International Journal of Education and Humanities (IJEH), 6(3) 2026:661-675
http://i-jeh.com/index.php/ijeh/index
E-ISSN: 2798-5768

Political Misinformation Recognition among College Students on Social Media and Educational Responses

Yang Tianyu[1]

Abstract

Social media gives college students rapid access to political information but also exposes them to ambiguous sources, decontextualized evidence, emotionally charged narratives, and misleading claims. This article aims to explain why college students may struggle to assess political content online and to propose an educational response grounded in research on misinformation, media and news literacy, civic online reasoning, and digital source evaluation. Using an integrative narrative review and conceptual synthesis of empirical and theoretical literature, the article thematically analyzes barriers to online political judgment and derives pedagogical design principles. The review identifies five connected barriers: weak attention to provenance, confusion between factual and interpretive claims, reliance on familiarity and social endorsement, limited verification at the moment of sharing, and a mismatch between open social media environments and classroom materials whose authority has already been established. In response, the article proposes a staged educational framework based on source investigation, lateral reading, claim–evidence reconstruction, contextual verification, independent corroboration, and calibrated judgment. It also recommends performance-based assessment using realistic, mixed-quality cases rather than relying on self-reported confidence or generalized skepticism. The article defines political information literacy as the ability to assign confidence in proportion to source credibility and verifiable evidence. Its main contribution is to integrate previously separate literatures on misinformation, literacy, and civic online reasoning into a coherent pedagogical account of political information literacy. The implications are that political and civic education should connect subject knowledge with the information conditions under which students encounter public affairs, and that assessment should evaluate students' calibrated judgments in realistic digital environments rather than generic skepticism or confidence alone.

Keywords: *Civic Education, College Students, Political Information Literacy, Political Misinformation, Social Media*

A. Introduction

Social media has become an increasingly important channel through which college students encounter information about public affairs, political institutions, policy controversies, social problems, and current events. Political communication that was once largely mediated through newspapers, television, official publications, and classroom instruction now circulates through short videos, public accounts, news feeds, online communities, discussion threads, screenshots, reposts, and user-generated commentary. This transformation has lowered the cost of political information acquisition and broadened the range of voices available to students. At the same time, it has made it more difficult to assess the credibility of political information. The problem is not simply that false information exists. Contemporary social media environments mix

[1]The Education University of Hong Kong (EdUHK). Hong Kong. 1061467075@qq.com

professionally produced journalism, official communication, personal interpretation, advocacy, satire, selectively edited material, commentary, and misinformation in similar visual and rhetorical forms. A fabricated story can imitate professional reporting; an authentic quotation can mislead when separated from its context; accurate statistics can be interpreted inappropriately; and genuine photographs or videos can be recirculated with incorrect descriptions. The distinction between reliable and unreliable political information is therefore often less visible than the distinction between obviously true and obviously false statements.

What makes this situation empirically surprising is that higher education and digital familiarity do not automatically produce effective evaluation. Studies of online source evaluation show that highly educated users do not always adopt effective verification strategies. Breakstone et al. (2022) found substantial variation in how college students assessed online information concerning social and political issues, while Wineburg and McGrew (2019) demonstrated that effective fact-checkers often differed from other educated readers not because they examined a webpage more carefully, but because they left the page and investigated the source through independent searches. Research on misinformation likewise shows that belief in or circulation of inaccurate information cannot be explained solely by a lack of factual knowledge. Familiarity, repetition, prior beliefs, emotional salience, social endorsement, reduced attention to accuracy, and reliance on cognitive shortcuts may all influence how information is evaluated (Ecker et al., 2022; Pennycook et al., 2021). These findings indicate that access to information no longer guarantees access to well-grounded political knowledge. Before information can contribute to meaningful political learning, users must determine whether its source is credible, whether the evidence supports the claim, whether relevant context has been omitted, and whether independent sources confirm the account.

These conditions place new demands on political and civic education. Conventional political education has understandably emphasized substantive knowledge: political institutions, historical processes, social values, public responsibility, political concepts, and the interpretation of established curricular materials. Yet students now encounter a significant proportion of politically relevant information outside formal educational environments, where reliability has not been pre-screened by teachers, editors, or textbook authors. The student must therefore make an epistemic judgment before information can be meaningfully incorporated into political understanding. This problem suggests a need to distinguish between political knowledge and political information literacy. Political knowledge concerns what students understand about institutions, policies, history, concepts, and public affairs. Political information literacy concerns how students assess the credibility of claims through which such knowledge is acquired or revised. The two capacities are complementary: a student may possess substantial political knowledge yet use weak verification strategies when confronted with unfamiliar digital content, or may know how to investigate sources but lack the background knowledge needed to interpret complex political developments.

