

Susceptibility to Unreliable Information Sources: Swift Adoption with Minimal Exposure

JINYI YE, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, USA

LUCA LUCERI, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, USA

JULIE JIANG, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, USA

EMILIO FERRARA, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, USA

Misinformation proliferation on social media platforms is a pervasive threat to the integrity of online public discourse. Genuine users, susceptible to others' influence, often unknowingly engage with, endorse, and re-share questionable pieces of information, collectively amplifying the spread of misinformation. In this study, we introduce an empirical framework to investigate users' susceptibility to influence when exposed to unreliable and reliable information sources. Leveraging two datasets on political and public health discussions on Twitter, we analyze the impact of exposure on the adoption of information sources, examining how the reliability of the source modulates this relationship. Our findings provide evidence that increased exposure augments the likelihood of adoption. Users tend to adopt low-credibility sources with fewer exposures than high-credibility sources, a trend that persists even among non-partisan users. Furthermore, the number of exposures needed for adoption varies based on the source credibility, with extreme ends of the spectrum (very high or low credibility) requiring fewer exposures for adoption. Additionally, we reveal that the adoption of information sources often mirrors users' prior exposure to sources with comparable credibility levels. Our research offers critical insights for mitigating the endorsement of misinformation by vulnerable users, offering a framework to study the dynamics of content exposure and adoption on social media platforms.

1 INTRODUCTION

Misinformation and non-credible information are critical challenges in contemporary society, drawing significant scholarly attention in recent years [10, 40, 54, 59]. In the digital age, the rapid dissemination of content on social media platforms has amplified the reach of false narratives, potentially leading to widespread misconceptions and harmful behaviors [61]. For example, the 2016 election witnessed a surge in fake news [20], and misinformation regarding COVID-19 was disseminated at a rate 32.4% higher than factual content [42]. While social bots have previously been shown to have played an important role in sharing questionable content [15, 16], a substantial amount of recent dissemination of unreliable COVID-19 information were, in fact, from plausibly genuine users [7, 38, 57].

There is a large body of research on the adoption and spread of misinformation and fake news. Most research focuses on answering *why* some people trust unreliable content [14, 44, 59], identifying *who* is most vulnerable to misinformation [1, 5, 43], or explaining *how* fake news spread in social networks [60, 65]. Yet much less is understood about the differences between the dynamics of adopting truthful information versus falsehoods. In this work, we bridge this gap in the literature by investigating the distinctions in the information adoption process, considering social network exposure, between credible and non-credible content.

In this paper, we present an empirical study to examine users' susceptibility to influence when exposed to a range of information sources, taking into account three key dimensions: the credibility of the information sources they are exposed to, the frequency of exposure to the information source, and the likelihood of subsequent adoption of the information source. In this work, we look at the information shared on Twitter through URLs to popular media and analyze how the exposure-adoption mechanisms differ for media of varying credibility. We approximate exposure to media content by considering the URLs shared by a user's social connections, and we operationalize adoption as the subsequent sharing of URLs from a particular media by the user.




Fig. 1. RQs and components of the proposed methodological framework.

Contributions of this work

Guided by our motivation to investigate the interplay between users' propensity to adopt an information source, the reliability of the source, and the extent of exposure (see Fig. 1), we formulate and investigate the three following research questions (RQs):

- RQ1:** How does the number of exposures to an information source affect its adoption, and how is this effect modulated by the credibility of the information source?
- RQ2:** How does the credibility of the information source influence the number of exposures needed for adoption?
- RQ3:** How is the adoption of information sources with varying credibility modulated by users' prior exposure to sources with similar credibility levels?

Our analysis reveals compelling evidence that increased exposure frequency corresponds to a higher likelihood of source adoption. Notably, given the same level of exposure, users are more likely to adopt low-credibility sources, a trend that is robust to potential political bias (RQ1). Considering all sources that are adopted, both extremely low- and high-credibility sources require fewer exposures prior to adoption than sources of moderate credibility (RQ2). Furthermore, we observe a strong positive correlation between the credibility of sources users are exposed to and those they subsequently adopt (RQ3). Specifically, users are more likely to adopt low-credibility sources if they are exposed to more low-credibility sources. The same trend holds true for users who adopt high-credibility sources, however, they usually require a much greater amount of high-credibility exposures before adoption. This suggests that the credibility of exposures may have an effect on corresponding adoptions. Our findings remain consistent across two large-scale Twitter datasets covering political and public health discussions. This research offers critical insights into understanding user behaviors and vulnerabilities on social media platforms, especially their tendencies to align with information sources of specific credibility levels, with broader implications for combating misinformation online.

2 RELATED WORK

The extensive literature on misinformation and fake news offers several theories about why people fall prey to them [14, 44, 59]. People are likely to accept claims from sources that they perceive to be credible [32, 58]. If a piece of information is repeated enough times, the increased exposure will make the claim easier to process and thus more likely taken to be true in a process known as the “illusory truth” effect [13, 41, 63]. Partisanship or ideological views may also play a role here due to our tendency to seek out and trust information that conforms to our worldviews (confirmation bias) [20, 34] or believe in messages from sources that are perceived to be similar to ourselves [58], especially with common political viewpoints [3, 31]. Misinformation that elicits stronger emotional responses could also render it more believable than truth [4, 12, 55]. The novelty of fake news could be another factor leading to their popularity [60]. Another theory is that people often forgo careful reasoning for intuitive, lazy reasoning, rendering them gullible to fake news [43, 44]. Even when people have been corrected with accurate information, many will persist in being affected by the false information owing to the continued influence effect [27, 61].

Many studies seek to answer the question: *who* is susceptible to influence? In a large randomized experiment on Facebook, Aral and Walker [1] found individual differences in users’ susceptibility to influence; for example, younger users are more susceptible than older users, and men are susceptible to influence from women. Politically right-leaning individuals are shown to be more susceptible to misinformation and deception [5, 8, 29, 43]. In particular, those with a lower belief in science or higher conspiratorial inclinations are more likely to share health misinformation [52]. These beliefs often manifest through distinct behavioral cues, including signals of group identity, compliance with community norms, and distrust towards opposing views [62].

Another line of work examines *how* fake news spreads online. Online diffusion patterns of fake news have been found to be distinct from those of truthful information: fake news tends to travel faster, deeper, and broader [60]. Further, they have more spreaders and spreaders who engage more actively with fake news, resulting in a larger and denser fake news network [65]. These insights have allowed research to discern misinformation from network diffusion patterns alone [36, 50, 65]

Nevertheless, several critical questions persist: Are users equally susceptible to influence across information sources with different levels of credibility? Does a person’s susceptibility to influence change based on the extent of exposure, thus affecting the adoption of low-credibility sources? Is the adoption rate of misinformation faster than that of truthful content? In this study, we aim to address these gaps in the existing literature by introducing a methodological framework that explores the interrelationships between exposure, adoption, and the credibility of a large suite of information sources.

