Credibility of Scientific Information on Social Media: Variation by Platform and Presence of Formal Credibility Cues

Clara Boothby^{1*}, Dakota Murray¹, Anna Polovick Waggy¹, Andrew Tsou¹, Cassidy R. Sugimoto¹

¹ School of Informatics, Computing, and Engineering, Indiana University Bloomington, Bloomington, Indiana, United States of America

Abstract

Responding to calls to take a more active role in communicating their research findings, scientists are increasingly using open online platforms, such as Twitter, to engage in science communication or to publicize their work. Given the ease at which misinformation spreads on these platforms it is important for scientists to present their findings in a manner that appears credible. To examine the extent to which the online presentation of science information relates to its perceived credibility, we designed and conducted two surveys on Amazon's Mechanical Turk. In the first survey, participants rated the credibility of science information on Twitter compared with the same information other platforms, and in the second, participants rated the credibility of tweets with modified characteristics: presence of an image, text sentiment, and the number of likes/retweets. We find that similar information about scientific findings is perceived as less credible when presented on Twitter compared to other platforms, and that perceived credibility increases when presented with recognizable features of a scientific article. On a platform as widely distrusted as Twitter, use of these features may allow researchers who regularly use Twitter for research-related networking and communication to present their findings in the most credible formats.

Keywords

Science Communication; Credibility; Twitter; Platform; Scholarly Communication; Social Media

1. Introduction

Scientific institutions and scientists themselves are increasingly making use of online communication platforms to disseminate scientific findings (Duggan et al., 2015). Covering science in informal outlets, such as Twitter, alongside traditional science news and peer-reviewed journal articles has the potential to reach a cross-section of science enthusiasts (Büchi, 2016; Ranger & Bultitude, 2014). However, presented with this crowded online arena, readers will employ various heuristics, conscious and unconscious, to assess the credibility of information (Flanagin & Metzger, 2007). Here, we define *credibility* as a perceived feature of trustworthiness that readers apply to information they encounter (Schmierbach & Oeldorf-Hirsch, 2012). If writers and publishers of online science information want information they present to be seen as credible, they will need to be cognizant of the methods users employ to make these judgements. In this study we focus on describing features, of both platforms and text, that contribute to user perceptions of the credibility of science information when presented online. How and where scientists present their work may enhance or undermine its credibility, and a stronger understanding of these features is important to upholding the credibility of reliable science information, particularly in platforms that struggle to filter out misinformation.

The reasons for science journalists to present their work online is self-evident, but there are also many reasons for scientists to present their findings online. In addition to science outreach, many researchers find general-use social media applications useful during many stages of research, including selecting research questions, collaborating, publicizing findings, and keeping up to date on recent publications (Collins et al., 2016; Côté & Darling, 2018; Holmberg et al., 2014; Rowlands et al., 2011; Tenopir et al., 2013). The utility of general use social media emerges in part from their lower time demands and barriers to entry than more traditional forms of outreach (McClain, 2017), and Twitter in particular has been a major platform used by scientists for outreach (Côté & Darling, 2018; Mohammadi et al., 2018).

The use of Twitter among scientists also appears to be increasing, as the majority of those users reported having their accounts for less than two years (Collins et al., 2016). While the choice of whether or not to engage in informal online science communication has been the subject of some controversy (Collins et al., 2016; Yammine et al., 2018), there is less guidance about selecting between the myriad of platforms for online engagement or about effectively composing posts. As many researchers are poised to engage in social media as a professional task, the stakes are high for maintaining the credibility of the information they present online.

Credibility is understood as a subjective feature that is perceived by individual readers and not an innate feature of the information (Bian, 2012; Schmierbach & Oeldorf-Hirsch, 2012; Shariff et al., 2017; Tseng & Fogg, 1999). As such, online credibility evaluations are commonly understood to be influenced by *formal cues*, the features surrounding the presentation of information, such as website design, source attribution, and genre conventions (Flanagin & Metzger, 2007). Even within a single online platform, differences in writing style and narrative frame (Shariff et al., 2017), cues indicating audience reception (Winter & Krämer, 2014), and the perception of both scientific and social consensus (Kobayashi, 2018) can often affect the credibility of scientific information. Complicating the influence of these formal features on credibility, specific media platforms often have strong reputations among users that affect their perceptions of the information on those platforms (Lucassen & Schraagen, 2013; Winter & Krämer, 2014). While it would be challenging to disentangle a platform's reputation from the influence of formal cues, information on Twitter is often considered less credible than on other online news platforms news media (Schmierbach & Oeldorf-Hirsch, 2012). However, as Twitter has recently come into wider usage in academic contexts (Collins et al., 2016), an updated study focusing on the credibility of scientific information on Twitter is needed.

Despite the recency of the movement, academic twitter has already adopted several conventions in the composition of tweets concerning scientific findings. Tweets about science exhibit a high incidence of

linking URLs, and tweets also frequently employ "mentioning" (including other's user ids) as another way to refer outwards to additional information or support (Büchi, 2016; Schmitt & Jäschke, 2017). Furthermore, since scientists frequently use Twitter to promote new publications (Holmberg et al., 2014), several features of the scientific paper that are readily transferrable to tweets, such as the title, abstract, and figures, are formal cues that may contribute to credibility. Outside the fringes of discourse, the public sees scientists as trusted sources of reliable scientific information such that trust in scientists may "spill over" into higher rates of trust for science-specific media (Brewer & Ley, 2013). For known scientists to personally endorse science information, even by briefly acknowledging their authorship or positive evaluation of the information, may similarly confer a boost to that information's credibility. It may also be possible that formal cues that are strongly and widely associated with academic research, such as scientific abstracts or figures, may also confer increased credibility for science information. Social approval can strongly impact credibility evaluations (Kobayashi, 2018; Winter & Krämer, 2014) indicators of reception may also positively correlate with perceived credibility. Most social media platforms have some means for users to rate content (e.g., "Like", "Favorite" and "Share") and to view aggregated ratings of others—these indicators of social approval may impact perceptions of credibility. In this study, we used online surveys through Amazon's Mechanical Turk (AMT) to examine the perceived credibility of scientific information appearing across several popular online media platforms, with a focus on Twitter. We explored both the relative credibility of Twitter compared with other platforms and the extent to which various formal and textual features within Twitter are related to the perceived credibility of scientific information. We focus on Twitter because Twitter is widely used for the dissemination of science information (Mohammadi et al., 2018), and it has higher rates of participation for scientists than other social media platforms, even as the platform is beset with concerns over the credibility of its content (Shao et al., 2018; Vosoughi et al., 2018). Amidst these concerns, this study will offer a more concrete evaluation of Twitter's credibility compared with other platforms commonly used

