

future work may investigate not only the perception of fake news but also the consequences of reading news that changes beliefs and behavior in real life. It is an important research question in understanding to what extent and how fake news impacts previous and ongoing elections worldwide.

Limitations. There are several limitations in the current study that are important to acknowledge. First, our survey results rely on Amazon Mechanical Turk workers and the sample size is limited to 100 responses per survey. The representation of this sample should not be over-claimed. However, previous work suggests that Turk workers are a reliable source for studying behaviors associated with fake news determination, which gives us more confidence [5]. Moreover, all the discussed results are proven to be statistically significant. Second, the user interface of news articles in our study is a confounding factor and difficult to rule out. However, the survey is designed in such a way as to reflect how people read diverse news articles on social media. Thirdly, our study environment is not a perfect simulation of a real-world setting. The participants are asked to rate a stream of news articles with no posts from friends, family members, or advertisements. Finally, participants are asked to rate each of the article's representation factors' importance before determining the credibility of the article. This could have prompted participants to think more analytically. In the future, we plan to design an application to monitor participants' real-time online news consumption and query them regarding the most important factors aiding their judgment about each article's credibility to further explore and address these problems.

VI. CONCLUSION

Guided by the open question of what factors contribute to the determination of the legitimacy of online news articles, we have conducted empirical surveys and identified that Content and Source are the most important factors. We further identify that when shown actual news content, Content and Source remain the most important factors, but their importance is less than when asked to rate these factors in the abstract. Our study, with an equal number of true and fake articles about liberals and conservatives, reveals differences in accuracy between two ideological groups. We also identify that these differences are more significant in true news articles than fake ones. Furthermore, we perform a qualitative analysis to understand why our users are confident or uncertain about an article's legitimacy and how these factors play out in their thought process. All these results shed light on readers' thinking process when deciding the credibility of an article and serve to extend the work on improving an individual's critical thinking skills to combat fake news online.

REFERENCES

- [1] C. Silverman, "This analysis shows how viral fake election news stories outperformed real news on facebook," *BuzzFeed news*, vol. 16, 2016.
- [2] M. Anany, "The partnership press: Lessons for platform-publisher collaborations as facebook and news outlets team to fight misinformation," *Tow Center for Digital Journalism*, 2018.
- [3] P. Moravec, R. Minas, and A. R. Dennis, "Fake news on social media: People believe what they want to believe when it makes no sense at all," *Kelley School of Business Research Paper*, no. 18-87, 2018.
- [4] B. Swire, U. K. Ecker, and S. Lewandowsky, "The role of familiarity in correcting inaccurate information," *J. of experimental psychology: learning, memory, and cognition*, vol. 43, no. 12, p. 1948, 2017.
- [5] G. Pennycook and D. G. Rand, "Lazy, not biased: Susceptibility to partisan fake news is better explained by lack of reasoning than by motivated reasoning," *Cognition*, vol. 188, pp. 39–50, 2019.
- [6] M. V. Bronstein, G. Pennycook, A. Bear, D. G. Rand, and T. D. Cannon, "Belief in fake news is associated with delusionality, dogmatism, religious fundamentalism, and reduced analytic thinking," *J. of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 108–117, 2019.
- [7] B. D. Horne and S. Adali, "This just in: fake news packs a lot in title, uses simpler, repetitive content in text body, more similar to satire than real news," in *ICWSM*, 2017, pp. 759–766.
- [8] M. L. Newman, J. W. Pennebaker, D. S. Berry, and J. M. Richards, "Lying words: Predicting deception from linguistic styles," *Personality and social psychology bulletin*, vol. 29, no. 5, pp. 665–675, 2003.
- [9] C. A. Harper and T. Baguley, "'you are fake news': Ideological (a) symmetries in perceptions of media legitimacy," 2019.
- [10] G. L. Cohen, "Party over policy: The dominating impact of group influence on political beliefs," *J. of personality and social psychology*, vol. 85, no. 5, p. 808, 2003.
- [11] A. N. Washburn and L. J. Skitka, "Science denial across the political divide: Liberals and conservatives are similarly motivated to deny attitude-inconsistent science," *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, vol. 9, no. 8, pp. 972–980, 2018.
- [12] A. Guess, J. Nagler, and J. Tucker, "Less than you think: Prevalence and predictors of fake news dissemination on facebook," *Science advances*, vol. 5, no. 1, p. eaau4586, 2019.
- [13] J. Gottfried and E. Shearer, *News Use Across Social Media Platforms 2016*. Pew Research Center, 2016.
- [14] M. J. Metzger, A. J. Flanagin, and R. B. Medders, "Social and heuristic approaches to credibility evaluation online," *J. of communication*, vol. 60, no. 3, pp. 413–439, 2010.
- [15] V. G. Cerf, "Information and misinformation on the internet," *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 60, no. 1, pp. 9–9, 2016.
- [16] L. Cui, S. Wang, and D. Lee, "Same: sentiment-aware multi-modal embedding for detecting fake news," in *ASONAM*, 2019, pp. 41–48.
- [17] K. Shu, X. Zhou, S. Wang, R. Zafarani, and H. Liu, "The role of user profiles for fake news detection," in *ASONAM*, 2019, pp. 436–439.
- [18] A. Chakraborty, B. Paranjape, S. Kakarla, and N. Ganguly, "Stop clickbait: Detecting and preventing clickbaits in online news media," in *ASONAM*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 9–16.
- [19] J. P. Dickerson, V. Kagan, and V. Subrahmanian, "Using sentiment to detect bots on twitter: Are humans more opinionated than bots?" in *ASONAM*. IEEE, 2014, pp. 620–627.
- [20] S. Helmstetter and H. Paulheim, "Weakly supervised learning for fake news detection on twitter," in *ASONAM*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 274–277.
- [21] R. Baly, G. Karadzhov, D. Alexandrov, J. Glass, and P. Nakov, "Predicting factuality of reporting and bias of news media sources," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.01765*, 2018.
- [22] Snopes, "Snopes," <http://www.snopes.com>, 2019, [Online; accessed 10-January-2019].
- [23] Poltifact, "Poltifact," <http://www.poltifact.com>, 2019, [Online; accessed 10-January-2019].
- [24] K. Krishna and M. N. Murty, "Genetic k-means algorithm," *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics, Part B (Cybernetics)*, vol. 29, no. 3, pp. 433–439, 1999.
- [25] N. Klein and E. O'Brien, "People use less information than they think to make up their minds," *PNAS*, vol. 115, no. 52, pp. 13 222–13 227, 2018.
- [26] M. Gabelkov, A. Ramachandran, A. Chaintreau, and A. Legout, "Social clicks: What and who gets read on twitter?" in *SIGMETRICS*, 2016, pp. 179–192.
- [27] H. Allcott and M. Gentzkow, "Social media and fake news in the 2016 election," *J. of economic perspectives*, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 211–36, 2017.
- [28] A. Coppock, "Generalizing from survey experiments conducted on mechanical turk: A replication approach," *Political Science Research and Methods*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 613–628, 2019.