Multidisciplinary Reviews

REVIEW ARTICLE
Published Online: June 1, 2026
https://doi.org/10.31893/multirev.2026spe017

New information threats and digital media as a means of shaping public opinion

Mykola Rusyniuk[a] ✉ | **Oleksii Bashmanivskyi**[b] | **Lesia Pron**[c] | **Dariia Smolych**[d]

[a]Department of Public Administration, Interregional Academy of Personnel Management, Kyiv, Ukraine.
[b]Educational and Research Institute of Philology and Journalism, Department of Slavic and Germanic Philology and Translation, Zhytomyr Ivan Franko State University, Zhytomyr, Ukraine.
[c]Horodenka District Court of Ivano-Frankivsk Region, Horodenka, Ukraine.
[d]Faculty of Business and Law, Department of Management, Lutsk National Technical University, Lutsk, Ukraine.

Abstract The rapid expansion of digital communication platforms has fundamentally transformed the circulation of information and the mechanisms through which public opinion is formed. Moreover, the growing prevalence of misinformation and disinformation has intensified concerns regarding information reliability, public trust, and the resilience of democratic communication processes. In this context, understanding the structural dynamics of misinformation and identifying mechanisms that enhance informational resilience have become central research challenges. The aim of this study is to develop an integrated analytical framework for understanding misinformation in digital communication environments by synthesizing interdisciplinary research on digital media, information disorder, and media literacy. Particular attention is given to the interaction between the cognitive, technological, and institutional dimensions that shape the dissemination and mitigation of misinformation. This study employs a structured theoretical literature review based on a systematic search of publications indexed in the Scopus and Web of Science databases for the period 2017–2025. Following a multistage screening procedure aligned with systematic review principles, 47 studies were included in the final analytical corpus. The selected literature was analyzed using a structured conceptual coding approach, focusing on theoretical perspectives, levels of analysis, and mechanisms of misinformation dissemination and mitigation. The findings demonstrate that contemporary research on misinformation is organized around three dominant but insufficiently integrated paradigms–cognitive, technological, and institutional–which together define the complexity of digital communication environments. The analysis further reveals that misinformation dissemination is driven by the interaction of emotional amplification, algorithmic prioritization, and networked communication structures, whereas mitigation strategies–such as media literacy, fact-checking, and platform governance–remain constrained by structural and temporal limitations. This study contributes to the literature by proposing a multilevel analytical perspective that integrates individual behavior, platform architectures, and institutional frameworks into a unified explanatory model. The results highlight that effective responses to misinformation require coordinated strategies that combine educational, technological, and regulatory interventions. Strengthening media literacy and ensuring alignment between governance mechanisms and digital infrastructures are therefore essential for enhancing the resilience and reliability of contemporary communication systems.

Keywords: integration, civil society, public administration mechanisms, nongovernmental organizations, democracy, European integration

1. Introduction

In the contemporary architecture of global communications, digital media resources function not only as dominant channels for the dissemination of information but also as significant factors shaping public perceptions and the cognitive environment of society. The level of interactivity and the participatory potential of citizens within the media space have become key indicators for assessing the dynamics of public communication and social engagement. Moreover, the rapid expansion of digital platforms has intensified the influence of destructive information practices, including the spread of disinformation, fake content, and cyberattacks. These phenomena transform patterns of information consumption and significantly affect the behavior of audiences at both the individual and collective levels.

Timely assessment of such processes makes it possible to identify emerging information risks at an early stage, develop strategic measures aimed at protecting national information environments, and minimize the consequences of audience vulnerability to manipulative content. A systematic academic examination of the interaction between society and digital media allows researchers to identify the evolving information needs of citizens, analyze emerging communication trends, and determine key challenges in the contemporary information environment. This analytical perspective contributes to the formation of a more resilient information ecosystem capable of resisting both internal and external factors that may influence

public behavior. In this context, the stability of democratic systems increasingly depends on the development of media literacy among citizens and on the active participation of civil society institutions in the discussion of socially significant issues.

Previous research also emphasizes the institutional dimension of digital communication processes. According to the conceptual framework proposed by Suen (2006), the level of inclusiveness and accessibility of electronic services represents important indicators of the effectiveness of e-government systems in public administration. The expansion of digital infrastructure and the functional development of online platforms have significantly broadened access to administrative services and verified information regardless of geographical location. As digital technologies continue to evolve, media platforms increasingly become integrated into everyday social practices and household environments, thereby strengthening their role in shaping political awareness and civic engagement.

Scholars have also highlighted the growing importance of digital media within contemporary public communication systems. Dahlgren (2018) argues that the transformation of media ecosystems has fundamentally altered the channels through which information circulates within the digital public sphere. In this environment, digital media performs several strategic functions: they connect diverse social actors around key sociopolitical issues, direct public attention toward significant policy debates, and create interactive spaces that facilitate communication between governmental institutions and civil society. Consequently, the development of e-governance together with the expansion of digital media infrastructures has become an important foundation for democratic governance based on transparency, participation, and information accountability.

