The Industrialization of Opinion

How modern media systems produce emotional reality

Sources.org.uk Review Brief | May 2026

The modern information system does more than report events. It repeatedly selects, ranks, frames, and rewards the material most likely to hold attention. Over time, that process can manufacture emotional climates: grievance, threat, contempt, urgency, cynicism, and tribal certainty.

This report reviews research on negativity bias, engagement ranking, out-group animosity, misinformation, influencers, news trust, and platform design. It argues that public opinion should increasingly be studied as an industrial output, shaped by incentives and distribution systems as much as by facts and arguments. The goal is not to accuse every journalist, creator, or platform of manipulation. The goal is to describe the machinery that makes certain emotional realities more available than others.

At a glance

What is being industrialised?	Attention, interpretation, emotional salience, and social proof.
What content tends to travel?	Negative, moralised, identity-relevant, surprising, and out-group-focused content often has distribution advantages.
Are algorithms the whole problem?	No. Algorithms interact with human bias, creator incentives, journalism economics, and political strategy.
What is the practical danger?	A public can become emotionally governed by what is most repeatedly surfaced, rather than what is most representative or important.

Opinion as an output

Public opinion is often described as if it forms inside individual minds after exposure to information. That is only partly true. Opinion is also shaped by what becomes visible, what is repeated, which claims appear socially rewarded, which emotions feel normal, and which stories are framed as urgent. Modern media systems intervene at every point in that chain.

The industrial feature is scale. A newspaper editor once decided what appeared on a front page. Today, millions of users, creators, journalists, political actors, advertisers, bots, and ranking systems continuously decide what is visible. Each participant may have limited intent. The total system still has direction because incentives align around attention.

This does not mean that the public is passive. People choose, share, argue, block, subscribe, and search. Yet those choices occur inside environments that make some reactions easier than others. An angry headline, a humiliating clip, a shocking claim, a visible enemy, and a simple moral frame all reduce cognitive effort. They offer immediate orientation.

The emotional economics of media

Negativity has long been a feature of news because threats matter to human attention. Recent research extends the point into platform environments. Studies find that negative language in online news can increase sharing, and that content about political out-groups can drive more engagement than content about in-groups. The effect is not magic. Outrage is socially useful: it signals loyalty, recruits allies, and clarifies enemies.

Engagement ranking makes this politically important. If a system learns from clicks, shares, comments, watch time, or replies, it can elevate material that makes people interact even when they do not like the experience. Research on engagement-based ranking suggests a tension between revealed behaviour and stated preference. People may engage with divisive content while saying they want less of it. The platform sees behaviour more clearly than regret.

Journalists and creators then adapt to the environment. A careful explanation may be valuable but slow. A sharp accusation is faster. A headline that compresses complexity into conflict is easier to circulate. A creator who checks claims carefully may publish less often than one who reacts instantly. UNESCO's 2024 survey of content creators found that many do not systematically verify information before sharing it. That is not just an individual failing. It reflects a market in which speed and personality can outrank verification.

How emotional reality is made

The emotional reality of a media user is produced through repetition and ranking. If a feed repeatedly shows crime, institutional hypocrisy, elite contempt, ideological threat, humiliation, disaster, and betrayal, the user may come to experience society through those categories. The content may be individually real while collectively misleading. A hundred true fragments can create a false picture if they are selected from the same emotional register.

This is why fact-checking, while necessary, is incomplete. A claim can be true and still distort if it is unrepresentative, decontextualised, or framed to maximise contempt. A feed can avoid outright misinformation while still producing paranoia or despair. The key unit is not only the article or post; it is the diet.

Agenda-setting theory described how media influence what people think about. The platform era adds a second layer: systems influence what people feel is socially confirmed. Metrics such as likes, shares, views, comments, and reposts turn attention into apparent public significance. A post with a million views feels like evidence that the issue is central, even when the distribution mechanism is opaque.

Misinformation, influencers, and trust brokers

The erosion of institutional trust has created a market for alternative trust brokers. Influencers, podcasters, newsletter writers, anonymous accounts, local commentators, specialists, and charismatic amateurs can all become authorities. This is not automatically bad. Some independent experts are excellent. Some institutions are complacent. The problem is that the signals of credibility have changed. Authenticity, confidence, narrative fluency, and perceived courage can substitute for method.

Reuters Institute's Digital News Report 2025 describes a difficult news environment: traditional outlets struggle to connect while audiences shift across platforms and formats. Pew has documented changes in how Americans trust information from news organisations and social media. These shifts mean that misinformation cannot be treated merely as bad facts entering a healthy system. It often arrives through trusted relationships and identity-compatible channels.

Misinformation is also emotionally efficient. It often supplies agency, blame, hidden order, and moral clarity. Corrective information is slower because it has to reintroduce uncertainty. This asymmetry gives falsehood a rhetorical advantage in fast environments.

