

FAKE NEWS CONSUMPTION AMONG INDONESIAN GENERATION Z ON TWITTER DURING PANDEMIC COVID-19

ANDARI KARINA ANOM¹, DIAN AYURIA SARWONO²,

YOSEPHINE CLAUDIA CHANDRA³

Communication Program, Bina Nusantara University Jakarta, Indonesia

E-mail: ¹aanom@binus.edu, ²dsarwono@binus.edu

ABSTRACT

This research aims to analyze how Indonesian Gen Z identifies and responds to fake news on Twitter and what types of sources produce fake news on Twitter. The research findings showed that Indonesian Gen Z identifies fake news through five metrics: Content, Context, Semantics, Structure, and User. The most used metric they used, which marked as the novelty findings of this research, was Context and Structure. Furthermore, Indonesian Gen Z tends to respond to fake news through Passive Engagement more, such as ignoring, cross-checking, passively reading, and showing skepticism, compared to Active Engagement, such as replying, sharing, and reporting.

Keywords: *Hoax, Fact Check, Twitter, Covid-19 Hoaxes, Indonesian Youth*

1. INTRODUCTION

Rising internet and social media penetration has turned the youths to have social media as one of their news sources. Nearly half of the younger population claimed to read their news, shared by family and friends, from Twitter and Facebook [2]. At the same time, news consumption had changed to become one that of incidental consumption, where instead of looking for the news, it is served to them alongside their social and entertainment content[1].

Born and raised in the digital era, Generation Z becomes the generation that is most familiar with the changing media landscape. Therefore, the question is to find out whether their familiarity in the digital world gives them the upper hand to help the war against fake news through the ability of self-identification of fake news.

Fake news, according to [2], can be defined as “news articles that are intentionally and verifiably false, and could mislead readers.” However, the umbrella term of “fake news” itself can be much larger than that. Many types of content can be categorized under “fake news”, yet each holds different meanings, based on the type of false content shared, the motives of the creator, even until the framing of the content.

Based on these parameters,[3] from the First Draft organization broke down the information ecosystem into 7 types of misinformation and

disinformation: 1. Satire or parody, No intention to cause harm but has the intention to fool; 2. False connection, When headlines, visuals, or captions don't support the content"; 3. Misleading content (Misleading use of information to frame an issue or an individual); 4. False context: when genuine content is shared with false contextual information; 5. Imposter content: When genuine sources are impersonated; 6. Manipulated content: When genuine information or imagery is manipulated to deceive; and 7. Fabricated content, New content is 100% false, designed to deceive and do harm.

The Internet penetration, as well as social media penetration in Indonesia, continues to show high growth every year. The latest data based on Simon Kemp's Database report shows that “there were 160 million social media users in Indonesia in January 2020”, with its penetration at 59 percent [4]. According to earlier writings by [5], Indonesian internet users spend “an average of 8 hours and 36 minutes online every day”.

With the global pandemic sweeping over countries, cases of misinformation surrounding COVID-19 and other health information became rampant in 2020. The COVID-19 outbreak was accompanied by what was called “infodemic” by the World Health Organization[6], defined as “an overabundance of information that makes it hard for people to find trustworthy sources and reliable guidance when they need it.” The World Health Organization has provided accurate information to

combat misinformation, spread all across their social media channels. There were also efforts from the Ministry of Communication and Information, Indonesia, as well as fact-checkers like kawalcovid19.go.id in providing accurate information and combating COVID-19 misinformation.

Based on the information above, this research wishes to answer the following questions: how do Indonesian Gen Z identify fake news on Twitter, how do Indonesian Gen Z respond to fake news on Twitter, and what type of sources produce fake news on Twitter.

Gen Z and the Social Media

This paper focused on Generation Z. Gen Z, the iGeneration, or the post-Millennials is the name of the generation that succeeded the Millennials that was generally born between the late 1990s until the early 2000s. There are many debates on what should be the exact age range of Generation Z, some might say it dates as far back as 1996 and goes as far as 2014. For this research, this study is going to use the one defined by Michael Dimock from *Pew Research Center*, whereas Generation Z is defined as individuals born between the year 1997 until 2012. That means as of 2020, the individuals should be around 8 to 23 years old.

The generation is also perceived as the first digital natives, since “they have never experienced life outside of the internet”. It is then assumed that they are the generation that “has become accustomed to interacting and communicating in a world that is connected at all times.”[7].

