Technological Enablement and Collective Effervescence: The Diffusion Logic and Governance Dilemmas of Online Misinformation

Cheng Ji

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Beijing Normal-Hong Kong Baptist University, Zhuhai, China
cheng0469@sina.com

Abstract. The proliferation of online misinformation, poses a significant threat to contemporary information ecosystems. This paper examines the dual dynamics fueling this issue: Technological Enablement, which explores how social media architecture and algorithms facilitate the rapid spread of falsehoods, and Collective Effervescence, which investigates the social and cognitive mechanisms driving user participation in these diffusion processes. Studies have consistently demonstrated that false information is more prone to dissemination than accurate information, primarily because it frequently elicits more pronounced emotional responses—an attribute that can facilitate its viral propagation. This study uses a cognitive cascade model to examine the entire lifecycle of misinformation. The findings indicate that the diffusion logic of misinformation differs fundamentally from that of true news. Because fact-checking, no matter how good it is, fails to dispel fake news for the public, particularly in highly polarized situations, traditional governance tactics frequently prove ineffectual. To foster a more robust information ecosystem, the conclusion of this paper addresses the prominent governance dilemmas arising from this dynamic and proposes a shift toward contextually nuanced strategies.

Keywords: Misinformation, Social Media, Diffusion Logic, Cognitive Bias, Governance Dilemmas

1. Introduction

The topic of online misinformation is becoming more and more important in today's information ecosystem. The observation that disinformation spreads six times faster than factual information—largely driven by emotional engagement and platform algorithms—renders this issue all the more critical [1]. This article looks at how technology and people's behavior work together to propagate false information online. The approach is based on two main ideas: Technological Enablement, which looks at how digital platforms and AI spread misleading information, and Collective Effervescence, which looks at the social and psychological reasons why people utilize these platforms.

To analyze this complex phenomenon, this study employs a theoretical framework centered on the concept of cognitive cascades. This approach could be understood as a cognitive cascade model that combines a network science belief cascade approach with an internal cognitive model of the individual agents [2]. The term "misinformation" is adopted as the core concept for this analysis, acknowledging a key challenge posed by a media environment where a wide range of unverified sources are easily accessible [3]. This distinction is critical, as much of this content is spread by users who are not maliciously motivated.

The structure of this paper is specifically designed to systematically unpack these multifaceted complexities. It begins by deconstructing the technological infrastructures that empower misinformation, before analyzing the psychological and social mechanisms that fuel its collective spread. Subsequently, the analysis delineates the distinct diffusion logic of misinformation and explores the profound governance dilemmas that arise from these dynamics. The significance of this research is therefore twofold. In practice, it deals with a serious threat to public health, as misinformation about health and healthcare is a serious problem that puts lives and public health at risk [4]. Societally, it engages with the defining challenge of navigating what has been termed a "post-truth era," a time when objective facts are less influential in shaping public opinion than appeals to emotion and personal beliefs [5].

2. Technological enablement

The proliferation of online misinformation is not a spontaneous occurrence but is fundamentally enabled by the technological architecture of the modern internet. The foundational shift was the creation of a disintermediated and decentralized environment for the production and dissemination of content by social media platforms [6]. This structure dismantled the traditional gatekeeping function of legacy media, allowing any user to become a content producer and publisher, which in turn can encourage speculation and may lead to mistrust among the users [6]. This technological environment provides the fertile ground upon which misinformation thrives.

Within this environment, the core mechanism of technological enablement is the mediation algorithm used by social networks to build the user's feed (or timeline) [7]. While ostensibly designed for personalization, these algorithms operate on a principle of maximizing user engagement. Consequently, they favor toxic content and fake news because emotionally charged and sensationalist narratives generate higher levels of interaction [7]. This creates a system where technology does not merely reflect user preference but actively shapes the information ecosystem in a way that benefits the spread of misinformation.

