

Building Hoax Resistant Generation at Higher Education Institution

Hendi Pratama^{1,*} Widya Amalia¹

¹English Department, Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

*Corresponding author: hendipratama@mail.unnes.ac.id

ABSTRACT

Hoax is defined as news which contains uncertain things or not even facts of a phenomenon. It has been studied since the 17th century and carried out in every sector. Hoax leads our young generation into misleading information and understanding. The objectives of this research are to find out students' sensitivity level on identifying hoax and to strengthen students' resistant towards hoax by proposing various methodologies. This research was done under descriptive quantitative method in order to explore students' understanding about the concept of hoax itself. The participants of this research were 182 vocational students from State Polytechnic of Jakarta (PNJ) and 100 English department students from Universitas Negeri Semarang (UNNES). The purpose of this sampling is to distinguish how respondents from vocational background and respondents from English background identify hoaxes. The data was gathered by giving several questions related to hoaxes to the participants. The result showed us how language lesson strengthens students' knowledge to choose whether it is a hoax or not. A language learner can be more aware of a hoax than a vocational student.

Keywords: *hoax, hoax resistant, character, higher education*

1. INTRODUCTION

As the rapid development of new technology in this 21st century there are numerous open platforms. These platforms offer various both verified and unverified contents which have been accessed by everyone as the main media to gain information. Unfortunately, these unverified contents may lead to hoaxes that influence the platform users. Hoax refers to news that contains uncertain things and cannot be justified (Juditha, 2018). There are several reasons why news or information can be called hoaxes such as statements, expressions, information, photos, or videos. The hoax phenomenon itself mislead people in receiving information and create more public assumption (Gorbach, 2018). As a result, there will be some character degradation of our young generation which gives negative impact both for their mental health and attitude. Character building is formed gradually by involving every single stakeholder in our inner circle. This kind of character education is urgently needed since the development of technology offers us many facilities, on the other hand we could not reject all the hoax that we see every day.

Hoax firstly introduced in the 17th century and has been spread in academic field, science, religion, myth, humor, legends, and so on (Salam, 2018). Posetti and Matthew (2018) stated that misinformation and

propaganda have been features of human communication since Roman times when Anthony met Cleopatra. During this time Octavian carried out a propaganda campaign against Antony which was designed to tarnish his reputation. Among them by using short and sharp slogans written on coins. These slogans imply that Antony was a drunken woman, and as a doll of Cleopatra. Octavian becomes Augustus, allowing Octavian to hack the republican system once and for all.

After that, in the 20th century, the internet began to appear in the society which was then followed by social media in the 21st century (Posetti & Matthew, 2018). As we know, at this time accessing information or news on the internet has become easier and more affordable. Therefore, this indirectly increases the risk of misunderstanding of information, disinformation, propaganda and hoaxes. This is an era where people don't know whether the news or information they get contains truth or false information (Salam, 2018). Salman also mentioned in his research that at the end towards September 2017, the hoax boom (especially on social media) had decreased. Some of the things that have led to the decline in hoax news include the government being stricter in implementing various rules related to the use of social media. Another cause is where several hoax writers or hoax news spreaders have been arrested and several others have received criminal penalties.

Hoax or fake news is presented as real as it is but actually it is false, fabricated, or exaggerated to the point where it no longer corresponds to the fact (Reilly, 2018). Several years ago fake news was only used for political or even social needs. Yet nowadays it is used in economic and even creative sector (Zakim, 2019). It proves that the society unconsciously has increased its role and it may be control the social regulation. Moreover, hoaxes keep growing since hoaxes are often more compelling than the truth.

This paper tells the difference between vocational and language department students in identifying hoaxes. The objectives of this research are to find out students' sensitivity level on identifying hoax and to strengthen students' resistant towards hoax by proposing various methodologies.

1.1. Types of Hoax

Based on the contents, hoax as false information includes several categories such as health, law, business, politics, economy, religion, ethnicity, race, and history (Salam, 2018). Almost all these categories can be used to fabricate lies that are meant to attack differences. According to the results of Mastel's (2017) research, socio-politics is the type of hoax that is most often accepted by the public. This can include regional elections, government, and SARA. The spreading of hoaxes cannot be controlled by the policy maker or government because they unconsciously validate a hoax in order to solve a certain case (Timmer, 2019). From the cases that have existed, the fraudulent or deceitful information provided can be in the form of information or news and pictures. Even news and pictures that are disseminated without clear sources can be accepted at face value by people who easily believe with hoaxes. Not many of them believe that everything they know is a hoax that is deliberately spread for a specific purpose.

