IJETIR

ISSN (Online) 2583-0554

International Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research (IJETIR)

Volume 6, Issue 3, March 2026

Impact Factor: 5.731

Influence of Political Misinformation on Voting Behavior: A Study of Social Media Users in Hisar District

Manjeet and Dr. Vijender Kumar

Research Scholar, Shri Jagdishprasad Jhabarmal Tibrewala University, Jhunjhunu, Rajasthan

Assistant Professor, Shri Jagdishprasad Jhabarmal Tibrewala University, Jhunjhunu, Rajasthan

Abstract: *The rapid dissemination of information, as well as misinformation, has been significantly facilitated by the proliferation of social media, which has significantly transformed political communication. This study examines the impact of political misinformation on the voting behavior of social media users in the Hisar District. The primary goal is to investigate the impact of deceptive or misleading political content on voter attitudes, perceptions, and electoral decisions. The primary data was collected from 200 respondents through structured questionnaires, and a descriptive and analytical research design was implemented. The following statistical tools were implemented: correlation, regression, ANOVA, and percentage analysis. The results indicate that a significant number of respondents frequently encounter political misinformation on social media platforms, which significantly influences their voting preferences. A positive correlation (r = 0.58) was observed between the change in voting behavior and the exposure to misinformation. The study also emphasizes that digital literacy and fact-checking behavior serve as moderators in the mitigation of the impact of misinformation. Political misinformation is a critical factor that shapes electoral behavior and presents challenges to democratic processes, according to the research. In order to combat misrepresentation, it underscores the necessity of more robust regulatory frameworks, public awareness campaigns, and digital literacy initiatives*

Keywords*:* Political Misinformation, Voting Behavior, Social Media, Fake News, Digital Literacy, Electoral Influence, Political Communication, Hisar District

I. INTRODUCTION

Social media platforms have become influential instruments for political communication in recent years, allowing political parties, candidates, and citizens to engage in real-time discourse. Nevertheless, these platforms have also become a breeding ground for the dissemination of misinformation, particularly during electoral periods, in addition to the advantages of accessibility and speed.

Political misinformation is the deliberate or inadvertent dissemination of false, misleading, or manipulated information with the intention of influencing public opinion. Social media's viral nature enables such content to rapidly reach a broad audience, frequently without verification. In contrast to traditional media, which is regulated by editorial supervision, social media lacks rigorous gatekeeping mechanisms, which facilitates the dissemination of misinformation.

Various factors, such as political ideology, socio-economic status, media exposure, and interpersonal communication, influence voting behavior, a critical component of democratic systems. Exposure to misinformation has become an increasingly significant factor in the decision-making process of voters in the digital era. Research suggests that misinformation has the potential to distort political perceptions, induce disorientation, and reinforce biases. It can also erode confidence in democratic institutions and processes. The impact of misinformation is particularly significant in semi-urban regions such as Hisar District, where digital adoption has increased at a rapid pace.

IJETIR
ISSN (Online) 2583-0554
International Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research (IJETIR)
Volume 6, Issue 3, March 2026
Impact Factor: 5.731

The objective of this investigation is to investigate the correlation between voting behavior and political misinformation, with a particular emphasis on social media users in the Hisar District. It has the objective of identifying factors that can reduce the impact of misinformation and to provide empirical evidence on how it influences electoral choices.

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The phenomenon of political misinformation has garnered substantial scholarly attention, particularly in the context of digital media.

The influence of fake news on voter decisions during elections was emphasized by Allcott and Gentzkow (2017), who emphasized that misinformation has the potential to substantially change public opinion. Vosoughi, Roy, and Aral (2018) discovered that false information disseminates more promptly and extensively than true information on social media platforms.

Lewandowsky et al. (2017) investigated the psychological mechanisms that contribute to the adoption of misinformation, concluding that cognitive biases and repetition exacerbate the belief in false information. In the same vein, Guess, Nyhan, and Reifler (2018) discovered that highly engaged social media users are more likely to be exposed to misinformation.

Research also indicates that political attitudes and voting intentions can be influenced by misinformation. For example, Tucker et al. (2018) contended that social media is particularly effective in amplifying misinformation during elections.

In the Indian context, research has underscored the increasing apprehension regarding the dissemination of misinformation during electoral processes. The rapid dissemination of unverified content and political allegations via messaging platforms has prompted concerns regarding the integrity of the electoral process.

Nevertheless, the majority of current research is centered on national-level analysis, with a scarcity of research on localized contexts, such as voter behavior at the district level. The Hisar District is the primary focus of this investigation, which aims to address this gap.

III. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

- To analyze the extent of exposure to political misinformation among social media users.
- To examine the impact of misinformation on voting behavior.
- To study the relationship between misinformation exposure and voter decision-making.
- To assess the role of digital literacy in mitigating misinformation.
- To suggest measures to reduce the influence of misinformation on voters.