3 PROBLEM DEFINITION

Our conceptualization of a user’s susceptibility to influence draws from both psychology [28, 35] and computer science studies [1, 23, 49, 65]. Social psychologists posit that individuals adjust their opinions, beliefs, or behaviors due to the influence of others [35]. In this context, susceptibility indicates an openness to peer influence, often leading to conformity behaviors [28]. Similarly, computer scientists studying social media define users’ susceptibility as their likelihood to be infected with items propagated by other users [1, 23, 51]. Researchers have operationalized susceptibility to misinformation, or “vulnerability to misinformation” according to Nikolov et al. [37], as the proportion of low-credibility sources shared by a user [65] or the probability of adoption given one or more exposures to misinformation [49]. Notably, susceptibility is modeled as a *probability*, capturing the fraction of users’ activity driven by social influence

[18, 30, 49, 65]. These overlapping definitions emphasize two main components of susceptibility: *exposure* to a piece of content and the potential subsequent content *adoption*.

Given these perspectives, in this work, we operationalize users’ susceptibility to influence as their likelihood to adopt content they are exposed to. In this study, we consider media and news outlets as pieces of content, examining exposure to and adoption of information sources. Importantly, our notion of susceptibility is measured independently from the credibility of the content, meaning that susceptibility to *misinformation* sources (low-credibility) is measured identically to susceptibility to *factual* (high-credibility) sources.

Exposure. Exposure to an information source on social media generally refers to the event wherein a user encounters or views a particular piece of content from that source, regardless of their subsequent interaction (e.g., like, share, comment). Measuring exposure can be challenging because simply viewing content does not result in an observable action. Nonetheless, exposure data could be gathered through self-reported measures like list-based recall surveys [19], and observational measures such as online browser web tracking [21, 33], and screen activity [48].

Following previous research, we approximate exposure leveraging observable sharing activities on social media. Existing methods typically consider that users are exposed to the content shared by their followers. However, with the latest feed ranking algorithms, users are not only exposed to posts generated by their followed accounts but also by tweets algorithmically curated by the platform’s recommendation systems, resulting in heightened levels of selective exposure [21]. For example, on Twitter, users can be exposed to and retweet content from any account, with or without a follow relationship. To address this challenge, previous work [17, 46, 47, 53] relies on users’ observed interactions to approximate their exposure to content generated by those they interact with. Specifically, a target user u_t is considered exposed to the set of users retweeted by u_t .

We further extend this idea by also considering quote and reply interactions as a proxy for exposure. The underlying assumption is that when users engage in actions like re-sharing, replying, or quoting others, they are necessarily exposed to the content generated by those users. Consequently, they are likely to follow these users or come across their content again in the future. Therefore, we operationalize exposure as follows: If a target user u_t interacts with a user u_s through a retweet, quote, or reply, then for each set of tweets \mathcal{X} that u_s shares after the time of their first observed interaction, we assume that u_t is exposed to tweets \mathcal{X} .

Adoption. In this study, we consider adoption as the act of sharing a URL containing a particular information source, regardless of its credibility and type of tweet, i.e., original tweet, retweet, quoted tweet, or reply tweet. Notably, it is essential to differentiate between exposure to content and the act of adopting it. Inspired by Aral and Walker [1], we consider two main adoption modes: (i) *influence-driven adoption*, where the content is shared post-exposure, and (ii) *spontaneous adoption*, where content is shared without any prior exposure (or from exposure that we do not capture through our methods). Recognizing these distinctions is crucial, especially when considering that adoptions can occur even without direct influence from other people.

4 DATA

For our study, we carefully select two distinct datasets during a specified time frame to provide a robust look at user susceptibility to online content. The first dataset (hereinafter referred to as the ELECTION dataset), gathered by Chen et al. [9], tracks over one billion tweets related to the 2020 US election beginning from January 1st, 2020. Tweets were collected by tracking messages mentioning the Twitter accounts of Republican and Democratic candidates in the presidential election. This was achieved by using Twitter’s streaming API service (v.1.1), which captured a roughly 1%

sample of all streaming tweets. We limit our study period to tweets that appeared between January 1st, 2020, and June 30th, 2020 to study roughly six continuous months of users’ online interaction. This subset of data contains 364 million tweets from 14.5 million users.

The second dataset (hereinafter referred to as the COVID dataset), collected by Chen et al. [11], contains COVID-19 pandemic-related tweets starting from January 21st, 2020. This dataset tracks tweets mentioning specific COVID-related keywords and accounts, offering a comprehensive view of online conversations and public sentiments regarding the pandemic. We similarly limit our study period from January 21st, 2020, to June 30th, 2020, which contains 260 million tweets from 35 million users.

Our choice of the ELECTION and COVID datasets for the overlapping six-month time span of the first half of 2020 is underpinned by the significance of two major events surrounding US national politics and the global public health crisis. Analyzing these pivotal events in tandem offers a unique opportunity to explore people’s receptivity to information across distinct topical interests. Furthermore, analyzing both datasets ensures the reliability and consistency of our results under different contexts.

5 METHODOLOGY

5.1 Categorizing Information Sources

Tweets often contain URLs from popular media outlets. We can, therefore, use the credibility of the media outlet as a proxy for the credibility of the information source cited by the tweet. Following prior research [29, 45, 46], we assess content credibility by examining pay-level domains within the URLs embedded in tweets. We curate two distinct lists of domains representing low- and high-credibility information sources shared on social media.

We use the Media Bias/Fact Check (MBFC) website¹ as well as the Iffy Index of Unreliable Sources² to assess news media credibility. MBFC is an independent news media watchdog that rates news media on a 6-point factuality scale ranging from *Very Low* to *Very High*. The Iffy Index further expands the reliability rating provided by MBFC by categorizing a source as either Conspiracy/Pseudoscience or Questionable Source/Fake News. We categorize a total of 1,481 domains from the Iffy Index as sources with low credibility. Within this low-credibility category, we further classify them based on their MBFC factual scores into three distinct subcategories: *Very Low*, *Low*, and *Mixed*. To identify high-credibility sources, we assemble a list of 1,942 media websites that received a *High* rating in terms of credibility by MBFC. These high-credibility sources are also divided into three separate subcategories based on factual scores: *Very High*, *High*, and *Mostly Factual*. Examples of sources representing these credibility categories are detailed in the Appendix.

For every post across the two datasets, we systematically extract, expand, and parse all embedded URLs. We then examine whether the URL is from either a low- or high-credibility domain from the two lists. The ELECTION dataset contains 4.6 million URLs shared amongst 776,000 users, while the COVID dataset contains 8.8 million URLs distributed by 2.5 million users.

5.2 Identifying Target Users

We conduct additional filtering to identify a subset of *target users*. A user must satisfy two criteria to be considered a *target user*. First, we restrict our attention to users who *have not* shared any specified low- or high-credibility sources during the first few months of our study period but did so later on. We refer to this timeframe as a *buffering period*.

¹<https://mediabiasfactcheck.com>

²<https://iffy.news/index/>

Table 1. Number of total users, target users, and breakdown across the three user categories.

