

Review On Algorithmic Influence on Truth: A Holistic Examination of Social Media and Misinformation in the Digital Age

^[1]Manoj P M
student
Alvas Institute of Engineering
and technology
^[1]4a121cs068@gmail.com

^[2]Manvitha
student
Alvas Institute of Engineering
and technology
^[2] manvithasrai@gmail.com

^[3]Meghana v
student
Alvas Institute of Engineering
and technology
^[3]meghanav633@gmail.com

^[4]Dr. Brahma Prakash H P
Associate Professor
Alvas Institute of Engineering
and technology
^[4] drbrahmap@aiet.org.in

Abstract

The review explores the pervasive impact of misinformation in the digital era, emphasizing its detrimental effects on societies, governments, economies, and public health. The focal point is the role of social media algorithms in amplifying the spread of false information, leading to a decline in trust and severe consequences, as seen in global events like the recent pandemic. The intricate interplay between user engagement and algorithmic choices is examined, highlighting pitfalls such as filter bubbles, bias, and misinformation amplification. Diverse technologies, including narrative correction theories, Hoaxy, and Bayesian naive classifiers, are presented as crucial tools in combating misinformation. The review concludes with strategies for positive change, emphasizing user education, robust fact-checking mechanisms, user feedback channels, and the need to break the cycle of sensationalism. A comprehensive and collaborative approach is proposed, urging ethical algorithm design and fostering a culture of critical thinking for a more trustworthy and resilient information ecosystem in the digital age.

I. INTRODUCTION

Misinformation has a negative impact on our popular governments, divides our societies, hurts our economies, and endangers our environment and health. Deception has become a serious and pervasive problem in the recent global pandemic, with grave repercussions including bodily harm, property destruction, and even fatalities. Although this issue is not unique to any one medium, it is significantly worsened on digital media because posting content can be shared quickly and easily.

Online entertainment dynamics allow individuals, bots, and criminal entities to quickly spread content without thoroughly verifying its accuracy. Furthermore, people can twist and modify information to fit their own agendas and worldviews because of the nature of digital platforms, which encourages the propagation of false information. Because of this, false narratives have the ability to spread swiftly, overshadowing true information and undermining the public's confidence in credible sources. It is now urgently necessary to address deception on digital entertainment platforms, which calls for

cooperation from a range of stakeholders in order to advance media literacy, fortify fact-checking procedures, and develop users' capacity for critical thought so they can responsibly navigate the digital world.

The issue of deception on the internet is a complex socio-technical challenge influenced by various factors. In the digital realm, the creation and presentation of information have a significant impact on how it is understood and disseminated. The way information is presented and packaged plays a major role in determining its legitimacy and virality. A user's susceptibility to misinformation can also be influenced by personal attributes such as identification traits, values, emotions, and cognitive biases, including a tendency to seek confirmation bias. These algorithms, however, might inadvertently promote divisive or sensationalized content, which would accelerate the spread of misinformation.

Nonetheless, these algorithms may inadvertently prioritize sensationalized or polarizing content, further amplifying the dissemination of misinformation. Tackling the obstacles presented by online falsehood demands a thorough grasp of

these interrelated elements and calls for cooperation among diverse stakeholders to devise successful strategies for mitigating its influence and fortifying digital literacy[1].

II. The Role of Social Media Algorithms

Social networking sites, powered by complex algorithms carefully created to enhance user interaction, inadvertently serve as channels for spreading fake news. The lack of reliable methods to filter and interpret content within these algorithms allows misinformation to spread freely, contradicting the platforms' initial goal of improving user satisfaction. The unintended outcomes of these advanced algorithms worsen current societal and ideological gaps, presenting a significant obstacle to the credibility of information shared on these online platforms.

These algorithms have a significant impact, shaping user experience and controlling content distribution on various platforms. By focusing on content that matches individual user preferences, like posts, images, or videos, social media algorithms customize feeds, enhancing user satisfaction and prolonging platform interaction. User engagements, such as likes, comments, and shares, are analyzed by algorithms to measure content popularity, increasing the visibility of highly engaging posts and promoting a feeling of community. Additionally, the emphasis on content freshness helps users stay updated with the most recent information, adding to the dynamic and ever-evolving nature of social media feeds.