As the digital natives, Gen Z is assumed to be the generation that is most familiar with the technology of social media. They are used to expressing themselves through social media, therefore used to both giving and accepting feedback and comments from others [8].

A 2017 study also stated that they are “technically innate and very style-conscious” compared to the previous generations. They have a constant need to be “involved and informed to/with other people”, as they are “vigorous contributors, high consumption of online content, creative and mash-up experts”. They have a much stronger need and emotional bond to have online communication, online participation, and to “remain connected” to the digital world compared to the previous generations [9].

Twitter as a micro-blogging site has enabled information to spread wider. As opposed to other social networking sites that might have to require visuals, such as Instagram and YouTube, Twitter

merely requires users to produce short, written content. It is also easier for users to repost content to their followers through retweeting and liking. Due to these features, Twitter becomes more prone to the spread of fake news. [10] conducted a study that suggested “false news spreads more than the truth” on Twitter, mainly because they were retweeted by many more people, especially when concerning political topics.

In a report about Generation Z, Barkley and FutureCast [11] suggested that the generation has the highest Twitter usage at 45 percent, as opposed to the preceding generations of Millennials and Gen X, whose usage is only at 34 percent. This might be the case as well for Indonesian Gen Z, as Indonesia was dubbed as the Twitter nation with its 11.2 million Twitter users as of July 2020[12].

Other than that, Generation Z is argued to have used Twitter to grow the trends of digital activism. This can be seen through the case of the Black Lives Matter movement, starting with the trend of #IRUNWITHMAUD from the murder case of Ahmaud Arbery, up to the murder of George Floyd in 2020[13].

Despite having the credentials of being “digitally natives”, a survey has found that they might still be “digitally naive”. A Stanford study shows that 82 percent of middle schoolers in the US couldn’t tell the difference between ads and news [14]. According to a Stanford professor, this was since their inept ability to operate digital devices to obtain the information within it did not necessarily translate to the fact that they understood the information that the digital devices had provided them[15].

However, Gen Z can be seen to handle fake news better than the previous generations. This can be seen through a 2019 study that shows how Gen Z is less likely to share misinformation online compared to the previous generations[16]. A survey done by Axios claims that “83% of Gen Z college students said they get the majority of their news from social media or online news sites”, yet they are skeptical enough towards social media to not always believe everything that they see or read there[17].

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Social media has a different dynamic compared to broadcast and print media. These traditional media have a “one-to-many” communication, where the media provides the information. From this, arises the theory of the Two-Step Flow of information by Katz and Lazarsfeld in 1944, which dictated the flow of information that goes from mass media to

opinion leaders, who have the power to influence public opinion as a whole.

Considering the different dynamics of social media, another theory similar to Katz and Lazarsfeld's Two-Step Flow theory arises called the **One-Step Flow theory** or also known as **Curated Flows** by Thorson and Wells (2015)[18]. This theory fits better in the "many-to-many" communication, as it provides a much more complex, yet the direct flow of information that would eventually shape and form one's opinion. Thorson and Wells (2015)[18] personally claim that it fits into the context of social media as it takes into consideration "the dynamics of a media environment characterized by many speakers; information overload; and the necessities of selectivity, choice, and filtering."

Thorson and Wells (2015)[18] recognized 5 types of curated flows: Journalistic, Strategic, Personal, Social, and Algorithmic. The first curated flow is the journalistic curated flow, which dictates that the flow of information comes from media organizations and journalists, which Thorson and Wells (2015)[18] believed would have a more "public-oriented logic" such as providing "news values" and "concern for informed democracy". Unlike the journalistic curated flow, the strategically curated flow that comes from corporate entities, elites, and/or politicians, whom Thorson and Wells (2015) believed have a more "commercial media logic" which serves a purpose as to maximize sales of the product or to get votes in the elections. Not only that, they mentioned that massive exposure to strategic curation might make an individual unaware of opposing views and much more prone to the spread of misinformation.

The third curated flow is the personally curated flow. This particular curation creates content based on the "logic of personal interest", where the users can actively decide what kind of news content that they wanted to consume (Thorson & Wells, 2015)[18]. They argued that "personal curation emphasizes active, intentional customization of one's media environment in pursuit of individual goals, following uses and gratifications." Thorson and Wells (2015) also implied that this type of curation flow often traps an individual inside of their own "echo chamber".