for disseminating science information. While the primary goal of this study is a descriptive understanding of the features that contribute to information's perceived credibility on Twitter, the results of this study will also inform recommendations for composing tweets about scientific papers that are more likely to be perceived as credible.

2. Methods

We conducted a study in two parts. In Part One, we conducted a survey through Amazon's Mechanical Turk (AMT) investigating user credibility evaluations of real-world instances of media coverage in Twitter compared to four other online platforms: Online Video, Blogs, News Articles, and Scientific Abstracts. The results of this survey were used to assess the extent to which the perceived credibility of information on Twitter differs from that of other common platforms. In Part Two, we conducted a survey that asked respondents to rate the credibility of artificially-constructed tweets. The results of this survey were used to determine the extent to which a tweet's perceived credibility was related to its formal cues.

2.1 Material selection.

Part One compared the degree of perceived credibility of tweets against other forms of media. We used Altmetric.com, a major altmetric data aggregator, to identify and sample journal articles that appeared at least once in a news site, a blog, on Twitter, and in an online video. Out of these media types, only Twitter is a specific branded platform; however because each type represents a specific genre with stylistic and formal conventions, we will refer to each source as a "platform" that is hosting and presenting the scientific information. We used purposive sampling to identify five articles across a range of topics. These studies and their abbreviated labels are provided in Table 1.

At the time of sampling, relatively few articles were covered on all four platforms; this is an admitted limitation of the present study and is further addressed in our discussion. In total, we had 25 unique

topic/platform combinations. For each of the text examples (Twitter, abstract, news, and blog) a screenshot was taken with no modification. However, given the heterogeneity of the sources, the screenshots were cropped in order to remove varying contextual influences and identifying information as well as to enforce a similar size and proportion was across all screenshots. We maintained all titles, bylines, and some pictures to keep the sources in their original form. Examples of screenshots for one study is provided in Fig 1.

Table 1. Abbreviated labels given to studies and Statements of Fact used in the Part One survey

Label	Study title	Reference
Caffeine	Post-study caffeine administration enhances memory consolidation in humans	(Borota et al., 2014)[24]
Dogs	Dogs are sensitive to small variations of the Earth's magnetic field	(Hart et al., 2013)[25]
Sweeteners	Artificial sweeteners induce glucose intolerance by altering the gut microbiota	(Suez et al., 2014)[26]
Vitamins	Vitamin D and the risk of dementia and Alzheimer disease	(Littlejohns et al., 2014)[27]
Marriage	'A Diamond is Forever' and Other Fairy Tales: The Relationship between Wedding Expenses and Marriage Duration	(Francis-Tan & Mialon, 2015)[28]

A. Scientific Abstract

'A Diamond is Forever' and Other Fairy Tales: The Relationship between Wedding Expenses and Marriage Duration

[Andrew M. Francis](#)

Emory University - Department of Economics

[Hugo M. Mialon](#)

Emory University - Department of Economics

September 15, 2014

Abstract:

In this paper, we evaluate the association between wedding spending and marriage duration using data from a survey of over 3,000 ever-married persons in the United States. Controlling for a number of demographic and relationship characteristics, we find evidence that marriage duration is inversely associated with spending on the engagement ring and wedding ceremony.

Number of Pages in PDF File: 17

Keywords: wedding expenses, engagement ring, marriage duration, divorce

JEL Classification: J12, Z1, D1

B. News Article

HEALTH

The Divorce-Proof Marriage

Your income, how long you dated, and how many people attend your wedding affect the odds you'll stay together.

Cory Doctorow/Pixar

OLGA KHAZAN | OCT 14, 2014

A diamond is forever, but an expensive engagement ring means the marriage might not last that long. According to a [new study](#), spending between \$2,000 and \$4,000 on an engagement ring is significantly associated with an increase in the risk of divorce.

C. Blog Post

Will a Cheap Wedding Help Your Marriage? A Lesson in Causation

ARTICLE COMMENTS (19)

CB RESEARCH CENSUS BUREAU CONSUMER SPENDING CONSUMPTION

Email Print Facebook Twitter LinkedIn

By SARAH PORTLOCK CONTACT

New research studied whether the cost of a wedding and the marriage's duration were related. Many interpreted the data as "cheap weddings make for long-lasting marriages." Not necessarily. —Giphy Images

Recent popular headlines seemed to suggest spending less on your wedding may help your marriage. Well, maybe.

Two economists at Emory University — Hugo Mialon and Andrew Francis — looked into whether the cost of an engagement ring and wedding have anything to do with how long a marriage might last. The message proffered to lovebirds from the multibillion-dollar wedding industry is certainly along those lines, they note. They titled their paper, "A Diamond is Forever" and Other Fairy Tales" and it boiled down to this line: "The evidence suggests that the types of weddings associated with lower likelihood of divorce are those that are relatively inexpensive but are high in attendance."

D. Video

Are diamonds really a girl's best friend? What your ring may say about your marriage

E. Tweet

Skeptical Scalpel @SkepticalScalpel

Follow

Study: The more expensive the ring and the wedding, the higher the rate of divorce. papers.ssm.com/sol3/papers.cf...