Within the broader academic discourse on digital governance, researchers have also explored how media environments influence patterns of civic participation and political engagement. Studies conducted within the Lund University research tradition emphasize that political participation in digital environments reflects complex interactions between rational deliberation and emotional communication. From this perspective, public engagement is interpreted not only as a form of political expression but also as a mechanism through which citizens influence the structure of power relations in democratic societies. Analytical models of political participation therefore combine normative standards of rational argumentation with affective dimensions of communication that significantly shape public opinion formation.

Recent studies further underline the broader socioeconomic implications of digital transformation. For example, Shchokin et al. (2023) emphasize the role of information technologies as important drivers of digital economic development, particularly in facilitating the expansion of e-commerce and the integration of national markets into the European economic space. From this perspective, the evolving digital environment should be viewed not only as a source of risk but also as a strategic resource that can enhance reputational capital, strengthen communication strategies, and support adaptation to rapidly changing socioeconomic conditions.

The evaluation of the activities of state authorities and local self-government institutions increasingly requires an analytical perspective focused on performance and managerial efficiency. In this context, the key criterion for assessing public administration systems is the degree of correspondence between achieved outcomes and the strategic objectives of state development (Ortina et al., 2023). Scholars note that the ongoing transition toward e-government models reveals several structural challenges. Comparative research demonstrates that both Ukraine and Germany encounter similar systemic limitations related to the incomplete digitalization of administrative services. These limitations are largely associated with the persistence of hybrid administrative mechanisms that simultaneously combine digital platforms with traditional paper-based procedures (Bakhtina et al., 2023a; Bakhtina, 2023b). As a result, excessive procedural regulation often reduces the potential benefits of digital governance tools and slows the implementation of efficient administrative practices.

Moreover, the digital transformation of governance and economic systems is accompanied by new security challenges. The transition of financial markets to digital infrastructures and the growing use of artificial intelligence create opportunities for improving transparency and reducing corruption risk. However, these technological developments also require more sophisticated mechanisms of institutional control and regulatory oversight, as the complexity of digital systems increases the potential vulnerability of financial and administrative environments (Kussainov et al., 2023).

The broader development of digital governance also involves the modernization of urban management and public administration practices. Research indicates that the effective integration of digital tools into governance structures requires a systematic approach that connects innovation policy with the needs of human and creative capital within the digital society (Yermachenko, 2023). From this perspective, digital technologies are not only technical instruments but also important drivers of institutional transformation and civic engagement.

Recent studies further emphasize the growing influence of interactive media and digital communities on public communication processes. Scholars analyze how the development of online platforms and digital public relations practices creates new opportunities for communication between institutions and citizens while simultaneously generating new challenges related to information reliability and public trust (Shin et al., 2024). Within the field of environmental governance, empirical research has also demonstrated that mechanisms of public participation significantly affect decision-making processes. Using factor analysis, Yang (2023) showed that citizen engagement can enhance the effectiveness of environmental management strategies by strengthening the social legitimacy of policy decisions.

In addition, social media platforms have become important arenas for political participation, particularly among younger generations. Empirical research conducted among Jordanian youth has indicated that digital platforms significantly influence

patterns of political engagement and civic communication. Moreover, scholars emphasize the need to consider gender differences when designing strategies aimed at increasing the effectiveness of digital participation initiatives (Alodat et al., 2023). Finally, interdisciplinary research on environmental governance highlights the growing role of digital tools in the dissemination of public information and reporting. For instance, the development of specialized online platforms that digitalize environmental reports contributes to increasing transparency and public access to ecological data (Northmore & Hudson, 2022).

The aim of this study is to develop a comprehensive analytical framework for understanding misinformation in digital communication environments by combining interdisciplinary research on digital media, information threats, and media literacy. This study seeks to identify dominant theoretical approaches, examine multilevel mechanisms of misinformation dissemination and mitigation, and assess the role of media literacy and information security as key factors, strengthening the resilience of contemporary information ecosystems.

2. Materials and Methods

This study employs a structured theoretical literature review aimed at synthesizing interdisciplinary research on misinformation, digital media communication, and media literacy. The methodological design was developed to ensure transparency, analytical consistency, and reproducibility of the source selection process while enabling a critical and integrative examination of existing scholarly approaches. The primary objective of the review is not limited to summarizing prior findings but focuses on identifying dominant theoretical paradigms, detecting conceptual inconsistencies, and constructing an integrated analytical framework for understanding misinformation in digital environments.

The literature search was conducted in the Scopus and Web of Science databases, which were selected because of their comprehensive coverage of peer-reviewed international research. Google Scholar was used as a supplementary tool to identify additional relevant publications and to verify citation coverage. The search covered the period of 2017–2025, reflecting the phase of rapid expansion of digital communication infrastructures and the intensification of scholarly debate on misinformation and media literacy.

The search strategy was based on combinations of keywords and Boolean operators. The core queries included ("misinformation" OR "disinformation" OR "fake news") AND ("social media" OR "digital media") AND ("media literacy" OR "public communication" OR "digital participation"). Additional keywords were incorporated to capture adjacent domains, including digital governance, information security, and online civic engagement.