What resistance would require

The first defence is diet awareness. Individuals and institutions should track not only factual accuracy but emotional exposure. What emotions does a news routine repeatedly train? What kinds of people does it make easy to hate? What issues does it make permanently urgent? What does it make invisible?

The second defence is slower authority. Public institutions, researchers, and journalists should build formats that reward patience: explainers, source notes, correction logs, transparent uncertainty, and follow-up pieces after the first wave of outrage. The third defence is platform accountability. Ranking systems should be examined for the emotional and civic effects they produce, not only for whether individual posts violate rules.

The sharp point: modern media can manufacture emotional weather. A mature information culture needs forecasts, not just fact-checks.

A simple model of emotional production

The process begins with selection. Out of all possible events, some are chosen because they are vivid, conflictual, morally loaded, surprising, visual, or useful to a pre-existing narrative. Selection is not always dishonest. News requires selection. The danger begins when selection repeatedly favours the same emotional shape.

The second stage is framing. A story can be framed as incompetence, corruption, cruelty, hypocrisy, decline, progress, tragedy, victory, or threat. The same facts can carry different emotional meanings depending on what the audience is invited to notice.

The third stage is ranking. Platforms, editors, users, and search systems decide what rises. Ranking can turn a marginal event into a national emotional experience. It can also bury slow, important, low-drama realities that do not generate fast response.

The fourth stage is social proof. Visible metrics make attention look like significance. Once a story appears everywhere, people infer that it must matter. Repetition creates perceived reality, even before a person has checked the underlying claim.

The fifth stage is identity absorption. The story becomes part of what "people like us" know. At that stage, correction becomes harder because changing one's view can feel like weakening one's group.

Why fact-checking is necessary but insufficient

Fact-checking addresses claims. It is strongest when a statement is specific, checkable, and important. It is weaker when the distortion comes from selection, emotional emphasis, missing context, or cumulative exposure. A feed can be composed of accurate items and still give a distorted picture of the world.

For example, a user may see real crimes, real scandals, real institutional failures, real extremist statements, and real personal disasters. If all of these are selected from the same emotional category, the user may develop an exaggerated sense of threat. The issue is not that the events are fake. The issue is that the sample is not the world.

A mature information culture therefore needs source-checking, claim-checking, proportion-checking, and emotion-checking. It should ask whether a claim is true, whether it is representative, whether it matters at the scale implied, and what state of mind repeated exposure is likely to produce.

Institutional implications

News organisations should treat emotional proportion as an editorial duty. This does not mean softening hard truths or avoiding disturbing stories. It means asking whether coverage gives readers a usable map of reality or only a sequence of shocks.

Platforms should be assessed by output, not only by rules. A platform can ban certain content while still amplifying hostility, despair, or misinformation-adjacent material. Regulators and researchers need ways to examine what ranking systems repeatedly produce for different users.

Researchers should study media diets rather than isolated posts. The public-health analogy is useful. A single item of food rarely explains health. Patterns do. Information diets may likewise shape attention, mood, trust, and social perception over time.

Individuals can adopt a simple audit: after consuming news or social media, ask what has been learned, what has merely been felt, and whether any constructive action is clearer. If the answer is repeated agitation without knowledge or action, the system is harvesting attention rather than informing judgement.

Sources and further reading

[1] Rathje et al., Out-group animosity drives engagement on social media, PNAS, 2021. https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.2024292118

[2] Watson et al., Negative online news articles are shared more to social media, Scientific Reports, 2024. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11405697/

[3] Metzler et al., Social Drivers and Algorithmic Mechanisms on Digital Media, 2023. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11373151/

[4] Milli et al., Engagement, user satisfaction, and the amplification of divisive content on social media, PNAS Nexus, 2025. https://academic.oup.com/pnasnexus/article/4/3/pgaf062/8052060

[5] Knight First Amendment Institute, Engagement, User Satisfaction, and the Amplification of Divisive Content. https://knightcolumbia.org/content/engagement-user-satisfaction-and-the-amplification-of-divisive-content-on-social-media

[6] UNESCO, 2/3 of digital content creators do not check their facts before sharing, 2024. https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/2/3-digital-content-creators-do-not-check-their-facts-sharing-want-learn-how-do-so-unesco-survey

[7] UNESCO, Behind the screens: insights from digital content creators, 2024. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000392006

[8] Reuters Institute, Digital News Report 2025. https://reutersinstitute.politics.ox.ac.uk/digital-news-report/2025

[9] Pew Research Center, Social Media and News Fact Sheet, 2025. https://www.pewresearch.org/journalism/fact-sheet/social-media-and-news-fact-sheet/

[10] Pew Research Center, How Americans trust information from news organizations and social media sites has changed over time, 2025. https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2025/10/29/how-americans-trust-in-information-from-news-organizations-and-social-media-sites-has-changed-over-time/