Fig 1. Examples of screenshots shown to survey respondents. All examples included in this figure relate to the journal article "Post-study caffeine administration enhances memory consolidation in humans" [24]. Listed are screenshots shown to respondents to assess the credibility of (A) the journal abstract, (B) a news article, (C) a blog post, (D) an online video (respondent would view the entire video); and (E) a tweet about the information in the study. Access to all screenshots used in the study is available at <https://github.com/murrayds/>.

100 Given that Twitter has been identified as a resource for paper sharing among academic scientists
 101 (Mohammadi et al., 2018), Part Two of the study focused exclusively on identifying features in tweets
 102 that were most strongly associated with high perceived credibility. Our sample was drawn from a s
 103 single field-specific journal, the *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, in order to control for the field
 104 differences observed in Part One. The labels given to each of the studies included in Part Two are listed
 105 in Table S1.

Fig 2. Example of tweet screenshots shown to survey respondents. Twelve tweet variants were constructed for each of the 14 studies used in the second survey. Each constructed tweet contained a combination of features relating to (A) whether there was a claim of ownership, (B) its audience reception, (C) the phrasing of its title, and (D) the presence of a visual. Username and profile images were removed. Because only twelve tweets were created for each study, not all possible tweet variants exist for every study; instead, each study only contains twelve of the possible feature combinations, organized such that all features are equally represented.

106 We constructed a series of sample tweets based on each article, with varying combinations of the
 107 following characteristics: 1) Use of first person possessive language like “our” to indicate authorial

ownership of the paper's findings; 2) Low, medium, or high tweet reception numbers in the form of likes and retweets; 3) Use of verbatim paper title, neutral paraphrase, or positive paraphrase; and 4) the presence of a figure from the selected paper, its abstract, or no visual. We gave the impression that identifying details, such as a Twitter handle or profile picture, were removed by placing a grey box where this information should appear. Each tweet contained a URL to its corresponding journal article as it common for science tweets (Büchi, 2016), but tweets were presented as images and so the link was not clickable. All tweet screenshots are included in the supporting material of this study. Examples of constructed tweets are provided in Fig 2.

2.2 Survey: Part One

We sought user credibility judgements using Amazon's Mechanical Turk (AMT) service, a crowd-sourcing application where respondents are solicited to perform tasks in exchange for monetary payment. Drawing survey participants from Amazon's Mechanical Turk is a common research procedure that is accepted to be a reputable means for recruiting a diverse set of survey participants in the current survey-weary climate (Cassese et al., 2013; Sheehan & Pittman, 2016).

All responses to Part One of the survey were obtained on June 16th and 17th, 2015. Five distinct Human Intelligence Tasks (HITs) were generated in AMT. Each HIT was a set of five distinct topics from each of the five platforms, which ensured that topic and platform was presented to each participant. While the embedded video needed to be presented last due to technological constraints, the other platforms and the topics were presented to respondents in several shuffled sequences. A pilot test was conducted with two participants that was used to refine the presentation of the HIT. The recruitment material is presented in Text SI.1. We asked those who had completed one of the previous News Credibility HITs to not complete another because, once exposed to the five topics, the respondent's impressions of credibility and familiarity would likely be compromised. Even though a participant could theoretically look up the author or articles, they were not directly linked to the sources.

Title: News credibility

Description: You will be shown a variety of news sources on a variety of topics. You will be asked to assess the credibility of these sources, as well as your familiarity with the topics.

Keywords: news, classification

Instructions: The following HIT is designed to assess the degree to which you believe that a statement is credible. Please read/view all materials carefully. The results of this research will not be used to identify you.

"NOTE: If you have already completed one of these News Credibility HITs, do NOT complete any further HITs. Your work will be rejected if you do!"

Fig 3. Presentation of HIT.

Once the respondent accepted a HIT, they were presented with a series of screenshots followed by a video for the five topics. While the video was presented last due to the need to embed it, the order of the screenshots was randomized. In addition, a statement corresponding with the topic was presented. As with the topics that were chosen, these statements were limited by the need for them to appear clearly in all five platforms for each topic. They were intended to be simple so that it was clear they directly corresponded to the finding of each original article. The statements of fact corresponding to each article were as follows in Table 2.

Table 2. Statements of Fact for Each topic

Topic Label	Statement of Fact
Caffeine	Caffeine can improve memory.
Dogs	Dogs are sensitive to Earth's magnetic field.
Sweeteners	Artificial sweeteners may lead to diabetes.
Vitamins	Vitamin D deficiency causes an increased risk of dementia and Alzheimer disease.
Marriage	Marriage duration is inversely associated with spending on the engagement ring and wedding.

Following the statement, participants were asked the following in the survey interface:

1. Based on this source, how credible do you find the following statement on a scale of 1-7, with 1 being "not at all credible" and 7 being "very credible"?
2. Before viewing this HIT, how familiar were you with this topic on a scale of 1-7, with 1 being "not at all familiar" and 7 being "very familiar"?

After responding to the five topic/genre combinations, respondents were asked to provide basic demographic information (i.e., gender, age, location, education level). Respondents selected Gender

from one of “Male”, “Female”, or “Other”. Age was entered freely as an integer. Location was selected as either from the United States or not. Users selected their highest education earned from a list of seven categories including “less than high school”, “high school”, “Associate”, “Bachelors”, “Masters”, “Doctorate”, or “Professional”; to simplify analysis this variable was later collapsed into a binary variable indicating whether or not the respondent had obtained a university degree (Bachelors, Masters, Doctoral, or Professional). Each of these questions allowed for no answer to be provided, which would result in a missing value. Respondents were also offered a free-input box to detail any issues that they had with reading the textual excerpts or viewing the videos (which were hosted on YouTube or embedded in news websites).

HITs were sent in batches over the course of the two days to recruit sufficient numbers of participants with no duplication. Respondents were initially paid \$0.10 per HIT. However, given the length of time that it took to complete the HIT this was increased to \$0.25 per HIT for the final batch. A validation question (“What is two plus two?”) was added to detect participants who were answering questions randomly or otherwise not paying full attention to the task.

