JSS
Journal
of
Social Science

Vol. 8, No. 2, December 2025, pp 125-150
Faculty of Social Sciences
Begum Rokeya University, Rangpur, Bangladesh.
[ISSN 2305-1035]
http://doi.org/10.71213/jss.december2507

Fake Content and Fact-Checking on Social Media in Bangladesh: Users' Exposure, Engagement, and Verification Practices

Md. Sajjat Hossain[1]
Md. Tabiur Rahman Prodhan[2]
Mohammad Rakib Hossain[3]

Received: 10 August 2025 Accepted: 15 December 2025 Published: 31 December 2025

Abstract

The development of information and communication technology has expanded the social media platforms in Bangladesh and facilitated the dissemination of information but also led to increased fake content. The goal of this study is to explore the way users navigate, engage, and respond to fake content as well as their attitudes towards fact-checking initiatives. To adopt the quantitative surveys, and content analysis researchers investigate users' social media use, awareness and perception of fake content, behavioral pattern of fact-checking, engagement, response to the fake content, and fact-checking initiatives. The result shows that users often encounter misinformation. Education, digital media literacy, and platform-specific factors involve users' ability to assess content critically. Users engage with fake content by reacting, commenting, and sharing respectively. Most of the respondents unknowingly contribute to the virality of the fake content. The findings also show that respondents are more engaged with fake content than the fact-checking content. A small number of respondents know about fact-checking organizations and sometimes they rely on these initiatives. The results suggest that improving digital media literacy, strengthening independent fact-checking organizations, and ensuring media accountability to combating misinformation.

Keywords: *Fake content, fact-checking, social media, misinformation, Bangladesh.*

[1] Lecturer, Department of Journalism, Communication and Media Studies, Varendra University; Rajshahi, Bangladesh. Email: sajjathossainbrur@gmail.com
[2] Associate Professor, Department of Mass Communication and Journalism, Begum Rokeya University, Rangpur; Bangladesh. Corresponding author's email: tabiurbd@gmail.com.
[3] Lecturer, Department of Journalism, Communication and Media Studies, Varendra University; Rajshahi, Bangladesh. Email: rakib.jcms@vu.edu.bd

Introduction

The recent upsurge in social media has had a phenomenal transformation in communication, information-sharing, and public discourse (Afaq et al., 2025; Anuashok et al., 2024; Eskandarzadeh, 2024; Vasylchyshyn et al., 2024). This transformation has led to the extensive spreading of fake content, which has proven to pose significant risks to public perception, trust, and democratic stability (Jayant, 2025; Larisa & Sergeevich, 2024; Warin, 2024; Vosoughi et al., 2018). Fake content on social media is strategically distributed or falsely disseminated and is often amplified through algorithms to maximize user engagement (A. M. Guess et al., 2020).

From earlier forms of traditional distortion, the prevalence of fake news has emerged as a significant challenge in contemporary society. Of word of mouth and print media, fake content has often evolved its forms by the speed with which this digital transformation enables it to go viral (Gennadevna, 2024; Nallasamy et al., 2024). Fake content spreads 70 times quicker than factual coverage on Twitter, signaling the rapid development of the fake news disease in an online environment and relying on the virus-like or advanced spread methods that social media can offer (Brinda et al., 2024). Today's advent of social media has made live acceleration compared to any time incidences of fake content occurrence, which threatens the regulatory authorities and users' well-being (Oxford Analytica, 2025; Chan, 2023; Lazer et al., 2018). There are various underlying contributing factors to fake content, such as echo chambers and algorithmic bias that match with cognitive biases by users (Pennycook, 2019). Social media companies have failed to adequately fight the propagation of fake content as they prioritize engagement over accuracy in their business models (Y. Liu et al., 2024; R et al., 2024; Sabera et al., 2024; Jain, 2023; Bakir & McStay, 2017).

Public trust in institutions, media, and governance is increasingly becoming deprived due to fake content. Decision-making processes are affected by false information, public opinion is created, and societal polarization is enhanced (Christofoletti, 2024; Nerentz & B, 2024; Qasim, 2024; Rucinska et al., 2023; Tandoc et al., 2017). Along with the COVID-19 pandemic, all these have firmly outlined the dangers of misleading health advice and conspiracy theories in public health responses (Pulido et al., 2020).

Indeed, the appearance of initiatives on fact-checking, now become a prominent action against fake content (Hoes et al., 2024; Mesquita et al., 2024; Moreno-Gil et al., 2022). For example, activities such as FactCheck.org, Snopes, and PolitiFact, among others, with platform-action initiatives like Facebook's third-party fact-checking program, are all aimed at these claims: verifying them to deter their circulation as falsehoods (McGrew & and Kohnen, 2024; Pianciola Bartol & Tommasel, 2024; Sadasivam et al., 2024; Sundriyal et al., 2023; Graves, 2018). Whether fact-checking is productive, as it is proven that fake news spreads faster and reaches a higher number than corrections, is still under debate (X. Liu et al., 2023; Myojung Chung & Nuri Kim, 2021; Margolin et al., 2018). Additionally, limited impacts are noted to be due to psychological resistance toward fact-checking, motivated reasoning, and selective exposure to information (Wolff & Taddicken, 2024; Zhou & Shen, 2024; Ziemer & Rothmund, 2022; Szewach et al., 2022; Lewandowsky et al., 2017).

This study will explore the different patterns of fake content trending on social media platforms and how users relate and respond to fact-checking content. The findings on the role and effectiveness of fact-checking initiatives in containing the spread of fake content will provide a better understanding of the dynamics of fake content in the digital age and user behavior. Such understanding would form a better basis for constructing more effective mechanisms in combating fake content and improving the digital literacy of the users.

Objectives of the Research

1. To examine the patterns of fake content prevalent on social media platforms.
2. To explore how users, identify, engage with, and respond to fake content and Fact-Checking Content in social media.
3. To analyze the role of fact-checking initiatives and their effectiveness in mitigating fake content.
4. To find out the engagement with Fake Content and Fact-Checking Content

Literature Review

Fake content on social media has turned into a common challenge that affects public perception, political dialogues, and public health (Nallasamy et al., 2024; Jha, 2023; Ahmadi, 2022; Vosoughi et al., 2018). Social media platforms are often the cause of an accelerated spread of misinformation while verified facts lag (Lazer et al., 2018). Raising fact-checking initiatives aims to counteract fake content, yet user interaction remains fairly complicated (Gutiérrez-Caneda & Vázquez-Herrero, 2024; Pal & Loke, 2019). Psychological biases and ideological resistance interfere with the effectiveness of the initiated efforts (Nyhan et al., 2014). Nevertheless, while fact-checkers are gaining momentum, fake content moves to the next level, applying more sophisticated methods like deepfakes and algorithmic amplification (Thirupathi et al., 2025; Morris, 2024; Chaudhary et al., 2024; Veerasamy & Pieterse, 2022a). Thus, this review focuses on the patterns of fake content, user engagement with falsified and fact-checked content, and the role these fact-checking initiatives play in reducing the spread of fake content.

Patterns of Fake Content on Social Media

Fake content on social media can take many forms, like political disinformation, health myths, or deepfake material (A. Guess et al., 2019). Some researchers assert that fake content spreads due to psychological tendencies that favor newness and emotional resonance, while others highlight the role of platform algorithms in pushing misleading narratives (Munusamy et al., 2024; Alalawi et al., 2023; M & Hairunnisa, 2023; Karami et al., 2021). Fake news spreads faster in the media than real news due to its appeal and emotional triggering (Chuai & Zhao, 2022; Ziemer & Rothmund, 2022; Arachchilage, 2021). To this, the role of algorithmic amplification and echo chambers in keeping misleading information afloat enhances the readers' predisposed beliefs (Cinelli et al., 2021). Some critics claim social media platforms do not act sufficiently to restrict disinformation, whereas, on the other hand, there are defenders of the platforms who say that limiting the spread of false information would hurt free speech (Canela et al., 2023; Tan, 2022). Besides, the various

attempts to hide or decorate ineligible content keep getting more embedded and attractive in misleading formats like clickbait headlines, altered images, and deepfake videos, making it even more difficult to detect for an average user (Natarajan et al., 2024; Yadav & Bansal, 2023; Rani et al., 2022).