IV. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

4.1 Research Design

Descriptive and analytical research design.

4.2 Data Collection

Primary Data: Structured questionnaire
Secondary Data: Journals, articles, reports

4.3 Sample Size

200 respondents
Stratified random sampling

4.4 Variables

Independent Variable: Exposure to misinformation
Dependent Variable: Voting behavior
Moderating Variable: Digital literacy

IJETIR
ISSN (Online) 2583-0554
International Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research (IJETIR)
Volume 6, Issue 3, March 2026
Impact Factor: 5.731

4.5 Tools of Analysis

Percentage
Correlation
Regression
ANOVA

V. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

5.1 Demographic Profile of Respondents

Table 5.1: Demographic Distribution (N = 200)

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Age	18–25	75	37.5%
	26–35	55	27.5%
	36–50	40	20%
	Above 50	30	15%
Gender	Male	118	59%
	Female	82	41%
Education	Graduate	90	45%
	Postgraduate	70	35%
	Others	40	20%

Interpretation:

The sample is largely young and educated, indicating higher likelihood of exposure to social media and political content.

5.2 Exposure to Political Misinformation

Table 5.2: Frequency of Exposure to Misinformation

Frequency	Respondents	Percentage (%)
Frequently	95	47.50%
Occasionally	70	35%
Rarely	35	17.50%

Interpretation:

A significant majority (82.5%) of respondents are exposed to misinformation either frequently or occasionally, indicating its widespread presence.

5.3 Types of Misinformation Encountered

Table 5.3: Nature of Political Misinformation

Type of Misinformation	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Fake News	80	40%
Misleading Headlines	55	27.50%
Edited/Manipulated Content	40	20%
Political Rumors	25	12.50%

Interpretation:

Fake news is the most prevalent form, followed by misleading headlines, highlighting the varied nature of misinformation.

IJETIR
ISSN (Online) 2583-0554
International Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research (IJETIR)
Volume 6, Issue 3, March 2026
Impact Factor: 5.731

5.4 Impact on Voting Behavior

Table 5.4: Influence of Misinformation on Voting Decisions

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Influenced	110	55%
Not Influenced	90	45%

Interpretation:
More than half of the respondents (55%) reported that misinformation influenced their voting decisions.

5.5 Misinformation Impact Scale (Likert-Based)

Table 5.5: Perception of Misinformation Influence

Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
"Misinformation changes my political opinion"	70	45	35	30	20
"I trust information shared on social media"	65	50	30	35	20
"I verify political information before believing"	40	50	35	45	30

Interpretation:
High agreement indicates strong influence of misinformation
Lower verification behavior increases vulnerability

5.6 Correlation Analysis

Table 5.6: Correlation between Misinformation Exposure and Voting Behavior

Variables	Correlation Coefficient (r)	Significance (p-value)
Misinformation Exposure vs Voting Behavior	**0.58**	0

Interpretation:
Moderate to strong positive correlation
Statistically significant (**$p < 0.01$**)
Confirms that increased exposure leads to changes in voting behavior

5.7 Regression Analysis

Model:
Voting Behavior = $\beta_0 + \beta_1$ (Misinformation Exposure) + ε

Table 5.7: Regression Results

Variable	Beta (β)	t-value	Significance
Constant	1.1	2.85	0.005
Misinformation Exposure	**0.63**	7.95	0

Model Summary:

R	R^2	Adjusted R^2
0.58	0.34	0.33

Interpretation:
Misinformation explains **34% variation** in voting behavior
Strong predictive power
Highly significant relationship

IJETIR
ISSN (Online) 2583-0554
International Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research (IJETIR)
Volume 6, Issue 3, March 2026
Impact Factor: 5.731

5.8 ANOVA Test

Table 5.8: ANOVA Results

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-value	Significance
Regression	48.6	1	48.6	**65.2**	0
Residual	91.4	198	0.46		
Total	140	199			

Interpretation:
Model is statistically significant (**F = 65.2, p < 0.001**)
Confirms reliability of regression model

5.9 Role of Digital Literacy (Moderating Effect)

Table 5.9: Digital Literacy vs Susceptibility to Misinformation

Digital Literacy Level	High Influence	Moderate	Low Influence
Low Literacy	60	20	10
Medium Literacy	30	25	20
High Literacy	20	15	20

Interpretation:
Lower digital literacy = higher susceptibility
Higher literacy reduces misinformation impact

5.10 Discussion

The findings clearly demonstrate that political misinformation significantly influences voting behavior among social media users.

High Exposure Rate
The majority of respondents frequently encounter misinformation, confirming its widespread presence.

Behavioral Impact
More than half of respondents admitted that misinformation influenced their voting decisions.

Statistical Evidence
Correlation (r = 0.58) and regression results confirm a strong and significant relationship.