After removing records of respondents who failed the validation question and duplicate respondents (in which case the respondent’s first response was kept and all later responses excluded), the final dataset consisted of 4,601 responses from 924 respondents. Most respondents for Part One, 56.0 percent, were male (n = 517), and 2.9 percent (n = 27) selected either “other” or provided no gender. The average age of a respondent was 33 years, whereas the median age was 30 years old. The majority, 58.7 percent, of respondents reported having a university degree or higher (n = 542). The majority of respondents, 90.8 percent, reported their location as within the United States (n = 839).

2.3 Survey: Part Two

In order to assess the relationship between tweet characteristics and perceptions of credibility, we performed a second survey with Amazon’s Mechanical Turk using artificially constructed tweets (see the Materials section) on December 15th, 2017. The description of the new HITs read as follows: “You will be shown a variety of tweets on a variety of topics. You will be asked to assess the credibility of these tweets.” Participants were paid \$0.25 for completing one HIT and were prohibited from responding to more than one HIT using the Unique Turker script (Ott, 2016).

Participants were shown 14 tweet variants on each of the 14 distinct topics. While the order of the topics remained constant, from topic 1 to topic 14, the variations and combinations of tweet features was shuffled for different respondents. For each tweet, the participants were instructed to answer, “How credible do you find this tweet on a scale of 1-7, with 1 being “not at all credible” and 7 being “very credible?” A series of demographic questions were posed at the end of the HIT that were presented and processed in the same fashion as for Part One. A validation question (i.e., “What is 2+2?”) was also asked, and a comment box was provided. The most frequent comments related to the size and/or resolution of certain tweets, which participants reported made it more difficult to ascertain their credibility.

After removing records of respondents who failed the validation question the final dataset for Part Two consisted of 1,568 responses by 112 respondents. The demographics of Part Two survey respondents was similar to those of Part One, though with fewer U.S. respondents and more having a university degree or higher. The majority of respondents for Part Two, 55.4 percent (n = 62) identified themselves as male, and three either reported their gender as “other” or did not report a gender. The average age of a respondent was 35 years, whereas the median age 32 years old. The majority, 69.9 percent, of respondents reported having a university degree or higher (n = 78). The majority of respondents, 75.9 percent, reported their location as within the United States (n = 85).

2.3 Analysis.

For Part One, we used the data from the first survey to investigate the respondent's views of a statement's credibility and its relationship to the platform of presentation. The relationship between stated credibility and platform was assessed with a linear mixed effects model with the worker ID of the survey respondents as the random intercept in order to account for variability between respondents, implemented using the R package lme4 (Bates et al., 2015). In the resulting regression, the stated credibility (an integer from one to seven) was used as the response variable and the platform as a predictor variable. The predictor *platform* was a categorical variable for which "abstract" was set as the reference level. The topic of study was included as a control variable and represented as a categorical variable for which "Caffeine" (see Table S2) was set as the reference level. We also controlled for the respondent's stated familiarity with the topic (integer from one to seven). Other control variables included the gender, age (in decades), education level, and location of the respondent. Records with missing values accounted for only about 3.4 percent of total responses and were excluded from the regression analysis. We followed this regression with a series of univariate analyses that were used to investigate the extent to which the distribution of and mean credibility differed between combinations of the platform of presentation and topic of the study.

For Part Two, using the data from the second survey we conducted another linear mixed effects model with the worker ID as the random intercept to assess the extent to which the characteristics of tweets related to their perceived credibility. A regression analysis was used in which the stated credibility (an integer from one to seven) was used as the response variable and the characteristics of the tweet as the predictor variables. Four predictor variables were used to characterize each tweet. These included 1) a binary variable indicating whether the tweet's author claimed ownership of the study; 2) a categorical variable indicating whether the tweet contained no visual (reference level), a figure from the paper, or a screenshot of the abstract; 3) a categorical variable indicating whether the tweet had a low (reference

level), medium, or high reception, characterized by the number of likes and retweets (see examples in supplemental materials); and 4) a categorical variable indicating whether the tweet included the title of the paper (reference level), a positive paraphrase of the title, or a negative paraphrase of the title. We controlled for topic of the study which was represented as a categorical with 14 levels, of which the first was held as the reference (Table S4). Other control variables included respondent demographics which were coded in the same way as in the first regression in Part One. The three respondents who did not report a gender were excluded from the second regression analysis.

All data pre-processing and analysis was carried out using the programming language R 3.5.1 and RStudio version 1.1.46. Code and anonymized data to replicate this analysis have been made available at <https://github.com/murrayds/sci-online-credibility>.

3. Results

The object of this study has been the relationship between the perceived credibility of science information and the platform on which it was presented, and the extent to which several language and formal features on a salient platform, Twitter, contributes to perceived credibility. In this section, we present the results of the analyses of participant responses indicating perceived credibility of science information from two surveys, the first on perceived credibility on five different online platforms and the second on different presentations within Twitter, one of the salient platforms in Part One.

Using an analysis of the Part One survey, we addressed the extent to which science information will be credible on Twitter compared to science information on other platforms. As shown in Fig 4, all topics were associated with lower credibility than the “Caffeine” study (see Table 1 for the terms that were used for each study topic) with the “Dogs” topic being the least credible ($\beta = -0.69$, $CI = [-0.82, -0.55]$), followed by “Marriage”, ($\beta = -0.57$, $CI = [-0.71, -0.44]$); the credibility of the “Vitamins”, ($\beta = -0.047$, $CI =$

230 [-0.18, 0.09]), and “Sweeteners” ($\beta = -0.029$, CI = [-0.17, 0.10]) topics were only slightly lower than the
231 “caffeine” topic. The respondent’s stated familiarity with the topic was the largest positive predictor of
232 credibility ($\beta = 0.23$, CI = [0.20, 0.25]). Compared to female respondents, being male was associated with
233 lower perceptions of credibility ($\beta = -0.076$, CI = [-0.19, 0.04]) whereas a gender of “other” or “unknown”
234 was associated with even lower credibility, though with wide confidence intervals ($\beta = -0.31$, CI = [-0.65,
235 0.04]). The age of respondents was trivially associated with increased perceived credibility ($\beta = 0.0036$,
236 CI = [-0.051, 0.059]). Compared to those with associates degrees or lower (“Associates-”), respondents
237 with a university degree or higher (“University+”) were trivially associated with lower perceived
238 credibility ($\beta = -0.004$, CI = [-0.12, 0.094]). A respondent being from the U.S. was associated with lower
239 perceived credibility ($\beta = -0.50$, CI = [-0.71, -0.28]).