# of Users	ELECTION Dataset	COVID Dataset
All users	775,937	2,504,689
Target users	21,200	34,053
ONLY low-credibility	1,592	1,402
ONLY high-credibility	8,201	18,872
Both low- and high-credibility	11,587	13,779

Driven by our exposure-adoption framework to assess user susceptibility (*cf.* §3), this approach narrows our pool of users down to estimate the extent of exposure target users experienced before they first adopted an information source. In line with Bakshy et al. [2], we choose a two-month buffer, equivalent to one-third of our study period, to balance a consistent *buffering* timeframe with a representative set of eligible target users.

The second criterion poses a minimum threshold on the number of URLs shared to qualify as a *target user*. Following [37], we only consider users who shared at least ten, not necessarily unique, links from low- and high-credibility sources. This criterion is particularly relevant as our study aims at understanding the differences across different susceptible populations. Users who share fewer than ten links have insufficient data points to assess their susceptibility to influence confidently and are thus excluded from our analysis.

This filtering results in 21,200 and 34,053 users from the ELECTION and COVID datasets, respectively. We categorize these target users into three mutually exclusive groups: those who *only* shared low-credibility sources, those who *only* shared high-credibility sources, and those who shared both. Table 1 provides an overview of the number of target users meeting the specified criteria and their distribution across the three categories. In both datasets, about half of the users share both low- and high-credibility sources. Users who share only low-credibility sources represent the smallest group in both datasets, accounting for less than 10% of the target users.

5.3 Quantifying User Credibility and Political Orientation

To further characterize users in these three groups, we introduce an *adoption credibility* metric. This metric gauges the overall credibility of content adopted by a target user. We devise this metric based on (i) the credibility of each information source a user adopts, and (ii) the frequency of adopting these sources. To quantify the credibility of each information source, we assign each of them a numerical value on a scale from 0 to 1: *Very Low* (0), *Low* (0.2), *Mixed* (0.4), *Mostly Factual* (0.6), *High* (0.8), and *Very High* (1). We calculate user credibility as the weighted average of the credibility scores of the sources that a user shares, with weights corresponding to the sharing frequency. It is worth noting that the above metric evaluates the credibility of the sources a user adopts. Similarly, we consider the credibility of the sources a user is exposed to and introduce an *exposure credibility* metric, computed as the weighted average of the credibility scores of the sources a user is exposed to.

Further, as part of our effort to control for biases arising from political partisanship, we also infer the political leaning of every target user in a similar manner. Utilizing the media bias ratings provided by MBFC, we classify information sources on a 7-point political leaning scale: *Extreme Left* (1), *Left* (2), *Left-Center* (3), *Least Biased* (4), *Right-Center* (5), *Right* (6), and *Extreme Right* (7). These scores are then normalized to a 0 to 1 scale. We exclude domains that do not fall into these categories or are not rated by MBFC from our analysis. The political leaning score of every target user is computed as the weighted mean of the political bias scores of the domains they share, weighted by their sharing frequency.




Fig. 2. Distribution of the exposure count.

6 RESULTS

6.1 Exposure Frequency Affects Adoption (RQ1)

In this section, we address RQ1 by exploring how the frequency of exposure influences users’ likelihood to adopt information sources and how this might vary based on the source’s credibility. To this aim, we frame the probability of adoption of an information source as a function of the number of exposures. We examine all user-domain pairs (u_t, d_i) , where target user u_t is exposed to information source d_i . For every pair, we calculate n_e as the number of exposures prior to u_t ’s adoption of d_i to compose a triplet (u_t, d_i, n_e) . When we do not observe any adoption of d_i from u_t , we use the number of accumulated exposures to d_i as n_e . The probability of adoption at a particular exposure count N , indicated as $Pr(A|n_e = N)$, is determined as the ratio of user-content pairs (u_t, d_i) resulting in adoption to all pairs with an exposure level of $n_e = N$. Figure 2 shows the distribution of (u_t, d_i) pairs across different exposure frequency N . Both histograms exhibit characteristics of a *heavy-tail* distribution, where a small number of (u_t, d_i) pairs have a very large number of exposures, while the majority have very few.

6.1.1 Adoption likelihood increases with exposure frequency. Our results show that the probability of adoption of information sources $Pr(A|n_e)$ increases with the number of exposures n_e in both datasets (Mann-Kendall $p < .001$), as depicted in Figure 3. We set an upper limit of the number of exposures n_e to 250, which encompasses over 99% of all (u_t, d_i) pairs. This is consistent with similar findings in previous work [24] on the adoption of distinct URLs. Further quantifying this relationship, our linear regression analysis—employing a logarithmic transformation on the number of exposures (n_e)—substantiates the influence of exposure on source adoption. Specifically, for the ELECTION dataset, every logarithmic increase in exposure correlates with a 6.4% rise in the likelihood of adoption ($b = .064, p < .001$), accounting for 83.2% of the variability in the data ($R^2 = .832$). Similarly, in the COVID dataset, a log-transformed exposure increment corresponds to a 4.2% increase in adoption likelihood ($b = .042, p < .001$), with a model fit explaining 55.4% of the data variation ($R^2 = .554$). These regression outcomes underscore the role of exposure frequency in users’ adoption of information sources.




Fig. 3. The probability of adoption at varying levels of exposures with a logarithmic regression fit. Each data point represents a specific instance of adoption probability $Pr(A|n_e)$ at a given exposure n_e .




Fig. 4. The probability of adoption at varying levels of exposures with a logarithmic regression fit, modulated by the credibility of information sources.

6.1.2 *Source credibility modulates adoption rate.* We now examine the impact of the source’s credibility on the relationship between adoption probability and exposure frequency. Figure 4 shows the probability of adoption $Pr(A|n_e)$ as a function of the number of exposures n_e to either high- or low-credibility content. It is evident that, at a specific level of exposure, low-credibility sources exhibit a significantly higher probability of adoption compared to high-credibility sources (Mann-Whitney $p < .001$). This result is consistent across both datasets.

Table 2. Comparison of target users’ likelihood to adopt low- (P_{Low}) and high-credibility (P_{High}) sources after removing the top (most right-leaning) and bottom (most left-leaning) x% of partisan users by political leaning scores. We apply the Mann-Whitney U test to test that $P_{Low} > P_{High}$ (***) $p < .001$.

Removal	ELECTION Dataset			COVID Dataset		
	10%	20%	30%	10%	20%	30%
No. of users	21,038	20,361	17,886	33,921	33,460	31,803
μ_{low}	0.273	0.274	0.271	0.271	0.271	0.268
μ_{high}	0.139	0.161	0.166	0.187	0.187	0.190
$P_{Low} > P_{High}$	***	***	***	***	***	***

Thus far, we have considered each user-content pair independently, but each user could be exposed to and adopt multiple information sources. Therefore, for further analysis, we distinguish users according to three credibility categories: those sharing exclusively low-credibility sources (“Only Low”), those disseminating only high-credibility content (“Only High”), and those who share both types (“Both”). In Figure 5, we display the probability of adoption given the number of exposures $n_e \leq 250$, taking into account the three distinct groups to which every target user u_t belongs.