Hartley (2012) concludes in simple terms some rules of thumb that can be used to identify a hoax. First, hoax stories have characteristics like chain letters, such as "Spread this out to everyone you know, otherwise something will happen". Second, hoax information or news usually does not include the date of the incident or some information. It can be seen by using a statement such as "yesterday" or "issued by ..." which is less clear in nature. Third, hoax information usually does not include an expiration date or the validity period of the information. Fourth, there is no quotation as a source of information related to the news given. Based on this mechanism, a person can easily spread hoaxes without thinking further effect after he spreads hoaxes.

1.2. Purpose of Creating Hoax

There are several purposes for creating a hoax. First, Finneman and Thomas (2018) explain that as recorded

in historical examinations, the general purpose of creating a hoax is to provide an explanation to the public and to entertain, not to deceive the public. Likewise, journalists who create hoaxes, they also have the main goal of entertaining viewers. Where they will admit when they have lied to the viewers. Zizek (2009) as stated in Salam (2018) also assumes that most people who spread hoaxes do not realize that the information is a hoax or pretend not to be aware of it.

To fulfill the requirements for creating a hoax, the hoax maker or what is known in English as a hoaxer, must be able to convince readers to trust the information presented. Besides, hoax requires mass media to achieve its goals. Therefore, in other words, it can be stated that fraud is a means, not an end.

The next goal of hoaxes is that some hoaxes lead to and legitimize diversity (Salam, 2018). Moreover, it is explained that hoaxes are used to fight against hoax anti-diversity, giving rise to a situation where hoaxes will compete with other hoaxes. Expressing opinions and forming a perception will occur on two sides.

2. METHODS

The technique of the study was descriptive quantitative techniques. The first question of this paper is how vulnerable are students in identifying hoaxes. The participants of this research were 182 vocational students from State Polytechnic of Jakarta (PNJ) and 100 English students from Universitas Negeri Semarang (UNNES). The purpose of this sampling is to distinguish how respondents from vocational background and respondents from English background identify hoaxes. In this study, there is one dependent variable, namely the ability to identify hoaxes. The instruments used are as follows.

2.1. The dependent variable: (V1) The ability to Identify Hoax

Instrument V1: The instrument used to measure this variable was made by researchers in the form of news or semi-news stories which usually visible on Facebook and Whatsapp. Usually, the news does not have the author's name and is accompanied by a convincing picture. This kind of news is made in such a way as to be easily shared or shared through Facebook and Whatsapp platforms. In this study, there was 8 news tested. Four of the news are actual stories that have been published in leading online newspapers. Meanwhile, the other four news are hoaxes that have circulated in the community and do not have a strong scientific or factual basis. The list of news given is as follows.

Table 1. List of News

Item	News	Hoax or Fact
1	Soursop Can Cure Cancer	Hoax
2	Sophia, An Arab Robot Citizen	Fact
3	Notice the Red Circle on Your LPG	Hoax
4	Mars Rover Took Selfie	Fact
5	Floating Rock in Saudi Arabia	Hoax
6	A Car Orbiting the Earth for Eighteen Months	Fact
7	HIV Spreads on Seats in Cinemas	Hoax
8	London to Hold Muslim Gay Parade	Fact

The respondents needed to distinguish which news is fact and which news is a hoax. Like hoaxes that spread in the community, the hoaxes which tested in the study are presented in a very convincing way. The maximum score of this test is 8 and the minimum score is 0. This test is a realistic representation of the respondent's ability to identify hoaxes. Respondents were asked to work on the V1 instrument without using Google and then asked to do the same thing on the V1 instrument using Google.

The second question of this paper is how to increase resistant against hoaxes, researchers used a literature review.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of the research of the first question were divided into three parts. The first result is a general result that describes the respondent ability to identify hoaxes. In general, there are 282 respondents and their ability to identify hoaxes is served on the table as follows.

Table 2. Hoax Identification Ability of All Groups

	Nogog	Gog
N Valid	282	282
N Missing	0	0
Mean	4.2695	5.4681
Std. Deviation	1.46309	1.66630
Minimum	0.00	1.00
Maximum	8.00	8.00

The 282 respondents indicated that the average value of hoax identification without using Google was 4.2695. Meanwhile, when respondents were asked to identify hoaxes using Google, the average value increased to 5.4681. Given that the total number of questions is 8 questions, this score, unfortunately, is not satisfying. The level of resilience of respondents in

identifying hoaxes without Googling is concerning. The following table shows the data identifying hoaxes without using Google by the PNJ and UNNES groups of 282 respondents.