240 Controlling for topic and respondent demographics, all platforms were associated with lower credibility
241 than journal abstracts. The platform with credibility scores most similar to journal abstracts were news
242 articles ($\beta = -0.77$, CI = [-0.91, -0.64]), followed by online video ($\beta = -0.78$, CI = [-0.92, -0.65]), blogs ($\beta = -$
243 0.94, CI = [-1.08, -0.80]), and finally tweets, which were associated with 1.4 points lower credibility than
244 abstracts ($\beta = -1.4$, CI = [-1.54, -1.27]). The ANOVA of the linear model (Table S3) revealed that the
245 platform accounted for the largest proportion of total variance, followed by the stated familiarity and
246 the topic of study. The demographics of respondents accounted for little of the total variance.

Fig 4. Abstracts are most credible and tweets are least credible. (A) Coefficients of mixed effects linear regression using the Credibility (1-7, treated as continuous) as the response variable. The x-axis corresponds to the coefficients for each predictor variable listed on the y-axis. Error bars correspond to the 95th percentile confidence intervals. The effects of predictor variable of interest, platform, have been highlighted. For Platform, the factor level “Abstract” has been held as the reference level. For Topic, “Caffeine” was the reference level. For Gender, “Female” was the reference level. For Education, “Associate-” (associates degree or lower) was the reference level. More detailed output can be found in Table S1. (B) Boxplots of the distribution of credibility scores for each platform. The notch corresponds to the median value, whereas the red line corresponds to the mean. Dots represent each observation scattered around each possible Credibility value. Labels refer to the number of responses for each credibility score as a proportion of all responses for that platform. (C) The distribution of responses for each Platform/Topic combination. The black dashed line refers to the mean of each distribution, which is also stated in the top left of each plot.

247 We also investigated the distribution of responses for each platform in Fig 4, which reinforced our
 248 findings. Abstracts were associated with the largest (median = 5, mean = 5.11) and tweets with the

lowest (median = 4, mean = 3.61) credibility ratings, 1.5 points of difference. Put another way, abstracts were associated with around 40 percent greater credibility than tweets. Tweets also received the largest proportion of one-point credibility ratings (17.5 percent) and had the lowest 25th percentile rating of two points.

While general patterns can be observed between platforms, there is also heterogeneity between topics, (Fig 4). In all but one topic (“Caffeine”) abstracts had the highest credibility on average. This is true even for the “Vitamin” topic, for which respondents complained that the screenshot of the abstract was too blurry to read. For all but one topic (“Sweeteners”), tweets had the lowest credibility ratings, with the lowest overall for “Dogs”: for this topic the distribution of ratings for tweets was nearly the inverse of the abstract, the former received a plurality of one-point ratings whereas abstracts received a plurality of seven-point ratings. It is more difficult to discern clear patterns among the remaining platforms, though taken together, Figs 4A, 4B and 4C suggest that online videos and news articles received roughly similar credibility ratings, whereas blogs tended to receive lower ratings than news outlets but higher than tweets.

Tweets were associated with the lowest credibility ratings compared to all other platforms. However, Twitter remains one of the most popular media platforms used by researchers (Piwowar, 2013; Rowlands et al., 2011; Tenopir et al., 2013; Van Noorden, 2014). While researchers have little control over the platform constraints of Twitter itself, there are possibly actions they can take to compose tweets in a way that maximizes their perceived credibility. In the second part of this study we assessed the extent to which *formal cues* of tweets related to their credibility. Specifically, whether source cues indicating a closer association with the scientists or the scientific process will be associated with higher perceived credibility, and whether indicators of reception positively correlate with perceived credibility.

271 In Fig 5, we present the results of a multiple linear regression applied to the responses for Survey Two,
272 using the credibility rating as the response and tweet characteristics, topic, and respondent
273 demographics as predictor variables. Topic 1 was held as the reference level, and compared to this
274 reference, all topics were associated with higher credibility except for topic 2, which was trivially
275 associated with lower credibility. The topic associated with the highest credibility was topic 14, which
276 was associated with a 1.9 point higher score than topic 1 ($\beta = 1.9$, $CI = [2.6, 3.2]$). The effects observed
277 when controlling for other variables differed from the univariate distribution of credibility by topic (see
278 Figure SI.2), for which topic 6 had the highest average credibility and topic 12 had the lowest. Male
279 respondents were trivially associated with higher perceived credibility ratings than female respondents
280 ($\beta = 0.049$, $CI = [-0.33, 0.42]$). Older participants were also only trivially associated with lower perceived
281 credibility ratings ($\beta = -0.074$, $CI = [-0.24, 0.096]$), and respondents with a university degree or higher
282 ("University+") were trivially associated with greater credibility ratings ($\beta = 0.015$, $CI = [-0.42, 0.45]$)
283 when compared to those with associates degrees or lower ("Associates-"). A respondent being from the
284 U.S. was associated with lower credibility ratings ($\beta = -0.30$, $CI = [-0.78, -0.17]$). All of these findings
285 reinforce those found in Part One.