Recommendation systems, powered by these algorithms, are crucial in guiding users towards new profiles, subjects, or trends, thus enriching the variety of their content consumption. Furthermore, algorithms play a significant role in targeted advertising, utilizing user data to provide personalized advertisements and enhance user interaction with sponsored content. In order to combat misinformation effectively, specific algorithms are equipped with content verification features, with the goal of reducing the dissemination of false information and ensuring the circulation of trustworthy content. Social media algorithms are continuously evolving, undergoing adjustments and enhancements by platforms to accommodate shifting user behaviors, tackle emerging obstacles, and enhance overall user satisfaction. The multifaceted function of social media algorithms offers valuable insights for users, content producers, and businesses, empowering them to navigate the dynamic realm of digital communication with increased awareness and flexibility[4].

III. Effects of False News on Different Elements of Life

Fake news, prevalent in today's digital era, has had a significant impact on various aspects of life, resulting in detrimental consequences. In addition to undermining the authority of trustworthy information sources, fake news

creates an atmosphere of uncertainty that makes it difficult for the general public to discern between reality and fiction. As false information spreads without restraint, individuals grow increasingly doubtful of media outlets and institutions, leading to a loss of credibility and trustworthiness. Additionally, the influence of fake news on political discussions is profound. Inaccurate information has the ability to manipulate public opinion, influence election outcomes, and disrupt the democratic process. By distorting facts and propagating misinformation, fake news weakens the foundation of an informed electorate and poses a threat to the integrity of democratic systems.

Beyond its political implications, fake news also has significant effects on social cohesion. The dissemination of false information can deepen social divides, fuel hate speech, and contribute to polarization within communities. As individuals isolate themselves in echo chambers of misinformation, societal bonds are strained, making it increasingly difficult to find common ground and engage in meaningful conversations.

The economic impact of fake news is another area of concern, as misinformation can have widespread effects on financial markets, damage the reputations of businesses or individuals, and jeopardize overall economic stability. By spreading misleading narratives that distort reality, fake news has the potential to disrupt markets, undermine investor confidence, and create uncertainty in the business environment. Moreover, fake news can have serious implications for health and safety. Misinformation regarding health issues, such as promoting unproven treatments or spreading vaccine hesitancy, can pose significant risks to public health and hinder efforts to combat diseases. Inaccurate information about environmental concerns can also impede progress in addressing urgent challenges like climate change, hindering collective action and exacerbating the issue[5].

IV. Overcoming the Difficulties of Fake News

The most influential social media platforms, including Twitter, Facebook, and Google, are at the forefront of the ongoing battle against the widespread dissemination of fake news. Each platform faces distinct challenges and employs unique strategies to address the pervasive issue of misinformation. Twitter, renowned for its rapid information sharing, has faced criticism for seemingly unregulated algorithms, particularly when fake news contributes to social tensions. The platform's limited content moderation tools have raised concerns about its role in fostering a responsible and secure online space. Under increasing pressure, there is a growing demand for Twitter to take proactive steps in controlling the spread of fake news.

Facebook, being one of the largest social media platforms, is currently under regulatory scrutiny for its handling of misinformation. The platform has introduced features like the

'false' content button as a significant effort to enhance algorithms and combat the spread of fake information. This tool enables users to report and flag content they believe to be false, improving the platform's ability to distinguish between accurate and inaccurate information. Facebook's approach recognizes the importance of user involvement in the fight against fake news, emphasizing the need for collaborative efforts to uphold a trustworthy digital environment[2].

V. Algorithmic mechanisms and human cognitive patterns

Human thought patterns and algorithmic processes represent two intricately connected realms that significantly influence our interactions with technology and information. Human thought patterns encapsulate the cognitive processes, biases, and heuristics that shape how individuals perceive, interpret, and respond to information. Conversely, algorithmic processes denote the computational procedures and rules governing algorithms' operations in processing data and making decisions.

At the nexus of human thought patterns and algorithmic processes lies a nuanced interplay with profound implications for various aspects of our lives. Algorithms, crafted by human hands, inherently bear the imprints of biases and assumptions present in the data they are trained on and the objectives set by their creators. These processes can both mirror and perpetuate human thought patterns, molding the information encountered, the decisions made, and the outcomes experienced in the digital realm.