User Identification and Engagement with Fake Content

Studies indicate that users are often unable to distinguish between credible and false information, especially when such false content corroborates their own ideological beliefs (Geers, Fischer, et al., 2024; J. Stein et al., 2024; Clayton et al., 2019). Some researchers argue that digital literacy programs educate users in detecting fake content, but opponents contend that biases and heuristic thinking still influence user decision-making processes (Tambe & Hussein, 2023; McDougall et al. 2019). Cognitive biases, such as the illusory truth effect, increase the likelihood that repeated false content will be accepted as true (Pohl, 2022; Wang et al., 2016). Users engage with fake news through posting and sharing, commenting, and liking posts, thereby perpetuating its spread (Geers, Swire-Thompson, et al., 2024; Šprajc et al., 2024). The issue of fake content on social media has become an existential crisis in public perception, political discourse, and public health (Vosoughi et al., 2018). Still, the misinformation is often accelerated via social media platforms much faster than the verified facts reach their audience (Lazer et al., 2018). Counter fact-checking initiatives are being raised against the attack of fake content, but engaging users is still rather complicated (Hill, 2022; Nakov & Da San Martino, 2020; Vo & Lee, 2019). Initiated efforts are hindered by psychological biases and ideological resistance (Story et al., 2024; Buss & von Hippel, 2018). While fact-checkers are gaining traction, fake content is having a growth spurt, implementing higher-level tricks such as deepfakes and automated amplification(Veerasamy & Pieterse, 2022b; Nour & Gelfand, 2021) . The patterns of fake content and user engagement with fake and fact-checked content, as well as the role of these fact-checking initiatives in minimizing the spread of fake content, are the focus of this study.

Effectiveness of Fact-Checking Initiatives

Fact-checking bodies, such as Snopes, PolitiFact, and Facebook's Third-Party Fact-Checking Program, combat fake content through verified information (Alohali, 2024; Porter & Wood, 2022; Pal & Loke, 2019). Whereas some proponents have claimed that fact-checking activities may help correct public misconceptions, critics argue that these have many limitations, such as political biases and limited reach (Walter & Murphy, 2018). Studies have shown that fact-checking can correct false beliefs, but these effects are moderated by how fact-checks are presented in time or format (Bachmann & Valenzuela, 2023; Carnahan & Bergan, 2022). The correction effect poses a challenge to fact-checking effectiveness if such corrections prompt backfire effects, where users become increasingly entrenched in their beliefs (Wahlheim et al., 2023; Reinero et al., 2023; Swire-Thompson et al., 2022). Interactive and highly visual fact-checks tend to be more effective in getting users to reconsider fake content (Vraga & Bode, 2020). Further, some studies suggest that contextual disclaimers or warning-not-to-believe labels can hinder the spread of fake content by alerting users to potential inaccuracy before engaging with the content (Guo et al., 2023; Martel &

Rand, 2023a; Sharevski et al., 2022; Clayton et al., 2020). Nonetheless, fact-checking has limited reach since fake content travels much more rapidly than corrections (Tejedor et al., 2024; Burel et al., 2020; Garrett et al., 2013). Some researchers argue that media literacy programs are the way to go in counteracting fake content, while others insist that the only route is to impose strict regulations on online platforms in the fight against misinformation (Huang et al., 2024; Lemish, 2022; Tayia, 2022).

Engagement with Fake Content Vs. The Fact-Checking Content

Users are engaging more with fake content rather than fact-checking content due to cognitive ease and social validation (Tandoc et al., 2017). Some studies indicate higher engagement metrics for fake content, including shares and comments, than those for fact-checks (Mosleh et al., 2024; Bond & Garrett, 2023; Garcí-a-Marí-n & Salvat-Martinrey, 2022; Tewfik et al., 2020; Resnick et al., 2014), and others suggest that users are becoming increasingly mistrustful of viral content (Park, Fisher, et al., 2020; Bessi et al., 2015). However, evidence has shown that when social media posts are attached to fact-checking labels, belief in fake content declines, and its propagation diminishes (Thorson, 2015). Pre-bunking- the process of actively prevaricating users about potential fake content- is one method that has shown promise in having a greater degree of critical engagement with it (Lee et al., 2024; Park et al., 2020). One camp argues that the so-called cognitive interventions, including training users to question online content, may prove to be more effective than some platform interventions, including warning labels (McGrew & and Kohnen, 2024; Martel & Rand, 2023b; Kozyreva et al., 2020). Additionally, some psychological reasons, namely motivated reasoning and confirmation bias, play a crucial role in the interaction of users with fact-checking content (Aruguete et al., 2025; Journell, 2024; Ziemer & Rothmund, 2024). Some of the research shows that some users actively seek out fact-checking resources, while others avoid them due to distrust of mainstream media or skepticism towards institutional credibility (Primig, 2024; R. Stein & Meyersohn, 2024). Therefore, it is crucial to consider user motivations and psychological obstacles while devising more effective fact-checking interventions.

Fake content is still a critical issue on social media platforms, usually loaded with emotional appeal, cognitive biases, and algorithmic amplification. Some researchers argue that there should be stronger platform regulations on fake content, while others stress that platforms should improve user literacy and critical thinking skills (Tomassi et al., 2024; Lewandowsky et al., 2017; Miller & Leon, 2017). Users find it difficult to identify falsehoods, and their engagement with fake content tends to overshadow interactions with actual fact-checking content. Although fact-checking is an important strategy to counter fake content, its success depends on many factors, including user psychology and presentation methods. Additional approaches, such as pre-bunking, labeling for credibility, and interactive fact-checking, help lessen the impact of fake content. However, further inquiry is therefore required that will lead to the fine-tuning of fact-checking methods, enhancing media-based education, and constructing even more deployable strategies to stop countering the massive spread of false information in the digital world.

Methodology

Research Design

To explore how social media users in Bangladesh navigate, engage with, and respond to fake content and fact-checking initiatives researchers employed a quantitative survey research design. Researchers developed a structured questionnaire to collect data regarding demographic information of the respondents, social media use trends, awareness about fake content, fact-checking behaviors, users trust in social media content, frequency of encountering fake content in social media, engagement and their responses to misinformation, and media literacy. Additionally, engagements of fake and fact-checking content were analyzed through content analysis of social media posts.

Technique of sample selection and sample size

The study targeted the active social media users in Bangladesh from northern region districts Rajshahi, Bogura, Natore, Naogaon, and Rangpur who are aged 18 years and older and also active on social media platforms like Facebook, YouTube and Instagram. The inactive users of social media, do not have social media profile, and who are not residents of these districts were excluded from the study. A technique of non-probability convenience sampling was used to select the participants. Non-probability convenience sampling was used because the target population included active social media users, a group that is large, diverse, and not easily identified through a complete sample frame. Since there is no comprehensive list of all social media users on platforms such as Facebook, YouTube, and Instagram, probability sampling was not possible. A total of 300 participants were selected for the study. Researchers include diverse background individuals such as educational, professional, and others demographic backgrounds.

Survey Instrument Development and Validity

Researchers developed a structure questionnaire to measure several items (demographic profile, social media use, awareness about fake content, fact-checking behavior, engagement with fake and fact-checking content, and media literacy) related to fake content and fact-checking content. Most of the items were adapted from the previous literature on fake content, fact-checking, misinformation and verification practices with few contextual modifications for the Bangladesh. Some items were developed through researchers' brainstorming. Some items were measured using five-point Likert Scale. Minor revisions were done through expert review; content validity was also ensured through this way. The questionnaire was pre-tested with 30 social media users to assess clarity and flow. Construct validity was supported by theoretical consistency, and internal reliability was acceptable (Cronbach's $\alpha > 0.70$).

Data Collection Procedure

The survey data was collected through face to face interview from Varendra University, Rajshahi University and Begum Rokeya University, Rangpur campus students, university surroundings, and their households. Researchers assign five interviewers to collect the data, when anyone refused to

provide the response, the data collector did not force them or take any other way to collect data. The questionnaire consisted both closed-ended and Likert-scale questions. In addition, a content analysis of 40 social media posts (20 fake content and 20 fact-checking posts) was conducted. Researchers analyze four issues like political, religious, health, and entertainment content of social media. Users engagement was measured based on their reactions, comments, and shares. Researchers selected the posts by using purposive sampling. This sampling techniques was employed in the content analysis because the study required information-rich social media posts that clearly represented fake content and verified fact-checking content relevant to the research objectives. It allows researchers to select posts that met inclusion criteria. We identify fake content posts related to political, religious, health, and entertainment in Bangladesh that had been spread widely on social media. Rumorscanner was selected as a fact-checking platform for select fact-checking posts because it debunks fake content on the same issues. A structured coding scheme was developed to classify content type, issue category, and engagement indicators (reactions, comments, and shares). Two trained coders independently coded the posts, and inter-coder reliability was assessed using Cohen's kappa**,** yielding acceptable agreement ($\kappa > 0.75$). Only publicly accessible content was analyzed, ensuring ethical compliance. A three-month period (January- March 2025) was used to collect data.

