ESL95 Analyzing text for Present Perfect: <u>Why Do People Fall for Fake News?</u>

After reviewing the uses of present perfect and simple past, reread the following paragraphs from the article.

    a. *Underline <mark style="background:yellow">present perfect</mark> and <mark style="background:#5cff5c">simple past</mark> verbs you see.*

    b. *Why did the author choose to use present perfect in some cases and simple past in others?*

    c. *Notice the present tenses as well. When do the authors use <mark style="background:cyan">simple present</mark>? When do they use present continuous (not used – all are gerunds)? Why?*

1. What makes people susceptible to fake news and other forms of strategic misinformation? And what, if anything, can be done about it?

   These questions <mark style="background:yellow">have become</mark> more urgent in recent years, not least because of revelations about the Russian campaign to influence the 2016 United States presidential election by disseminating propaganda through social media platforms. The rationalization camp, which <mark style="background:yellow">has gained</mark> considerable prominence in recent years, <mark style="background:cyan">is built</mark> around a set of theories contending that when it <mark style="background:cyan">comes</mark> to politically charged issues, people <mark style="background:cyan">use</mark> their intellectual abilities to persuade themselves to believe what they <mark style="background:cyan">*want*</mark> to be true rather than attempting to actually <mark style="background:cyan">discover</mark> the truth.

2. Some of the most striking evidence <mark style="background:#5cff5c">used</mark> *(reduced adjective clause – present, past, or present perfect – which is used or which was used or which has been used)* to support this position <mark style="background:cyan">comes</mark> from an influential 2012 study in which the law professor Dan Kahan and his colleagues <mark style="background:yellow">found</mark> that the degree of political polarization on the issue of climate change <mark style="background:#5cff5c">was</mark> greater among people who <mark style="background:#5cff5c">scored</mark> higher on measures of science literary and numerical ability than it <mark style="background:#5cff5c">was</mark>

among those who scored lower on these tests. Apparently, more "analytical" Democrats were better able to convince themselves that climate change was a problem, while more "analytical" Republicans were better able to convince themselves that climate change was not a problem. Professor Kahan has found similar results in, for example, studies about gun control in which he experimentally manipulated the partisan slant of information that participants were asked to assess.

3. We found that people who engaged in more reflective reasoning were better at telling true from false, regardless of whether the headlines aligned with their political views. (We controlled for demographic facts such as level of education as well as political leaning.) In follow-up studies yet to be published, we have shown that this finding was replicated using a pool of participants that was nationally representative with respect to age, gender, ethnicity and region of residence, and that it applies not just to the ability to discern true claims from false ones but also to the ability to identify excessively partisan coverage of true events.

4. Our results strongly suggest that somehow cultivating or promoting our reasoning abilities should be part of the solution to the kinds of partisan misinformation that circulate on social media. And other new research provides evidence that even in highly political contexts, people are not as irrational as the rationalization camp contends. Recent studies have shown, for instance, that correcting partisan misperceptions does not backfire most of the time — contrary to the results of Professors Nyhan and Reifler described *(reduced adjective clause present or past – which WAS described or which IS described)* above — but instead leads to more accurate beliefs.