Existing research has begun to examine related questions, but three limitations remain. First, studies of information literacy, news literacy, and new media literacy have explored relationships with fake-news recognition and online information evaluation, yet their findings are uneven. Jones-Jang et al. (2021) found that information literacy was associated with greater ability to identify fake news, while other forms of literacy were not necessarily equally predictive; Orhan (2023) reported that critical-thinking dispositions and new media literacy predicted university students' fake-news detection performance. These studies establish important correlations but do not fully translate them into a coherent pedagogical account of political information literacy. Second, research on civic online reasoning has shown that students can improve their evaluation of digital information when they receive explicit instruction in source investigation and lateral

reading (McGrew, 2020), but this work is not always integrated with political and civic education's concern with substantive political knowledge. Third, within political and ideological education research, scholars have recognized the changing information environment surrounding college students. Work published in the International Journal of Education and Humanities has examined the spread of problematic information in new media environments and the relationship between short-video platforms and mainstream ideological recognition among college students (Peng et al., 2024; Zhao, 2022). Such studies demonstrate that digital media have already become an important concern within the field. However, much of the discussion continues to emphasize the effects of media environments on political attitudes, values, or educational communication. Less attention has been given to the intermediate competence through which students evaluate political information before accepting, rejecting, or sharing it. Moreover, although news literacy has been conceptually defined and studied in relation to corrections and misinformation responses (Tully et al., 2022; Vraga et al., 2022), the literature still lacks an integrative framework that connects misinformation research, media and news literacy, civic online reasoning, and political education around a single construct.

To address these limitations, this article treats political misinformation recognition as a problem of political information literacy. Rather than defining misinformation recognition as a simple ability to label individual statements as true or false, political information literacy is understood here as the capacity to examine the origins, evidence, context, and credibility of political claims and to calibrate judgment based on the quality of available information. Using an integrative narrative review and conceptual synthesis, the article brings together research on misinformation, media and news literacy, civic online reasoning, and digital source evaluation. It then derives an educational response from that synthesis: first, by identifying barriers to recognizing misinformation at the levels of learner judgment, platform design, and educational practice, and second, by translating those barriers into instructional and assessment strategies.

Accordingly, the article focuses on explaining why college students may struggle to assess political content online and on proposing a staged educational framework to address those difficulties. The framework emphasizes source investigation, lateral reading, claim–evidence reconstruction, contextual verification, independent corroboration, and calibrated judgment. It also recommends performance-based assessment using realistic, mixed-quality cases rather than relying on self-reported confidence or generalized skepticism. The article first explains its integrative review approach and defines political information literacy. It then analyzes barriers to misinformation recognition. The final sections translate those barriers into instructional and assessment strategies.

This offer is generous for two reasons. Academically, it integrates previously separate literatures on misinformation, literacy, civic online reasoning, and political education into a coherent account of political information literacy, thereby clarifying a construct that has often been used loosely. Pedagogically, it connects substantive political knowledge with the information conditions under which students actually encounter public affairs. Political education should not only teach students what to know about institutions, policies, and public affairs; it should also develop the procedures they need to decide which digital claims deserve confidence. Without such procedures, access to information may produce confusion, generalized skepticism, or premature acceptance rather than well-grounded political understanding. The central argument is therefore that political education should develop both substantive knowledge and the evaluative procedures students need to assess politically relevant information under realistic digital conditions.

B. Methods

This study employed a qualitative, library-based design consisting of an integrative narrative review and a conceptual synthesis. This design was adopted because the study aimed not to test relationships among variables or to measure students' competences empirically, but to explain why college students may struggle to assess political content on social media and to propose an educational response grounded in the relevant literature. The study was therefore interpretive and conceptual in nature. The "data" consisted of texts, arguments, findings, and conceptual frameworks drawn from empirical and theoretical literature on misinformation, media and news literacy, civic online reasoning, digital source evaluation, and political and civic education. The design was not intended to be an exhaustive systematic review; rather, it sought to provide a transparent integrative synthesis from which a coherent conceptual account and pedagogical principles could be developed.

The research procedure was carried out in six stages. First, the focus and guiding questions of the review were established: why college students have difficulty recognizing political misinformation on social media and how political education can address these difficulties. Second, the conceptual boundaries of the review were defined by identifying four main clusters of literature: misinformation and misinformation correction; media, news, and information literacy; civic online reasoning and digital source evaluation; and political and civic education. Third, literature searches were conducted in relevant databases and journal portals, particularly Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar, as well as in publications in the fields of education and political communication. Fourth, the retrieved literature was screened according to inclusion and exclusion criteria, and full texts were read to assess conceptual relevance. Fifth, key information was extracted from each source, including its focus, constructs, main findings, theoretical arguments, and limitations. Sixth, thematic and conceptual synthesis was conducted, and the results were translated into a staged educational framework and assessment principles. Analytical notes were maintained throughout the process to ensure that decisions regarding selection, interpretation, and framework development could be traced.