Psychological Influence
Misinformation exploits cognitive biases, leading to belief reinforcement.

Role of Digital Literacy
Users with higher digital literacy are less influenced, indicating the importance of awareness.

VI. CONCLUSION

This study examined the influence of political misinformation on voting behavior among social media users in Hisar District. The findings provide strong empirical evidence that misinformation circulating on digital platforms significantly shapes voter perceptions, attitudes, and electoral decisions.

The analysis revealed that a large proportion of respondents are frequently exposed to political misinformation in various forms, including fake news, misleading headlines, and manipulated content. This widespread exposure highlights the pervasive nature of misinformation in the digital ecosystem, particularly during politically sensitive periods such as elections.

A key finding of the study is the statistically significant relationship between misinformation exposure and voting behavior. The correlation (r = 0.58) and regression results confirm that misinformation is a strong predictor of changes in voter decision-making. Individuals who are more frequently exposed to misinformation are more likely to alter their political opinions, often without verifying the authenticity of the information.

The study also identifies the presence of cognitive and behavioral factors that amplify the impact of misinformation. Many respondents demonstrated a tendency to trust and share political content without adequate verification, which contributes to the rapid spread of false information. This creates a cycle where misinformation is continuously reinforced within social networks.

An important moderating factor identified in the study is digital literacy. Respondents with higher levels of digital awareness and fact-checking behavior were less susceptible to misinformation. This suggests that education and awareness play a crucial role in mitigating the negative effects of misleading content.

The implications of these findings are significant for democratic processes. Misinformation has the potential to distort electoral outcomes by influencing voter choices based on inaccurate or manipulated information. It can also erode public trust in political institutions and create confusion among voters.

Recommendations

Enhancement of Digital Literacy

Educational initiatives should be implemented to improve critical thinking and fact-checking skills among social media users.

Regulation of Social Media Platforms

Stronger policies and monitoring mechanisms are needed to identify and limit the spread of misinformation.

Promotion of Fact-Checking Mechanisms:

Independent fact-checking organizations should be encouraged and integrated with social media platforms.

Public Awareness Campaigns

Government and civil society should collaborate to educate citizens about the dangers of misinformation.

Algorithmic Accountability

Platforms should ensure transparency in content recommendation systems to reduce the amplification of false information.

Limitations of the Study

The study is limited to a specific geographic area and may not represent broader populations.

Data is based on self-reported responses, which may include bias.

The cross-sectional design limits the ability to establish long-term causal relationships.

Future Scope

Future research can focus on comparative studies across regions, longitudinal analysis of misinformation effects, and experimental designs to better understand causal relationships.

REFERENCES

[1]. Allcott, H., & Gentzkow, M. (2017). Social media and fake news in the 2016 election. *Journal of Economic Perspectives, 31*(2), 211–236.

[2]. Bakshy, E., Messing, S., & Adamic, L. A. (2015). Exposure to ideologically diverse news on Facebook. *Science, 348*(6239), 1130–1132.

[3]. Bail, C. A. (2021). *Breaking the social media prism: How to make our platforms less polarizing*. Princeton University Press.

[4]. Bruns, A. (2019). *Are filter bubbles real?* Polity Press.

[5]. Cinelli, M., Morales, G. D. F., Galeazzi, A., et al. (2021). The echo chamber effect on social media. *PNAS, 118*(9).

[6]. Del Vicario, M., Bessi, A., Zollo, F., et al. (2016). The spreading of misinformation online. *PNAS, 113*(3), 554–559.

[7]. Dubois, E., & Blank, G. (2018). The echo chamber is overstated. *Information, Communication & Society, 21*(5), 729–745.

[8]. Fletcher, R., & Nielsen, R. K. (2017). News audience fragmentation. *Digital Journalism, 5*(4), 476–494.

[9]. Garrett, R. K. (2009). Politically motivated selective exposure. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 14*(2), 265–285.

[10]. Guess, A., Nyhan, B., & Reifler, J. (2018). Selective exposure to misinformation.

[11]. Lewandowsky, S., Ecker, U. K. H., & Cook, J. (2017). Beyond misinformation. *Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition, 6*(4), 353–369.

[12]. Nguyen, T. T., Hui, P. M., Harper, F. M., et al. (2014). Exploring filter bubbles. *WWW Conference Proceedings*, 677–686.

[13]. Sunstein, C. R. (2017). *#Republic: Divided democracy in the age of social media*. Princeton University Press.

[14]. Tucker, J. A., Guess, A., Barberá, P., et al. (2018). Social media and political polarization. *Political Science Quarterly*.

[15]. Vosoughi, S., Roy, D., & Aral, S. (2018). Spread of true and false news online. *Science, 359*(6380), 1146–1151.

[16]. Zuiderveen Borgesius, F. J., Trilling, D., et al. (2016). Should we worry about filter bubbles? *Internet Policy Review, 5*(1).