Table 3. Hoax Identification Scores without Google from All Groups

No Googling All Groups				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid .00	1	.4	.4	.4
Valid 1.00	8	2.8	2.8	3.2
Valid 2.00	23	8.2	8.2	11.3
Valid 3.00	46	16.3	16.3	27.7
Valid 4.00	86	30.5	30.5	58.2
Valid 5.00	59	20.9	20.9	79.1
Valid 6.00	43	15.2	15.2	94.3
Valid 7.00	13	4.6	4.6	98.9
Valid 8.00	3	1.1	1.1	100.0
Valid Total	282	100.0	100.0	

In general, without using Google, 1 person or 0.4% out of 282 respondents answered all wrongly. Only 3 people answered 8 questions correctly or 1.1%. In more detail, based on the table served, there are 2.8% of respondents or 8 people who answered only one question correctly. 23 respondents or 8.2% answered 2 questions correctly out of a total of 8 questions. Furthermore, 16.3% answered 3 questions correctly without using Google. Some of the respondents answered half of the total questions correctly, reaching 30.5% or 86 people. The second-largest answered 5 correct questions with a percentage of respondents reaching 20.9%. Then, 15.2% or 43 people answered correct questions, and 7 correct answers, only 13 people or 4.6%. It can be concluded that only 1.1% of respondents were able to correctly identify all news without Google's help. Meanwhile, with the help of Google, there has been an increase in the number of questions answered correctly by respondents which can be seen in the table below.

Table 4. Hoax Identification Score with Google from All Groups

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 1.00	3	1.1	1.1	1.1
Valid 2.00	10	3.5	3.5	4.6
Valid 3.00	25	8.9	8.9	13.5
Valid 4.00	45	16.0	16.0	29.4
Valid 5.00	47	16.7	16.7	46.1
Valid 6.00	63	22.3	22.3	68.4
Valid 7.00	61	21.6	21.6	90.1
Valid 8.00	28	9.9	9.9	100.0
Valid Total	282	100.0	100.0	

By using Google, respondents certainly find it easier to identify hoax rather than without Google, so there is an increase in the number of respondents answering questions correctly. If in the previous table where respondents did not use Google to identify the validity of the news, only 3 people or 1.1% were able to answer all the questions correctly. Meanwhile, using Google, there was an increase to 28 people or 9.9% of respondents. In more detail, as many as 63 people or 22.3% of the total of 282 respondents managed to answer 6 questions correctly. Only 3 people or 1.1% of respondents can answer only 1 question out of a total of 8 questions given. Ten people were able to answer 2 questions correctly and 25 people answered 3 questions correctly or in percentage, it could be stated 3.5% and 8.9%. Furthermore, there are almost the same percentage results for respondents who answered 4 correct questions and 5 correct questions, namely 45 and 47 people or 16.0% and 16.7%. Meanwhile, respondents answered 7 questions correctly from the total number of questions given, amounting to 61 people or 21.6%. From the data above, it can be concluded that, with the help of Google, there was an increase of 8.8% of respondents who managed to answer all the questions correctly

Table 5. The Ability of PNJ (vocational education) Group Hoax Identification

STATISTICS			
		NOGOG	GOG
N	Valid	182	182
N	Missing	0	0
Mean		4.1099	4.9670
Std. Deviation		1.44857	1.66173
Minimum		.00	1.00
Maximum		8.00	8.00

In table 5, the data of Hoax identification ability by the PNJ (vocational) group is presented which is detailed

as follows. For 182 respondents, it can be seen that the average value of hoax identification without using Google is 4.1099, while when respondents were asked to identify hoaxes with using Google, the average value increased by 0.8571, become 4.9670. The number of questions remains the same. Unfortunately, the level of resilience of respondents in identifying hoaxes without Google is still concerning. The following is a more detailed explanation which is presented in the table.

Table 6. Hoax Identification Score without Google from the PNJ Group

NO GOOGLE PNJ GROUP					
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	
Valid .00	1	.5	.5	.5	
1.00	6	3.3	3.3	3.8	
2.00	18	9.9	9.9	13.7	
3.00	28	15.4	15.4	29.1	
4.00	65	35.7	35.7	64.8	
5.00	32	17.6	17.6	82.4	
6.00	23	12.6	12.6	95.1	
7.00	8	4.4	4.4	99.5	
8.00	1	.5	.5	100.0	
Total	182	100.0	100.0		

From the table above, it can be concluded that only 1 respondent managed to answer all the questions correctly or 0.5% of the total percentage. The results of the data are the same for respondents who cannot answer any of the questions correctly, so they get a minimum score. Most of the respondents, 35.7% or 65 people only answered half of the questions correctly. The rest of them, 8 people managed to answer 7 questions correctly or 4.4%. 23 people answered 2 wrong questions from the total, or in percent it can be stated as 12.6%. The second-highest number of respondents was 32 people who managed to answer 5 questions correctly. The rest answered correct question 3, there were 28 people or 15.4%, 18 people answered correct question 2 or 9.9%, and answered 1 correct question as many as 6 people or 3.3%.