A more direct form of technological enablement comes from the use of automated agents. The use of Botometer, a state-of-the-art social bot detection tool, reveals a higher presence of social bots in the main core of misinformation networks [8]. These social bots, or "water armies," function as strategic instruments rather than mere passive amplifiers. For example, bots are employed to distort perception by generating a deceptive sense of consensus, as studies indicate that links to Snopes or Politifact are disseminated either to ridicule these sites or to mislead other users (e.g., by inaccurately asserting that the fact-checkers validated a claim as factual) [8]. This technological intervention prompts a critical research inquiry: what precise function does technology, particularly these bots, serve in facilitating and enhancing this process, especially given that approximately 25% of the retweets in the primary core are identified as people retweeting bots [8].

In response to the spread of misinformation, technology also provides tools for governance. The information technology scientific community's efforts are multifaceted, focusing on automating claim detection and validation, detecting misinformation using content and propagation patterns,

identifying users (malicious or not) that instigate or facilitate misinformation, as well as mitigating misinformation [4]. Content-based methodologies conduct analytical investigations into neural network architectures, including Transformers and Graph Neural Networks (GNNs), among others [4].

Ultimately, technology's role is complex and dual-natured. The role of AI was highlighted, both as a tool for fact-checking and building truthiness identification bots, and as a potential amplifier of false narratives [3]. This duality defines the landscape of technological enablement: a constant arms race where the same technologies that fuel the problem are also humanity's best hope for containing it.

3. Collective effervescence

However, technology provides the infrastructure for the spread of misinformation, but the dynamics of human psychology and collective behavior are the root causes. The spread of online misinformation is more like a collective effervescence or a carnival rather than a carefully planned deception campaign. Its participation is driven by emotions, identity, and social connections, rather than a rational assessment of facts. This unwitting participation can be explained by deep-seated cognitive processes; the belief-dependent realism theory explains how beliefs are likely formed. The mind, bombarded with sensory information, searches for patterns and infuses them with meaning, and these meaningful patterns are beliefs of people [5]. Users, in their natural attempt to make sense of a complex world, become unwitting accomplices. Also, emotion is what makes this communal effervescence happen. Research indicates that falsehoods are more frequently disseminated than real information, as they typically elicit more intense emotional responses, resulting in viral propagation [1]. Misinformation narratives are often crafted to trigger primal emotions like fear, anger, or tribal loyalty, bypassing critical thought and encouraging immediate, reactive sharing.

This emotional response is further amplified through the mechanism of social proof.. As one study demonstrates, people change their beliefs more in line with evidence portrayed as normative (e.g., shared by many on social media platforms) compared to evidence portrayed as non-normative [5]. The very act of a post being widely shared serves as a powerful signal of its validity, creating a feedback loop where popularity begets more popularity, regardless of the content's truthfulness. This process taps into a fundamental human need for social conformity and belonging.

Indeed, The motivations for participating in this "carnival" are deeply social. Social media fulfills the needs of belonging and self-presentation. Individuals share news and opinions to both discuss and to create a structure of socially mediated context in which to interpret the information [9]. The sharing of misinformation can serve as a means to signal one's identity, affirm allegiance to a specific group, and engage in a collective meaning-construction process. The content of the misinformation is secondary to its function as a social object that binds a community together.

Ultimately, this dynamic leads to and is reinforced by societal polarization. Users with polarized opinions are not only prone to believing in misinformation. They are also more likely to spread it, which renders opinion polarization both a cause and a consequence of misinformation diffusion [6]. In this polarized environment, misinformation becomes a weapon in an identity-based conflict. The collective effervescence of sharing and amplifying these narratives is not about spreading information but about reinforcing one's own tribe and attacking the other, a carnival of confirmation bias where the goal is not truth but victory.