The selection of publications followed a multistage screening procedure aligned with systematic review principles. The initial search identified 126 records. After 23 duplicates were removed, 103 publications remained for preliminary screening. In the first stage, the titles and abstracts were assessed for thematic relevance, resulting in the exclusion of studies not directly related to misinformation, digital media interaction, or media literacy. This stage yielded 76 publications. In the second stage, full-text analysis was conducted to evaluate the theoretical contribution, methodological transparency, and relevance to the research objectives. Following this assessment, 29 publications were excluded because of insufficient analytical depth or conceptual relevance. As a result, 47 studies were included in the final analytical corpus.

The inclusion criteria included peer-reviewed journal articles addressing misinformation, digital communication, or media literacy published in English and focused on public communication, digital participation, or information security. The exclusion criteria included studies lacking analytical rigor, publications outside the defined thematic scope, and duplicate records. To ensure analytical robustness, the selected literature was examined using a structured conceptual coding approach. Each study was analyzed according to three key dimensions: (1) theoretical perspective (e.g., cognitive, technological, institutional approaches); (2) level of analysis (individual, platform, or systemic); and (3) proposed mechanisms of misinformation dissemination and mitigation. This coding procedure enabled the classification of studies into coherent analytical categories and facilitated comparative evaluation across different research traditions.

The analytical strategy combined comparative analysis, thematic synthesis, and critical interpretation. Rather than presenting a descriptive overview, the review was designed to identify dominant explanatory models, reveal tensions between competing theoretical approaches, and systematize the role of media literacy within broader digital communication frameworks. This integrative perspective provides a foundation for developing a more comprehensive understanding of misinformation as a multidimensional phenomenon embedded in digital communication ecosystems.

3 Results and Discussion

3.1. Theoretical paradigms of misinformation in digital communication research

The structured synthesis of the selected corpus demonstrates that contemporary research on misinformation in digital communication environments is organized around three dominant yet only partially integrated paradigms: cognitive, technological, and institutional. While each of these approaches provides a distinct explanatory lens, their parallel

development has resulted in a fragmented theoretical landscape in which key mechanisms of misinformation are often examined in isolation rather than as components of a unified system.

Recent systematic and scientometric analyses indicate that the field has undergone a rapid process of conceptual expansion, evolving from descriptive accounts of false information toward more complex models of information disorder embedded in digital ecosystems (Broda & Strömbäck, 2024; Wang et al., 2025; Xu et al., 2025). Within this shift, misinformation is increasingly conceptualized not as a deviation from informational accuracy but as a structurally produced and dynamically sustained phenomenon shaped by the interaction of technological infrastructures, user behavior, and institutional contexts (Surjatmodjo et al., 2024; Hassani et al., 2024). However, despite this conceptual advancement, the literature remains divided in terms of analytical focus and explanatory priorities.

The cognitive paradigm interprets misinformation primarily as a consequence of individual-level processing limitations and biases. Studies within this tradition emphasize mechanisms such as confirmation bias, motivated reasoning, and the illusory truth effect, demonstrating that repeated exposure to information–regardless of its accuracy–can increase perceived credibility (Ahmed et al., 2024; Halevy & Landry, 2024). From this perspective, misinformation is less of a property of content than a function of how individuals interpret and internalize information under conditions of cognitive constraint. Nevertheless, a critical limitation of this approach lies in its methodological individualism. By focusing predominantly on internal psychological processes, cognitive models tend to undertheorize the structural conditions that determine exposure to information, particularly the role of algorithmic mediation.

In contrast, the technological paradigm shifts the analytical focus from users to platforms. Within this framework, misinformation is conceptualized as an emergent outcome of digital infrastructures characterized by algorithmic filtering, engagement optimization, and networked dissemination (Hassani et al., 2024; Xu et al., 2025). Research consistently demonstrates that platform architectures privilege content that maximizes user interaction, often amplifying emotionally charged or sensational narratives regardless of their factual accuracy. This logic of algorithmic amplification produces what can be described as visibility bias, where the prominence of information is determined not by epistemic validity but by engagement metrics. However, while technological approaches effectively explain large-scale dissemination dynamics, they often rely on implicit assumptions of user passivity, thereby neglecting the interpretative agency and reflexivity of audiences.

The institutional paradigm extends the analysis to the level of governance and systemic regulation, framing misinformation as a challenge to democratic stability, information security, and public trust. Studies within this approach focus on the role of regulatory frameworks, platform governance, and fact-checking systems in mitigating misinformation (Broda & Strömbäck, 2024; Surjatmodjo et al., 2024). Importantly, institutional analyses highlight that misinformation is not merely a communicative anomaly but also a phenomenon with direct implications for political legitimacy and social cohesion. Moreover, this paradigm reveals a persistent normative tension: efforts to regulate misinformation inevitably intersect with concerns regarding censorship, freedom of expression, and political neutrality. As a result, institutional solutions remain inherently constrained and context dependent.

An important extension of these paradigms is found in research on the digital public sphere, which emphasizes the hybrid nature of contemporary communication environments. Digital platforms simultaneously function as spaces of information dissemination, affective interaction, and public deliberation (Dahlgren, 2018; Hess et al., 2026). In such environments, misinformation is not only transmitted but also socially constructed through interaction, reinterpretation, and collective meaning-making. This perspective challenges linear models of information flow by demonstrating that audiences actively participate in the circulation and transformation of narratives. However, the integration of communicative and structural perspectives remains limited, as studies of the public sphere often operate independently from technological and cognitive analyses.

