

## ESL95: Analyzing text for Present Perfect: Misinformation and Biases Infect Social Media, Both Intentionally and Accidentally

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

- a. **Underline present perfect and simple past 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 simple present? When do they use present continuous? Why?**
- 
1. Our research **has identified** three types of bias that **make** the social media ecosystem vulnerable to both intentional and accidental misinformation. That **is** why our Observatory on Social Media at Indiana University **is building** tools to help people **become** aware of these biases and **protect** themselves from outside influences (REDUCED ADJECTIVE CLAUSE – could be present: which are, past: which were, or present perfect: which have been) **designed** to exploit them.
  2. In fact, in our research we **have found** that it **is** possible to determine the political leanings of a Twitter user by simply looking at the partisan preferences of their friends. Our analysis of the structure of these partisan communication networks **found** social networks **are** particularly efficient at disseminating information – accurate or not – when they **are** closely tied together and disconnected from other parts of society.

3. To study these manipulation strategies, we **developed** a tool to detect social bots called Botometer. Botometer **uses** machine learning to detect bot accounts, by inspecting thousands of different features of Twitter accounts, like the times of its posts, how often it **tweets**, and the accounts it **follows** and **retweets**. It **is** not perfect, but it **has revealed** that as many as 15 percent of Twitter accounts **show** signs of being bots.
  
4. A great deal of research in cognitive psychology **has shown** that a little bit of reasoning goes a long way toward forming accurate beliefs. For example, people who **think** more analytically (those who **are** more likely to exercise their analytic skills and not just **trust** their “gut” response) **are** less superstitious, less likely to believe in conspiracy theories and less receptive to seemingly profound but actually empty assertions (like “Wholeness quiets infinite phenomena”). This body of evidence **suggests** that the main factor explaining the acceptance of fake news **could be** cognitive laziness, especially in the context of social media, where news items **are** often skimmed or merely **glanced at**.  
To test this possibility, we recently **ran** a set of studies in which participants of various political persuasions **indicated** whether they **believed** a series of news stories. We **showed** them real headlines **taken** from social media, some of which **were** true and some of which **were** false.