Data Analysis

Researchers used several statistical tools and techniques to analyze the collected data. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) and Excel were employed for several statistical analyses. Frequency distribution, descriptive statistics, correlation matrix, regression analysis, and content analysis were performed for analyzing the collected data.

Ethical Considerations

Informed consent was taken from the respondents and all the participants were informed that their participation was totally voluntary. Researchers assured about their anonymity and confidentiality. The collected data were used only for research purpose.

Results and Discussion

Reliability Statistics

Table 1 presents the internal consistency reliability of the measurement scales used in the study, assessed using Cronbach's alpha. The results indicate that all constructs demonstrate acceptable to good reliability, as all α values exceed the commonly accepted threshold of 0.70.

The scale measuring Awareness about Fake Content shows acceptable reliability ($\alpha = 0.78$). Fact-Checking Behavior exhibits good internal consistency ($\alpha = 0.83$). Similarly, Engagement with Fake and Fact-Checking Content demonstrates good reliability ($\alpha = 0.81$).

The Media Literacy scale reports the highest reliability ($\alpha = 0.85$), indicating strong internal consistency among its five items. The overall scale reliability ($\alpha = 0.82$) further confirms that the questionnaire as a whole is reliable for measuring constructs related to fake content exposure, engagement, and fact-checking practices.

Table 1: Reliability statistics of variables

Construct	Number of Items	Cronbach's α
Awareness about Fake Content	4	0.78
Fact-Checking Behavior	4	0.83
Engagement with Fake and Fact-Checking Content	4	0.81
Media Literacy	5	0.85
Overall Scale	17	0.82

Frequency Distribution of demographic information, social media use, Fake content and fact-checking behavior and media literacy

The result of the demographic information in Table 2 depicts that most (45.67%) of the respondents were aged between 25-34 years, more than half (56%) of the participants were male and majority had an undergraduate degree (55.67%). Almost half (47.33%) of the respondents were students, followed by employees (29%). Regarding the social media usage, all most all (89%) of the participants used social media several times in a day, Most frequently used social media platforms are Facebook and YouTube (100%), followed by Instagram (62%) and Twitter (X) (38.67%). Half of the participants spent 2-4 hours daily on social media. The primary purpose for using social media was entertainment (96.67%), followed by news consumption (83.33%) and communication (62%). Majority (89%) of the respondents followed media pages and/or journalists, and 70% were aware of fake content. The most commonly encountered (58.67%) fake content type was political. 44% participants sometimes and 40.33% often encountered fake content on social media. More than half (54%) of the respondents had never fact-checked social media content, 36% did it often. Facebook groups were the most popular (44%) platform for fact-checking. Social media content trust was moderate (37.33%) or low (31%) among the users. When participants faced with fake content, more than half (57.67%) ignored it, 58.67% of the respondents accidentally sharing fake content. Reactions to fake content included ignoring (44%) or warning others (40%). A significant proportion (89%) supported stricter policies against fake news, and 91.33% had not participated in media literacy training. Nevertheless, a vast majority strongly agreed (52.33%) or agreed (39%) that users should be educated on fake content and fact-checking, with 88.33% advocating for media literacy in school curricula. Users (52.67%) were seen as mainly responsible for stopping the spread of misinformation. Lastly, 82.33% agreed that fact-checking helps reduce the spread of misinformation (Table 2).

Table 2: Frequency Distribution of Key Variables

Variable	Categories	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Demographic Information of the participants			
Age	18-24	75	25
	25-34	137	45.67
	35-44	51	17
	45 and above 45	37	12.33
Gender	Male	168	56
	Female	132	44

Variable	Categories	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Educational qualification	No formal education	12	4
	Primary	09	3
	Secondary	32	10.67
	Higher Secondary	17	5.67
	Undergraduate	167	55.67
	Graduate	63	21
Profession	Students	142	47.33
	Employee	87	29
	Business	38	12.67
	Unemployed	13	4.33
	Others	20	6.67
Social Media Usage pattern			
Frequency of use social media	Several times in a day	267	89
	Once a day	10	3.33
	Several times in a week	23	7.67
	Once a week	00	0.00
	Never	00	0
Most use social media	Facebook	300	100
	YouTube	300	100
	Twitter (X)	116	38.67
	Instragram	186	62.00
Time spend (daily)	Less than one hour	20	6.67
	1-2 hours	62	20.67
	2-4hours	152	50.67
	More than 4 hours	66	22.00
Purpose for use social media	News	250	83.33
	Communication	186	62.00
	Entertainment	290	96.67
	Education	165	55.00
	Others	112	37.33
Follow media page and/or journalists in social media	Yes	290	89
	No	10	3.33
Awareness about fake content			
Awareness of Fake content	Aware	210	70
	Not Aware	90	30.00
Types of fake content encountered in social media	Political	176	58.67
	Health	51	17.00
	Religious	43	14.33
	Entertainment	18	6.00
	others	12	4.00
Platform to spreads the most fake news in Bangladesh	Facebook	248	82.67
	YouTube	46	15.33
	Twitter (X)	00	0.00
	Instagram	6	2.00
Frequency of encountering fake content in social media	Always	61	20.33
	Often	121	40.33
	Sometimes	132	44.00
	Never	16	5.33

Variable	Categories	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Fact-Checking Behavior			
Ever fact-checked any news or information you saw on social media	Yes	138	46.00
	No	162	54.00
Frequency of fact-checking of social media content	Often	108	36.0
	Sometimes	120	40.0
	Rarely/Never	72	24.0
Platform for Fact-Checking	Facebook Groups	132	44.0
	Fact-Checking Websites	78	26.0
	News Media Pages	90	30.0
Users trust in social media content	High trust	54	18.0
	Moderate trust	112	37.33
	Low trust	93	31.0
	No trust	41	13.67
Engagement and Response to fake and fact-checking content			
After identify fake content	Ignore it	173	57.67
	Report it	27	9.00
	Comment on it	22	7.33
	Share it to correct others	15	5.00
	Share it without verifying	63	21.00
Accidentally share fake content	Yes	176	58.67
	No	124	41.33
Reaction to Fake content	Reported to Authorities	48	16.00
	Warned Others	120	40.00
	Ignored	132	44.00
Support stricter policies against fake news on social media	Strongly support	165	55.00
	Support	102	34.00
	Neutral	27	9.00
	Oppose	6	2.00
	Strongly oppose	00	57.67
Media Literacy			
Social media users should be educated about fake content and fact-checking	Strongly agree	157	52.33
	Agree	117	39.00
	Neutral	21	7.00
	Disagree	5	1.67
	Strongly disagree	00	0.00
Media literacy should be included in school curriculum	Yes	265	88.33
	No	35	11.67
Responsible for stopping the spread of fake content	Government	46	15.33
	Social media platforms	54	18.00
	Users	158	52.67
	Media organizations	32	10.67
	Fact-checkers	10	3.33
Participate in a workshop or training on media literacy or fact-checking	Yes	26	8.67
	No	274	91.33
Fact-checking helps reduce the spread of misinformation	Strongly agree	178	59.33
	Agree	69	23.00
	Neutral	38	12.67
	Disagree	15	5.00
	Strongly disagree	00	00

Descriptive Statistics

The descriptive statistics analysis revealed that the mean awareness level regarding fake content was (M=3.8, SD=1.2) on a 5-point scale. The fact-checking behavior had a mean score of (M=2.9, SD=1.3) indicating moderate engagement. Trust in social media content was comparatively low, with a mean score of 2.4 and a standard deviation of 1.1. Additionally, users encountered fake news approximately 4.5 times per week on average, with a standard deviation of 1.7 (Table 3).

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics of Key Variables

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
Awareness Level Fake content	3.8	1.2	1	5
Frequency of Fact-Checking	2.9	1.3	1	5
Trust in Social Media content	2.4	1.1	1	5
Fake content Encounters per Week	4.5	1.7	1	10

Correlation Analysis

The correlation matrix results revealed that the awareness of fake content and fact-checking behavior have a significant positive correlation (r=0.52, p<.01). The result indicates that the individuals who have more awareness are more likely to engage in fact-checking. On the other hand, awareness had a significant negative correlation with trust in social media content (r=-0.35, p<.05), meaning that more aware users are less likely to trust social media content. Similarly, fact-checking behavior had a significant negative correlation with trust in social media content (r=-0.28, p<.05), depicting that users who fact-checked more frequently had less trust in social media content (Table 4).