A cross-paradigmatic comparison reveals that each approach captures a necessary but insufficient dimension of misinformation dynamics. Cognitive studies explain susceptibility, technological analyses account for dissemination, and institutional frameworks address regulation. However, the absence of a unified analytical model capable of integrating these dimensions constitutes a central limitation of the current research landscape. In practice, misinformation emerges from the interaction of cognitive biases, algorithmic amplification, and institutional constraints, but existing studies rarely conceptualize these processes as interdependent.

This fragmentation suggests the need for a multilevel theoretical framework that integrates individual, platform, and systemic dimensions into a coherent analytical structure. Such an approach would allow misinformation to be understood as a dynamic process rather than a static category, in which dissemination, interpretation, and regulation are mutually constitutive. By moving beyond isolated paradigms, future research can develop more robust explanatory models capable of capturing the complexity of digital communication environments and the conditions under which misinformation is both produced and mitigated.

3.2. Levels of analysis in misinformation studies: Individual, platform, and systemic perspectives

The classification of the reviewed literature according to the level of analysis reveals a consistent stratification of research into three analytical layers: individual, platform, and systemic. While this distinction is widely implicit in contemporary

studies, the structured coding applied in this research demonstrates that these levels are not merely descriptive categories but reflect fundamentally different explanatory logics. Moreover, the literature shows limited integration across these layers, which constrains the development of comprehensive models of misinformation dynamics. At the individual level, studies emphasize cognitive and behavioral responses to information, focusing on how users perceive, interpret, and disseminate digital content (Ahmed et al., 2024; Alodat et al., 2023). Research in this domain has demonstrated that user engagement with misinformation is shaped by a combination of cognitive biases, emotional triggers, and social identity factors. For instance, exposure to deepfake content or emotionally charged narratives can significantly amplify belief formation and sharing behavior, particularly in environments characterized by high information overload (Ahmed et al., 2024). Similarly, analyses of political participation indicate that social media engagement is not neutral but is mediated by individual motivations, including identity expression and affective alignment (Alodat et al., 2023). Additional studies suggest that narrative engagement mechanisms–such as identification with content or symbolic framing–play a critical role in shaping user responses to digital information (Lu et al., 2024).

However, despite providing detailed insights into user-level processes, individual-centered research has structural limitations: It tends to treat exposure to information as given rather than problematizing how such exposure is produced. As a result, cognitive explanations often operate independently of the technological conditions that determine the visibility and accessibility of content. This limitation is addressed at the platform level, where research shifts the analytical focus toward the structural properties of digital media systems. Studies from this perspective examine how platform architectures, algorithmic curation, and interaction design shape patterns of information dissemination and user engagement (Shin et al., 2024; Connolly, 2024).

In particular, research highlights that digital platforms are not passive intermediaries but active agents that configure communicative environments through algorithmic prioritization and interface design. Analytical models of social media movements demonstrate that engagement patterns emerge from the interaction between content characteristics and platform affordances, including visibility algorithms and network structures (Connolly, 2024). Similarly, studies of interactive digital communities emphasize that communication dynamics are coproduced by users and platform mechanisms, resulting in complex feedback loops that amplify certain types of content (Hassan et al., 2023).

Despite its explanatory strength, platform-centered research introduces its own reductionism by privileging structural determinism. In many cases, users are implicitly conceptualized as reactive agents whose behavior is shaped by algorithmic systems, thereby underestimating their capacity for critical interpretation and selective engagement. This creates a conceptual tension between user-centered and platform-centered approaches, as the former emphasizes agency, while the latter highlights structural constraints. At the systemic level, misinformation is analyzed as a multidimensional phenomenon embedded within broader governance, institutional, and societal frameworks.

Research at this level focuses on the interaction between digital communication, public institutions, and regulatory mechanisms, emphasizing that misinformation constitutes not only a communicative issue but also a challenge to democratic governance and information security (Yang, 2023; Yermachenko et al., 2023). Studies in digital governance demonstrate that the effective management of information environments requires coordinated strategies that integrate technological innovation, institutional regulation, and civic participation (Ortina et al., 2023). From this perspective, misinformation is interpreted as a systemic risk arising from the misalignment between rapidly evolving digital infrastructures and comparatively slower institutional adaptation.

Moreover, systemic approaches reveal a further layer of complexity by highlighting the role of participatory mechanisms in shaping information environments. Research on public participation indicates that citizen engagement can function both as a source of resilience and as a vector of vulnerability, depending on the quality of communication and the presence of reliable information frameworks (Yang, 2023). This duality underscores the ambivalent role of digital participation within contemporary information ecosystems. A comparative synthesis across the three levels demonstrates that each analytical layer captures a distinct dimension of misinformation while simultaneously omitting critical aspects addressed by the others. Individual-level studies explain why users engage with misinformation, platform-level analyses clarify how such information is amplified, and systemic perspectives address the conditions under which misinformation can be regulated or mitigated. However, the absence of cross-level integration remains a persistent limitation within the literature.