In the ELECTION dataset, there is no significant difference in the adoption probability between the “Only Low” and “Both” groups (Mann-Whitney U $p = .34$). However, the “Only Low” group exhibits a higher adoption rate compared to the “Only High” group (Mann-Whitney U $p < .001$). For the COVID dataset, the adoption probability of the “Only Low” group is significantly higher than both the “Only High” and “Both” user groups (Mann-Whitney U $p < .001$ in both instances). These results underscore that users exclusively adopting low-credibility content consistently exhibit a higher probability of adoption at every exposure level compared to other users. For a more granular breakdown, the reader is directed to the Appendix.

However, drawing such a conclusion requires careful scrutiny of potential confounding factors. One salient factor is highlighted in a large body of research on online political polarization, which consistently reports that extremely partisan individuals tend to dominate misinformation consumption and dissemination [21, 26, 39, 46]. Thus, a crucial question arises: Do our findings remain consistent when excluding users with extremely left or right political leanings?

6.1.3 Robustness checks with non-partisan users. To mitigate potential biases that might arise from partisanship, we repeat the same analyses, taking into account news source political partisanship. It is worth noting that a substantial amount of left-leaning sources are rated as credible (84% with a credibility score ≥ 0.8 and 93% ≥ 0.6). That said, there is still a non-negligible number of non-credible left-leaning sources: 7% ($n = 54$) of left-leaning sources have a credibility score ≤ 0.4 . In contrast, right-leaning sources exhibit a more diverse distribution of credibility scores. About 33% ($n = 478$) of these sources have a credibility score of ≥ 0.6 and 67% a credibility score of ≤ 0.4 . This indicates that consumers of both left- and right-leaning news sources have the potential to encounter both credible and non-credible content.

We repeat our evaluation by filtering out the most partisan users from our target user group. We experiment with retaining users falling within the top and bottom 10%, 20%, and 30% of the political leaning score distribution. The results for these varying thresholds, detailed in Table 2, confirm our previous findings: the probability of adopting low-credibility sources is significantly higher than that of high-credibility sources at varying exposure levels.




Fig. 5. The probability of adoption given a number of exposures $n_e \leq 250$, modulated by user groups.

Summary: Our findings indicate that **it takes fewer exposures for individuals to adopt low-credibility sources than highly credible sources**. This suggests that people may be more susceptible to misinformation than factual information when experiencing the same level of exposure, regardless of their political leanings. Expanding on Nikolov et al. [37]’s insights into the correlation between partisanship and misinformation vulnerability, we provide a more nuanced understanding of how both right- and left-leaning users can be susceptible to misinformation, potentially at different rates, based on their exposure to low-credibility sources.

6.2 Credibility Modulates the Exposures Needed for Adoption (RQ2)

While in the previous section, we investigate the probability of adoption based on exposure, in this section, we focus on understanding how many exposures are typically needed to adopt an information source. Specifically, we aim to investigate how the credibility of the source influences the number of exposures leading up to adoption. To address




Fig. 6. Exposure level of the top 15 most frequently adopted information sources at varying credibility for the COVID dataset. Each data point in the simplex is an information source, and the position of the point represents the percentage (%) of instances where the information source was adopted at low/medium/high exposure levels.

RQ2, we assess the frequency of exposures associated with each instance of adoption and then categorize them based on the credibility of the adopted source.

To systematically categorize the relative exposure levels that led to adoption, we aggregate adoption instances across all information sources. Each case of adoption is associated with a specific number of exposures. We subsequently distribute these counts into three equal parts, or terciles, for each dataset: *Low Exposure* (first tercile), *Medium Exposure* (second tercile), and *High Exposure* (third tercile).

In Figure 6, we visually represent the distribution of adopted information sources as a function of their exposure levels in the COVID dataset (results are consistent in the ELECTION dataset — see the Appendix). To enhance the clarity of the visualization, we focus on the top 15 most frequently shared information sources across all six credibility levels. For each of these information sources, we depict the percentages of adoption cases at low, medium, and high exposure levels. Each point within the simplex represents an individual information source, with the sum of the percentages always equating to 100%. The color of each point indicates the credibility of the corresponding information source. We observe that sources with both very low (dark red points) and very high (dark blue points) credibility require fewer exposures to achieve adoption compared to sources with moderate credibility. Our statistical analysis (Table 3), which encompasses all information sources, confirms that sources positioned at the extreme ends of the credibility spectrum are statistically significantly more prone to being adopted with fewer exposures with respect to other sources. Full results of the pairwise comparison tests are available in the Appendix.

Summary: We show that **both extremely low and high credibility sources require fewer exposures for adoption**. This swift adoption may be indicative of polarization in user behavior. For extremely low credibility sources,

Table 3. Comparison of adoption probabilities for varying credibility sources with *Low Exposure* level using one-sided Mann-Whitney U tests (* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$, N.S.= not significant). Extremes of the credibility spectrum (*Very Low* and *Very High*) are compared with moderate credibility sources (*Low*, *Mixed*, *Mostly Factual*, *High*).

		P_{Low}	P_{Mixed}	$P_{Mostly\ Factual}$	P_{High}
ELECTION	$P_{Very\ Low}$	>**	>*	>***	>***
Dataset	$P_{Very\ High}$	>***	>**	>***	>***
COVID	$P_{Very\ Low}$	N.S.	N.S.	>**	>**
Dataset	$P_{Very\ High}$	>**	>***	>***	>***

users might be drawn to these due to their novel or controversial nature [60], the allure of “alternative” news [56], or because they resonate with fringe beliefs [3]. For extremely high credibility sources, users might be seeking authoritative information, looking for a trusted and definitive viewpoint on a topic [64]. This could also reflect a segment of the audience that highly values accuracy and reliability. The fact that both extremes require fewer exposures to be adopted suggests that users may have strong emotional or cognitive reactions to these types of sources, leading to quicker decisions about adoption [4].

6.3 Adoption Credibility Is Driven by Exposure Credibility (RQ3)

In addressing RQ3, we present an analysis to gain a deeper understanding of individual user behavior concerning the sources they encounter and choose to adopt. Our objective is to investigate whether exposure to a particular set of sources interplays with users’ decision to adopt sources with either similar or dissimilar levels of credibility.

6.3.1 Exposure credibility correlates with adoption credibility. To begin, we examine the link between the credibility of sources users are exposed to (*exposure credibility*) and the credibility of sources they adopt (*adoption credibility*) in Figure 7. Notably, there is a prominent concentration of users on the diagonal, as well as within the upper- and mid-range of both exposure and adoption credibility scores. This suggests that while the majority of users predominantly encounter and share highly credible sources, a substantial portion of users are also susceptible to less credible information. Additionally, we observe a strong positive Pearson’s correlation between exposure and adoption credibility scores for both datasets, with $r = 0.64$ ($p < .001$) for the ELECTION dataset and $r = 0.66$ ($p < .001$) for the COVID dataset.