4. Diffusion logic

To understand how online misinformation spreads, we must go beyond simple epidemiological comparisons and look at how content production, network dynamics, and human cognition all operate together in a complicated way. A full examination must look at the whole life of a misleading story. This includes the root messages that contain misinformation, the people who make those messages, and the people who read them and share them [6]. By examining the process through this lifecycle framework—spanning from conception to viral propagation—it becomes feasible to decompose the diffusion process and identify the distinct logic that governs each stage.

At the center of this logic is a model that takes into consideration how people think. The cognitive cascade model, which combines a network science belief cascade technique with an internal cognitive model of the individual agents, is a big step forward from simpler contagion models [2]. This point of view suggests that exposure alone does not cause a rumor to spread. In fact, it is a probabilistic occurrence based on the resonance between the message and an individual's cognitive framework. This explains why certain instances of false information resonate so strongly, whereas others fail to gain comparable traction.

The explanatory power of the cognitive cascade model is most evident when comparing the diffusion patterns of true and false information. A significant structural divergence has been observed in how these two forms of content travel through networks. Research demonstrates that real news propagation tends to form dense structures, as users cluster around the disseminated information, whereas fake news forms sparser networks, with connections between users becoming more pronounced [10]. This finding reveals two distinct logics at play. Factual news typically follows a broadcast logic, emanating from a central, credible source to a wide but relatively passive audience. Misinformation, in contrast, operates on a viral logic. It spreads through peer-to-peer chains where interpersonal connections and social trust are paramount, creating a decentralized and distributed structure that relies on the multiplicative power of social networks.

Within this viral logic, the network itself is not random but develops a specific and resilient topology. A strong core-periphery structure emerges, where the diffusion is not uniform but is instead driven by a small, stable, and densely interconnected core of highly active users [8]. This core is very strong; in fact, the primary core reaches a steady size with little change and connections that get denser over time, which means that there is a stable group of users who keep the network going [8]. The ideological cohesion of this core is maintained not by factual verification, but by social trust. The truth bias model helps explain why individuals are more trusting of other individuals with whom they have an established relationship [9]. It is this structure, reinforced by a social trust that overrides the need for constant critical evaluation, that makes misinformation networks so efficient and difficult to dismantle, as the core ensures the persistence of the narrative while the periphery provides the broad, explosive reach.

5. Governance dilemmas

The unique diffusion logic of online misinformation presents profound and multifaceted governance dilemmas. The most fundamental challenge lies in the inherent asymmetry of the information ecosystem. While research in misinformation detection has advanced, a critical gap persists in the development of effective countermeasures. One study starkly underscores this gap, noting that the issue of disseminating fact-checks to refute misinformation has not garnered adequate attention. As a result, fact-checking, no matter how good it is, fails in its goal of debunking fake news for the general public [7]. This failure is not due to a lack of effort but to a fundamental mismatch in

communication strategies. Misinformation is engineered for virality and emotional resonance, while fact-checks are designed for accuracy and objectivity. In the attention economy of social media, the former will almost always outcompete the latter.

This problem is exacerbated in highly polarized environments. In such spaces, the very premise of fact-based governance collapses. Attempts to introduce corrective, fact-based information from outside sources can therefore be perceived as an attack on the group itself. When a group's identity is predicated on a shared set of beliefs, any external evidence that contradicts those beliefs is not seen as a correction but as an attack. This can trigger a backfire effect, making the governance attempt actively harmful.

Given the failures of content-based interventions, platforms often resort to more direct, technologically driven governance, such as content removal or account suspension. However, this approach is fraught with its own set of dilemmas. A primary concern is the potential for overreach and censorship. The possibility of authentic content being erroneously identified or censored endangers free speech. It is still hard to find a balance between stopping false information and protecting free speech [9]. The line between dangerous misinformation and unpopular but legitimate opinion is often blurry, and centralized platform control raises significant ethical and legal questions.