Fig 5. Charts and graphs associated with greater credibility. (A) Coefficients of linear regression using the Credibility (1-7, treated as continuous) as the response variable. The x-axis corresponds to the coefficients for each predictor variable listed on the y-axis. Error bars correspond to the 95th percentile confidence intervals. The effects of predictor variable of interest, tweet characteristics, have been highlighted. For presence of visual, “no visual” was the reference; for title phrasing “no paraphrase” was the reference; for claim of ownership, “no claim” was the reference; for reception, “low” was the reference. For Topic, “Caffeine” was the reference level. For Gender, “Female” was the reference level. For Education, “Associate-” (associates degrees or lower) was the reference level. More detailed output can be found in Table S3. (B-E) Boxplots of the distribution of credibility scores across tweet characteristics for (B) presence of a title, (C) claim of ownership, (D) phrasing of the title, and (E) the reception of the tweet. The notch of the boxplot indicates the median value, whereas the red line indicates the mean. Dots represent each of the observations scattered around each possible Credibility value. Labels refer to the number of responses for each credibility score as a proportion of all responses for that feature.

286 The tweet features indicating the presence of a visual accounted for the greatest total variance,
287 followed by topic of the paper (see the ANOVA in Table S5). Controlling for topic and respondent
288 demographics, tweets that contained a chart from the paper were associated with a full 2.30 points
289 higher credibility rating than tweets that did not contain any visual ($\beta = 2.30$, $CI = [1.0, 3.6]$) which was
290 held as reference, even as the confidence interval was quite wide. Similarly, tweets that featured a
291 screenshot of the abstract were associated with 1.5 points higher credibility than those with no visual (β
292 $= 1.5$, $CI = [0.88, 2.2]$). Paraphrasing, both positive and neutral, was associated with lower credibility
293 than no paraphrasing— 0.31 point lower for Neutral paraphrasing ($\beta = -0.31$, $CI = [-0.73, -0.16]$) and
294 0.065 lower for positive paraphrasing ($\beta = -0.065$, $CI = [-0.34, -0.12]$)—but only trivially as the confidence
295 interval for both conditions crossed 0. Claiming ownership in a tweet was associated with a trivially
296 greater credibility ratings than not ($\beta = 0.032$, $CI = [-0.15, 0.21]$). Medium reception tweets were not
297 associated with a strong increase or decrease in credibility from low reception tweets ($\beta = -0.00092$, $CI =$
298 $[-0.16, 0.16]$), but high-reception tweets were associated with slightly more credibility ($\beta = 0.19$, $CI =$
299 $[0.036, 0.36]$).

300 We further investigated the distribution of credibility responses by each tweet characteristic. Fig 5B
301 demonstrates the extent to which tweets containing a visual, whether a chart (median = 5, mean = 5.14)
302 or a photo of the abstract (median = 5, mean = 5.06), were rated as more credible, on average, than
303 tweets with no visual (median = 4, mean = 4.01). Differences were less pronounced for title phrasing,
304 differing from effects observed in Fig 5A when controlling for topic and respondent demographics. Fig
305 5C shows that, considering only the raw distribution, the average credibility for both positive (median =
306 5, mean = 4.87) and neutral (median = 5, mean = 4.75) paraphrasing is higher than that of no
307 paraphrasing (median = 5, mean = 4.63). This may indicate that other factors, such as the title of the
308 study itself, have more to do with the perceived credibility of the tweet than the phrasing. The opposite
309 was true for claims of ownership—while claiming ownership was associated with increased credibility in

4.A, claiming ownership is associated with slightly lower mean (median = 5, mean = 4.68) than not claiming ownership (median = 5, mean = 4.84) in 4.C. For reception there were no notable differences between the regression and raw distribution; compared to tweets with a low reception (median = 5, mean = 4.76), tweets with moderate reception were associated with slightly lower (median = 5, mean = 4.64) and tweets with high reception with slightly higher credibility (median = 5, mean = 4.87).

4. Discussion

Researchers have been encouraged to engage with a wider audience with their research, and online platforms offer a prime avenue through which they can reach broad interested audiences. However, online platforms are often crowded with both accurate information and disinformation. In order to cut through noise, researchers and science communicators need a better understanding of how the platform and composition of their content relate to its perceived credibility. Research on credibility emphasizes the role of formal cues that users draw upon as they evaluate unfamiliar subject matter (Lucassen & Schraagen, 2013). Even within the limited space of Tweets, the inclusion of particular formal cues are associated with higher credibility of science information.

We observed evidence consistent with past studies that Science information is least credible on Twitter compared to science information on other platforms (Schmierbach & Oeldorf-Hirsch, 2012). Twitter was rated the least credible platform, even when controlling for the topic, respondent's stated familiarity, and respondent demographics. While there was heterogeneity by study, Twitter was rated as least credible on average, for four of the five study topics. Differences in platform have been shown to influence user perceptions of credibility to the point that such associations have been framed as bias in previous studies (Schmierbach & Oeldorf-Hirsch, 2012; Winter & Krämer, 2014). Research on credibility emphasizes the role of formal cues that users draw upon as they evaluate unfamiliar subject matter (Lucassen & Schraagen, 2013). The particular formal cues of Twitter, such as character restrictions that

leave little space for the inclusion of cues that could signal credibility, may affect the overall credibility of information on Twitter.

In contrast to tweets, scientific abstracts were consistently rated as the most credible, associated with 0.77 more points from credibility ratings from the second most credible source, news articles, and 1.4 point (tweets) higher credibility ratings than tweets. The images of abstracts may impart some degree of credibility to a claim. This notion was supported by an accidental finding from our analysis: after receiving the survey results, we found that that the screenshot of the abstract for “Vitamin” study was blurry and mostly illegible (Fig S3 A). Even though it was unreadable, the abstract was still rated more credible than other platforms. The association of the abstract with the institution of science may bolster its credibility, as was theorized by Brewer and Ley in their study of public perceptions of climate science (Brewer & Ley, 2013). The high credibility of the blurry abstract suggests that the format of the abstract and its close association with the institutions of formal research could be more important to credibility than the content itself.