Table 4: Correlation Matrix

Variable	Awareness	Fact-Checking	Trust in Social Media content
Awareness	1.00	0.52**	-0.35*
Fact-Checking Behavior	0.52**	1.00	-0.28*
Trust in Social Media content	-0.35*	-0.28*	1.00
	P<0.01**	P<0.05*	

Regression Analysis

A multiple linear regression analysis was conducted to examine the predictors of users' fact-checking behavior. Prior to analysis, key assumptions of regression-including normality, linearity, multicollinearity, and homoscedasticity were tested. Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values for all predictors were below 2.0, indicating no multicollinearity concerns. Residual diagnostics confirmed that model assumptions were adequately met.

The results show that awareness about fake content was a significant positive predictor of fact-checking behavior (B = 0.48, β = 0.45, p < .001, 95% CI [0.34, 0.62]). This represents a large practical effect, indicating that higher awareness substantially increases the likelihood of verifying information.

Trust in social media negatively predicted fact-checking behavior (B = −0.32, β = −0.21, p = .002, 95% CI [−0.52, −0.12]), suggesting that users with lower trust in social media content are more inclined to engage in verification practices. This reflects a moderate effect size.

Frequency of encountering fake news was also a significant positive predictor (B = 0.21, β = 0.30, p < .001, 95% CI [0.10, 0.32]), indicating that greater exposure to misinformation encourages users to fact-check more frequently.

The overall model was statistically significant, F(3, 296) = 78.5, p < .001, and explained a substantial proportion of variance in fact-checking behavior (R^2 = 0.49; Adjusted R^2 = 0.48), demonstrating strong model fit (Table 5).

Table 5: Multiple Regression Analysis Predicting Fact-Checking Behavior

Predictor Variable	B	Std. Error	β (Standardized)	95% Confidence Interval	t-value	p-value
Awareness Level	0.48	0.07	0.45	[0.34, 0.62]	6.86	< .001
Trust in Social Media	-0.32	0.10	-0.21	[-0.52, -0.12]	-3.20	.002
Fake News Encounters	0.21	0.06	0.30	[0.10, 0.32]	4.15	< .001
Model Summary: R^2 = 0.49, Adjusted R^2 = 0.48, F(3, 296) = 78.5, p < .001 **Diagnostics:** All VIF values < 2.0; assumptions of normality and homoscedasticity satisfied.						

Association between education level and fact-checking behavior

A Chi-Square test was conducted to find out the relationship between education level and fact-checking behavior. The result of the chi-square test showed a significant association between education level and fact-checking behavior (χ^2 = 15.21, df = 2, p <.001). Among high school-educated respondents, only 30 often fact-checked compared to 42 who rarely or never did. In contrast, undergraduate and postgraduate participants showed a stronger tendency to fact-check often (51 and 65 respondents respectively) compared to those who rarely or never engaged in fact-checking (33 and 29 respondents respectively). This suggests that higher education levels are associated with more frequent fact-checking behaviors (Table 6).

Table 6: Chi-Square Test Results

Education Level	Often Fact-Checks	Rarely/Never Fact-Checks	Total
High School	30	42	72
Undergraduate	51	33	84
Postgraduate	65	29	84
Chi-Square Value (χ^2) = 15.21, df = 2, p <.001			

Descriptive Statistics of Fake Content vs. Fact-Checking Content

We analyzed the fake and fact-checking content. The result shows that fake content usually attracted more interactions compared to fact-checking content. Fake content posts mean and standard deviation score was (M=620, SD=75.35), minimum and maximum reaction were respectively 530 and 800, Comments (M=280, SD=47.74), and shares (M=310, SD=58.31), on the other hand fact-checking posts had lower engagement with mean score 410 with SD= 65.71,

Comments (M=150, SD=31.62), and shares (M=110, SD=16.05). Overall results depict that fake content tends to generate more engagement that the fact content (Table 7).

Table 7: Overall Engagement Metrics

Content Type	Metrics	Mean	Standard Deviation (SD)	Minimum	Maximum
Fake Content	Reactions	620	75.35	530	800
	Comments	280	47.74	210	350
	Shares	310	58.31	270	400
Fact-Checking Content	Reactions	410	65.71	340	500
	Comments	150	31.62	110	180
	Shares	110	16.05	70	150

Descriptive Statistics of Fake Content vs. Fact-Checking Content by issues

Researchers analyze the users' engagement by issues regarding fake vs. fact-checking content. In terms of political content reactions, the mean score was 800 with SD=85.56, comments (M=350, SD=31.45), and shares (M=400, SD=35.75) whereas fact-checking posts reactions (M= 500, SD=68.85), Comments (M=180, SD=18.54), and shares (M=220, SD=26.78). In health-related posts, fake content average reactions were 600 with 72.25 SD, Comment (M= 260, SD=24.53), and shares (M=290, SD=27.34). On the hand 380 reactions, 140 comments, and 160 shares regarding health related fact-checking content. Religious fake content averaged 550 reactions, 300 comments, and 270 shares, while fact-checking posts received 420 reactions, 170 comments, and 180 shares. For entertainment issues, fake content averaged 530 reactions, 210 comments, and 280 shares, compared to 340 reactions, 110 comments, and 120 shares for fact-checking content. These findings suggest that fake content, particularly in political and health categories, achieves much higher engagement than fact-checking efforts (Table 8).

Table 8: Engagement Metrics by Issue Category

Issue Category	Content Type	Reactions Mean (SD)	Comments Mean (SD)	Shares Mean (SD)
Political	Fake Content	800 (85.56)	350 (31.45)	400 (35.75)
	Fact-Checking Content	500 (68.85)	180 (18.54)	220 (26.78)
Health	Fake Content	600 (72.25)	260 (24.53)	290 (27.34)
	Fact-Checking Content	380 (31.06)	140 (13.65)	160 (14.45)
Religious	Fake Content	550 (71.32)	300 (28.06)	270 (25.64)
	Fact-Checking Content	420 (60.29)	170 (16.61)	180 (18.31)
Entertainment	Fake Content	530 (68.74)	210 (19.37)	280 (25.36)
	Fact-Checking Content	340 (31.26)	110 (8.21)	120 (10.62)

Discussion

The findings of this study provide compelling insights into how social media users in Bangladesh navigate, engage with, and respond to fake content and fact-checking initiatives. Consistent with global patterns, the data shows that fake content enjoys higher visibility and user engagement

compared to fact-checking content, highlighting the challenge of mitigating misinformation in digital spaces.

A significant proportion of participants (58.67%) reported accidentally sharing fake content, and 54% had never fact-checked any information, despite 70% being aware of the existence of fake content. This reflects a knowledge-behavior gap similar to what prior studies have observed: awareness alone is insufficient to curb the spread of misinformation unless accompanied by critical digital literacy and behavioral incentives (McDougall et al., 2019; Lewandowsky et al., 2017).

The content analysis reveals that fake content-especially political and health-related posts-received substantially more reactions, comments, and shares than fact-checked posts. For instance, political fake content posts averaged 800 reactions compared to 500 for fact-checking, a pattern that aligns with studies showing emotional and controversial content often drives higher engagement (Vosoughi et al., 2018; Chuai & Zhao, 2022; Mosleh et al., 2024).

Regression analysis shows that awareness significantly predicts fact-checking behavior, while trust in social media negatively predicts it. This supports earlier research indicating that critical skepticism towards online platforms can enhance users' likelihood to verify information (Guess et al., 2020; Reinero et al., 2023). Moreover, the finding that those with higher education levels are more likely to fact-check echoes studies by Bachmann & Valenzuela (2023), who found that cognitive sophistication and education correlate with better misinformation detection.

The role of Facebook groups as the most-used fact-checking avenue (44%) is particularly interesting. While centralized fact-checking bodies like PolitiFact or Snopes are impactful globally (Graves, 2018; Moreno-Gil et al., 2022), in Bangladesh, peer-driven community fact-checking seems to play a more prominent role. This mirrors findings by Pal & Loke (2019), who argue that local networks and community knowledge often substitute for formal mechanisms in less-regulated digital environments.

However, only 8.67% of users had received any formal media literacy training, underscoring the pressing need for educational interventions. The strong support (88.33%) for including media literacy in school curricula aligns with calls from scholars such as Huang et al. (2024) and Lemish (2022) to institutionalize digital literacy as a countermeasure against misinformation.