Furthermore, human thought patterns wield influence over the development and deployment of algorithms. Cognitive biases, such as confirmation bias or the availability heuristic, can sway how algorithms are conceived, implemented, and assessed. These biases may introduce unintended consequences, such as algorithmic discrimination or the propagation of misinformation, stemming from the alignment of algorithmic processes with flawed human thought patterns.

The dynamic interaction between human thought patterns and algorithmic processes prompts essential considerations regarding transparency, accountability, and ethics in algorithm design and deployment. Understanding how human biases intersect with algorithmic decision-making is vital for mitigating the risks of algorithmic bias, ensuring fairness and equity in outcomes, and fostering responsible technology use in society.

To navigate this intricate relationship effectively, interdisciplinary collaboration, critical thinking, and ethical reflection are imperative. Recognizing the interplay between human cognition and algorithmic decision-making allows us to strive for algorithms that align more closely with human values, promote transparency in their processes, and

encourage an informed and ethical use of technology in our increasingly digital world[8].

VI. Algorithmic Pitfalls

Social media algorithms, designed to enhance user experience, inadvertently introduce vulnerabilities to misinformation. The reliance on relevance feedback, driven by user engagement metrics, becomes a breeding ground for fake news. Studies, exemplified by "Google or Not," reveal a correlation between human thought patterns and algorithmic content selection, creating an environment conducive to misinformation.

The interplay between user behavior and algorithmic choices prioritizes sensational or misleading information that aligns with biases, fostering a challenging information ecosystem. Recognizing these pitfalls emphasizes the need for ethical algorithm design, striking a balance between user engagement and the promotion of accurate information. Continuous refinement is crucial to mitigate unintended consequences, urging a collective commitment to a resilient and trustworthy digital landscape.

Algorithmic pitfalls encompass filter bubbles, bias, misinformation, harmful content amplification, privacy concerns, and emotional manipulation, requiring a comprehensive approach involving transparency, accountability, and ethical considerations in algorithm design. Addressing these issues is pivotal for a responsible and user-centric approach in the intricate realm of social media algorithms[1].

VII. Theory of Mental Models and Narrative Correction

The psychological subtleties of narrative correction are clarified by the Mental Model Theory, which highlights people's propensity to remember information that has been ingrained in their minds regardless of other options (Lewandowsky et al., 2012). This idea shows that alternative possibilities can effectively replace erroneous information and allow for effective correction by offering replacement explanations for misinformation. Known as 'heightened rectification,' narrative-based approaches combine causal reasoning, emotional responses, and narrative norms to engage active online users with factual information (Murphy et al., 2013; Capella et al., 2015).

Hoaxy

Hoaxy addresses misinformation, defined as false or inaccurate information, employing an advanced algorithm to detect deliberate spread on social media (Shao et al., 2016). Developed by researchers at Indiana University Network Science Institute and the School of Informatics and Computing, Hoaxy tracks and analyzes online misinformation, enabling users to assess the credibility of

news information. It utilizes the "POST statues/filter" API endpoints to gather public tweets, including links to fact-checking and misinformation articles, contributing to the identification of factors influencing misinformation's triumph (Hui et al., 2018).

Misinformation Checker Websites

In response to the surge of misinformation, fact-checking websites like BuzzSumo.com, Politifact, FactCheck.org, and Snopes.com have emerged. BuzzSumo.com identifies popular content by topic relevance, focusing on delivering desired content while protecting users from irrelevant information. Politifact assesses political statements, rating them from "Mostly True" to "Pants on Fire." Factcheck.org concentrates on factual accuracy in American politics, and Snopes.com debunks myths and rumors through extensive fact-checking research.

Bayesian naive classifier

Based on Bayes' Theorem, the Naive Bayes Classifier uses probability to classify data and assess the veracity of news headlines. It uses word frequency to determine the likelihood that a headline is authentic or fraudulent.

Automated Identification

In response to the deluge of false information, automatic detection models such as PHEME have been created. Using a collection of tweets, PHEME automatically recognizes rumors and categorizes material as reliable or suspicious. PHEME is developing a typology of support, deny, query, and comment in order to validate information that causes uncertainty and unease.

By giving consumers the means to traverse the intricacies of the digital information environment, these technologies jointly support the continuous efforts to counteract disinformation[1].