Patterns for the remaining platforms were less clear. Generally, abstracts were rated as most credible, followed by news articles and online videos, which tended to have similar credibility ratings. Blogs were rated as one of the least credible platforms, second only to tweets. The confidence intervals calculated for these three variables in the regression analysis all overlap, suggesting a lack of certainty in this ordering (see Fig 4A). However, tweets were rated as the least credible with confidence intervals that overlapped with no other platforms. This low credibility may not necessarily undermine Twitter’s usefulness for scientists performing outreach and professional networking; these findings only sound a warning note that the deliberate use of appropriate formal and stylistic features to convey credibility is important when composing tweets.

We observed only partial support for the idea that formal cues in tweets that indicate a closer association with the scientists or the scientific process will be associated with higher perceived credibility. Specifically, we found that only one feature of a tweet, the presence of a visual in the tweet, was significantly associated with increased ratings of credibility. The inclusion of a figure from the paper was associated with highest credibility, and the inclusion a screenshot of an abstract than tweets as nearly as high. However, as there was still considerable variability in these effects as seen in the wide confidence intervals, the type and information density of the paper figures included in the tweet may have a strong influence on the credibility. While the overall formatting of the scientific figures was in a similar style as the figures originated from the same journal, the figure type varied from study to study and included circle charts, schematic diagrams, bar graphs, and tables. Since abstracts and scientific figures have strong associations with formal science, they may also appear especially credible. Future work should investigate the effects of the inclusion of a generic image that is not the abstract or a figure to investigate whether scientific figures in particular contribute to credibility, or if any image confers a similar credibility boost. The remaining features that we observed were at most weakly associated with credibility. There was some evidence that paraphrasing the title and claiming ownership relate to the tweet's perceived credibility. However, since these effects disappear when other variable are controlled, it is possible that they are artefacts of the papers themselves, rather than of the composition of the tweet.

We observed only weak evidence that indicators of reception will positively correlate with perceived credibility. Compared to tweets with low reception (low number of likes and retweets), tweets with moderate reception were trivially-associated with lower credibility. However, tweets with high reception were associated with slightly higher credibility. While this effect was found to be statistically significant, its confidence intervals nearly included zero and its estimated effect was small, associated with only 0.19 point greater credibility than low reception (Fig 5A; Table S4). Our finding regarding

reception disagrees somewhat with past studies, which found that for other online formats, the presence of peer-evaluations was strongly related to credibility (Kobayashi, 2018; Winter & Krämer, 2014). This discrepancy may result from differences between Twitter’s formal cues and those of other platforms, if likes and retweets on Twitter are not interpreted by viewers as social approval, or if that social approval is not as important to evaluating the credibility of information on Twitter in other contexts. Twitter’s reputation for spreading misinformation (Shao et al., 2018; Vosoughi et al., 2018) may also lead users to become indifferent to reception.

We note several limitations to this study. For Part One of the study, articles were selected which appeared across several existing platforms, which was a high standard for inclusion; this meant that the five studies we selected were covered online due to their attention-grabbing qualities and may not be representative of scientific information as a whole. Variance in the presentation of topics across each platform is also a limitation; for example, the title of the “Dogs” news article was sensationalized as “Scientists observe dogs relieving themselves, discover something amazing”, whereas the scientific article was more neutrally-titled with “Dogs are sensitive to small variations in the earth’s magnetic field.” These differences in tone may have affected the users’ evaluations of credibility for these articles. There were issues with some screenshots that were discovered after the survey was conducted; for instance, the abstract for the study about Vitamin D and reducing the risk of Alzheimer’s was blurry. Furthermore, only the Francis and Mialon 2015 paper showed the authors’ institutional affiliation, which could have affected the abstract results. More generally, there was variation in many factors in the screenshots used to represent each platform. The use of real-world examples of online science information lent realism to the study, but it also introduced many potential confounding factors such as differences in formatting, presence of images, and the presentation of authors.

In Part Two of our study, we mitigated this heterogeneity by selecting articles from a single psychology journal, but this may affect the generalizability of our findings if factors relating to tweet credibility for

psychological sciences are not consistent across scientific fields. Furthermore, as the study topics of the tweets in Part Two were presented in a consistent order, it is inadvisable to draw any conclusions about the relative credibility of the topics due to order effects. The use of Amazon Mechanical Turk, rather than other traditional survey methodology, makes it difficult to assess the representativeness of our respondents and also limits the generalizability of our findings. In addition, real Twitter users are more likely to know the authors of tweets they encounter, whether personally or by reputation, and this may also contribute to tweet credibility that we have been unable to represent within the survey. However, because many tweets that Twitter users are exposed to have been retweeted from users whom they do not follow, we believe that perceived credibility in the absence of a pre-existing relationship between users is important in itself. Despite these limitations, we observed clear and consistent trends that lend insight into the factors influencing online credibility of scientific information.

5. Conclusion

In this study, we conducted a survey to investigate the extent to which perceived credibility of scientific information differed between five online platforms. We observed that journal abstracts were consistently deemed most credible whereas tweets were consistently deemed the least credible, though we also noted high variance by topic. We then conducted a second survey in which we assessed the extent to which perceptions of the credibility of tweets related to the characteristics of their composition. We constructed a set of artificial tweets reporting science information but each with a unique combination of key characteristics, including whether the tweet displayed an image relating to the paper, the paraphrasing of the paper's title, whether the author claimed ownership of the research, and the tweet's reception (number of likes and retweets). We observed that the presence of a chart or a screenshot from the paper was associated with greater credibility but little to no evidence of meaningful differences based on other factors.

426 As researchers continue to leverage these platforms, it becomes important that researchers compose
427 scientific information in ways that make it most credible. Beyond helping researchers to communicate
428 their work, composing credible content may help the general public focus on the most credible scientific
429 information, rather than the wealth of disinformation. During outreach efforts, it is important that
430 researchers be cognizant of how context and format affect the credibility of the information they
431 present. Some formal cues are more influential than others in user's evaluations of credibility. Our
432 findings provide evidence of the importance of platform and topic to perceived credibility online. We
433 also demonstrated the importance of visuals to the perceived credibility of tweets. More work is needed
434 to understand how the credibility of scientific information differs by context and platform, and the ways
435 that the formal cues of information impact its credibility.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the members of our research group who gave useful feedback on a presentation of this work, and for useful discussions during our weekly meetings.