Data were collected through documentary analysis of scholarly literature. Searches were conducted using combinations of keywords and Boolean operators, including “political misinformation” OR “fake news” AND "college students" OR “university students” AND “social media”; “media literacy” OR “news literacy” OR “information literacy” AND “fake news detection” OR “source evaluation”; and “civic online reasoning” OR “lateral reading” OR “digital source evaluation” AND “political education” OR “civic education.” The inclusion criteria comprised peer-reviewed journal articles, relevant theoretical or empirical works, publications in English or Indonesian, and studies published mainly between 2019 and 2024, with exceptions for seminal works that remained conceptually relevant. The exclusion criteria comprised non-scholarly opinion pieces, sources unrelated to the constructs under review, and studies that addressed digital literacy only in general terms without a connection to the evaluation of political information. In addition to database searches, snowballing was conducted through reference lists and articles citing key works. An extraction matrix was developed to record the author, year, focus, constructs, findings, and conceptual contribution of each source.

Data were analyzed through thematic analysis and conceptual synthesis. First, the literature was openly coded for ideas, findings, and claims relevant to difficulties in evaluating political information. Second, the codes were compared continuously through constant comparison in order to identify patterns, tensions, and connections across the literature. Third, the codes were grouped into more abstract categories, which were then formulated as five interconnected barriers: weak attention to provenance, confusion between factual and interpretive claims, reliance on familiarity and social endorsement, limited verification at the moment of sharing,

and a mismatch between open social media environments and classroom materials whose authority has already been established. Fourth, conceptual synthesis was conducted to define political information literacy as the ability to assign confidence in proportion to source credibility and verifiable evidence. Fifth, the results of the synthesis were translated into principles for staged instructional design and performance-based assessment using realistic mixed-quality cases. To support the quality of interpretation, the analysis employed triangulation across bodies of literature, an audit trail of search and coding decisions, negative case analysis, and researcher reflexivity regarding theoretical assumptions. The findings were not intended to support statistical generalization but to offer a conceptual understanding and a pedagogical framework that can be examined further through empirical research.

C. Results and Discussion

Political Misinformation and Political Information Literacy

The concept of misinformation requires careful use. Kapantai et al. (2021) synthesize competing definitions and taxonomies of false and misleading information, including distinctions based on factuality and communicative intent. Misinformation refers to false or inaccurate information that may circulate without deliberate intent to deceive, whereas disinformation involves intentional deception. Malinformation generally refers to genuine information that is used in a harmful or misleading manner, often through selective disclosure or decontextualization.

For educational purposes, misinformation can serve as a useful starting point because students often cannot discern the original communicator's motives when encountering a claim online. A misleading post may result from deliberate manipulation, poor reporting, misunderstanding, careless reposting, selective editing, or the repetition of an earlier error. From the learner's perspective, the immediate task is therefore not to infer intention but to evaluate the claim and the evidence supporting it.

Political misinformation should also not be reduced to fully fabricated stories. In practice, some of the most difficult political content to evaluate contains a mixture of accurate and misleading elements. A quotation may be authentic but incomplete; a statistic may be correct but lack a relevant baseline; a policy document may be cited accurately while its implications are exaggerated; a photograph may be genuine but associated with the wrong event. These forms of partial accuracy can be more difficult to identify than wholly invented content because they provide recognizable evidence around which a misleading interpretation can be constructed.

This characteristic has important consequences for education. A binary distinction between "real news" and "fake news" may encourage students to assume that political information can always be classified with certainty. In reality, information quality exists on a continuum. Some claims can be firmly verified, some are demonstrably false, while others remain incomplete, disputed, insufficiently supported, or impossible to establish with currently available evidence. An appropriate educational response must therefore cultivate calibrated judgment rather than categorical certainty.

The concept of political information literacy helps to frame this task. It draws on several adjacent traditions but cannot be reduced entirely to any one of them. Media literacy generally concerns the ability to access, analyze, evaluate, and create mediated messages. News literacy focuses more specifically on understanding how news is produced, distributed, and consumed (Tully et al., 2022). Information literacy emphasizes the capacity to locate, evaluate, and use information effectively. Civic online reasoning, meanwhile, has developed a more procedural focus on how individuals evaluate digital information related to social and political issues.