6.3.2 Same-credibility exposure precedes same-credibility adoption. We extend our analysis to investigate the likelihood of users’ adoption of low- and high-credibility sources conditional on the credibility of their prior exposures. To achieve this, we observe all the posts that a target user u_t might have been exposed to within a 7-day period prior to adopting an information source. Subsequently, we calculate the proportion of these prior exposures originating from low- and high-credibility sources. The resulting distribution of these prior exposures is visualized in Figure 8.

The two quadrants depict the probability distributions for adopting low-credibility (top panel) and high-credibility (bottom panel) sources, depending on the percentage of exposure to low-credibility (pink distribution) or high-credibility (light blue distribution) sources in the ELECTION dataset. Results indicate that, prior to posting a tweet containing a low-credibility source, users are exposed to an average of 48% (± 0.21) low-credibility sources and 52% (± 0.21) high-credibility sources. In contrast, prior to posting a tweet containing a high-credibility source, users are exposed to an average of 77% (± 0.24) high-credibility sources, which is 25% higher than in low-credibility adoptions. To prove the statistical significance of these differences, we run a Mann–Whitney U test comparing the probabilities of exposure to high- versus




Fig. 7. Correlation between exposure and adoption credibility scores for the ELECTION dataset.




Fig. 8. Distribution of the percentages of low- and high-credibility exposures in the 7 days prior to low- and high-credibility adoptions in the (ELECTION dataset). $Pr(high|low)$, for example, refers to the probability of high-credibility adoption given the percentage of low-credibility exposure.

low-credibility sources prior to low-credibility adoptions ($Pr(high|low)$ and $Pr(low|low)$), and between high- and low-credibility sources prior to high-credibility adoptions ($Pr(high|high)$ and $Pr(low|high)$), with both comparisons yielding significant results ($p < .001$).

It is important to highlight that the probability $Pr(low|low)$ is significantly lower than $Pr(high|high)$ (Mann-Whitney U $p < .001$). This observation suggests that individuals who share high-credibility content tend to require a notably higher proportion of high-credibility exposure before adopting such sources, likely because they are less susceptible to content exposure. In contrast, those who adopt low-credibility sources may adopt it with approximately 50% exposure to low-credibility sources. As a robustness check, we experiment with different prior exposure windows (three days and one day) and conduct a parallel analysis on the COVID dataset, detailed in the Appendix. The results from these additional analyses closely align with those obtained in the primary analysis.

Summary: Our findings reveal that **the overall credibility of sources a user is exposed to aligns with the overall credibility of sources the user eventually adopts**. Although this pattern holds true for users who adopt both high- and low-credibility sources, it is important to note that the former group appears to exhibit lower trust levels, necessitating more exposure compared to the latter group. This analysis reinforces the presence of echo chambers as previously highlighted in the literature [47, 53]. However, our study extends this understanding by exploring the impact of source credibility, suggesting that echo chambers on Twitter may not only be self-selective based on political ideology but also influenced by the credibility of the content adopted by users.

7 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

This study, grounded in millions of tweets, delves into the intricate dynamics of information source adoption on Twitter, with a particular emphasis on the pivotal roles played by source credibility and user exposure. We present three main insights from our research.

First, we show that users' susceptibility to influence is associated with the credibility of the information to which they are exposed. Adoption of low-credibility sources tends to occur with fewer prior exposures than the adoption of high-credibility sources, a trend we find consistent at the individual user-source level and aggregated at the user level. Though source credibility is correlated with partisanship, with most credible sources being left-leaning, we find that source partisanship alone does not explain the exposure variability in high- vs. low-credibility source adoption.

Second, when considering all adopted sources, both extremely low- and high-credibility sources require less exposure before adoption, whereas moderately credible sources need more. One theory to explain this dichotomy of information adoption is that low-credibility sources are prone to be adopted by users who are easily susceptible, whereas high-credibility sources are prone to be adopted by those who trust the source as official or authoritative. Further research could take into account media source popularity, sensational language use, user demographics, and cognitive biases for a more in-depth exploration.

Finally, we show the credibility of sources from past exposure aligns with the credibility of sources the users adopt, emphasizing how users' prior experience can reinforce and possibly steer their future choices and behavior. Our research suggests that misinformation susceptibility could be linked to a tendency to trust content too swiftly. As such, vulnerability to misinformation among susceptible users could be exacerbated by the frequent circulation of such content within their networks.

Beyond these insights, our study contributes methodologically by operationalizing the theoretical concept of susceptibility as a probability function of exposure and adoption, independent of content credibility. We thereby offer a

more nuanced view of how individuals interact with information sources, whether credible or not. Future research could extend our analysis by constructing a generalized framework to assess users' susceptibility to *any* piece of information, potentially taking into account network structures or the psychological profiles of users.

Implications. Our research provides several practical implications for social media platforms and policymakers. The observed correlation between the frequency of exposure to certain credibility levels of information and subsequent adoption underscores the potential of modifying platform algorithms to diminish the spread of low-credibility content (e.g., shadowbanning [25]). Since the credibility of users' adoption tends to align with the credibility level of their most common exposures, platforms can design interventions to promote high-credibility sources (e.g., crowdsourced fact-checking [42]). Additionally, our research lends support to the implementation of countermeasures against misinformation, such as increased transparency about source credibility (e.g., displaying news source trustworthiness ratings [6]) and the proactive dissemination of factual information to users frequently exposed to misinformation.

Limitations. We recognize certain limitations of our research. First, our study relies on datasets centered around two specific events: the 2020 US election and the COVID-19 pandemic. Therefore, generalizing our results to different contexts or other social media platforms requires additional validation. Second, we infer exposure from observable user interactions, which may not reflect an accurate representation of their actual exposures. However, given the constraints of our dataset, this serves as a practical proxy for accessing exposure, consistent with previous work [17, 46, 47]. Third, we consider engagements with an information source as an adoption, which can potentially be an indicator of endorsement, but this may not always be the case. Replies and quotes, for instance, may signify disagreement or critique rather than support [22]. Despite these caveats, the robustness of our results across multiple tests lends credibility to our research outcomes.

Ethical considerations. Our study's exploration into the effects of source credibility and exposure on information adoption on Twitter bears the dual-edged potential of being misapplied, particularly in engineering information cascades that could amplify misinformation. We are aware of these risks, yet posit that the insights gleaned offer substantial value in informing strategies to combat the spread of unreliable information online. This work is conducted with a commitment to ethical standards and has been reviewed and approved by our institution's IRB.