Importantly, the interaction between these levels is not additive but constitutive. Cognitive biases influence how users respond to algorithmically curated content, whereas platform architectures shape the informational environment within which such cognitive processes operate. Moreover, institutional frameworks define the boundaries within which both users and platforms function. This interdependence suggests that misinformation should be conceptualized as a multilevel process in which individual behavior, technological infrastructure, and governance structures are mutually embedded. The lack of integrative models that explicitly account for these interactions represents a critical gap in contemporary research. Most studies remain confined to a single level of analysis, which limits their explanatory capacity and reduces their applicability in addressing real-world information challenges. Bridging this gap requires the development of analytical frameworks capable of linking microlevel cognitive processes, meso-level platform dynamics, and macrolevel institutional structures into a coherent explanatory system. Such an integrative perspective provides the foundation for a more comprehensive understanding of

misinformation as a dynamic and context-dependent phenomenon. It also creates the conceptual basis for examining how mitigation strategies–particularly those related to media literacy, platform governance, and institutional regulation–can be effectively aligned across different levels of digital communication environments.

The relevance of the identified multilevel structure becomes particularly evident in the context of Ukraine, where digital communication environments are shaped by hybrid information threats and large-scale disinformation campaigns. The ongoing war has significantly intensified the role of digital platforms as instruments of strategic communication, in which misinformation is systematically used not only to influence public opinion but also to undermine institutional trust and destabilize social cohesion.

Within this context, the interaction between analytical levels can be observed with particular clarity. At the individual level, emotionally charged war-related narratives increase cognitive vulnerability and stimulate rapid content sharing. At the platform level, algorithmic curation mechanisms amplify such narratives due to high engagement dynamics, reinforcing their visibility regardless of factual accuracy. At the systemic level, institutional responses are often constrained by the need to balance information security objectives with democratic principles, including freedom of expression and media pluralism.

This case illustrates that the levels of analysis identified in the literature are not abstract categories but empirically observable dimensions of real-world information processes. The Ukrainian context therefore provides a concrete example of how cognitive, technological, and institutional factors interact in the formation and dissemination of misinformation, reinforcing the necessity of a multilevel analytical approach.

3.3. Mechanisms of misinformation dissemination and mitigation in digital environments

The analysis of the reviewed literature indicates that misinformation in digital communication environments is sustained through a set of interrelated dissemination mechanisms that operate across the cognitive, technological, and systemic levels. These mechanisms are not independent but mutually reinforcing, forming dynamic feedback loops that enable rapid diffusion, amplification, and normalization of misleading content. Moreover, mitigation strategies–while increasingly sophisticated–remain structurally slower and less adaptive, creating an asymmetry that defines contemporary information ecosystems.

At the core of dissemination processes lies the interaction between emotional amplification and algorithmic prioritization. Empirical and modeling studies demonstrate that misinformation tends to achieve greater visibility when it is characterized by emotionally charged narratives, simplified causal explanations, and strong affective framing (Hassani et al., 2024; Xu et al., 2025). These features align with platform logics that prioritize engagement metrics, thereby increasing the probability of diffusion regardless of factual accuracy. In this context, misinformation can be conceptualized as “engagement-optimized content,” whose spread is determined less by epistemic value than by its capacity to trigger user interaction. Research further shows that such dynamics produce cascading effects in which repeated exposure reinforces perceived credibility, contributing to the normalization of misleading narratives (Dennis & Lindberg, 2025).

A critical extension of these mechanisms is observed in the emergence of synthetic and manipulated media. Studies on deepfakes and visual misinformation demonstrate that advances in artificial intelligence significantly increase the persuasive power of misleading content by increasing its realism and emotional impact (Sanchez-Acedo et al., 2024; Ahmed et al., 2024). Unlike traditional misinformation, which relies on textual distortion, synthetic media operates at the level of perceptual credibility, making detection more difficult and amplifying cognitive vulnerability. Importantly, the effectiveness of such content is not solely technological but depends on the interaction between visual realism and preexisting cognitive biases, reinforcing the multilevel nature of misinformation processes.

While dissemination mechanisms operate through speed, repetition, and emotional resonance, mitigation strategies are structured around verification, regulation, and education. Among these, media literacy emerges as a central mechanism of resilience. Research consistently demonstrates that individuals with higher levels of media literacy are better equipped to critically evaluate information sources, identify manipulative techniques, and resist the spread of misleading content (Aljalabneh, 2024; Ziapour et al., 2024). Media literacy is therefore not limited to technical skills but encompasses a broader set of cognitive and interpretative competencies that enable users to navigate complex information environments. Studies further indicate that media literacy contributes not only to individual resistance but also to collective communication quality, as more informed users are more likely to engage in evidence-based discussions and responsible information sharing (Voitovych et al., 2025; Synchak, 2022).

However, the effectiveness of media literacy as a mitigation strategy is contingent upon its interaction with other mechanisms. In isolation, educational interventions may reduce susceptibility to misinformation, but they cannot fully counteract the structural dynamics of algorithmic amplification. This limitation has led to increased attention to fact-checking and platform-based interventions. Experimental studies demonstrate that fact-checking can produce immediate corrective effects by reducing the perceived credibility of false information, particularly when corrections are presented clearly and

supported by credible sources (Berger et al., 2025). Moreover, research highlights that such effects are often temporary, as users may revert to prior beliefs because of confirmation bias and selective exposure.