Political information literacy can be understood as the application and integration of these capacities within the domain of public affairs. It refers to the ability to locate, contextualize, evaluate, verify, compare, and interpret political information before incorporating that information into judgment, discussion, or civic action. Such literacy requires attention to several interconnected questions: Who produced the claim? What evidence supports it? Is the evidence directly relevant to the conclusion being drawn? Does the claim distinguish fact from interpretation? Is important context missing? Can the information be confirmed through independent sources? How certain should the user be given the available evidence?

This definition deliberately emphasizes both knowledge and practice. A student may understand abstractly that online sources differ in reliability yet fail to investigate the source of a specific claim. Similarly, students may know that political information should be cross-checked while rarely performing such checks in ordinary media use. Political information literacy, therefore, involves not only declarative knowledge about information quality but also procedural routines that can be activated in everyday information encounters.

The distinction between media use and information literacy is especially important among college students. Young adults are often highly experienced users of digital platforms, but frequency of use does not necessarily produce competence in source evaluation. Familiarity with interfaces, search functions, or social media conventions may coexist with limited understanding of how political claims should be verified. Digital fluency and epistemic judgment are related only indirectly. The latter requires explicit attention to evidence.

Barriers to Political Misinformation Recognition

Source Credibility and Provenance

A central challenge in political misinformation recognition is weak attention to source credibility. On social media, information is frequently detached from its original producer. A claim may appear as a screenshot, a short video excerpt, a quotation card, a repost, or a summary provided by another user. Each act of recirculation can obscure the chain linking the current post to the original source. As a result, students may evaluate the content's plausibility without investigating its provenance.

This problem is reinforced by the visual design of digital platforms. Content is usually foregrounded, while information about authorship, institutional affiliation, publication history, or evidence may require additional effort to locate. Under these conditions, users can easily substitute appearance for credibility. Professional visual design, confident language, a large number of followers, or high engagement may create an impression of authority even when the underlying source is weak.

Research on lateral reading demonstrates why such cues are insufficient. Wineburg and McGrew (2019) found that professional fact-checkers often responded to unfamiliar websites by leaving them and searching for external information about the organizations involved. In contrast, other readers tended to remain on the site and evaluate it based on its internal features. The more effective approach was therefore not deeper reading of the original source but broader investigation beyond it. For political misinformation recognition, this suggests that credibility cannot be reliably inferred from the claim's presentation alone.

Factual Claims and Interpretation

A second difficulty concerns the distinction between factual statements and interpretive claims. Political communication typically contains both. A social media post may report an event, attribute a cause to it, assess the motives of political actors, predict future consequences,

and express a normative judgment within the same narrative. The factual component may be accurate while the causal or evaluative components remain unsupported.

This mixture is important because students may treat the verification of one element as confirmation of the entire message. If an authentic image accompanies an inaccurate explanation, the image's credibility can transfer to the interpretation. If a numerical statistic is correct, students may overlook whether the comparison is meaningful. If a quotation is genuine, they may not examine whether preceding or subsequent statements alter its meaning.

The challenge is therefore not only to identify false facts but to reconstruct the logical structure of a political claim. Students need to distinguish among empirical statements, causal explanations, interpretations, predictions, and normative evaluations. Different kinds of claims require different standards of assessment. An empirical statement may be verified through records or data. A causal inference requires evidence that alternative explanations have been considered. A normative judgment cannot be settled by factual verification alone.

Emotional and Heuristic Cues

Emotional framing further complicates this process. Political communication often involves topics that legitimately evoke concern, anger, fear, solidarity, or moral disagreement. Emotion is not inherently incompatible with reasoned political judgment. The problem arises when emotional intensity serves as a proxy for evidentiary strength. A highly affecting story may be remembered and shared even when its factual basis is weak, while less emotionally salient but more reliable information receives little attention.

A third challenge concerns heuristic judgment. Social media exposes users to more information than they can reasonably evaluate in depth. Cognitive shortcuts are therefore an inevitable part of digital information processing. Individuals may use familiarity, repetition, source identity, popularity, social endorsement, or consistency with prior expectations as rapid indicators of credibility. These heuristics are efficient, but they do not always track accuracy.

Research on misinformation has repeatedly shown that familiarity and repetition can increase perceived plausibility (Ecker et al., 2022). Social media can amplify this effect because users may encounter the same claim in multiple formats and from multiple accounts. Repetition can create the impression of independent confirmation even when the various posts derive from a single source.

Prior beliefs can also influence evaluation. Political claims often concern issues that are already connected to values, identities, or established expectations. Information that confirms an existing view may receive less scrutiny than information that challenges it. The educational significance of this tendency should be interpreted carefully. It does not justify assigning cognitive deficiency to particular political viewpoints. Confirmation bias is better understood as a general vulnerability that can affect individuals across ideological positions. Political information literacy should therefore emphasize symmetrical standards of evaluation: claims should be scrutinized by the evidence they support or challenge, regardless of whether they do so.