VIII. Mitigating the Impact of Misinformation: Strategies for Positive Change

Setting user education for content evaluation procedures as a top priority is essential to addressing the algorithmic traps that fuel the dissemination of false information. User experiences are greatly influenced by social media platforms, and open information about the workings of algorithms might enable consumers to make better judgments. Users can lessen their vulnerability to false information by learning the mechanisms underlying content curation and developing into more astute information consumers.

Putting strong fact-checking procedures in place is another essential tactic to combat the detrimental effects of false information. Effective fact-checking tools that enable users to confirm the legitimacy of the content they come across should be integrated into social media platforms. Through the

provision of cross-verification tools, platforms can foster in their user base a critical mindset and a sense of responsibility.

User-feedback columns represent a valuable resource in the fight against misinformation. Allowing users to report and flag content that they find concerning or misleading enables platforms to swiftly address and take down problematic information. This two-way communication not only helps in content moderation but also fosters a collaborative approach between users and platform administrators in maintaining a trustworthy online environment.

Breaking the vicious cycle of sensationalism requires a joint effort from both users and platforms. While algorithms play a significant role in content dissemination, empowering users with the tools to critically evaluate information and actively participate in the content moderation process is essential. Through continuous education, transparent communication, and collaborative initiatives, social media platforms can contribute to a more informed and responsible digital community[1].

Conclusion

Misinformation is a pressing problem that poses substantial risks to our societies, governments, economies, and general welfare, particularly in the digital era. The impact of misinformation has been evident in global events like the recent pandemic, where it has resulted in severe consequences such as harm to individuals and a decline in trust towards reliable sources. This intricate challenge is further intensified in the digital domain, where information can be rapidly disseminated and manipulated. Consequently, there is an immediate requirement for collective endeavors to tackle the underlying causes and consequences of deception.

One of the critical factors contributing to the spread of misinformation is the influence of social media algorithms. These algorithms, designed to enhance user experience, inadvertently become conduits for false information. The intricate interplay between user engagement and algorithmic choices often results in the prioritization of sensational or misleading content, creating a challenging information ecosystem. To counter these algorithmic pitfalls, a multifaceted approach is necessary, involving ethical algorithm design, transparency, and continuous refinement.

The review also sheds light on the role of social media algorithms in shaping user experiences, controlling content distribution, and influencing various aspects of life, including politics, social cohesion, economics, and health. Understanding these dynamics is crucial for devising effective strategies to combat the far-reaching consequences of fake news.

Diverse technologies and tools, such as narrative correction theories, Hoaxy, misinformation checker websites, Bayesian naive classifiers, and automated detection models, serve as

valuable assets in combating misinformation. These technologies aim to empower users, enhance fact-checking processes, and automate the recognition of false information, collectively contributing to a more resilient digital information environment.

Addressing these challenges involves implementing strategies for positive change, including user education, robust fact-checking mechanisms, user feedback channels, and breaking the cycle of sensationalism. Prioritizing these initiatives enables social media platforms to assume a crucial role in nurturing a well-informed, critical, and actively engaged digital community that effectively mitigates the impact of misinformation.

In conclusion, combating misinformation demands a comprehensive and collaborative approach. This entails grasping the intricate interplay between human thought patterns and algorithmic processes, deploying ethical algorithms, and leveraging technologies to counteract false information. Fostering a culture of critical thinking, ongoing learning, and responsible digital citizenship is essential to navigating the complexities of the digital era and constructing a more trustworthy and resilient information ecosystem.