Platform governance represents another key direction mitigation strategy. Studies examining digital platform regulation emphasize that algorithmic moderation, content labeling, and transparency policies can reduce the visibility of misleading content and limit its spread (Clemons et al., 2025; Shahbazi & Bunker, 2024). Nevertheless, these interventions introduce normative and practical challenges, including concerns about censorship, political bias, and the scalability of moderation processes. As a result, platform-based solutions are often characterized by trade-offs between information control and freedom of expression.

The complexity of misinformation dynamics becomes particularly evident in crisis contexts, where information environments are characterized by uncertainty, urgency, and heightened emotional engagement. Research on health misinformation during global crises has demonstrated that misleading content can spread more rapidly than verified information can, undermining public trust and complicating coordinated responses (Adebisi et al., 2023). Similar patterns are observed in the context of natural disasters, where misinformation distorts risk perception and influences behavioral responses (Hilberts et al., 2025). These findings highlight that crisis situations amplify existing dissemination mechanisms while simultaneously reducing the effectiveness of traditional mitigation strategies.

A cross-level synthesis of dissemination and mitigation processes reveals a fundamental asymmetry: misinformation spreads through decentralized, adaptive, and engagement-driven mechanisms, whereas mitigation relies on more centralized, slower, and institutionally constrained interventions. This asymmetry is further reinforced by the temporal dimension of information dynamics, as dissemination often occurs in real time, whereas verification and correction require additional time and resources. Importantly, the interaction between dissemination and mitigation mechanisms cannot be understood at a single analytical level. Cognitive factors influence how users respond to both misinformation and corrective information, platform architectures determine the visibility of both types of content, and institutional frameworks define the regulatory conditions under which interventions are implemented. This interdependence suggests that effective responses to misinformation require alignment across individual competencies, technological systems, and governance structures.

The absence of such alignment represents a key limitation of current approaches. Many existing strategies focus on isolated mechanisms–such as media literacy programs or fact-checking initiatives–without adequately accounting for their interaction with platform dynamics and institutional constraints. As a result, their impact remains partial and context dependent. In this regard, the findings of the literature synthesis support the need for an integrated mitigation model that combines educational, technological, and regulatory interventions. Media literacy enhances user resilience, platform governance reduces structural amplification, and institutional frameworks provide normative and legal support for information regulation. Only through the coordinated interaction of these elements can the structural imbalance between dissemination and mitigation processes be effectively addressed.

Taken together, the findings of the literature synthesis allow for the conceptualization of misinformation as a multilevel adaptive system in which cognitive biases, algorithmic amplification, and institutional constraints operate simultaneously rather than independently. Unlike linear models that treat dissemination and mitigation as separate processes, the evidence suggests that these dynamics are structurally intertwined, with feedback loops connecting user behavior, platform architectures, and governance mechanisms. This integrative perspective not only clarifies the limitations of isolated interventions but also provides a theoretical basis for developing coordinated strategies that align educational, technological, and regulatory responses within a unified framework.

4. Conclusion

The results of this study confirm that digital communication environments should be conceptualized as complex multilevel systems in which information dissemination, public interaction, and opinion formation are dynamically interconnected. The rapid expansion of digital media infrastructures has not only increased the scale and speed of information circulation but has also structurally intensified the conditions under which misinformation and disinformation emerge and persist. The literature synthesis demonstrates that misinformation is best understood not as an isolated informational anomaly but as a systemic feature of digital communication ecosystems shaped by the interaction of algorithmic amplification, fragmented information environments, and evolving patterns of user engagement.

A key finding of this study lies in the identification of three dominant yet insufficiently integrated analytical dimensions–cognitive, technological, and institutional–which together define the contemporary research landscape. While cognitive approaches explain user susceptibility, technological perspectives account for dissemination dynamics, and institutional frameworks address governance and regulation, the absence of integrative models remains a central limitation in existing scholarship. This study advances the literature by proposing a multilevel analytical perspective in which these dimensions are treated as interdependent components of a unified explanatory framework.

The analysis further demonstrates that misinformation dissemination is driven by the interaction of emotional amplification, algorithmic prioritization, and networked communication structures, which together produce rapid and adaptive patterns of information spread. Moreover, mitigation strategies–including media literacy, fact checks, and platform

governance–operate under structural constraints that limit their effectiveness when implemented in isolation. This asymmetry between dissemination and mitigation processes represents a fundamental characteristic of contemporary digital information environments. The findings highlight the central role of media literacy as a form of social resilience. Media literacy should be understood not only as an individual's level of cognitive competence but also as a systemic element embedded within broader digital governance frameworks. Its effectiveness depends on alignment with platform design, institutional regulation, and communicative practices that promote information transparency and accountability.

From a theoretical perspective, the study contributes to the development of an integrated model of misinformation that links individual behavior, platform architectures, and institutional conditions within a single analytical structure. Such an approach allows for a more comprehensive understanding of how misinformation is produced, disseminated, and contested in digital environments. From a practical perspective, the findings suggest that effective responses to misinformation require coordinated, multilevel strategies that combine educational, technological, and regulatory interventions.