Verification at the Moment of Use

A fourth difficulty lies in the gap between knowing that verification is important and actually performing verification. Students may be aware that social media contains inaccurate information and may endorse the principle of checking sources. Yet such awareness does not guarantee action. Verification requires time and effort, while social media interaction encourages rapid reading, immediate reaction, and frictionless sharing.

Pennycook et al. (2021) provide useful evidence on this point. Their work suggests that misinformation sharing can partly result from insufficient attention to accuracy at the moment of decision rather than from a preference for false information. When users were prompted to consider accuracy, the quality of subsequent sharing decisions improved. The implication for education is that misinformation recognition involves not only competence but activation. Students need routines that bring evaluative questions into the moment of information use.

The difficulty is compounded by the structural characteristics of social media communication. Fragmentation reduces context. Compression encourages simplified representations of complex political questions. Reposting can obscure original sources. Social endorsement cues provide visible signals of popularity that may be mistaken for credibility. Images and short-form videos create a sense of immediacy but may omit the temporal or institutional context necessary for interpretation.

These characteristics should not be treated as proof that social media is intrinsically unreliable. Digital platforms also allow users to access primary documents, expert commentary, public data, official statements, and multiple viewpoints more rapidly than before. The educational issue is therefore not whether students should avoid social media, but whether they can navigate its mixed information environment with appropriate evaluative procedures.

The Curriculum Environment Gap

The problem becomes especially significant when political education and media literacy remain institutionally separated. Political education may provide substantive knowledge but devote limited attention to the processes through which students encounter political claims outside the classroom. Media literacy education, where available, may focus on general communication skills without engaging deeply with political reasoning. Students can therefore receive instruction in political concepts without learning how to investigate claims about those concepts in everyday digital life.

Breakstone et al. (2022) illustrate the importance of this gap. Their research showed that many college students used ineffective strategies when evaluating online sources dealing with social and political issues. The finding challenges the assumption that higher education or general academic ability automatically produces sophisticated digital evaluation. Effective verification practices require explicit teaching and repeated application.

The underlying problem can therefore be summarized as a mismatch between the information environment of contemporary students and the evaluative practices emphasized in conventional political education. Students increasingly encounter politics through information that is incomplete, rapidly circulated, and only partially contextualized. Yet classroom evaluation often occurs through texts whose authority and relevance have already been established. The transition from pre-selected educational material to open digital information requires an additional layer of competence: students must first decide what merits being treated as evidence.

Educational Responses for Political Information Literacy

An educational response to political misinformation should begin by avoiding two inadequate approaches. The first is the assumption that misinformation can be addressed simply by supplying more correct information. Correction is necessary when false claims are identified, but it does not by itself teach students how to evaluate future claims. The second is a generalized call to "think critically." Critical thinking is valuable, yet the instruction remains too abstract unless students are shown what critical evaluation looks like in practice.

Source Investigation and Lateral Reading

Political information literacy should instead be translated into a sequence of concrete evaluative practices. The first of these is source investigation. Students need to learn that the credibility of an unfamiliar political claim cannot be determined solely by inspecting the post in which it appears. The relevant questions concern provenance: Who originally produced the information? Is the source identifiable? Does the source possess relevant expertise or institutional responsibility? Is it independent of the claim it is reporting? How is the source assessed by other credible institutions?

Such questions naturally lead to lateral reading. Rather than remaining within a single webpage or post, students should move outward to investigate the source through independent searches. The importance of this practice lies in its procedural simplicity. It does not require students to memorize lists of trusted or untrusted websites. Instead, it gives them a method for investigating unfamiliar sources. McGrew (2020) found that explicit instruction in civic online reasoning strategies could improve students' ability to evaluate digital sources, suggesting that such practices are teachable rather than merely intuitive.

Claim Evidence and Context

Source investigation, however, should not become a substitute for evidence evaluation. A credible source does not make every claim automatically correct, just as an unreliable source does not make every individual statement false. Students therefore need to reconstruct the relationship between claims and evidence.

A useful educational sequence begins with precise identification of the claim. Political posts frequently contain multiple assertions, and students should be encouraged to separate them. Once the claim is identified, the next task is to determine what evidence supports it. This may involve an official document, survey, dataset, video, expert statement, news report, photograph, or another post. Students should then ask whether the evidence is relevant to the conclusion and whether key contextual information is missing.

Context is especially important in political misinformation. A quotation requires its surrounding statement. A statistic requires a denominator, time period, and data source. A video requires information about when and where it was recorded. A comparison requires an appropriate baseline. In this sense, misinformation recognition is often an exercise in restoring information that has been removed during circulation.

