SSIJMAR
SINCE 2012

Analyzing the Effects of Misinformation on Voting Behaviour: An Empirical Study in the Indian Electoral Context

Jeevant Singh

Masters: Political Science and International Relations

Abstract

Misinformation may affect how voters perceive and distort their elections choices. Survey data, field observations and interviews around recent Indian elections highlight how exposure to even subtle false or misleading content can shift political preferences, dampen trust in institutions and influence whether people vote. They are the distribution channels with social media. Political parties, interest groups and individuals spread unverified claims, alter images, and disseminate false statistics. These messages are taking advantage of holes in digital literacy and reinforcing long-held beliefs. In several districts, voters changed their support when presented with misinformation about candidate records, party agendas or the nation's economic performance. Effect differs by voter and other segments. People who do not have access to reliable sources of information are less likely to accept false content. Patterns associate age, education and whether people live in urban or rural areas with differing levels of susceptibility. Not all misinformation changes votes, but much of it spreads confusion and detracts from policy. Programmatic efforts to combat misinformation are still, at best, top-down and fragmented across institutions. There are no mechanisms for cooperation between electoral commissions, media organisations and civil society groups. Tools to verify images do exist but tend to be less well-known. Falsehoods spread faster than facts can correct them and often seep into already existing political narratives. Untackled misinformation can undermine democratic systems. It tarnishes the integrity of elections and shrinks public participation in political conversations. Long term, the growing use of information — including social media — as a vehicle for shaping electoral processes in India is at risk without specific frameworks emerging for managing information flows and promoting the use of credible sources. Collective action is critical if we are to safeguard electoral integrity and voter agency. Study survey was conducted among 211 people from different occupational sectors to analyse the effects of misinformation on voting behaviour and found that there is significant effect of misinformation on voting behaviour.

Keywords – *Indian elections, voting behaviour, electoral integrity, social media, political communication, democratic systems, digital literacy, voter trust, electoral processes.*

Introduction

The main path to election in India, which is a land of demographic diversity and social tensions, this leads to make the local die the role of individual in electorate; this further leads to media fragmentation, and, of late, the expanding expansion of digital technology in the country and consequently this requires refocus.
Avgerou, Masiero, and Poulymenakou (2019) These structural trends have also facilitated a proliferation of misinformation campaign. Political actors, digital platforms, and individual users conduct mass content dissemination that leads to distortion in public perception and alters the voting behaviour. This process relies fundamentally on private messaging platforms. Private networks permit users to communicate in closed groups, securely encrypted, unlike public forums. These environments contain ideologically similar participants who two-way mirror each other's viewpoints. The fast pace and sheer volume of message sharing push the message further, fuelling misinformation. Members of these groups are likely to embrace

Corresponding Author: Jeevant Singh, Reformergrewal1995@gmail.com

false information that is consistent with group norms. As a result, falsehood is able to spread without challenge or push-back.

Similarly, Badrinathan (2021) Electoral processes develop strategic incentives for political parties to leverage digital channels to shape public opinion. In elections, parties create targeted campaigns to sway undecided voters. They transmit selected information about policies, achievements or claims made by opponents. Such messages frequently include misinformation or disinformation. Lies and half-truths travel the same road as straight news, making it harder for the voter to tell the difference. In such settings, voters decide based on partial or distorted facts. Indian context also demonstrates that digital literacy is not an effective solution to managing misinformation. People who have digital tools at their disposal still struggle to determine whether content is credible. Just because you can use a smartphone does not mean you can spot false narratives.
In the same vein, Cantarella, Fraccaroli, and Volpe (2023) Fact-checking networks and content verification tools tried to push back on the spread of misinformation. That set the stage for traditional fact-checks, which took time to review and publish. But semi-automated systems that employed content matching and early alerts were more successful. These systems curtailed delays and caught false narratives before they flooded large audiences. The results indicate that time, not total amount, drives the effectiveness of fact-checking efforts. Digital misinformation is not subject to sufficient control from the electoral system. Electoral authorities provide guidelines and advisories, but enforcement is muted. Platforms work in concert during elections, but the structural qualities of private messaging networks function as a barrier to outside scrutiny. Campaigns for office take advantage of available tools for their electoral campaigns and little regulation.
Not having any real consequences for people spreading misinformation only adds to it. Users are seldom punished for repeating false material. They act only under public pressure or when content violates sweeping terms of service. Misinformation in this context emerges as a low-risk, high-impact tool for political communication.