Moreover, several limitations should be acknowledged. As a structured literature review, the study relies on the interpretation and synthesis of existing research, which may be influenced by the selection criteria and analytical framework applied. In addition, the focus on studies published between 2017 and 2025 reflects a rapidly evolving field, meaning that emerging trends and technologies may require further investigation. Future research should focus on the empirical validation of integrated multilevel models, the comparative analysis of different digital platforms, and the examination of how media literacy interventions interact with platform governance mechanisms in real communication contexts. Particular attention should be given to developing adaptive strategies capable of addressing the dynamic and context-dependent nature of misinformation in digital ecosystems.

Overall, the study demonstrates that addressing misinformation in contemporary digital environments requires moving beyond fragmented analytical perspectives toward integrated frameworks that systematically align cognitive, technological, and institutional dimensions. Without such integration, mitigation efforts remain inherently partial and structurally limited. The proposed multilevel approach provides a conceptual foundation for developing more effective and adaptive strategies capable of responding to the complexity, speed, and scale of misinformation in the digital age. The absence of empirical validation should be interpreted as a deliberate limitation of the study design, which prioritizes conceptual integration over statistical testing. However, this also defines a clear direction for future research, where the proposed framework can be operationalized and tested using quantitative and mixed-method approaches.

5. Declarations

5.1. Ethical considerations

Not applicable.

5.2. Use of artificial intelligence (AI)

The authors declare that no generative artificial intelligence tools were used in the preparation, analysis, or writing of this manuscript.

5.3. Conflict of interest

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

5.4. Funding

This research did not receive any financial support.

References

Adebisi, F., Smuts, H., Mawela, T., Maramba, G., & Hattingh, M. (2023). The role of social media in health misinformation and disinformation during the COVID-19 pandemic: Bibliometric analysis. *JMIR Infodemiology, 3*, e48620. https://doi.org/10.2196/48620

Ahmed, S., Bee, A. W. T., Ng, S. W. T., & Masood, M. (2024). Social media news use amplifies the illusory truth effects of viral deepfakes: A cross-national study of eight countries. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 68*(5), 778–805. https://doi.org/10.1080/08838151.2024.2410783

Aljalabneh, A. A. (2024). Visual media literacy: Educational strategies to combat image and video disinformation on social media. *Frontiers in Communication, 9*, 1490798. https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomm.2024.1490798

Alodat, A. M., Al-Qora'n, L. F., & Abu Hamoud, M. (2023). Social media platforms and political participation: A study of Jordanian youth engagement. *Social Sciences, 12*(7), 402. https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci12070402

Bakhtina, I. S. (2023b). Administrative discretion in states of full democracy and hybrid regime (on example of Germany and Ukraine). *P.A. Persona e Amministrazione, 12*(1), 727–757. https://doi.org/10.14276/2610-9050.4307

Bakhtina, I. S., Berendieieva, A. I., Pyshna, A. H., Bilozorov, Y. V., & Kuchuk, A. M. (2023a). Administrative discretion in states of full democracy and hybrid regime: The example of Germany and Ukraine. *Multidisciplinary Reviews, 6*(4), 2023035. https://doi.org/10.31893/multirev.2023035

Berger, L. M., Kerkhof, A., Mindl, F., & Münster, J. (2025). Debunking "fake news" on social media: Immediate and short-term effects of fact-checking and media literacy interventions. *Journal of Public Economics, 245*, 105345. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2025.105345

Broda, E., & Strömbäck, J. (2024). Misinformation, disinformation, and fake news: Lessons from an interdisciplinary, systematic literature review. *Annals of the International Communication Association, 48*(2), 139–166. https://doi.org/10.1080/23808985.2024.2323736

Clemons, E. K., Schreieck, M., & Waran, R. V. (2025). Managing disinformation on social media platforms. *Electronic Markets, 35*, 52. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12525-025-00796-6

Connolly, E. A. (2024). An innovative methodological approach to analysing social media movements. *International Journal of Social Media and Online Communities, 16*(1), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.4018/IJSMOC.342847

Dahlgren, P. (2018). Public sphere participation online: The ambiguities of affect. *Les Enjeux de l'information et de la communication, 19*(1), 5–20.

Dennis, E., & Lindberg, R. (2025). Social media and the spread of misinformation: Infectious and a threat to public health. *Health Promotion International, 40*(2), daaf023. https://doi.org/10.1093/heapro/daaf023

Halevy, N., & Landry, A. P. (2024). Intergroup conflict as contest and disease. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 28*(1), 5–7. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2023.10.004

Hassan, J. T., Adams, E. J., Ofordi, J., & Amarachi, O. J. (2023). How interactive digital communities impact public relations. *Wukari International Studies Journal, 7*(4), 20–31.