Cross-source comparison should follow. Students should distinguish between independent corroboration and repeated reproduction of the same source. If several websites all cite the same unverified account, the number of reproductions does not strengthen the evidence. Independent confirmation requires information derived from separate and credible sources.

Calibrated Judgment

This process should culminate in a proportionate judgment rather than a compulsory binary label. Students should be able to conclude that a claim is well supported, unsupported, misleading, incomplete, disputed, or currently unverifiable. Such distinctions matter because they teach students to align confidence with evidence. Political information literacy is undermined by both excessive credulity and excessive certainty.

The distinction between fact and interpretation should also become an explicit instructional objective. Political education frequently asks students to analyze social issues, yet students may benefit from more systematic practice in identifying the type of claim being made. Classroom materials can be annotated to distinguish factual statements from causal inferences, predictions,

evaluations, and rhetorical expressions. This exercise clarifies which aspects of a political message are empirically verifiable and which depend on broader argument.

For example, the statement that a policy was implemented on a particular date is a factual claim. The assertion that the policy caused a subsequent social outcome is a causal claim. The claim that the policy is unjust is a normative judgment. These statements may appear together, but they cannot be assessed using identical methods. Teaching students to separate them reduces the likelihood that verification of one element will be mistaken for confirmation of the whole narrative.

Reflection Before Sharing

A further educational task is to connect verification with the act of sharing. Social media users participate not only as recipients but also as distributors of political information. The decision to repost, comment on, or summarize a claim contributes to its circulation. Political information literacy should therefore include reflection before amplification.

Accuracy-oriented prompts provide a useful conceptual basis for this practice. Pennycook et al. (2021) showed that directing attention toward accuracy could improve the quality of information-sharing decisions. In educational settings, this principle can be reduced to a small set of routine questions: Is the original source known? Has the full material been consulted rather than only a headline or excerpt? Is there evidence for the central claim? Can the information be independently confirmed? Is the desire to share driven primarily by evidentiary confidence or by surprise, emotional response, or prior agreement?

The value of such questions is not that students must perform exhaustive research before every minor interaction. Rather, they establish a threshold for politically consequential information. The more serious the claim and the greater its potential impact, the stronger the obligation to verify.

Case-Based Instruction

Political information literacy is also likely to develop more effectively when authentic or realistically constructed social media cases are integrated into political and civic education. Abstract discussions of misinformation tend to produce general agreement but may not transfer to real information environments. Students need opportunities to encounter ambiguity, incomplete evidence, persuasive framing, and mixed-quality sources.

Case-based learning can therefore begin with an initial judgment made before verification. Students can then trace the source, recover the original context, compare independent accounts, examine the evidence, and revisit their initial assessment. The final stage is particularly important. Students should explain whether their judgment changed and identify which evidence justified the revision. This converts misinformation education from a search for predetermined answers into an exercise in epistemic reflection.

Such an approach also allows political education to maintain neutrality toward students' legitimate political differences. The educational standard is procedural rather than ideological. Students are not required to adopt a particular political interpretation merely because it is favored by an instructor or institution. They are required to justify claims with relevant evidence and to apply comparable standards of scrutiny across sources.

This principle is essential for the credibility of political information education. If verification practices are applied selectively only to claims associated with particular political positions, students may interpret media literacy as a form of persuasion rather than an academic

competence. By contrast, consistent evidentiary standards reinforce the distinction between education and political advocacy.

Curriculum Integration

The integration of these practices does not require the creation of an entirely new course. Political information literacy can be embedded within existing political, civic, communication, and general education curricula. A discussion of public policy can require students to identify original policy documents rather than rely on screenshots. A classroom debate may require participants to submit justifications for their sources. Written assignments can assess not only the number of citations but the quality of source evaluation. Current affairs discussions can begin with source tracing before moving on to interpretation.

Over time, such practices may help normalize verification as part of political learning. The goal is not for students to perform formal fact-checking whenever they encounter a political statement. It is to develop a habit of asking whether a claim is adequately supported before incorporating it into judgment.

Curriculum and Assessment Implications

A Competency Oriented Model

The analysis above points toward a broader change in how political education is conceptualized in digital environments. Traditional models have often been organized primarily around the transmission and interpretation of political knowledge. Such knowledge remains fundamental, but contemporary information conditions require an additional emphasis on the competence through which knowledge is acquired and revised.

A competency-oriented approach treats students as participants in an open information environment. Political learning no longer occurs only through carefully selected educational materials. Students continually encounter claims outside the classroom and must decide how much weight to give them. The quality of political learning therefore depends partly on the quality of the procedures used to evaluate incoming information.

