (2017). Spreadable spectacle in digital culture: Civic expression, fake news, and the role of media literacies in "post-fact" society. American Behavioral Scientist, 61(4), 441–454. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764217701217

Nickerson, R. S. (1998). Confirmation bias: A ubiquitous phenomenon in many guises. Review of General Psychology, 2(2), 175–220. https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2680.2.2.175

Oreskes, N., & Conway, E. M. (2010). Merchants of doubt: How a handful of scientists obscured the truth on issues from tobacco smoke to global warming. Bloomsbury.

Oyeyemi, S. O., Gabarron, E., & Wynn, R. (2014). Ebola, Twitter, and misinformation: A dangerous combination? BMJ, 349, g6178. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.g6178

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

Pennycook, G., & Rand, D. G. (2019). Lazy, not biased: Susceptibility to partisan fake news is better explained by lack of reasoning than by motivated reasoning. Cognition, 188, 39–50. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2018.06.011

Pennycook, G., McPhetres, J., Zhang, Y., Lu, J. G., & Rand, D. G. (2020). Fighting COVID-19 misinformation on social media: Experimental evidence for a scalable accuracy nudge intervention. Psychological Science, 31(7), 770–780. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797620939054

Shu, K., Wang, S., Lee, D., & Liu, H. (2020). Mining disinformation and fake news: Concepts, methods, and recent advancements. In C. C. Aggarwal (Ed.), Data mining and machine learning in cybersecurity (pp. 1–31). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-38181-2_1

Sunstein, C. R. (2018). #Republic: Divided democracy in the age of social media. Princeton University Press.

Tsfati, Y., & Cappella, J. N. (2003). Do people watch what they do not trust? Exploring the association between news media skepticism and exposure. Communication Research, 30(5), 504–529. https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650203253371

Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1973). Availability: A heuristic for judging frequency and probability. Cognitive Psychology, 5(2), 207–232. https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0285(73)90033-9

Vosoughi, S., Roy, D., & Aral, S. (2018). The spread of true and false news online. Science, 359(6380), 1146–1151. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aap9559

Wardle, C., & Derakhshan, H. (2017). Information disorder: Toward an interdisciplinary framework for research and policy making. Council of Europe Report. https://edoc.coe.int/en/media/7495-information-disorder.html

Wilson, S. L., & Wiysonge, C. (2020). Social media and vaccine hesitancy. BMJ Global Health, 5(10), e004206. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2020-004206

Zhou, X., & Zafarani, R. (2020). A survey of fake news: Fundamental theories, detection methods, and opportunities. ACM Computing Surveys, 53(5), 1–40. https://doi.org/10.1145/3395046