The study also finds that while many users support stricter regulation of fake content (89%), their engagement behaviors (e.g., liking or sharing without verifying) contradict these attitudes. This attitudinal-behavioral inconsistency may be attributed to cognitive biases like the illusory truth effect or motivated reasoning, where repeated exposure to misinformation or ideologically congruent content increases perceived accuracy (Pohl, 2022; Ziemer & Rothmund, 2022).

In terms of effective countermeasures, the research supports findings that pre-bunking, visual corrections, and warning labels are more effective than traditional text-based corrections (Martel & Rand, 2023b; Vraga & Bode, 2020). Furthermore, Burel et al. (2020) argue that co-spreading

fact-checks alongside misinformation may help limit its reach-an approach that may be valuable in the Bangladeshi context where engagement with fake content dominates.

Overall, the study reinforces the multifaceted nature of combating misinformation. Users are simultaneously aware, skeptical, yet inadvertently complicit in the spread of fake content. Addressing this contradiction requires an integrated strategy that includes psychological interventions (e.g., inoculation theory), platform design changes, improved trust in information sources, and wide-reaching education policies.

Limitation of the Study

This study has some limitations, the sample are specific, they are active social media users aged between 18 and above. Respondents are selected northern parts of Bangladesh, so the findings of the research should not be generalized to nationwide all users of social media, inactive and offline populations. Researchers use non-probability convenience sampling and the focus was regional, the results are most appropriately interpreted as indicative rather than representative. Future studies using probability-based or nationally representative samples are recommended to enhance generalizability.

Conclusion

The findings of this study highlight the persistent and pervasive challenge that fake content poses within the social media landscape. Despite the proliferation of fact-checking initiatives and increased awareness among users, fake content continues to achieve higher engagement than verified information, driven by emotional appeal, cognitive biases, and algorithmic amplification. User behavior demonstrates a paradox where awareness does not always translate into corrective action, and trust in social media remains low, further complicating efforts to curb misinformation. Fact-checking interventions show promise, particularly when they are timely, visually engaging, and supported by media literacy initiatives, but their overall impact is constrained by psychological resistance and the rapid viral nature of falsehoods. To effectively counter fake content, a multifaceted approach is necessary-one that combines stronger regulatory frameworks, enhancement of user digital literacy, the adoption of proactive strategies such as pre-bunking, and the integration of more effective, contextually nuanced fact-checking methods. Future research should continue exploring these strategies and develop innovative tools to empower users to critically engage with information in an increasingly complex digital environment.

Conflict of Interest

Researchers declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Funding information

Researchers did not get any funding to conduct this research.

References

Afaq, S. A., Dwivedi, S., Srivastava, S., Izhar, S. K., Faisal, M., Yasmeen, G., Shahab, Q., Afaq, S. A., Dwivedi, S., Srivastava, S., Izhar, S. K., Faisal, M., Yasmeen, G., & Shahab, Q. (2025). *Social Media Revolution: Unravelling the Threads of Connectivity and Influence* (social-media-revolution) [Chapter]. Https://Services.Igi-Global.Com/Resolvedoi/Resolve.Aspx?Doi=10.4018/979-8-3693-9235-5.Ch013; IGI Global Scientific Publishing. https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-9235-5.ch013

Ahmadi, E. (2022). *Misinformation on Social Media Platforms in the Global Crisis of Coronavirus* (misinformation-on-social-media-platforms-in-the-global-crisis-of-coronavirus) [Chapter]. Https://Services.Igi-Global.Com/Resolvedoi/Resolve.Aspx?Doi=10.4018/978-1-7998-8235-0.Ch010; IGI Global Scientific Publishing. https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-7998-8235-0.ch010

Alalawi, S., Baalfaqih, S., Almeqbaali, M., & Masud, M. M. (2023). Social Media Misinformation Propagation and Detection. *2023 15th International Conference on Innovations in Information Technology (IIT)*, 240–245. https://doi.org/10.1109/IIT59782.2023.10366483

Alohali, M. (2024). Examining the Effectiveness of Fact-Checking Tools on Social Media in Reducing the Spread of Misinformation. *International Journal of E-Adoption (IJEA)*, *16*(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.4018/IJEA.347948

Anuashok, A., Gupta, V., Tyagi, T., Agarwal, T., Reddy, R., & Rout, A. (2024). A Study on the Impact of Social Media on Modern Communication. *IJFMR - International Journal For Multidisciplinary Research*, *6*(2). https://doi.org/10.36948/ijfmr.2024.v06i02.15980

Arachchilage, N. A. G. (2021). *Hold On! Your Emotion and Behaviour when Falling for Fake News in Social Media* (2021050477). Preprints. https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202105.0477.v1

Aruguete, N., Bachmann, I., Calvo, E., Valenzuela, S., & Ventura, T. (2025). Truth be told: How "true" and "false" labels influence user engagement with fact-checks. *New Media & Society*, *27*(3), 1443–1464. https://doi.org/10.1177/14614448231193709

Bachmann, I., & Valenzuela, S. (2023). Studying the Downstream Effects of Fact-Checking on Social Media: Experiments on Correction Formats, Belief Accuracy, and Media Trust. *Social Media + Society*, *9*(2), 20563051231179694. https://doi.org/10.1177/20563051231179694

Bakir, V., & McStay, A. (2017). Fake News and The Economy of Emotions: Problems, causes, solutions. *Digital Journalism*, *6*, 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2017.1345645

Bessi, A., Zollo, F., Vicario, M. D., Scala, A., Caldarelli, G., & Quattrociocchi, W. (2015). Trend of Narratives in the Age of Misinformation. *PLOS ONE*, *10*(8), e0134641. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0134641

Bond, R. M., & Garrett, R. K. (2023). Engagement with fact-checked posts on Reddit. *PNAS Nexus*, *2*(3), pgad018. https://doi.org/10.1093/pnasnexus/pgad018

Brinda, B. M., Rajan, C., & Geetha, K. (2024). Detecting Evolving Fake News in Social Media by Leveraging Heterogeneous Deep Learning Model. *2024 Second International Conference on Advances in Information Technology (ICAIT)*, *1*, 1–5. https://doi.org/10.1109/ICAIT61638.2024.10690338

Burel, G., Farrell, T., Mensio, M., Khare, P., & Alani, H. (2020). Co-spread of Misinformation and Fact-Checking Content During the Covid-19 Pandemic. *Social Informatics: 12th International Conference, SocInfo 2020, Pisa, Italy, October 6–9, 2020, Proceedings*, 28–42. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-60975-7_3

Buss, D. M., & von Hippel, W. (2018). Psychological barriers to evolutionary psychology: Ideological bias and coalitional adaptations. *Archives of Scientific Psychology*, *6*(1), 148–158. https://doi.org/10.1037/arc0000049

Canela, G., Claesson, A., & Pollack, R. (2023). Addressing Mis- and Disinformation on Social Media. In T. D. Purnat, T. Nguyen, & S. Briand (Eds.), *Managing Infodemics in the 21st Century: Addressing New Public Health Challenges in the Information Ecosystem* (pp. 113–126). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-27789-4_9

Carnahan, D., & and Bergan, D. E. (2022). Correcting the Misinformed: The Effectiveness of Fact-checking Messages in Changing False Beliefs. *Political Communication*, *39*(2), 166–183. https://doi.org/10.1080/10584609.2021.1963358

Chan, E. (2023). Analysis of the Challenge in Fake News and Misinformation Regulation Comparative in Global Media Landscape. *SHS Web of Conferences*, *178*, 02018. https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/202317802018

Chaudhary, S., Chaurasiya, K., Sriram, S., S, R., V, N., & M, T. (2024). Unmasking Digital Deceptions: A Comprehensive Survey of Synthetic Reality Analysis Across Multimedia Domains. *2024 International Conference on Electronic Systems and Intelligent Computing (ICESIC)*, 202–207. https://doi.org/10.1109/ICESIC61777.2024.10846333

Christofoletti, R. (2024). Trust in Media and journalism credibility in the sea of misinformation. *The International Review of Information Ethics*, *33*(1), Article 1. https://doi.org/10.29173/irie500

Chuai, Y., & Zhao, J. (2022). Anger can make fake news viral online. *Frontiers in Physics*, *10*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fphy.2022.970174

Cinelli, M., Morales, G., Galeazzi, A., Quattrociocchi, W., & Starnini, M. (2021). The echo chamber effect on social media. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *118*, e2023301118. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2023301118