This perspective preserves the central role of knowledge. Political knowledge and information literacy reinforce one another. Background knowledge helps students recognize implausible statements, understand institutional context, and identify missing information. Verification skills, in turn, help prevent unreliable digital content from distorting that knowledge.

The proposed educational logic can be summarized as a movement from exposure to evaluation and from evaluation to informed judgment. Students first encounter political information through social media. Initial processing may be influenced by familiarity, emotion, social endorsement, and prior expectations. At this stage, the risk of misinformation acceptance is relatively high because credibility may be inferred from intuitive cues. Educationally developed practices—source investigation, lateral reading, evidence reconstruction, contextual verification, and cross-source comparison—introduce a second stage of deliberate evaluation. The result is not guaranteed agreement, but a more transparent basis for judgment.

This model differs from a correction-centered approach. Correction intervenes after an inaccurate belief or claim has already emerged. Political information literacy aims to strengthen evaluation before belief and to ensure that the circulation of information becomes firmly established. It is therefore both preventive and corrective.

It also differs from an approach based on generalized skepticism. Students should not be taught to distrust all media, institutions, experts, or political communication. Such indiscriminate

distrust would weaken rather than improve information literacy. The aim is discriminating trust: the ability to understand why some sources deserve greater confidence in particular contexts, why some claims require stronger evidence than others, and why uncertainty should sometimes be retained.

Performance-Based Assessment

This point has implications for the assessment of educational outcomes. Self-reported confidence in identifying misinformation is insufficient. Students may feel highly capable while relying on ineffective source-evaluation strategies. Performance-based assessment is therefore more appropriate. Students can be asked to investigate unfamiliar claims while educators observe which sources they consult, whether they identify the original material, how they distinguish evidence from interpretation, and whether they revise conclusions in response to stronger information.

Assessment should also consider false positives. An educational intervention should not be judged successful merely because students become more suspicious. If students reject accurate information at the same time that they reject misinformation, overall information competence may not have improved. Effective political information literacy should increase the ability to discriminate between stronger and weaker evidence rather than indiscriminately increase distrust.

This is one reason why misinformation education should be embedded in broader information-evaluation practice rather than organized solely around examples of deception. If students encounter only obviously false cases, they may learn that misinformation is easily recognizable or primarily associated with extreme content. Realistic political information is often ambiguous. Educational cases should therefore include accurate reporting, partially misleading claims, incomplete evidence, contested interpretations, and uncertain information.

The use of mixed cases also supports a more mature understanding of public communication. Political disagreement does not necessarily indicate misinformation. Different actors may interpret the same verified facts differently or prioritize competing values. Political information literacy should help students identify the point at which disagreement shifts from factual dispute to interpretive or normative disagreement. This distinction can improve both misinformation recognition and the quality of civic discussion.

The growing importance of social media in political communication creates an educational problem that is broader than fake-news detection. College students increasingly form understandings of public affairs within environments where the credibility of information is often uncertain at first exposure. Political education must therefore address not only the substance of what students learn but also the procedures by which they determine what is worth learning.

The analysis presented here has three principal implications

First, political information literacy should be treated as a distinct but integrated component of political and civic competence. Students need both substantive political knowledge and the ability to evaluate claims through which new political knowledge is acquired. Treating digital source evaluation as a separate technical skill overlooks its direct relevance to political understanding.

Second, educational responses should translate broad commitments to critical thinking into concrete practices. Source investigation, lateral reading, contextual recovery, evidence comparison, and calibrated judgment are more actionable than generalized advice to be skeptical

or think independently. Their practical character also allows them to be incorporated into classroom assessment.

Third, political misinformation education should maintain a clear distinction between evaluating information and determining political conclusions. Students may reach different interpretations after examining the same evidence. The role of education is not necessarily to eliminate such disagreement, but to ensure that factual claims, causal arguments, and normative judgments are distinguished and supported appropriately.

This distinction is particularly important because misinformation research intersects with politically contested topics. Educational legitimacy depends on procedural consistency. The same standards should be applied to information that confirms prior beliefs and information that challenges them. Otherwise, fact-checking instruction risks being interpreted as selective persuasion.

The literature also suggests that no single intervention is likely to be sufficient. News literacy, corrections, accuracy prompts, source-evaluation strategies, and prebunking approaches may each contribute to resilience against misinformation, but their effects vary across contexts and outcomes (van der Linden, 2022; Vraga et al., 2022). For universities, the implication is that political information literacy should not be reduced to a single workshop or awareness campaign. Repeated application across courses is more likely to support durable evaluative habits.