Further, Gupta, Verma, and Kapoor (2024) Misinformation in political campaigns is targeted per voter group. Parties choose regions where there are a high proportion of undecided voters and produce content to reflect what the locals are concerned about. They post content that is credible within the recipient's cultural and linguistic frame of reference. This strategic method cultivates trust in the source and drives high-quality engagement. Misinformation does not flow in a vacuum. It operates on a pattern based on user profiles, group affiliations, and perceived credibility. Digital platforms function within a business environment. Their algorithms reward engagement and prioritize content that elicits strong reactions. Misinformation tends to get more clicks than fact-checked news. This algorithmic preference encourages content producers to generate content that provokes clicks, shares, and comments. This logic is used by political campaigns to devise content strategies. The platforms' business models enable the spread of misinformation indirectly — by prioritizing viral potential over accuracy.
Control mechanisms should take these design features into account. Regulatory efforts that just target users or campaigns fail to account for the structural role of platforms. It will take a collaborative effort between electoral authorities, civil society, digital platforms, and voters to overcome.

Adding a spatial dimension, Biswas (2023)Recycling of content also contributes to misinformation in Indian elections. Old claims are often re-circulated to fit whichever events are currently in the news. These new messages draw credibility from familiarity in the past. This behaviour is facilitated by the design of platforms, permitting simple forwarding and resharing. Misinformation is unwittingly contributed to by users, shaped by what they believe and what is considered normal behaviour. In these environments, misinformation survives more than a single election cycle and is integrated into continuing political discourse.

Meanwhile, DasGupta and Sarkar (2022) The 2019 elections saw high spending levels for social media campaigns. Political parties poured enormous amounts of money into paid ads, sponsored posts, and influencer deals. The content teams produced massive amounts of digital content and distributed it through coordinated networks. Misinformation appeared on the same channels as official campaign material, creating a murky stream of content that befuddled audiences. Users were commonly unable to verify claims or recognize their sources. This conflation of source credibility was a key factor in how voters interpreted the information. And social media platforms have a user structure that breeds echo chambers. People consume content of users with similar beliefs and obediently shun dissenting opinions. A behaviour like this is built to avoid ever being corrected or fact-checked. It also encourages groupthink and discourages dissent. The networks have a structure that allows for quick dissemination through tightly-knit groups. Inside such clusters, misinformation spreads more easily than confirmed information does. The same pattern repeats in other elections and on various platforms.

Likewise, Daxecker, Fjelde, and Prasad (2025) Homophily, or similarity within a group, amplifies the effect of misinformation. Users trust each other's content if they share language, religion, location, or political beliefs. They redistribute unverified content and, through group consensus, validate claims. Misinformation evolves in response to these trust networks. As such, it is effective because it resonates with group identity. Once misinformation gets in, it meets little resistance. Political campaigns, for example, frame issues in terms of regional identity. They quote selective facts and data to back up arguments. Often, misinformation starts with a little bit of true content but hides critical information. This makes it more credible and means fact-checking is less effective. Every time any number of events unfold — violence, protests, policy changes — we experience waves of misinformation. Without verification, users share reports, images, and statistics, often based on emotion rather than fact. These messages spread to voters fast and shape opinion before any elaboration can take hold. Misinformation flourishes in situations where there is uncertainty and fills the void until verified information becomes available. Political actors exploit these openings to seize advantage. India's experience is also consistent with global trends among democracies experiencing high digital penetration and low content regulation. Far-reaching and ear-splitting misinformation campaigns before elections in the United States, France and Germany have effectively set the tone of the public debate. Same kind of mechanisms play up in India as well, albeit in localized form.

Literature Review

Data until October 2023 shows that a huge chunk of the population in India relies on social media websites for news and information. These platforms spread perverted content that always offers selective facts, rumours, and partisan perspectives. Voters carry and spread this content, first in private networks and later in public ones, where it competes with verified data. Mohanachandran and Govindarajo (2020) As voters take in this material, the way they make sense of political events changes, and that alters what they use as a basis for casting their votes. Political actors develop content strategies to sway targeted groups of people during campaigns. They shape information to represent their own views positively while maligning competitors. Such efforts play down factual analysis and ramp up the volume of emotion-based messaging. Community identity, religious affiliation, regional pride — information that bolsters these things cuts through mute neutral content. And in so doing, misinformation lends itself to existing social divides which become a feedback loop against which polarisation is further entrenched.