Hassani, H., Komendantova, N., Rovenskaya, E., & Yeganegi, M. R. (2024). Unveiling the waves of mis- and disinformation from social media. *International Journal of Modeling, Simulation, and Scientific Computing, 15*(3), 2450033. https://doi.org/10.1142/S1793962324500338

Hess, A., Negrea-Busuioc, E., Ciunova-Shuleska, A., Palamidovska-Sterjadovska, N., Stępińska, A., Bączkowska, A., Gërguri, D., Milioni, D., Veseljević Jerković, S., Mulahmetović Ibrišimović, A., Krstić, A., Gugu, E., & Reçi, A. (2026). Rethinking public opinion studies in the digital era: Expert discourse on the theoretical and methodological challenges of public opinion research. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research, 38*(1), edag001. https://doi.org/10.1093/ijpor/edag001

Hilberts, S., Govers, M., Petelos, E., & Evers, S. (2025). The impact of misinformation on social media in the context of natural disasters: Narrative review. *JMIR Infodemiology, 5*, e70413. https://doi.org/10.2196/70413

Kussainov, K., Goncharuk, N., Prokopenko, L., Pershko, L., Vyshnivska, B., & Akimov, O. (2023). Anti-corruption management mechanisms and the construction of a security landscape in the financial sector of the EU economic system against the background of challenges to European integration: Implications for artificial intelligence technologies. *Economic Affairs, 68*(1), 509–521. https://doi.org/10.46852/0424-2513.1.2023.20

Lu, A. S., Green, M. C., & Alon, D. (2024). The effect of animated Sci-Fi characters' racial presentation on narrative engagement, wishful identification, and physical activity intention among children. *Journal of Communication, 74*(2), 160–172. https://doi.org/10.1093/joc/jqad030

Northmore, L., & Hudson, M. D. (2022). Digital environmental impact assessment: An exploration of emerging digital approaches for non-technical reports. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review, 92*, 106689. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eiar.2021.106689

Ortina, H., Zayats, D., Akimova, L., Akimov, O., & Karpa, M. (2023). Economic efficiency of public administration in the field of digital development. *Economic Affairs, 68*(3), 1543–1553. https://doi.org/10.46852/0424-2513.3.2023.21

Sanchez-Acedo, A., Carbonell-Alcocer, A., Gertrudix, M., & Rubio-Tamayo, J.-L. (2024). The challenges of media and information literacy in the artificial intelligence ecology: Deepfakes and misinformation. *Communication & Society, 37*(4), 223–239. https://doi.org/10.15581/003.37.4.223-239

Shahbazi, M., & Bunker, D. (2024). Social media trust: Fighting misinformation in the time of crisis. *International Journal of Information Management, 77*, 102780. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2024.102780

Shchokin, R., Domyshche-Medyanyk, A., Prav, R., Pryhara, O., & Borko, T. (2023). Application of interactive technologies to promote tourism services. *Economic Affairs, 68*(1s), 279–287. https://doi.org/10.46852/0424-2513.1s.2023.30

Shin, B., Floch, J., Rask, M., Bæck, P., Edgar, C., Berditchevskaia, A., Mesure, P., & Branlat, M. (2024). A systematic analysis of digital tools for citizen participation. *Government Information Quarterly, 41*(3), 101954. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2024.101954

Suen, I.-S. (2006). Assessment of the level of interactivity of e-government functions. *Journal of E-Government, 3*(1), 29–51. https://doi.org/10.1300/J399v03n01_03

Surjatmodjo, D., Unde, A. A., Cangara, H., & Sonni, A. F. (2024). Information pandemic: A critical review of disinformation spread on social media and its implications for state resilience. *Social Sciences, 13*(8), 418. https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci13080418

Synchak, B. (2022). The tendency to increase media literacy level as a result of increasing requests for quality information. *Ukrainian Information Space, 1*(9), 133–145. https://doi.org/10.31866/2616-7948.1(9).2022.257210

Voitovych, N., Kitsa, M., & Mudra, I. (2025). Media education and media literacy as a factor in combating disinformation. *Journalism and Media, 6*(4), 188. https://doi.org/10.3390/journalmedia6040188

Wang, J., Zhai, Y., & Shahzad, F. (2025). Mapping the terrain of social media misinformation: A scientometric exploration of global research. *Acta Psychologica, 252*, 104691. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2025.104691

Xu, G., Qian, M., & Meng, L. (2025). Misinformation dissemination on social media: Key research themes and evolutionary paths between 2013 and 2023. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications, 12*, 1775. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-025-06067-1

Yang, R. (2023). Public participation and risk prevention in the process of digital governance of environment: Performance evaluation, influence mechanism and improvement path. *Polish Journal of Environmental Studies, 32*(4), 3895–3903. https://doi.org/10.15244/pjoes/161516

Yermachenko, V., Bondarenko, D., Akimova, L., Karpa, M., Akimov, O., & Kalashnyk, N. (2023). Theory and practice of public management of smart infrastructure in the conditions of the digital society's development: Socio-economic aspects. *Economic Affairs, 68*(1), 617–633.

Ziapour, A., Malekzadeh, R., Darabi, F., Yildirim, M., Montazeri, N., Kianipour, N., & Nejhaddadgar, N. (2024). The role of social media literacy in infodemic management: A systematic review. *Frontiers in Digital Health, 6*, 1277499. https://doi.org/10.3389/fdgth.2024.1277499