Future empirical research should test the proposed framework in diverse student populations. Particular attention should be given to the difference between self-reported literacy and demonstrated performance. Experimental and task-based studies could compare students' judgments before and after training in lateral reading, evidence verification, or accuracy reflection. Longitudinal designs would be especially valuable for determining whether these practices persist beyond the immediate instructional setting.

Research should also examine cross-topic transfer. Students may apply rigorous verification to unfamiliar issues yet rely more heavily on prior beliefs when evaluating topics linked closely to identity or strong values. A robust model of political information literacy should therefore examine whether evaluative practices remain stable across ideologically congenial and incongruent claims.

This review has two important limitations. Its source base is selective rather than systematic, and the cited studies use different measures, populations, and information contexts. The framework should therefore be understood as a theory-informed synthesis, not as evidence that one instructional package will produce the same effect across settings. Its value lies in identifying procedures and assessment targets that can be tested in future classroom research.

D. Conclusion

Social media has expanded students' access to political information while transferring more responsibility for credibility judgments to individual users. Misleading content is not limited to fabricated stories; it also appears through selective quotation, missing context, unsupported causal claims, ambiguous sourcing, and the combination of accurate evidence with misleading interpretation. Political misinformation recognition should therefore be treated as an educational competence rather than a narrow fact-checking task.

The reviewed literature identifies connected barriers in source evaluation, claim classification, heuristic judgment, contextual recovery, and verification at the moment of sharing. Political and civic education can address these barriers through repeated practice in source investigation, lateral reading, claim-evidence reconstruction, contextual comparison,

independent corroboration, and calibrated judgment. Assessment should examine students' actual investigative behavior and their willingness to revise a conclusion when stronger evidence appears.

The aim is neither to prescribe political conclusions nor to cultivate indiscriminate distrust. Students should learn to distinguish factual disputes from interpretive and normative disagreements and to apply comparable evidentiary standards to congenial and uncongenial claims. In an information environment where political learning often begins outside the classroom, this capacity is a necessary part of informed civic participation.

References

Breakstone, J., Smith, M. D., Ziv, N., & Wineburg, S. (2022). Civic preparation for the digital age: How college students evaluate online sources about social and political issues. The Journal of Higher Education, 93(7), 963–988. https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2022.2082783

Ecker, U. K. H., et al. (2022). The psychological drivers of misinformation belief and its resistance to correction. Nature Reviews Psychology, 1, 13–29. https://doi.org/10.1038/s44159-021-00006-y

Jones-Jang, S. M., Mortensen, T., & Liu, J. (2021). Does media literacy help identification of fake news? Information literacy helps, but other literacies don't. American Behavioral Scientist, 65(2), 371–388. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764219869406

Kapantai, E., Christopoulou, A., Berberidis, C., & Peristeras, V. (2021). A systematic literature review on disinformation: Toward a unified taxonomical framework. New Media & Society, 23(5), 1301–1326. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444820959296

McGrew, S. (2020). Learning to evaluate: An intervention in civic online reasoning. Computers & Education, 145, Article 103711. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2019.103711

Orhan, A. (2023). Fake news detection on social media: The predictive role of university students' critical thinking dispositions and new media literacy. Smart Learning Environments, 10, Article 29. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-023-00248-8

Peng, L., Ouyang, J., & Xu, P. (2024). The impact mechanism of mobile short video platforms on the recognition of mainstream ideology among college students. International Journal of Education and Humanities, 12(1), 268–271. https://doi.org/10.54097/nxqa2s27

Pennycook, G., Epstein, Z., Mosleh, M., Arechar, A. A., Eckles, D., & Rand, D. G. (2021). Shifting attention to accuracy can reduce misinformation online. Nature, 592, 590–595. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-021-03344-2

Tully, M., Maksl, A., Ashley, S., Vraga, E. K., & Craft, S. (2022). Defining and conceptualizing news literacy. Journalism, 23(8), 1589–1606. https://doi.org/10.1177/14648849211005888

van der Linden, S. (2022). Misinformation: Susceptibility, spread, and interventions to immunize the public. Nature Medicine, 28, 460–467. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-022-01713-6

Vraga, E. K., Tully, M., & Bode, L. (2022). Assessing the relative merits of news literacy and corrections in responding to misinformation on Twitter. New Media & Society, 24(10), 2354–2371. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444821998691

Wineburg, S., & McGrew, S. (2019). Lateral reading and the nature of expertise: Reading less and learning more when evaluating digital information. Teachers College Record, 121(11), 1–40. https://doi.org/10.1177/016146811912101102

Zhao, S. (2022). The reasons for the spread of "information virus" among college students and paths for prevention from the perspective of new media. International Journal of Education and Humanities, 2(2), 60–62. https://doi.org/10.54097/ijeh.v2i2.292.