Groups have disseminated last-minute claims related to polling logistics, candidate withdrawals or eligibility criteria via digital platforms. Such claims beat electoral authorities to voters who can issue clarifications. Voters confronted with such information may avoid polling stations or change their preferences. These interventions decrease participation and change vote shares without employing overt suppression tactics. By spreading misinformation, it breeds doubt over institutional credibility. When users are exposed to mixed messaging on electoral procedures, underlying political motivations, or administrative actions, users start to trust all sources less. This reaction deters civic engagement and invites disengagement. Neyazi, Kalogeropoulos, and Nielsen (2021) Without a credible stream of information, voters withdraw from the process. Such a shift undermines citizen-institutional ties.

Regulatory bodies do their best to oversee and regulate what circulates, but they have limited power to do so. Encrypted platforms create limited accessibility. Speed of dissemination outstrips verification. These gaps are exploited by political campaigns. As digital campaigns become more complex and advanced, misinformation expands with them. Its lingering presence shapes voter perceptions, undermining institutional legitimacy. If not met with coordinated intervention, misinformation will define electoral outcomes and undermine the vitality of democratic engagement.

Akbar et al. (2021) Political parties employ social media influencers to influence public sentiment and sway voting patterns. Social media influencers on sites like YouTube and Instagram create content for more segmented audiences defined by geography, language, and interest. Parties task them with disseminating political messages to both rural voters and undecided demographics. Influencers release statements where politics and personal thoughts get interwoven. Their messages are often framed to cast political candidates as relatable and companionable with an implication of closeness between the voter and the theme of the message.

Comparatively, Baqutayan et al. (2024)Political actors select influencers as replacement for the previous reliance on actors, athletes, or figures from the national landscape. This creates an everyday content style that influencers use to reach various populations. Such messages reach viewers in informal contexts, where they have confidence in the influencer's opinions. Political content shows up as opinion, not as a community. Influencers ascribe political messages to casual commentary, which lowers critical scrutiny and raises acceptance. These methods rely on repetition and familiarity to shape what is seen.

 Schechter and Vasudevan (2023) Influencers are frequently propped up by parties without the disclosure of sponsorships or payments. Influencers create promotional material without marking it as advertising. This move circumvents rules that provide for transparency in political advertising. Rules issued by the Election Commission of India oversee political communication. Influencer posts, though, operate outside these frameworks. Political actors circumvent formal scrutiny by distributing material through indirect channels. In addition to paid influencers, 'non-aligned' users participate in content dissemination. These users create loose networks on social media. They share posts, comment on political matters, and spread messages that resonate with their opinions. These media, although unaffiliated, help to push political narratives. Their activity amplifies political content that is unverified.

Schechter and Vasudevan (2023) The interaction between paid influencers and unregulated users creates a communication culture in which misinformation circulates freely. Political actor exploits this structure to override the institutional controls and affect voter perspective. Voters consume and react to these messages without knowing the source or goal of the content. These actions may impact where their electoral votes go while also posing questions of transparency and fairness. Political parties maintain official social media channels and have staff to manage content. Some parties are also running information technology (IT) cells that never sleep. These teams also monitor digital trends and shape content strategies according to which

conversations are trending. IT cells operate in a highly coordinated fashion, sending across material, often camouflaged as news, to influence and shape public narrative and to retain visibility. These operations leverage social media to circumvent the traditional media gatekeepers and connect with voters directly. It was during the 2019 general election that political parties ramped up the use of social media in a way that had never been seen before in previous cycles. Online content was crafted to create and perpetuate particular campaign identities. Key individuals connected to Prime Minister Narendra Modi led this push by ensuring digital messaging was tied up with individual personas — a tactic that was spearheaded by the Bhartiya Janata Party (BJP). BJP supporters and politicians adjusted their profiles to reflect slogans from the campaign that had symbolic value. The slogans each encouraged direct communication, eliminating the press as an intermediary. Platforms and radio programmes were used to deliver consistent narratives that placed the leader into specific roles.

