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**On online sensationalism:**

Another offspring of news digitalisation is online sensationalism. Sensationalism is an editorial practice of appealing reader’s emotion (for example, empathy and curiosity) through dramatisation of events (Slattery & Hakanen, 1994; Kilgo et al., 2016). Even though sensationalism itself in the news isn’t new – the extraordinary has always been attention-grabbing and used to attract readers, listeners or viewers – it accelerated even more due to digitalisation. Convergence, collapse of two times per day news and introduction of fast, instant, “breaking” news has increased the need for sensational stories to appeal to ever-changing reader in short-span attention economy. In some cases, the need to break through the digital noise could lead to unfair practices, such as distorting journalistic reports for clicks and views, increasing political polarizing, appealing to exaggerated positive or negative sentiments, etc. – all of which have an effect on public opinion (Gunter, 1998) and potentially lead to elicit emotional responses or even unwanted panic (Grabe et al., 2001; Vresse & Semetko, 2002).

As many other issues, information privacy coverage is easy to fall under sensationalism practice. According to the Pew Research reports (2017), many citizens show a higher awareness of famous data breaches which involve major companies and have higher coverage, rather than smaller cyberattacks.
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**Excerpt from a personal research, results reporting:**

The main effect for neutral sentiment by political bias and years yielded an F ratio F (2, 1091) = 4.353, p = .777, indicating no significance in the combined between-subject effects (for the full output table see Appendix 2). When the effects are taken separately, though, both bias and years show significant findings, F (2, 1091) = 2.918, p = .05 and F (1, 1091) = 4.353, p = .04 respectively. As shown by Post Hoc tests, neutral newspapers use significantly more neutral sentiment words, compared to both right-biased and left-biased newspapers. However, there is no significant dissimilarity in neutral language use between right and left newspapers. Concerning the neutral sentiment and the variable describing years, my data indicates an increase in the presence of this sentiment in newspaper articles covering information privacy overtime (p = 0.37). Moreover, notably, the neutral sentiment factorial ANOVA chart has the smallest error bars due to a considerably higher proportion of neutral words in the dataset. As noted above, all words which are not in the lexicon of VADER analysis tool are considered neutral.
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**On fake news:**

“Fake news” is term commonly used to describe propaganda articles or yellow journalism concealed and presented to the audience as real news. Named Word of the Year in 2017 by Collins Dictionary, fake news made headlines as an influential player during 2016 US election, spreading paranoid style conspiracy theories about the candidates, hoaxes around their past and advertisements polarising the American voters to more radical sides of R-L spectrum (Allcott & Gentzkow 2017; Faris at al. 2017). Consequently, the popularity of the topic generated the wave of research in fields of communication, psychology, political and computer science. Our main aim in this paper is to discover (a.) whether fake news generate interest around the topics they discuss; (b.) whether they influence some aspects of media economy, such as perceived reliability of news, the willingness to pay for news and (c.) what are possible solutions against fake news.

Hoax news, as any other online and, arguably, offline information source, uses attention economy. Both information and attention are social currencies, exchanged for one another between users and providers in a modern online business trade. Attention economy treats human attention, mental engagement with an item, as a scarce commodity whose value is determined by the excess of information (Bueno, 2016; Davenport & Beck, 2001). Meaning, exactly because humans live in the modern information-rich world, our attention becomes a crisis.

What makes one more likely to get false news? The ability to recognize and reject the fallacy have a weight in the vulnerability towards the fake news. Low cognitive ability populations, according to findings by Roets (2017), are particularly persuaded by information they receive and, even after being assured the received information was false, remain biased. Such people are more likely to believe and, accordingly, share fake news, making them diffuse. Hypothetically, a correlation might arise in inability of some individuals to transform from “passive consumers” of media, being injected with information by hypodermic needle (Lasswell, 1927), to active and conscious, engaging and critical ones. Although, such hypothesis must be tested, as we did not find any proof for it.