REFERENCES

- [1] Sinan Aral and Dylan Walker. 2012. Identifying Influential and Susceptible Members of Social Networks. *Science* 337, 6092 (2012), 337–341.
- [2] Eytan Bakshy, Itamar Rosenn, Cameron Marlow, and Lada Adamic. 2012. The Role of Social Networks in Information Diffusion. In *WWW 2012*. 519–528.
- [3] Paul C Bauer and Bernhard Clemm von Hohenberg. 2021. Believing and Sharing Information by Fake Sources: An Experiment. *Political Communication* 38, 6 (2021), 647–671.
- [4] Julia Baum and Rasha Abdel Rahman. 2021. Emotional News Affects Social Judgments Independent of Perceived Media Credibility. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience* 16, 3 (2021), 280–291.
- [5] Dustin P Calvillo, Abraham M Rutchick, and Ryan JB Garcia. 2021. Individual Differences in Belief in Fake News About Election Fraud After the 2020 US Election. *Behavioral Sciences* 11, 12 (2021), 175.
- [6] Tatiana Celadin, Valerio Capraro, Gordon Pennycook, David G Rand, et al. 2023. Displaying News Source Trustworthiness Ratings Reduces Sharing Intentions for False News Posts. *Journal of Online Trust and Safety* 1, 5 (2023).
- [7] Ho-Chun Herbert Chang and Emilio Ferrara. 2022. Comparative Analysis of Social Bots and Humans During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Journal of Computational Social Science* (2022), 1409–1425.
- [8] Emily Chen, Herbert Chang, Ashwin Rao, Kristina Lerman, Geoffrey Cowan, and Emilio Ferrara. 2021. COVID-19 Misinformation and the 2020 US Presidential Election. *The Harvard Kennedy School Misinformation Review* (2021).
- [9] Emily Chen, Ashok Deb, and Emilio Ferrara. 2021. #Election2020: The First Public Twitter Dataset on the 2020 US Presidential Election. *Journal of Computational Social Science* (2021), 1–18.

- [10] Emily Chen, Julie Jiang, Ho-Chun Herbert Chang, Goran Muric, and Emilio Ferrara. 2022. Charting the Information and Misinformation Landscape to Characterize Misinfodemics on Social Media: COVID-19 Infodemiology Study at a Planetary Scale. *JMIR Infodemiology* 2, 1 (2022), e32378.
- [11] Emily Chen, Kristina Lerman, and Emilio Ferrara. 2020. Tracking Social Media Discourse About the COVID-19 Pandemic: Development of a Public Coronavirus Twitter Data Set. *JMIR Public Health and Surveillance* 6, 2 (2020), e19273.
- [12] Wen-Ying Sylvia Chou and Alexandra Budenz. 2020. Considering Emotion in COVID-19 Vaccine Communication: Addressing Vaccine Hesitancy and Fostering Vaccine Confidence. *Health Communication* 35, 14 (2020), 1718–1722.
- [13] Alice Dechêne, Christoph Stahl, Jochim Hansen, and Michaela Wänke. 2010. The Truth About the Truth: A Meta-Analytic Review of the Truth Effect. *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 14, 2 (2010), 238–257.
- [14] Ullrich KH Ecker, Stephan Lewandowsky, John Cook, Philipp Schmid, Lisa K Fazio, Nadia Brashier, Panayiota Kendeou, Emily K Vraga, and Michelle A Amazeen. 2022. The Psychological Drivers of Misinformation Belief and its Resistance to Correction. *Nature Reviews Psychology* 1, 1 (2022), 13–29.
- [15] Emilio Ferrara. 2018. Measuring Social Spam and the Effect of Bots on Information Diffusion in Social Media. *Complex Spreading Phenomena in Social Systems: Influence and Contagion in Real-world Social Networks* (2018), 229–255.
- [16] Emilio Ferrara. 2022. Twitter Spam and False Accounts Prevalence, Detection and Characterization: A Survey. *First Monday* 27, 12 (2022).
- [17] Emilio Ferrara and Zeyao Yang. 2015. Measuring Emotional Contagion in Social Media. *PLoS one* 10, 11 (2015), e0142390.
- [18] Amit Goyal, Francesco Bonchi, and Laks VS Lakshmanan. 2010. Learning Influence Probabilities in Social Networks. In *WSDM 2010*. 241–250.
- [19] Andrew Guess, Kevin Munger, Jonathan Nagler, and Joshua Tucker. 2019. How Accurate are Survey Responses on Social Media and Politics? *Political Communication* 36, 2 (2019), 241–258.
- [20] Andrew Guess, Brendan Nyhan, and Jason Reifler. 2018. Selective Exposure to Misinformation: Evidence from the Consumption of Fake News during the 2016 US Presidential Campaign. (2018).
- [21] Andrew M Guess, Brendan Nyhan, and Jason Reifler. 2020. Exposure to Untrustworthy Websites in the 2016 US Election. *Nature Human Behaviour* 4, 5 (2020), 472–480.
- [22] Jeff Hemsley, Jennifer Stromer-Galley, Bryan Semaan, and Sikana Tanupabrungsun. 2018. Tweeting to the Target: Candidates’ Use of Strategic Messages and @Mentions on Twitter. *Journal of Information Technology & Politics* 15, 1 (2018), 3–18.
- [23] Tuan-Anh Hoang and Ee-Peng Lim. 2016. Tracking Virality and Susceptibility in Social Media. In *CIKM 2016*. 1059–1068.
- [24] Nathan O Hodas and Kristina Lerman. 2014. The Simple Rules of Social Contagion. *Scientific Reports* 4, 1 (2014), 4343.
- [25] Kokil Jaidka, Subhayan Mukerjee, and Yphtach Lelkes. 2023. Silenced on Social Media: the Gatekeeping Functions of Shadowbans in the American Twitterverse. *Journal of Communication* 73, 2 (2023), 163–178.
- [26] Julie Jiang, Xiang Ren, Emilio Ferrara, et al. 2021. Social Media Polarization and Echo Chambers in the Context of COVID-19: Case Study. *JMIRx med* 2, 3 (2021), e29570.
- [27] Hollyn M Johnson and Colleen M Seifert. 1994. Sources of the Continued Influence Effect: When Misinformation in Memory Affects Later Inferences. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition* 20, 6 (1994), 1420.
- [28] Brett Laursen and Sharon Faur. 2022. What Does It Mean To Be Susceptible To Influence? A Brief Primer on Peer Conformity and Developmental Changes That Affect It. *International Journal of Behavioral Development* 46, 3 (2022), 222–237.
- [29] Luca Luceri, Ashok Deb, Adam Badawy, and Emilio Ferrara. 2019. Red Bots Do It Better: Comparative Analysis of Social Bot Partisan Behavior. In *Companion Proceedings of the 2019 World Wide Web Conference*. 1007–1012.
- [30] Luca Luceri, Alberto Vancheri, Torsten Braun, and Silvia Giordano. 2018. On the Social Influence in Human Behavior: Physical, Homophily, and Social Communities. In *Complex Networks & Their Applications VI: Proceedings of Complex Networks 2017 (The Sixth International Conference on Complex Networks and Their Applications)*. Springer, 856–868.
- [31] Joseph Marks, Eloise Copland, Eleanor Loh, Cass R Sunstein, and Tali Sharot. 2019. Epistemic Spillovers: Learning Others’ Political Views Reduces the Ability to Assess and Use Their Expertise in Nonpolitical Domains. *Cognition* 188 (2019), 74–84.
- [32] Elizabeth J Marsh and Brenda W Yang. 2018. Believing Things That Are Not True: A Cognitive Science Perspective on Misinformation. In *Misinformation and Mass Audiences*. University of Texas Press, 15–34.
- [33] Ryan C Moore, Ross Dahlke, and Jeffrey T Hancock. 2023. Exposure to Untrustworthy Websites in the 2020 US Election. *Nature Human Behaviour* (2023), 1–10.
- [34] Patricia Moravec, Randall Minas, and Alan R Dennis. 2018. 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* 18-87 (2018).
- [35] Mehdi Moussaïd, Juliane E Kämmer, Pantelis P Analytis, and Hansjörg Neth. 2013. Social Influence and the Collective Dynamics of Opinion Formation. *PLoS one* 8, 11 (2013), e78433.
- [36] Christof Naumzik and Stefan Feuerriegel. 2022. Detecting False Rumors From Retweet Dynamics on Social Media. In *WWW 2022*. 2798–2809.
- [37] D Nikolov, A Flammini, and F Menczer. 2021. Right and Left, Partisanship Predicts (Asymmetric) Vulnerability to Misinformation. *The Harvard Kennedy School Misinformation Review* (2021).
- [38] Gianluca Nogarà, Padinjaredath Suresh Vishnuprasad, Felipe Cardoso, Omran Ayoub, Silvia Giordano, and Luca Luceri. 2022. The Disinformation Dozen: An Exploratory Analysis of Covid-19 Disinformation Proliferation on Twitter. In *14th ACM Web Science Conference 2022*. 348–358.
- [39] Mathias Osmundsen, Alexander Bor, Peter Bjerregaard Vahlstrup, Anja Bechmann, and Michael Bang Petersen. 2021. Partisan Polarization is the Primary Psychological Motivation Behind Political Fake News Sharing on Twitter. *American Political Science Review* 115, 3 (2021), 999–1015.