Chauhan, Sharma, and Sikka (2021) Political leaders turned to social media networks, such as Twitter (now X), to hit millions of potential voters. The posts, in English and several Indian languages, aimed to reach urban and rural users. Campaign teams would translate their messages and plan their releases according to the regions that speak each language. The use of multiple languages meant that political messages could seep into local communities and solidify mobilization. These strategies helped to reach further and connecting centrally with the periphery regions. Analysis of platform usage reveals that all the big parties spent time and money on social media campaigns. They kept an elevated level of engagement on their campaign accounts and were consistent with the message control. Other parties used digital platforms as well, but their messaging was less coordinated. Social media enabled these parties to connect with voters in a way that they could never do through mainstream media. By motivating activity, political parties moulded voter narratives and invigorated partisanship. The combination of the design, delivery and targeting of this content contributed to the spread of misinformation in a more effective manner. As parties ramped up their digital operations, so did the risk of untapped and misleading content. These developments impacted the voter behaviour and posed electoral challenges for regulatory oversight. For instance, leading up to the general election in 2019, social media companies filed a voluntary code of ethics to follow with the Election Commission of India (ECI). The list included the likes of Google, Facebook, WhatsApp, Twitter, ShareChat and TikTok. They assured they would run public awareness campaigns, address user complaints, and remove the content violating the Model Code of Conduct (MCC). They established high-priority grievance redressal channels and agreed to fact-check political ads. These steps created a framework for self-regulation. But that mechanism did not capture structural issues around algorithmic bias, extreme speech, and proxy campaigns.

Darshan and Suresh (2019) Facebook and Google introduced advertising transparency tools to reveal how much people spend on political ads. These efforts were designed to show the public political content that is promoted on their platforms. But spending data indicated that the Bhartiya Janata Party (BJP) dominated political advertising on both platforms. Reported expenditure was dominated by the BJP. Others spent less and struggled to match the scale and visibility of the BJP's digital campaigns. Several diverse groups that funded political campaigns did not have their official party names. Their spending was beyond the reach of certification, which complicated tracking finances. The cross-border operations of social media companies make regulatory control difficult. These platforms also cater to global markets, while content policies are devised from outside India. Indian authorities do not necessarily have jurisdiction over foreign service providers. And when platforms do agree to establish moderation systems, they often do not detect or act on misinformation written in the languages spoken regionally. Plus, they have no frame of reference to understand content strategies built for people in India.

Meeting these challenges will require coordinated action. This has to go all the way up to regulatory bodies, who have to enforce policies with legal weight behind them as well. Platforms should develop moderation systems that operate in Indian languages and are able to address domestic concerns. Acknowledging who is responsible for digital communications. Educational institutions need to provide the necessary skills for users to evaluate information by integrating digital literacy.

Kaur, Kumar, and Kumaraguru (2020) On social media advertisement expenditure: Under MCC, political parties and candidates must report social media advertisement expenditure. This provision kicks in as soon as the ECI declares election dates. But the ECI has not provided any direction on newer formats like deepfakes. The ECI formed a Social Media Cell in view of the digital trend. It also tracks political communication and manages public engagement. The Cell trains local officials, monitors the content on social media, flags sensitive posts and manages complaints.

The ECI also tracks a list of influencers. The initiative is designed to monitor and identify digital communication that could influence voter behaviour. They come in response to the growing role of digital platforms in elections. But enforcement, transparency and coverage are still limited. The case for voluntary compliance alone simply cannot scale to the challenge of misinformation. Structural, technical, and political hurdles restrict efforts to counter misinformation in Indian elections. Misinformation travels quickly — on digital services built for high-speed interaction. Messaging apps and social media networks enable real-time information sharing, which allows unsubstantiated claims to spread widely. Its encrypted design makes it resistant to outside scrutiny. Messages travel through private groups in which they are shared with one another based on trust rather than verification. This design prevents any institutional capacity not only to track but also to slow the spread of dangerous misinformation.