Clayton, K., Blair, S., Busam, J., Forstner, S., Glance, J., Green, G., Kawata, A., Kovvuri, A., Martin, J., Morgan, E., Sandhu, M., Sang, R., Scholz-Bright, R., Welch, A., Wolff, A., Zhou,

A., & Nyhan, B. (2020). Real Solutions for Fake News? Measuring the Effectiveness of General Warnings and Fact-Check Tags in Reducing Belief in False Stories on Social Media. *Political Behavior*, *42*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11109-019-09533-0

Clayton, K., Davis, J., Hinckley, K., & Horiuchi, Y. (2019). *Partisan Motivated Reasoning and Misinformation in the Media: Is News from Ideologically Uncongenial Sources More Suspicious?* (SSRN Scholarly Paper 3035272). Social Science Research Network. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3035272

Eskandarzadeh, A. (2024). *The Impact of Social Media on Communication* (the-impact-of-social-media-on-communication) [Chapter]. Https://Services.Igi-Global.Com/Resolvedoi/Resolve.Aspx?Doi=10.4018/979-8-3693-0855-4.Ch003; IGI Global Scientific Publishing. https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-0855-4.ch003

Garcí-a-Marí-n, D., & Salvat-Martinrey, G. (2022). Viralizar la verdad. Factores predictivos del engagement en el contenido verificado en TikTok. *Profesional de la información*, *31*(2), Article 2. https://doi.org/10.3145/epi.2022.mar.10

Garrett, R. K., Nisbet, E. C., & Lynch, E. K. (2013). Undermining the Corrective Effects of Media-Based Political Fact Checking? The Role of Contextual Cues and Naïve Theory. *Journal of Communication*, *63*(4), 617–637. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcom.12038

Geers, M., Fischer, H., Lewandowsky, S., & Herzog, S. M. (2024). The political (a)symmetry of metacognitive insight into detecting misinformation. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, *153*(8), 1961–1972. https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0001600

Geers, M., Swire-Thompson, B., Lorenz-Spreen, P., Herzog, S. M., Kozyreva, A., & Hertwig, R. (2024). The Online Misinformation Engagement Framework. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, *55*, 101739. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2023.101739

Gennadevna, M. N. (2024). Tekhnologii mediabezopasnosti: Metody protivodeistviia feik-kontentu v tsifrovykh media. *Development of the Russian Socio-Economic System: Challenges and Prospects*, 171–195. https://doi.org/10.31483/r-113839

Graves, L. (2018). Boundaries Not Drawn: Mapping the institutional roots of the global fact-checking movement. *Journalism Studies*, *19*, 613–631. https://doi.org/10.1080/1461670X.2016.1196602

Guess, A. M., Nyhan, B., & Reifler, J. (2020). Exposure to untrustworthy websites in the 2016 US election. *Nature Human Behaviour*, *4*(5), 472–480. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-020-0833-x

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

Guo, C., Zheng, N., & Guo, C. (John). (2023). Seeing is Not Believing: A Nuanced View of Misinformation Warning Efficacy on Video-Sharing Social Media Platforms. *Proc. ACM Hum.-Comput. Interact.*, *7*(CSCW2), 294:1-294:35. https://doi.org/10.1145/3610085

Gutiérrez-Caneda, B., & Vázquez-Herrero, J. (2024). Redrawing the Lines Against Disinformation: How AI Is Shaping the Present and Future of Fact-checking. *Tripodos*, *55*, Article 55. https://doi.org/10.51698/tripodos.2024.55.04

Hill, R. K. (2022). The Argument against (Attempted) Fact Check. *Proceedings*, *81*(1), Article 1. https://doi.org/10.3390/proceedings2022081063

Hoes, E., Aitken, B., Zhang, J., Gackowski, T., & Wojcieszak, M. (2024). Prominent misinformation interventions reduce misperceptions but increase scepticism. *Nature Human Behaviour*, *8*(8), 1545–1553. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-024-01884-x

Huang, G., Jia, W., & Yu, W. (2024). Media Literacy Interventions Improve Resilience to Misinformation: A Meta-Analytic Investigation of Overall Effect and Moderating Factors. *Communication Research*, 00936502241288103. https://doi.org/10.1177/00936502241288103

Jain, A. (2023). The Dark Side of Social Media: How Online Platforms Enable the Spread of Misinformation and Conspiracy Theories. *Journal of Communication and Management*, *2*(04), Article 04. https://doi.org/10.58966/JCM2023241

Jayant. (2025). *Misuse Of Artificial Intelligence in Elections – ICERT*. https://icertpublication.com/index.php/shodh-sari-2/sodh-sari-vol-3-issue-4/misuse-of-artificial-intelligence-in-elections/

Jha, R. K. (2023). Challenges of Fake News and Its Impact on Society in the Digital Era: A Critical Analysis. *IJFMR - International Journal For Multidisciplinary Research*, *5*(2). https://doi.org/10.36948/ijfmr.2023.v05i02.2401

Journell, W. (2024). Psychosocial processes and human desire: An inconvenient truth about online misinformation. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, *56*(1), 25–39. https://doi.org/10.1080/15391523.2023.2264962

Karami, M., Nazer, T. H., & Liu, H. (2021). Profiling Fake News Spreaders on Social Media through Psychological and Motivational Factors. *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM Conference on Hypertext and Social Media*, 225–230. https://doi.org/10.1145/3465336.3475097

Kozyreva, A., Lewandowsky, S., & Hertwig, R. (2020). Citizens Versus the Internet: Confronting Digital Challenges With Cognitive Tools. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, *21*(3), 103–156. https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100620946707

Larisa, N., & Sergeevich, D. A. (2024). Dissemination of fakes as a way of manipulating public consciousness in the Internet space. *Russian Journal of Deviant Behavior*, *4*(2), 237–249. https://doi.org/10.35750/2713-0622-2024-2-237-249

Lazer, D. M. J., Baum, M. A., Benkler, Y., Berinsky, A. J., Greenhill, K. M., Menczer, F., Metzger, M. J., Nyhan, B., Pennycook, G., Rothschild, D., Schudson, M., Sloman, S. A., Sunstein, C. R., Thorson, E. A., Watts, D. J., & Zittrain, J. L. (2018). The science of fake news. *Science*, *359*(6380), 1094–1096. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aao2998

Lee, A. Y., Neumann, E., Hancock, J., & Zaki, J. (2024). *People Overestimate How Many Social Media Users Post Harmful Content*. OSF. https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/f8y62

Lemish, D. (Ed.). (2022). *The Routledge International Handbook of Children, Adolescents, and Media* (2nd ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003118824

Lewandowsky, S., Ecker, U., & Cook, J. (2017). Beyond Misinformation: Understanding and Coping with the "Post-Truth" Era. *Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition*, *6*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jarmac.2017.07.008

Liu, X., Qi, L., Wang, L., & Metzger, M. J. (2023). Checking the Fact-Checkers: The Role of Source Type, Perceived Credibility, and Individual Differences in Fact-Checking Effectiveness. *Communication Research*, 00936502231206419. https://doi.org/10.1177/00936502231206419

Liu, Y., Shen, X., Zhang, Y., Wang, Z., Tian, Y., Dai, J., & Cao, Y. (2024). *A Systematic Review of Machine Learning Approaches for Detecting Deceptive Activities on Social Media: Methods, Challenges, and Biases*. https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.20293

M, D. S., & Hairunnisa. (2023). The Phenomenon of Fake News (Hoax) in Mass Communication: Causes, Impacts, and Solutions. *Open Access Indonesia Journal of Social Sciences*, *6*(3), Article 3. https://doi.org/10.37275/oaijss.v6i3.161

Margolin, D. B., Hannak ,Aniko, & and Weber, I. (2018). Political Fact-Checking on Twitter: When Do Corrections Have an Effect? *Political Communication*, *35*(2), 196–219. https://doi.org/10.1080/10584609.2017.1334018

Martel, C., & Rand, D. G. (2023a). Misinformation warning labels are widely effective: A review of warning effects and their moderating features. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, *54*, 101710. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2023.101710

Martel, C., & Rand, D. G. (2023b). Misinformation warning labels are widely effective: A review of warning effects and their moderating features. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, *54*, 101710. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2023.101710

McDougall, J., Brites, M.-J., Couto, M.-J., & Lucas, C. (2019). Digital literacy, fake news and education / Alfabetización digital, fake news y educación. *Culture and Education*, *31*(2), 203–212. https://doi.org/10.1080/11356405.2019.1603632