References

- [1] Ahmad, I., Yousaf, M., Yousaf, S., & Ahmad, M. O. (2020). Fake News Detection Using Machine Learning Ensemble Methods. *Complexity*, 2020, 1-11.
- [2] Ahuja, N., & Kumar, S. (2020, June). S-HAN: Hierarchical Attention Networks with Stacked Gated Recurrent Unit for Fake News Detection. In *2020 8th International Conference on Reliability, Infocom Technologies and Optimization (Trends and Future Directions) (ICRITO)* (pp. 873-877). IEEE.
- [3] Alalwan, A. A., Rana, N. P., Dwivedi, Y. K., & Algharabat, R. (2017). Social media in marketing: A review and analysis of the existing literature. *Telematics and Informatics*, 34(7), 1177-1190.
- [4] Alina, C., Cuzzocrea, A., & Truta, T. M. (2017). Fighting fake news spread in online social networks: Actual trends and future research directions. *2017 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (Big Data)*, Boston, MA, 2017 (pp. 4453-4457). <https://doi.org/10.1109/BigData.2017.8258484>
- [5] Andı, S., Aytaç, S. E., & Çarkoğlu, A. (2020). Internet and social media use and political knowledge: Evidence from Turkey. *Mediterranean Politics*, 25(5), 579-599.
- [6] Aphiwongsophon, S., & Chongstitvatana, P. (2020). Identifying misinformation on Twitter with a support vector machine. *Engineering and Applied Science Research*, 47(3), 306-312.
- [7] Badawy, A., Ferrara, E., & Lerman, K. (2018). Analysing the digital traces of political manipulation: The 2016 Russian interference Twitter campaign. *2018 IEEE/ACM International Conference on Advances in Social Networks Analysis and Mining (ASONAM)*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/asonam.2018.8508646>
- [8] Bagheri, E., Liu, H., Shu, K., & Zarrinkalam, F. (2020). The 5th international workshop on mining actionable insights from social networks (Maison 2020). *Proceedings of the 29th ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3340531.3414078>
- [9] Barsi, J. A., Schott, J. R., Palluconi, F. D., & Hook, S. J. (2005). Validation of a web-based atmospheric correction tool for single thermal band instruments. *Earth Observing Systems X*. <https://doi.org/10.1117/12.619990>
- [10] Bhuiyan, M. M., Zhang, K., Vick, K., Horning, M. A., & Mitra, T. (2018). FeedReflect. Companion of the 2018 ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work and Social Computing. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3272973.3274056>
- [11] Butler, K. (2014). The Boston marathon bombing: After-action review of the Brigham and women's hospital emergency radiology response. *The Journal of Emergency Medicine*, 47(6), 753-754. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jemermed.2014.10.017>
- [12] Cappella, J. N., Maloney, E., Ophir, Y., & Brennan, E. (2015). Interventions to correct misinformation about tobacco products. *Tobacco Regulatory Science*, 1(2), 186-197. <https://doi.org/10.18001/trs.1.2.8>
- [13] Choi, S. (2013). An empirical study of social network service (SNS) continuance: incorporating the customer value-satisfaction-loyalty model into the I.S. continuance model. *Asia Pac. J. Inf. Syst.* 23 (4), 1-28
- [14] Chung, N., Han, H., Koo, C. (2012). Mediating roles of attachment for information sharing in social media: social capital theory perspective. *Asia Pac. J. Inf. Syst.* 22 (4), 101-123
- [15] CnetS. (2016, December 21). Hoaxy: A platform for tracking online misinformation. CNetS. <https://cnets.indiana.edu/blog/2016/12/21/hoaxy/>
- [16] Collins, B., Hoang, D. T., Nguyen, N. T., & Hwang, D. (2020). Trends in combating fake news on social media—a survey. *Journal of Information and Telecommunication*, 1-20.
- [17] Cueva, E., Ee, G., Iyer, A., Pereira, A., Roseman, A., & Martinez, D. (2020). Detecting Fake News on Twitter Using Machine Learning Models.