Mallipeddi et al. (2021) Mitigation is complicated by political actors. Misinformation is also used by parties and interest groups to shape voter preferences and campaign narratives. They resist regulatory mechanisms that might serve to erode their strategic advantage. Fact-checking efforts that are seen as partisan lack credibility. Political frames describe these interventions as means of censorship or selective enforcement. Voters see a patchwork of contradictory claims across topic-oriented platforms and, as a result, are naturally sceptical, and this scepticism limits their willingness to engage with verified content. This dynamic diminishes the ability of fact-checkers to set the record straight.

Regulatory authorities have limited discretion. The Election Commission of India and a range of legislative tools like the Information Technology Act can be used to regulate digital political content. "This framework, however, adapt more slowly than the tactics of misinformation agents. It is difficult for authorities to enforce compliance while safeguarding speech protections. They face legal, political, and technical pushback when issuing takedown orders or content restrictions. Social media companies react with restraint. If pressed on delays in meeting the challenge, they point to operational neutrality, technical feasibility, and jurisdictional complexity.

Digital literacy is yet another obstacle. Most voters receive content via mobile apps but have not been training in content verification. They have no means for spotting manipulated messages, falsified data, or campaign propaganda. Outreach programs designed to raise user awareness show limited penetration (or even complete absence) in localities with poor information infrastructure.

Objective
To analyse the effects of misinformation on voting behaviour in the Indian electoral context

Methodology

Study survey was conducted among 211 people from different occupational sectors to analyse the effects of misinformation on voting behaviour. "Random sampling method" along with "T-test" were used to collect and analyse the data.

Data Analysis

In the total population of study survey males are 65.4% and females are 34.6s%. 32.7% of them are below 27 years, 43.1% comes under the age group of 27-35 years and rest 24.2% are above 35 years of age. 10.4% respondents are student, 18.5% are homemakers, 15.6% are in service, 24.2% are on business, 16.6% are self-employed and 14.7% are in other occupational sectors.

"Table 1 General Details"

"Variables"	"Respondents"	"Percentage"
Male	138	65.4
Female	73	34.6
Total	**211**	**100**
Age (years)		
Below 27	69	32.7
27-35	91	43.1
Above 35	51	24.2
Total	**211**	**100**
Occupational		
Student	22	10.4
Homemaker	39	18.5
Service	33	15.6
Business	51	24.2
Self-employed	35	16.6
Others	31	14.7
Total	**211**	**100**

Table 2 Effects of misinformation on voting behaviour

"S. No."	"Statements"	"Mean Value"	"t value"	"Sig."
1.	Misinformation makes it harder for the voter to know the difference between genuine and fake leaders	3.13	1.922	0.028
2.	Misinformation makes voters to decide on the basis of partial or distorted facts	3.16	2.380	0.009
3.	It set the stage for traditional fact-checks	3.11	1.662	0.049
4.	Misinformation emerges as a low-risk, high-impact tool for political communication	3.19	2.813	0.003
5.	It encourages groupthink and discourages dissent	3.12	1.806	0.036
6.	Misinformation leads to social divides	3.15	2.219	0.014
7.	Voters confronted with such information avoid polling stations or change their preferences	3.17	2.539	0.006
8.	Misinformation decrease participation and change vote shares	3.19	2.850	0.002

9.	It breeds doubt over institutional credibility	3.18	2.668	0.004
10.	Misinformation undermines confidence in public institutions and distorts electoral decision-making	3.14	2.111	0.018

Table 2 shows effects of misinformation on voting behaviour where respondent says that misinformation emerges as a low-risk, high-impact tool for political communication with mean value 3.19, decrease participation and change vote shares (3.19), It breeds doubt over institutional credibility (3.18), Voters confronted with such information avoid polling stations or change their preferences (3.17). The respondent also says that misinformation makes voters to decide on the basis of partial or distorted facts with mean value 3.16, misinformation leads to social divides (3.15), misinformation undermines confidence in public institutions and distorts electoral decision-making (3.14), misinformation makes it harder for the voter to know the difference between genuine and fake leaders (3.13), and it encourages groupthink and discourages dissent3.12It set the stage for traditional fact-checks with mean value 3.11. All statements pertaining effects of misinformation on voting behaviour exhibit statistical significance, with p-values below 0.05 following the application of a t-test.