References

- Bates, D., Mächler, M., Bolker, B., & Walker, S. (2015). Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models Using lme4. *Journal of Statistical Software*; Vol 1, Issue 1 (2015). <https://www.jstatsoft.org/v067/i01>
- Bian, B. (2012). Research of Factors on Impacting Internet Information Credibility Based on Electronic Commerce Users Demands. *2012 International Conference on Communication Systems and Network Technologies, Communication Systems and Network Technologies (CSNT), 2012 International Conference On*, 987. edsee. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CSNT.2012.210>
- Brewer, P. R., & Ley, B. L. (2013). Whose Science Do You Believe? Explaining Trust in Sources of Scientific Information About the Environment. *Science Communication*, 35(1), 115–137.
- Büchi, M. (2016). Microblogging as an extension of science reporting. *Public Understanding of Science*, 26(8), 953–968. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963662516657794>
- Cassese, E. C., Huddy, L., Hartman, T. K., Mason, L., & Weber, C. R. (2013). Socially Mediated Internet Surveys: Recruiting Participants for Online Experiments. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 46(4), 775–784. JSTOR.
- Collins, K., Shiffman, D., & Rock, J. (2016). How Are Scientists Using Social Media in the Workplace? *PLOS ONE*, 11(10), e0162680. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0162680>
- Côté, I. M., & Darling, E. S. (2018). Scientists on Twitter: Preaching to the choir or singing from the rooftops? *FACETS*, 3(1), 682–694. <https://doi.org/10.1139/facets-2018-0002>
- Duggan, M., Ellison, Nicole. B., Lampe, C., Lenhart, A., & Madden, M. (2015). *Social Media Update 2014*. Pew Research Center. <http://www.pewinternet.org/2015/01/09/social-media-update-2014>
- Flanagin, A. J., & Metzger, M. J. (2007). The role of site features, user attributes, and information verification behaviors on the perceived credibility of web-based information. *New Media & Society*, 9(2), 319–342. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444807075015>
- Holmberg, K., Bowman, T. D., Hausteine, S., & Peters, I. (2014). Astrophysicists’ Conversational Connections on Twitter. *PLOS ONE*, 9(8), e106086. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0106086>
- Kobayashi, K. (2018). The Impact of Perceived Scientific and Social Consensus on Scientific Beliefs. *Science Communication*, 40(1), 63–88. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1075547017748948>
- Lucassen, T., & Schraagen, J. M. (2013). The influence of source cues and topic familiarity on credibility evaluation. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 29(4), 1387–1392. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2013.01.036>
- McClain, C. R. (2017). Practices and promises of Facebook for science outreach: Becoming a “Nerd of Trust.” *PLOS Biology*, 15(6), e2002020. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.2002020>
- Mohammadi, E., Thelwall, M., Kwasny, M., & Holmes, K. L. (2018). Academic information on Twitter: A user survey. *PLOS ONE*, 13(5), e0197265. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0197265>
- Ott, M. (2016). *Unique Turker Script*. : <https://uniqueturker.myleott.com/>
- Piowar, H. (2013). Value all research products. *Nature*, 493(7431), 159–159. <https://doi.org/10.1038/493159a>
- Ranger, M., & Bultitude, K. (2014). ‘The kind of mildly curious sort of science interested person like me’: Science bloggers’ practices relating to audience recruitment. *Public Understanding of Science*, 25(3), 361–378. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963662514555054>
- Rowlands, I., Nicholas, D., Russell, B., Canty, N., & Watkinson, A. (2011). Social media use in the research workflow. *Learned Publishing*, 24(3), 183–195. <https://doi.org/10.1087/20110306>
- Schmierbach, M., & Oeldorf-Hirsch, A. (2012). A Little Bird Told Me, So I Didn’t Believe It: Twitter, Credibility, and Issue Perceptions. *Communication Quarterly*, 60(3), 317–337. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01463373.2012.688723>

- Schmitt, M., & Jäschke, R. (2017). What do computer scientists tweet? Analyzing the link-sharing practice on Twitter. *PLOS ONE*, 12(6), e0179630. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0179630>
- Shao, C., Ciampaglia, G. L., Varol, O., Yang, K.-C., Flammini, A., & Menczer, F. (2018). The spread of low-credibility content by social bots. *Nature Communications*, 9(1), 4787. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-06930-7>
- Shariff, S. M., Zhang, X., & Sanderson, M. (2017). On the credibility perception of news on Twitter: Readers, topics and features. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 75, 785–796. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2017.06.026>
- Sheehan, K. B., & Pittman, M. (2016). *Amazon's Mechanical Turk for academics: The HIT handbook for social science research*. Melvin & Leigh, Publishers.
- Tenopir, C., Volentine, R., & King, D. W. (2013). Social media and scholarly reading. *Online Information Review*, 37(2), 193–216. <https://doi.org/10.1108/OIR-04-2012-0062>
- Tseng, S. (1), & Fogg, B. J. (2). (1999). Credibility and computing technology. *Communications of the ACM*, 42(5), 39–44. edselc. <https://doi.org/10.1145/301353.301402>
- Van Noorden, R. (2014). Online collaboration: Scientists and the social network. *Nature*, 512(7513), 126–129
- Vosoughi, S., Roy, D., & Aral, S. (2018). The spread of true and false news online. *Science*, 359(6380), 1146. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aap9559>
- Winter, S., & Krämer, N. (2014). *A question of credibility – Effects of source cues and recommendations on information selection on news sites and blogs*. 39. <https://doi.org/10.1515/commun-2014-0020>
- Yammine, S. Z., Liu, C., Jarreau, P. B., & Coe, I. R. (2018). Social media for social change in science. *Science*, 360(6385), 162. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aat7303>