- [18] Darbyshire, P. (2018). Fake news. Fake journals. Fake conferences. What we can do. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, 27(9-10), 1727-1729. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jocn.14214>
- [19] Dordevic, M., Pourghomi, P., & Safieddine, F. (2020, October). Identifying Fake News from the Variables that Governs the Spread of Fake News. In 2020 15th International Workshop on Semantic and Social Media Adaptation and Personalization (SMA (pp. 1-6). IEEE.
- [20] Dordevic, M., Pourghomi, P., & Safieddine, F. (2020, October). Identifying Fake News from the Variables that Governs the Spread of Fake News. In 2020 15th International Workshop on Semantic and Social Media Adaptation and Personalisation (SMA (pp. 1-6). IEEE.
- [21] Ebrahim Bagheri, Huan Liu, Kai Shu, Fattane Zarrinkalam. (2020, August 27). Information processing & management. <https://www.journals.elsevier.com/information-processing-and-management/call-for-papers/special-issue-on-disinformation-mining-from-social-media>
- [22] Eysenbach, G., Powell, J., Kuss, O., & Sa, E. (2002). Empirical studies assessing the quality of health information for consumers on the World Wide Web. *JAMA*, 287(20), 2691. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.287.20.2691>
- [23] Goldvarg, E., & Johnson-Laird, P. (2001). Naive causality: A mental model theory of causal meaning and reasoning. *Cognitive Science*, 25(4), 565-610. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15516709cog2504_3
- [24] Gupta, A., Lamba, H., Kumaraguru, P., & Joshi, A. (2013). Faking sandy. Proceedings of the 22nd International Conference on World Wide Web - WWW '13 Companion. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2487788.2488033>
- [25] Hoaxy (Observatory on social media). (2016). RAND Corporation Provides Objective Research Services and Public Policy Analysis | RAND. <https://www.rand.org/research/projects/truth-decay/fighting-disinformation/search/items/hoaxy-observatory-on-social-media.html>
- [26] Hoaxy: A platform for tracking online misinformation. (2017, January 18). CNetS. <https://cnets.indiana.edu/blog/2016/12/21/hoaxy/>
- [27] Hunt, K., Agarwal, P., & Zhuang, J. (2020). Monitoring misinformation on Twitter during crisis events: a machine learning approach. *Risk analysis*.
- [28] Hunt, K., Agarwal, P., & Zhuang, J. (2020). Monitoring misinformation on Twitter during crisis events: a machine learning approach. *Risk analysis*.
- [29] Jaroucheh, Z., Alissa, M., Buchanan, W. J., & Liu, X. (2020, July). TRUSTD: Combat Fake Content using Blockchain and Collective Signature Technologies. In 2020 IEEE 44th Annual Computers, Software, and Applications Conference (COMPSAC) (pp. 1235-1240). IEEE.
- [30] Jindal, S., & Anand, G. (2020). Fighting an Infodemic in the Time of the COVID-19 Pandemic in India: Leveraging Technology and Social Media. *Journal of Preventive Medicine and Public Health*, 53(5), 311.
- [31] Kirchner, J., & Reuter, C. (2020). Countering Fake News: A Comparison of Possible Solutions Regarding User Acceptance and Effectiveness. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, 4(CSCW2), 1-27.
- [32] Koo, C., Wati, Y., Jung, J.J. (2011). Examination of how social aspects moderate the relationship between task characteristics and usage of social communication technologies (SCTS) in organizations. *Int. J. Inf. Manage.* 31, 445-459
- [33] Ksieniewicz, P., Zyblewski, P., Choraś, M., Kozik, R., Gielczyk, A., & Woźniak, M. (2020, July). Fake News Detection from Data Streams. In 2020 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN) (pp. 1-8). IEEE
- [34] Kumar, K.P.K. and Geethakumari, G. (2014), "Detecting misinformation in online social networks using cognitive psychology", *Human-centric Computing and Information Sciences*, Vol. 4 No. 1, 22pp.
- [35] Lange-Faria, W., & Elliot, S. (2012). Understanding the role of social media in destination marketing. *Tourismos*, 7(1).
- [36] Levush, R. (2019, September). Government Responses to Disinformation on Social Media Platforms: Comparative Summary. Library of Congress. <https://www.loc.gov/law/help/social-mediadisinformation/compsum.php>
- [37] Lewandowsky, S., Ecker, U. K., Seifert, C. M., Schwarz, N., & Cook, J. (2012). Misinformation and its correction. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 13(3), 106-131. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100612451018>
- [38] Malhotra, B., & Vishwakarma, D. K. (2020, September). Classification of Propagation Path and Tweets for Rumor Detection using Graphical Convolutional Networks and Transformer based Encodings. In 2020 IEEE Sixth International Conference on Multimedia Big Data (BigMM) (pp. 183-190). IEEE.
- [39] Maryam, A., & Ali, R. (2019). Misinformation source identification in an online social network. 2019 IEEE 5th International Conference for Convergence in Technology (I2CT). <https://doi.org/10.1109/i2ct45611.2019.9033558>
- [40] Mendoza, M., Poblete, B., & Castillo, C. (2010). Twitter under crisis. Proceedings of the First Workshop on Social Media Analytics - SOMA '10. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1964858.1964869>