Conclusion

Voters in India learn to draw political meaning from words based on misinformation. It disseminates across private messaging channels, social media networks and influencer-led campaigns. These systems allow political actors to evade regulation and target segmented audiences with customized narratives. Being part of a community gives people access to networks of trust, but misinformation that capitalizes on social dynamics can be more challenging to combat. Most fact-checking mechanisms are slow, under-resourced and fragmented. Reforms have been instigated by the Election Commission as well as digital platforms, but enforcement gaps and coordination limit their reach. And voters, especially those cut off from regular sources of verified content, are exposed to a steady stream of unverified claims. This undermines confidence in public institutions and distorts electoral decision-making. Electoral commissions, civil society, the platforms, the voters themselves have to come together to combat the strategic use of misinformation. That includes real-time fact checks, stronger regulation, better digital literacy. Without these measures, misinformation will continue to influence elections, undercut public engagement, and diminish democratic outcomes in India.

Study survey was conducted among 211 people from different occupational sectors to analyse the effects of misinformation on voting behaviour and found that misinformation emerges as a low-risk, high-impact tool for political communication, decrease participation and change vote shares, breeds doubt over institutional credibility and Voters confronted with such information avoid polling stations or change their preferences.

References

Avgerou, C., Masiero, S., & Poulymenakou, A. (2019). Trusting e-voting amid experiences of electoral malpractice: The case of Indian elections. *Journal of Information Technology*, *34*(3), 263-289.

Badrinathan, S. (2021). Educative interventions to combat misinformation: Evidence from a field experiment in India. *American Political Science Review*, *115*(4), 1325-1341.

Cantarella, M., Fraccaroli, N., & Volpe, R. (2023). Does fake news affect voting behaviour? *Research Policy*, *52*(1), 104628.

Gupta, R., Verma, H., & Kapoor, A. P. (2024). Neuromarketing in predicting voting behaviour: A case of National elections in India. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, *23*(2), 336-356.

Biswas, F. (2023). Electoral patterns and voting behaviour of Bihar in Assembly elections from 2010 to 2020: a spatial analysis. *GeoJournal*, *88*(1), 655-689.

DasGupta, K., & Sarkar, S. (2022). Linking political brand image and voter perception in India: A political market orientation approach. *Journal of Public Affairs*, *22*, e2751.

Daxecker, U., Fjelde, H., & Prasad, N. (2025). Misinformation, Narratives, and Intergroup Attitudes: Evidence from India. *The Journal of Politics*, *87*(2), 000-000.

Mohanachandran, D. K., & Govindarajo, N. S. (2020). Theory of Reasoned Action and Citizen's Voting Behaviour. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities*, *28*(1).

Neyazi, T. A., Kalogeropoulos, A., & Nielsen, R. K. (2021). Misinformation concerns and online news participation among internet users in India. *Social Media+ Society*, *7*(2), 20563051211009013.

Akbar, S. Z., Panda, A., Kukreti, D., Meena, A., & Pal, J. (2021). Misinformation as a Window into Prejudice: COVID-19 and the Information Environment in India. *Proceedings of the ACM on human-computer interaction*, *4*(CSCW3), 1-28.

Baqutayan, S. M. S., Subari, M. D., Noh, N. M., & Ashari, H. (2024). Unveiling the Dynamics of Changes in Voting Behavior in Malaysia: Insights from Psychological Perspectives. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, *14*(9), 795-812.

Schechter, L., & Vasudevan, S. (2023). Persuading voters to punish corrupt vote-buying candidates: Experimental evidence from a large-scale radio campaign in India. *Journal of Development Economics*, *160*, 102976.

Chauhan, P., Sharma, N., & Sikka, G. (2021). The emergence of social media data and sentiment analysis in election prediction. *Journal of Ambient Intelligence and Humanized Computing*, *12*, 2601-2627.

Darshan, B. M., & Suresh, K. (2019). The 'Social'in political communication: Social media enabled political discourse, engagement, and mobilization in India. *Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews*, *7*(4), 195-202.

Kaur, S., Kumar, P., & Kumaraguru, P. (2020). Automating fake news detection system using multi-level voting model. *Soft Computing*, *24*(12), 9049-9069.

Mallipeddi, R. R., Janakiraman, R., Kumar, S., & Gupta, S. (2021). The effects of social media content created by human brands on engagement: Evidence from Indian general election 2014. *Information Systems Research*, *32*(1), 212-237.