

Column 2 shows the time since publication

Columns 4–7 show the distribution of stances (S: Support, D: Deny, C: Comment, and R: Report)

# Introduction

## Engagement of social media users with respect to fake and real news articles

News title (Label)	Time	# Posts	S	D	C	R	Noticeable responses
Virginia Republican Wants Schools To Check Children's Genitals Before Using Bathroom ( <b>Fake</b> )	3h	38	0.00	0.03	0.19	0.78	"DISGUSED SO TRASNPHOBIK", "FOR GODS SAKE GET REAL GOP", "You cant make this up folks"
	3h - 6h	21	0.00	0.10	0.10	0.80	"Ok This cant be real", "WTF IS THIS BS", "Rediculous RT"
	6h+	31	0.00	0.10	0.14	0.76	"Cant make this shit up", "how is this real", "small govern-ment", "GOP Cray Cray Occupy Democrats"
1,100,000 people have been killed by guns in the U.S.A. since John Lennon was shot and killed on December 8, 1980 ( <b>Real</b> )	3h	9	0.56	0.00	0.00	0.44	"#StopGunViolence", "guns r the problem"
	3h+	36	0.50	0.00	0.11	0.39	"Some 1.15 million people have been killed by firearms in the United States since Lennon was gunned down", "#StopGunViolence"

- The real news invokes moderate engagement, mainly comprised of supportive posts with neutral sentiment that stabilize quickly.
- Such **temporal shifts in user perception** serve as important signals for distinguishing fake from real news.

# Introduction

## Pervious work

- Previous work proposed partial representations of social context with [news, sources and users](#) as major entities, and [stances, friendship, and publication](#) as major interactions.
- However, they didn't put much emphasis on the quality of representation, modeling of entities and their interactions, and minimally supervised settings at all.