- [40] Irene V Pasquetto, Briony Swire-Thompson, Michelle A Amazeen, Fabricio Benevenuto, Nadia M Brashier, Robert M Bond, Lia C Bozarth, Ceren Budak, Ullrich KH Ecker, Lisa K Fazio, et al. 2020. Tackling Misinformation: What Researchers Could Do With Social Media Data. *The Harvard Kennedy School Misinformation Review* (2020).
- [41] Gordon Pennycook, Tyrone D Cannon, and David G Rand. 2018. Prior Exposure Increases Perceived Accuracy of Fake News. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General* 147, 12 (2018), 1865.
- [42] Gordon Pennycook, Jonathon McPhetres, Yunhao Zhang, Jackson G Lu, and David G Rand. 2020. Fighting COVID-19 Misinformation on Social Media: Experimental Evidence for a Scalable Accuracy-Nudge Intervention. *Psychological Science* 31, 7 (2020), 770–780.
- [43] Gordon Pennycook and David G Rand. 2019. Lazy, Not Biased: Susceptibility to Partisan Fake News Is Better Explained by Lack of Reasoning Than by Motivated Reasoning. *Cognition* 188 (2019), 39–50.
- [44] Gordon Pennycook and David G Rand. 2021. The Psychology of Fake News. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 25, 5 (2021), 388–402.
- [45] Francesco Pierri, Luca Luceri, Nikhil Jindal, and Emilio Ferrara. 2023. Propaganda and Misinformation on Facebook and Twitter during the Russian Invasion of Ukraine. In *Proceedings of the 15th ACM Web Science Conference 2023*. 65–74.
- [46] Ashwin Rao, Fred Morstatter, and Kristina Lerman. 2022. Partisan Asymmetries in Exposure to Misinformation. *Scientific Reports* 12, 1 (2022), 15671.
- [47] Ashwin Rao, Fred Morstatter, and Kristina Lerman. 2023. Retweets Distort Exposure to Polarized Information. *IEEE/ACM International Conference on Advances in Social Networks Analysis and Mining (ASONAM)* (2023).
- [48] Byron Reeves, Nilam Ram, Thomas N Robinson, James J Cummings, C Lee Giles, Jennifer Pan, Agnese Chiatti, MJ Cho, Katie Roehrick, Xiao Yang, et al. 2021. Screenshots: A Framework To Capture and Analyze Personal Life Experiences and the Ways That Technology Shapes Them. *Human-Computer Interaction* 36, 2 (2021), 150–201.
- [49] Daniel M Romero, Brendan Meeder, and Jon Kleinberg. 2011. Differences in the Mechanics of Information Diffusion Across Topics: Idioms, Political Hashtags, and Complex Contagion on Twitter. In *WWW 2011*. 695–704.
- [50] Nir Rosenfeld, Aron Szanto, and David C Parkes. 2020. A Kernel of Truth: Determining Rumor Veracity on Twitter by Diffusion Pattern Alone. In *WWW 2020*. 1018–1028.
- [51] Kazumi Saito, Ryohei Nakano, and Masahiro Kimura. 2008. Prediction of Information Diffusion Probabilities for Independent Cascade Model. In *International Conference on Knowledge-Based and Intelligent Information and Engineering Systems*. Springer, 67–75.
- [52] Lauren L Saling, Devi Mallal, Falk Scholer, Russell Skelton, and Damiano Spina. 2021. No One is Immune to Misinformation: An Investigation of Misinformation Sharing by Subscribers to a Fact-Checking Newsletter. *PLoS ONE* 16, 8 (2021), e0255702.
- [53] Kazutoshi Sasahara, Wen Chen, Hao Peng, Giovanni Luca Ciampaglia, Alessandro Flammini, and Filippo Menczer. 2021. Social Influence and Unfollowing Accelerate the Emergence of Echo Chambers. *Journal of Computational Social Science* 4, 1 (2021), 381–402.
- [54] Karandeep Singh, Gabriel Lima, Meeyoung Cha, Chiyoung Cha, Juhi Kulshrestha, Yong-Yeol Ahn, and Onur Varol. 2022. Misinformation, Believability, and Vaccine Acceptance Over 40 Countries: Takeaways From the Initial Phase of the COVID-19 Infodemic. *PLoS ONE* 17, 2 (2022), e0263381.
- [55] Kirill Solovev and Nicolas Prölsch. 2022. Moral Emotions Shape the Virality of COVID-19 Misinformation on Social Media. In *WWW 2022*. 3706–3717.
- [56] Galen Stocking, Amy Mitchell, Katerina Eva Matsa, Regina Widjaya, Mark Jurkowitz, Shreenita Ghosh, Aaron Smith, Sarah Naseer, and Christopher St Aubin. 2022. The Role of Alternative Social Media in the News and Information Environment. *Pew Research Center* (2022).
- [57] Xian Teng, Yu-Ru Lin, Wen-Ting Chung, Ang Li, and Adriana Kovashka. 2022. Characterizing User Susceptibility to COVID-19 Misinformation on Twitter. In *ICWSM 2022*, Vol. 16. 1005–1016.
- [58] Cecillie Steenbuch Traberg and Sander van der Linden. 2022. Birds of a Feather are Persuaded Together: Perceived Source Credibility Mediates the Effect of Political Bias on Misinformation Susceptibility. *Personality and Individual Differences* 185 (2022), 111269.
- [59] Sander Van Der Linden. 2022. Misinformation: Susceptibility, Spread, and Interventions to Immunize the Public. *Nature Medicine* 28, 3 (2022), 460–467.
- [60] Soroush Vosoughi, Deb Roy, and Sinan Aral. 2018. The Spread of True and False News Online. *Science* 359, 6380 (2018), 1146–1151.
- [61] Nathan Walter and Riva Tukachinsky. 2020. A Meta-Analytic Examination of the Continued Influence of Misinformation in the Face of Correction: How Powerful Is It, Why Does It Happen, and How To Stop It? *Communication Research* 47, 2 (2020), 155–177.
- [62] Emily L Wang, Luca Luceri, Francesco Pierri, and Emilio Ferrara. 2023. Identifying and Characterizing Behavioral Classes of Radicalization Within the QAnon Conspiracy on Twitter. In *ICWSM 2023*, Vol. 17. 890–901.
- [63] Wei-Chun Wang, Nadia M Brashier, Erik A Wing, Elizabeth J Marsh, and Roberto Cabeza. 2016. On Known Unknowns: Fluency and the Neural Mechanisms of Illusory Truth. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience* 28, 5 (2016), 739–746.
- [64] Waheeb Yaqub, Otari Kakhidze, Morgan L Brockman, Nasir Memon, and Sameer Patil. 2020. Effects of Credibility Indicators on Social Media News Sharing Intent. In *CHI 2020*. 1–14.
- [65] Xinyi Zhou and Reza Zafarani. 2019. Network-based Fake News Detection: A Pattern-Driven Approach. *ACM SIGKDD Explorations Newsletter* 21, 2 (2019), 48–60.