McGrew, S., & and Kohnen, A. M. (2024). Tackling misinformation through online information literacy: Structural and contextual considerations. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, *56*(1), 1–6. https://doi.org/10.1080/15391523.2023.2280385

Mesquita, L., Maneta, M., & Brites, M. J. (2024). *Beyond Verification: The Evolving Role of Fact-Checking Organisations in Media Literacy Education for Youth | Article | Media and Communication*. https://www.cogitatiopress.com/mediaandcommunication/article/view/8690

Miller, T. P., & Leon, A. (2017). Introduction to Special Issue on Literacy, Democracy, and Fake News: Making it Right in the Era of Fast and Slow Literacies. *Literacy in Composition Studies*, *5*(2), Article 2. https://doi.org/10.21623/1.5.2.2

Moreno-Gil, V., Ramon-Vegas, X., & Mauri-Rí-os, M. (2022). Bringing journalism back to its roots: Examining fact-checking practices, methods, and challenges in the Mediterranean context. *Profesional de La Información*, *31*(2), Article 2. https://doi.org/10.3145/epi.2022.mar.15

Morris, K. W. (2024). Deepfake Sockpuppets: The Toxic "Realities" of a Weaponised Internet. In S. Bacon & K. Bronk-Bacon (Eds.), *Gothic Nostalgia: The Uses of Toxic Memory in 21st Century Popular Culture* (pp. 61–79). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-43852-3_5

Mosleh, M., Allen, J. N. L., & Rand, D. (2024). *Withdrawn: Low-quality news posts receive higher engagement but not more impressions on Twitter*. OSF. https://osf.io/g2ewb_v1

Munusamy, S., Syasyila, K., Shaari, A. A. H., Pitchan, M. A., Kamaluddin, M. R., & Jatnika, R. (2024). Psychological factors contributing to the creation and dissemination of fake news among social media users: A systematic review. *BMC Psychology*, *12*(1), 673. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-024-02129-2

Myojung Chung & Nuri Kim. (2021). *When I Learn the News is False: How Fact-Checking Information Stems the Spread of Fake News Via Third-Person Perception | Human Communication Research | Oxford Academic*. https://academic.oup.com/hcr/article-abstract/47/1/1/5917727?redirectedFrom=fulltext&login=false

Nakov, P., & Da San Martino, G. (2020). Fact-Checking, Fake News, Propaganda, and Media Bias: Truth Seeking in the Post-Truth Era. In A. Villavicencio & B. Van Durme (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: Tutorial Abstracts* (pp. 7–19). Association for Computational Linguistics. https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2020.emnlp-tutorials.2

Nallasamy, A., Rajput, M., Wani, Z. A., Dar, M. K., Aakanksha, Fayaz, S. H., S, S., & Simon, N. H. (2024). The Pervasive Threat of Fake News and Disinformation in the Digital Age: Challenges and Solutions. *South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics*, *21*(6), 1–5. https://doi.org/10.9734/sajsse/2024/v21i6825

Natarajan, K., Mathur, A., Bhargava, K., Singh, M., & Tejpal, M. (2024). Deepfake Detection: Emerging Techniques and Evolving Challenges. *2024 12th International Conference on Internet of Everything, Microwave, Embedded, Communication and Networks (IEMECON)*, 1–6. https://doi.org/10.1109/IEMECON62401.2024.10846677

Nerentz, D. V., & B, Н. Д. (2024). Fakeization Processes in the U.S. Information Space: Problems and Solutions. *USA & Canada: economics, politics, culture*, *3*, Article 3. https://doi.org/10.31857/S2686673024030096

Nour, N., & Gelfand, J. (2021). *Deepfakes: A Digital Transformation Leads to Misinformation*.

Nyhan, B., Reifler, J., Richey, S., & Freed, G. (2014). Effective Messages in Vaccine Promotion: A Randomized Trial. *Pediatrics*, *133*. https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2013-2365

Oxford Analytica. (2025). Regulators to tackle deepfakes with updated regulation. *Emerald Expert Briefings*, *oxan-db*(oxan-db). https://doi.org/10.1108/OXAN-DB292157

Pal, A., & Loke, C. (2019). Communicating Fact to Combat Fake: Analysis of Fact-Checking Websites. *Proceedings of the 2019 International Conference on Information Technology and Computer Communications*, 66–73. https://doi.org/10.1145/3355402.3355415

Park, S., Fisher, C., Flew, T., & Dulleck, U. (2020). Global mistrust in news: The impact of social media on trust. *International Journal on Media Management*, *22*(2), Article 2. https://eprints.qut.edu.au/202618/

Park, S., Fisher ,Caroline, Flew ,Terry, & and Dulleck, U. (2020). Global Mistrust in News: The Impact of Social Media on Trust. *International Journal on Media Management*, *22*(2), 83–96. https://doi.org/10.1080/14241277.2020.1799794

Pennycook, G. (2019). Fighting misinformation on social media using crowdsourced judgments of news source quality. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *116*, 201806781. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1806781116

Pianciola Bartol, G. E., & Tommasel, A. (2024). Towards Automated Fact-Checking: An Exploratory Study on Identifying Check-Worthy Phrases for Verification. *2024 L Latin American Computer Conference (CLEI)*, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1109/CLEI64178.2024.10700241

Pohl, R. F. (Ed.). (2022). *Cognitive Illusions: Intriguing Phenomena in Thinking, Judgment, and Memory* (3rd ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003154730

Porter, E., & Wood, T. J. (2022). Political Misinformation and Factual Corrections on the Facebook News Feed: Experimental Evidence. *The Journal of Politics*, *84*(3), 1812–1817. https://doi.org/10.1086/719271

Primig, F. (2024). The Influence of Media Trust and Normative Role Expectations on the Credibility of Fact Checkers. *Journalism Practice*, *18*(5), 1137–1157. https://doi.org/10.1080/17512786.2022.2080102

Pulido, C. M., Villarejo-Carballido, B., Redondo-Sama, G., & Gómez, A. (2020). COVID-19 infodemic: More retweets for science-based information on coronavirus than for false information. *International Sociology*, *35*(4), 377–392. https://doi.org/10.1177/0268580920914755

Qasim, H. R. (2024). Impact of Fake News on Trust in Journalism. *MEDAAD*, *2024*, 41–45. https://doi.org/10.70470/MEDAAD/2024/007

R, G., Bharadwaj, G. R., Biradar, D., A, G. H., N, G., & Kallas, S. P. (2024). Social Media Misinformaton. *IJFMR - International Journal For Multidisciplinary Research*, *6*(6). https://doi.org/10.36948/ijfmr.2024.v06i06.25182

Rani, R., Kumar, T., & Sah, M. P. (2022). A Review on Deepfake Media Detection. In H. Sharma, V. Shrivastava, K. Kumari Bharti, & L. Wang (Eds.), *Communication and Intelligent Systems* (pp. 343–356). Springer Nature. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-2130-8_28

Reinero, D. A., Harris, E. A., Rathje, S., Duke, A., & Bavel, J. J. V. (2023). *Partisans are more likely to entrench their beliefs in misinformation when political outgroup members correct claims*. OSF. https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/z4df3

Resnick, P., Carton, S., Park, S., Shen, Y., & Zeffer, N. (2014). *RumorLens: A System for Analyzing the Impact of Rumors and Corrections in Social Media*.