Table 7. Hoax Identification Score Using Google from the PNJ Group

GOOGLING PNJ GROUP					
	Frequency		Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	3	1.6	1.6	1.6
Valid	2.00	10	5.5	5.5	7.1
Valid	3.00	23	12.6	12.6	19.8
Valid	4.00	38	20.9	20.9	40.7
Valid	5.00	35	19.2	19.2	59.9
Valid	6.00	35	19.2	19.2	79.1
Valid	7.00	29	15.9	15.9	95.1
Valid	8.00	9	4.9	4.9	100.0
Valid	Total	182	100.0	100.0	

After looking at the data analysis in the previous table, which the identification of PNJ (vocational) groups without Google, there are some differences presented in table 6. By using Google, there was an increase of 8 people to 9 respondents who managed to identify 8 news correctly and got a maximum score. At least one question was answered correctly by 3 people, and no one else scored zero. The highest percentage, which is 20.9% or 38 people, can answer only 4 questions even though they have used Google for news identification. The rest, 7 questions were answered correctly by 19 people or 15.9%. 35 people or 19.2% answered correctly 6 and 5 points. There were 23 people who answered 3 questions correctly and 10 people answered correctly as many as 2. It can be concluded that there is an increase in correctly identifying the questions after using Google as previously mentioned. It can be concluded that there was an increase of 10.71% in the PNJ (vocational) group after identifying hoaxes using Google.

Table 8. The Ability of UNNES Group Hoax Identification (Language Department)

		NOGOG	GOG
N	Valid	100	100
N	Missing	0	0
Mean		4.5600	6.3800
Std. Deviation		1.45171	1.23730
Minimum		1.00	3.00
Maximum		8.00	8.00

In table 8, the data on Hoax identification ability by UNNES (Language Department) group is presented which is detailed as follows. In 100 respondents, the average value of hoax identification without using

Google is 4.5600, while when respondents were asked to identify hoaxes using Google, the average value increased by 1.8200, which became 6.3800. As before, the number of questions remains the same. In this data, the resilience level of respondents in identifying hoaxes without Google is still unsatisfying. However, the ability to identify hoaxes after using Google is quite a breath of fresh air. The following is a more detailed explanation that is presented in the table.

Table 9. Score of Hoax Identification without Google from UNNES Group

NO GOOGLE UNNES GROUP					
	Frequency		Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	2	2.0	2.0	2.0
Valid	2.00	5	5.0	5.0	7.0
Valid	3.00	18	18.0	18.0	25.0
Valid	4.00	21	21.0	21.0	46.0
Valid	5.00	27	27.0	27.0	73.0
Valid	6.00	20	20.0	20.0	93.0
Valid	7.00	5	5.0	5.0	98.0
Valid	8.00	2	2.0	2.0	100.0
Valid	Tota	100	100.0	100.0	
d	I				

Without using Google, UNNES (Language Department) group was able to answer at least one question correctly, namely 2 people or 2%, and no one got a zero score. The same percentage was for respondents who managed to identify hoaxes without Google and got the maximum score. A total of 5 respondents or 5% managed to get a score of 7 and 20 respondents managed to answer 6 questions correctly. At most, 27 respondents answered 5 hoax news or fact questions without the help of Google, or as much as 27%. The remaining 4 questions were successfully answered by 21 people, 3 correct questions were answered by 18 respondents, and only 5 people got a score of 2 in identifying hoax news and facts without Google's help. However, there is only an increase of 1 respondent compared to the previous group who can answer the questions correctly and got the maximum score.

Table 10. Scores of Hoax Identification Using Google from UNNES Group

GOOGLE UNNES GROUP					
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	
Valid	3.00	2	2.0	2.0	
Valid	4.00	7	7.0	7.0	
Valid	5.00	12	12.0	12.0	
Valid	6.00	28	28.0	28.0	
Valid	7.00	32	32.0	32.0	
Valid	8.00	19	19.0	19.0	
Valid	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

Noticing some differences from the previous result, in identifying hoaxes using Google from UNNES group, respondents answered at least 3 correct questions, 2 people or 2%. While quite a lot, there were 19 people or 19% of respondents got the maximum score. The remaining 32% of respondents, the most respondent of the total, managed to answer 7 questions correctly. 28 people managed to answer 6 questions correctly and 12 people answered 5 points correctly. For respondents who managed to answer 4 out of 8 questions correctly, only 7 people. It can be concluded that there was an increase of 22.75% in the UNNES group after identifying news using Google.