Furthermore, even the most advanced AI-driven governance tools face inherent limitations. Their usefulness is limited by the data on which they are trained, as several studies depend on static datasets and do not assess model generalization across various sources and changing disinformation trends [1]. Misinformation is a constantly moving target; narratives, keywords, and tactics evolve rapidly. An AI model trained on yesterday's fake news may be completely ineffective against tomorrow's, placing governance in a perpetual state of catch-up.

These interconnected dilemmas suggest that a new paradigm for governance is needed. A promising direction lies in shifting from a top-down, reactive model of control to a bottom-up, proactive model of resilience. Simulations have demonstrated that the sole message sets from studies that effectively influenced all agents within the population were those that progressively transitioned agents from one belief polarity to another [2]. This points toward a future where governance focuses less on trying to stamp out every falsehood and more on cultivating an information ecosystem where users are empowered to think critically and are gently nudged towards more reliable information.

6. Conclusion

In conclusion, this paper has systematically dissected the multifaceted phenomenon of online misinformation through an analysis of the interplay between Technological Enablement and Collective Effervescence. The analysis has demonstrated that technological architectures, particularly the decentralized nature of social media and engagement-driven personalization algorithms, provide a fertile ground for falsehoods to spread. However, the true engine of this diffusion is a form of collective effervescence, a process driven not by malicious intent but by deep-seated psychological needs for emotional resonance and social belonging, which is especially potent in polarized environments. This dynamic produces a distinct "viral" diffusion logic, characterized by a resilient core-periphery network structure that spreads misinformation through chains of social trust. Consequently, traditional governance methods like fact-checking are often rendered ineffective, creating profound dilemmas where top-down moderation conflicts with free speech principles and AI-based solutions struggle against constantly evolving narratives.

A primary limitation of this study is that it is a theoretical synthesis based on a curated selection of existing literature rather than new empirical research. Therefore, a valuable direction for future

research would be to conduct empirical case studies to test the applicability of the "cognitive cascade" model across different platforms and cultural contexts. Such studies could also quantitatively analyze the "lifecycle of misinformation" for specific events, moving from theoretical modeling to concrete validation. This would further refine our understanding and inform the development of more effective, evidence-based governance strategies.

References

[1] Mouratidis D, Kanavos A, Kermanidis K. From Misinformation to Insight: Machine Learning Strategies for Fake News Detection. Information. 2025; 16(3): 189.

[2] Rabb N, Cowen L, de Ruiter JP, Scheutz M. Cognitive cascades: How to model (and potentially counter) the spread of fake news. PLOS ONE. 2022; 17(1): e0261811.

[3] Tomassi M, Monaco A, Rossi L, Poltronieri A. Mapping automatic social media information disorder. First Monday. 2024; 29(1).

[4] Papanikou V, Christou G, Panagopoulos O, Dimitriou N, Kanavos A, Kermanidis K. Health Misinformation in Social Networks: A Survey of Information Technology Approaches. Information. 2025; 16(5): 262.

[5] Vlasceanu M. Cognitive Processes Shaping Individual and Collective Belief Systems [dissertation]. Princeton University; 2021.

[6] Han Y. Examining Production, Dissemination, and Consumption of Misinformation: The Case of COVID-19 Pandemic [dissertation]. The University of North Carolina at Greensboro; 2021.

[7] Marcondes FS, Barbosa MA, Gala A dCOS, Almeida JJ, Novais P. Emotional and Mental Nuances and Technological Approaches: Optimising Fact-Check Dissemination through Cognitive Reinforcement Technique. Electronics. 2024; 13(1): 240.

[8] Shao C, Ciampaglia GL, Varol O, Flammini A, Menczer F. The spread of low-credibility content by social bots. Nature Communications. 2018; 9(1): 4787.

[9] Miller S. Examining Engagement Behavior on Social Media Related to Fake News [dissertation]. University of South Alabama; 2019.

[10] Soga K, O'Brien F, Harrison L, Johnson S, Hall M. Graph-Based Interpretability for Fake News Detection. arXiv preprint arXiv: 2401.03158. 2024.