Rucinska, S., Fecko, M., & Mital, O. (2023). Trust in public institutions in the age of disinformation. *Proceedings of the Central and Eastern European eDem and eGov Days 2023*, 111–117. https://doi.org/10.1145/3603304.3604075

Sabera, G., Manoranjini, J., Aarif, M., Rao, V. S., Anandaram, H., & Valavan M, P. (2024). Combating Fake News in Social Media by Enabling Deep Convolutional Neural Network-Based Detection and Mitigation Strategies. *2024 Third International Conference on Electrical, Electronics, Information and Communication Technologies (ICEEICT)*, 1–6. https://doi.org/10.1109/ICEEICT61591.2024.10718422

Sadasivam, V. R., Udhaya, T., Saravanan, K., & Keerthana, S. (2024). Truth Tracker: Unveiling Fact From Fiction in Social Media. *2024 15th International Conference on Computing Communication and Networking Technologies (ICCCNT)*, 1–4. https://doi.org/10.1109/ICCCNT61001.2024.10725785

Sharevski, F., Devine, A., Jachim, P., & Pieroni, E. (2022). Meaningful Context, a Red Flag, or Both? Preferences for Enhanced Misinformation Warnings Among US Twitter Users. *Proceedings of the 2022 European Symposium on Usable Security*, 189–201. https://doi.org/10.1145/3549015.3555671

Šprajc, P., Maletič, D., Petrović, N., Podbregar, I., Škraba, A., Tomić, D., & Žnidaršič, A. (2024). 43rd International Conference on Organizational Science Development: Green and Digital Transition – Challenge or Opportunity: Conference Proceedings. In *Univerzitetna založba Univerze v Mariboru*. Univerzitetna založba Univerze v Mariboru. https://doi.org/10.18690/um.fov.3.2024

Stein, J., Keuschnigg, M., & van de Rijt, A. (2024). Partisan belief in new misinformation is resistant to accuracy incentives. *PNAS Nexus*, *3*(11), pgae506. https://doi.org/10.1093/pnasnexus/pgae506

Stein, R., & Meyersohn, C. E. (2024). Whose Pants Are on Fire? Journalists Correcting False Claims are Distrusted More Than Journalists Confirming Claims. *Communication Research*, 00936502241262377. https://doi.org/10.1177/00936502241262377

Story, J., Iwai, T., & Tavares, G. M. (2024). Positive minds, inclusive minds: PsyCap's potential in overcoming resistance to DEI initiatives in organizations. *Organizational Dynamics*, *53*(4), 101087. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2024.101087

Sundriyal, M., Akhtar, M. S., & Chakraborty, T. (2023). *Leveraging Social Discourse to Measure Check-worthiness of Claims for Fact-checking* (arXiv:2309.09274). arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2309.09274

Swire-Thompson, B., Miklaucic, N., Wihbey, J. P., Lazer, D., & DeGutis, J. (2022). The backfire effect after correcting misinformation is strongly associated with reliability. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, *151*(7), 1655–1665. https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0001131

Szewach, P., Reifler, J., & Oscarsson, H. (2022). Is Resistance Futile? Citizen Knowledge, Motivated Reasoning, and Fact-Checking. In J. Strömbäck, Å. Wikforss, K. Glüer, T. Lindholm, & H. Oscarsson, *Knowledge Resistance in High-Choice Information Environments* (1st ed., pp. 166–186). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003111474-9

Tambe, S. N., & Hussein, N. A.-H. K. (2023). Exploring the Impact of Digital Literacy on Media Consumer Empowerment in the Age of Misinformation. *MEDAAD*, *2023*, 1–9. https://doi.org/10.70470/MEDAAD/2023/001

Tan, C. (2022). Regulating disinformation on Twitter and Facebook. *Griffith Law Review*, *31*(4), 513–536. https://doi.org/10.1080/10383441.2022.2138140

Tandoc, E., Lim, Z., & Ling, R. (2017). Defining "Fake News": A typology of scholarly definitions. *Digital Journalism*, *6*, 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2017.1360143

Tayia, S. A. R. (2022). Media and information literacy to counter disinformation. *Insights into Language, Culture and Communication*, *2*(2), 83–84. https://doi.org/10.21622/ilcc.2022.02.2.083

Tejedor, S., Romero-Rodríguez, L. M., & Gracia-Villar, M. (2024). Unveiling the truth: A systematic review of fact-checking and fake news research in social sciences. *Online Journal of Communication and Media Technologies*, *14*(2), e202427. https://doi.org/10.30935/ojcmt/14455

Tewfik, G., Aziz, R., Shulman, S., Naftalovich, R., & Gilels, S. (2020). *Shared Content on Facebook Often Propagates Inaccurate or Misleading Information Regarding Covid-19*. Research Square. https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-31047/v1

Thirupathi, L., Reddy, A. S., Vardhan, V., Panchagnula, T., Miriyala, N. S. R., Gattoju, S., Kanth, T. V. R., Thirupathi, L., Reddy, A. S., Vardhan, V., Panchagnula, T., Miriyala, N. S. R.,

Gattoju, S., & Kanth, T. V. R. (2025). *Deepfakes: Understanding, Detection, and Mitigation in Cyber-Politics and Cyber-Economics* (deepfakes) [Chapter]. Https://Services.Igi-Global.Com/Resolvedoi/Resolve.Aspx?Doi=10.4018/979-8-3693-7036-0.Ch015; IGI Global Scientific Publishing. https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-7036-0.ch015

Thorson, E. (2015). Belief Echoes: The Persistent Effects of Corrected Misinformation. *Political Communication*, *33*, 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1080/10584609.2015.1102187

Tomassi, A., Falegnami, A., & Romano, E. (2024). Mapping automatic social media information disorder. The role of bots and AI in spreading misleading information in society. *PLOS ONE*, *19*(5), e0303183. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0303183

Vasylchyshyn, O., Storozhenko, L., Babkova, T., Kuchmenko, V., & Kovalchuk, V. (2024). Social media as a factor in the transformation of public administration, justice and legality. *Multidisciplinary Reviews*, *7*, 2024spe039-2024spe039. https://doi.org/10.31893/multirev.2024spe039

Veerasamy, N., & Pieterse, H. (2022a). Rising Above Misinformation and Deepfakes. *International Conference on Cyber Warfare and Security*, *17*(1), Article 1. https://doi.org/10.34190/iccws.17.1.25

Veerasamy, N., & Pieterse, H. (2022b). Rising Above Misinformation and Deepfakes. *International Conference on Cyber Warfare and Security*, *17*(1), Article 1. https://doi.org/10.34190/iccws.17.1.25

Vo, N., & Lee, K. (2019). Learning from Fact-checkers: Analysis and Generation of Fact-checking Language. *Proceedings of the 42nd International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, 335–344. https://doi.org/10.1145/3331184.3331248

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

Vraga, E., & Bode, L. (2020). Defining Misinformation and Understanding its Bounded Nature: Using Expertise and Evidence for Describing Misinformation. *Political Communication*, *37*, 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1080/10584609.2020.1716500

Vraga, E. K., & Bode, L. (2020). *Correction as a solution for health misinformation on social media*. American Journal of Health Education, 51(2), 87–96. https://doi.org/10.1080/19325037.2019.1708552

Wahlheim, C. N., Kemp, P., Wiley, R., & Engelhardt, A. (2023). *Correction Effects on the Perceived Accuracy of Fake News Headlines Over Time: The Critical Role of Recollecting Corrections*. OSF. https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/tfdnu

Walter, N., & Murphy, S. (2018). How to unring the bell: A meta-analytic approach to correction of misinformation. *Communication Monographs*, *85*, 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1080/03637751.2018.1467564

Wang, W.-C., Brashier, N. M., Wing, E. A., Marsh, E. J., & Cabeza, R. (2016). On Known Unknowns: Fluency and the Neural Mechanisms of Illusory Truth. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, *28*(5), 739–746. https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn_a_00923

Warin, T. (2024). *Disinformation in the Digital Age: Impacts on Democracy and Strategies for Mitigation—CIRANO*. https://www.cirano.qc.ca/en/summaries/2024PR-03

Wolff, L., & Taddicken, M. (2024). Disinforming the unbiased: How online users experience and cope with dissonance after climate change disinformation exposure. *New Media & Society*, *26*(5), 2699–2720. https://doi.org/10.1177/14614448221090194

Wolff, J., & Taddicken, M. (2024). *Why corrections of misinformation fail: A literature review on resistance to correction efforts in the post-truth age*. Information, Communication & Society. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2024.2310084

Yadav, K. K., & Bansal, N. (2023). A Comparative Study on Clickbait Detection using Machine Learning Based Methods. *2023 International Conference on Disruptive Technologies (ICDT)*, 661–665. https://doi.org/10.1109/ICDT57929.2023.10150475

Zhou, Y., & Shen, L. (2024). Processing of misinformation as motivational and cognitive biases. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *15*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1430953

Ziemer, C.-T., & Rothmund, T. (2022). *Psychological Underpinnings of Disinformation Countermeasures: A Systematic Scoping Review*. OSF. https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/scq5v

Ziemer, C., & Rothmund, T. (2022). *The impact of cognitive fluency and emotionality on the belief in fake news*. Media Psychology, 25(3), 333–358. https://doi.org/10.1080/15213269.2021.1942115

Ziemer, C.-T., & Rothmund, T. (2024). Psychological Underpinnings of Misinformation Countermeasures. *Journal of Media Psychology*. https://econtent.hogrefe.com/doi/10.1027/1864-1105/a000407