3.1. Building hoax resistant generation

With the sophistication of technology, information spreading is getting faster. Only by prioritizing the speed of spread or with a specific goal, fake news will spread more easily. This is what is known as a "hoax". As the young generation, you must be careful not to get involved in helping irresponsible people in spreading hoaxes. This is because hoaxes can harm and become slander for others.

To identify hoaxes, Nugroho (2018) as Chairman of the Indonesian Society Against Hoaxes explained the characteristics of hoaxes, including:

(1) Provocative Title

The news often uses provocative headlines, for example by cornering certain parties. The content of the news can be taken from official media news which is changed to create a perception in accordance with the wishes of the hoax maker. Therefore, you should look for similar references from the official website and compare their contents.

(2) Unofficial Website Address

If the information obtained is from a certain website, pay attention to the URL address of that site. Sites that have not been verified as an official press institution or are still using a blog domain.

(3) News sources are not official sites

Don't be easy to believe if the source of the news is not from an official institution like the KPK or the Police. Mass organization activists, political figures, or observers may try to lead public opinion with hoaxes. You must distinguish between opinions and facts. Facts are events that occur with testimony and evidence, while opinions are only the opinions and impressions of the author, so they tend to be subjective.

(4) Photo Edited

Nowadays, unscrupulous people can manipulate text or photos or videos. There are times when hoax makers edit photos to provoke readers. You can check the authenticity of photos by drag-and-dropping them to the Google page. You can compare search results in the form of similar images on the internet.

(5) Read more references

Read more references from trusted source such as books, articles, and journals. This activity will help people to minimize their trust toward hoaxes which may be spread in numerous platforms.

If you find hoax information, you can help prevent it from spreading, by reporting hoaxes through different means for each media. For example, on Facebook, there is a Status Report feature and reporting hoax information as hate speech/harassment/rude/threatening or other appropriate categories.

4. CONCLUSION

Building hoax resistant in a higher-level institution is a continuity process. It cannot be done instantly as if you fix a simple problem. The data above showed us how language lesson strengthens students' knowledge to choose whether it is a hoax or not. Moreover, language students have better ability to use google in identifying hoaxes. A language learner can be more aware of a hoax than a vocational student. It means that being a hoax resistant insist us to know more theoretically than practically. After all, language learners are better in identifying hoax since they have a better understanding in language mastery than the one who does not have

enough language proficiency. To build a hoax resistant generation in higher education, we need continuous process especially related with language mastery.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Salam, "The Hoax Phenomenon in Indonesian Society: Observing Anti-Diversity Memes since 2014," *Jurnal Humaniora*, 30(3), 315. doi: 10.22146/jh.v30i3.38891, 2018.
- [2] C. Juditha, "Hoax Communication Interactivity in Social Media and Anticipation (Interaksi Komunikasi Hoax di Media Sosial serta Antisipasinya)," *Journal Pekommas*, 3(1), 31, 2018.
- [3] I. Reilly, "F for Fake: Propaganda! Hoaxing! Hacking! Partisanship! and Activism! in the fake news ecology." *The Journal of American Culture*, 41(2), 139-152, 2018.
- [4] J. Gorbach, "Not Your Grandpa's Hoax: A Comparative History of Fake News." *American Journalism* 35.2, 236-249, 2018.
- [5] J. Hartley, *Digital Futures for Cultural and Media Studies*. John Wiley & Sons: United Kingdom, 2012.
- [6] J. Timmer, "Potential FCC Actions Against "Fake News": The News Distortion Policy and the Broadcast Hoax Rule." *Communication Law and Policy* 24.1, 1-53, 2019.
- [7] J. Posetti, and A. Matthews, "A short guide to the history of 'fake news' and disinformation," ICFJ. A Learning Module for Journalist and Journalism Educators, 2018.
- [8] Mastel, "Hasil Survey MASTEL Tentang Wabah HOAX Nasional" retrieved from <http://mastel.id/infografis-hasil-survey-masteltentang-wabah-hoax-nasional/> Desember 2017, 2017.
- [9] M. Zakim, "The Creativity Hoax: Precarious Work and the Gig Economy, by George Morgan and Pariece Nelligan." 176-178, 2019.
- [10] S. E. Nugroho, "Cara mengetahui hoax," *Kata Pakar*, 2018.
- [11] S. Zizek, *The Sublime Object of Ideology*. London & New York: Verso, 2009.