Table 4. The top 5 most commonly shared information sources within each credibility level in both the ELECTION and COVID datasets.

Credibility	ELECTION Dataset	COVID Dataset
<i>Low-Credibility Sources</i>		
Very Low (<i>N</i> = 197)	rt.com	rt.com
	thegatewaypundit.com	thegatewaypundit.com
	bitchute.com	bitchute.com
	newspunch.com	breaking911.com
	technocracy.news	infowars.com
Low (<i>N</i> = 470)	davidharrisjr.com	dailymail.co.uk
	theconservativetreehouse.com	zerohedge.com
	donaldjtrump.com	truepundit.com
	thedcpatriot.com	swarajyamag.com
	hannity.com	oann.com
Mixed (<i>N</i> = 813)	breitbart.com	foxnews.com
	foxnews.com	breitbart.com
	thefederalist.com	justthenews.com
	washingtontimes.com	washingtontimes.com
	justthenews.com	theepochtimes.com
<i>High-Credibility Sources</i>		
Mostly Factual (<i>N</i> = 164)	whitehouse.gov	washingtonpost.com
	washingtonpost.com	cnbc.com
	wsj.com	thehill.com
	thehill.com	today.com
	nationalreview.com	wsj.com
High (<i>N</i> = 1,700)	caller.com	nytimes.com
	cbsnews.com	nbcnews.com
	nytimes.com	cbsnews.com
	ew.com	al.com
	politico.com	politico.com
Very High (<i>N</i> = 77)	house.gov	reuters.com
	reuters.com	cdc.gov
	cdc.gov	nature.com
	gallup.com	house.gov
	factcheck.org	bmj.com

APPENDIX

7.1 Information Source Details

Table 4 displays the most frequently shared information sources across varying credibility levels.

7.2 Exposure Frequency and Probability of Adoption


Figure 9 depicts the probability of adoption as a function of exposure frequency, modulated by the three user groups: those sharing exclusively low-credibility sources (“Only Low”), those disseminating only high-credibility content (“Only High”), and those who share both types (“Both”). To provide a finer-grained analysis of exposure, we categorize the exposure frequency into three bins: (0,10], (10,100], and (100,250].

Table 5. Pairwise comparison of adoption probabilities for varying credibility sources at the *High Exposure* level. Mann-Whitney U test * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$, N.S. = not significant. Extremes of the credibility spectrum (*Very Low* and *Very High*) are compared with moderate credibility sources (*Low*, *Mixed*, *Mostly Factual*, *High*).


		P_{Low}	P_{Mixed}	$P_{Mostly\ Factual}$	P_{High}
ELECTION	$P_{Very\ Low}$	<**	N.S.	<**	<**
Dataset	$P_{Very\ High}$	<**	<*	<***	<***
COVID	$P_{Very\ Low}$	N.S.	<*	<*	<**
Dataset	$P_{Very\ High}$	<*	<**	<**	<***

Table 6. Probability of low- and high-credibility exposures prior to low- and high-credibility adoptions. These values are calculated based on data from the ELECTION and COVID datasets, using exposure windows of 7 days, 3 days, and 1 day.

Exposure Window	ELECTION Dataset			COVID Dataset		
	7 days	3 days	1 day	7 days	3 days	1 day
$\mu Pr(low high)$	0.523	0.517	0.572	0.550	0.542	0.528
$\mu Pr(low low)$	0.477	0.483	0.428	0.450	0.458	0.472
$\mu Pr(high low)$	0.233	0.255	0.247	0.102	0.112	0.101
$\mu Pr(high high)$	0.767	0.745	0.753	0.898	0.888	0.899



(a) ELECTION dataset



(b) Covid dataset

Fig. 9. The probability of adoption at varying levels of exposures modulated by user groups.




Fig. 10. Visualization of the exposure amount of the top 15 most frequently adopted information sources from every credibility level for the ELECTION dataset, similar to Figure 6.




Fig. 11. Correlation between exposure and adoption credibility scores for the COVID dataset. Pearson's correlation $r = 0.66$, $p < .001$.




Fig. 12. Distribution of the percentages of low- and high-credibility exposures in the 7 days prior to low- and high-credibility adoptions in the (Covid dataset).

7.3 Exposures Needed for Adoption

In Figure 10, we visually represent the distribution of adopted information sources as a function of their exposure levels in the ELECTION dataset. Similar to Figure 6, we display the top 15 most frequently shared information sources across all six credibility levels. Table 5 presents comprehensive results of pairwise comparison tests conducted between sources of differing credibility levels, considering adoption at *Low* and *High Exposure* levels, respectively. Our findings indicate that sources positioned at the extremes of the credibility spectrum are more frequently adopted at the *Low Exposure* level, less frequently at the *High Exposure* level, with no discernible differences at the *Medium Exposure* level.

7.4 Low-/High-Credibility Exposure Prior to Low-/High-Credibility Adoption

As part of a robustness check for RQ3 (§6.3.2), we explore variations using different prior exposure windows (7 days, 3 days, and 1 day), as detailed in Table 6. Using pairwise one-sided Mann-Whitney U tests, we verify that the following distributions are significantly different ($p < .001$) across both datasets: $Pr(low|low) > Pr(high|low)$, $Pr(high|high) > Pr(low|high)$, and $Pr(high|high) > Pr(low|low)$. Figure 11 shows the correlation between exposure and adoption credibility in the COVID dataset. Figure 12 demonstrates the distribution of the percentages of low- and high-credibility exposures in the 7 days prior to low- and high-credibility adoptions in the COVID dataset.