The fourth curated flow is the socially curated flow, influenced by one's social networks, such as friends, family, colleagues, and others (Thorson & Wells, 2015)[18]. They believed that the curation flow would be mostly "a result of interests and opinions of one's social contacts." The last curated flow is the algorithmically curated flow, where the news content was provided by the algorithm or

recommendation engines of the social network (Thorson & Wells, 2015)[18]. They stated that the results of this particular curation may either amplify or counter personal curated flow, depending on how the algorithm is designed by the particular social network.

Understanding the balance between these curation flows may affect the news consumption process of young users and therefore how a person responds to certain news content would depend on both the curation flows and their news consumption process. Considering the different flows that exist within a social network, this study would then be able to provide a better contextualization of how different sources and flows might interact with different metrics in identifying fake news.

Metrics in Identifying Fake News

A socio-scientific study in 2018 by Andy Nestor Ryan Pazon was conducted on Gen Z Filipinos and how they identify fake news based on different metrics. Pazon (2018)[19] defines that Gen Z Filipinos identified fake news based on 5 different categories of determinants:

1. Content, which includes "the content of the articles, date, and place of publication, substantial content, and showbiz personalities on topic."
2. Context, which includes "author's biases, sources' credibility, references, manipulative, integrity attack, illogical, propaganda, and hearsay."
3. Semantics, which includes "grammar and coherence of topic".
4. Structure, which includes "websites' reliability, site's legitimacy, design, contradicting title and content, and photoshop mistakes."
5. User, which includes the critical thinking of the users, and whether or not the users understand the content or post (relating to literacy).

This study would take these metrics to understand further the identifying process of fake news by Indonesian Gen Z.

News Consumption Process in Social Media

The news consumption process in social media is more inclined to be "incidental" than "actively seeking" (Boczkowski et al., 2017)[1]. Furthermore, Boczkowski and other writers characterized the news consumption by young consumers on social media where the consumers are constantly exposed to news content, yet these content seemed to be "undifferentiated from other types of content on social media feeds". This incidental news consumption also translates to "acquiring information multiple times a day", yet in short bursts of time, which resulted in "reading the

content partially” (Boczkowski et al., 2017). [1] Due to this time limitation, Boczkowski et al. (2017)[1] believed that it resulted in the “young users clicking on news items sporadically” and “engaging with them only superficially on most occasions”, such as by reading the headlines and scanning the content instead of reading the whole article.

Another study by Oeldorf-Hirsch (2017)[20] regarding news consumption on social media shows that both types of news consumption (“active seeking of” and “incidental exposure to news”) linked to both engagement (defined as “replying to, liking, or retweeting another user’s tweet” for example) and greater cognitive elaboration (defined as “connecting new information to other information stored in the memory”), yet it does not translate into political knowledge. Oeldorf-Hirsch (2017) [20] suggested that “engaging in shared news content on social media takes on a more social function that redirects users away from the facts in a news story”, where the engagement itself “leads to thinking about it more personally, but potentially at the expense of knowledge” in the context of Twitter users.

Responding to Misinformation

A study by Christine Geeng, Savanna Yee, Franziska Roesner in 2020[21] provides information as to how users might interact with misinformation, irrespective of whether they are aware of fake news or not. Geeng et al. (2020) suggested that there are 5 different responses to misinformation, namely ignoring/skipping, believing the content straight away, sharing and/or liking the content, showing skepticism towards the content, and showing skepticism towards the context of the content.

As to provide contextualization of these responses, one should refer back to the news consumption process and to other relevant studies to find out why these kinds of responses happened. The relevant studies provided would focus on the active responses, such as opposition towards fake news (such as showing skepticism) and show support towards fake news (such as believing, sharing, and/or liking).

Relevant to the Curated Flows theory and how people might share misinformation online, another relevant study discussed how Twitter perpetuates echo chambers. According to Laura Brukner (2020)[22], Twitter users are “likely to follow other people with opinions similar to their own” as people are more likely to “engage with a small subset of

content aligned with their ideological preferences”, which might cause “incorrect information being circulated among like-minded people” and causing them to adopt an even more extreme political stance.

Concluding from these previous studies, there are various motivations for sharing misinformation online. People might share misinformation online due to its utility, may it be to seek information and express one’s opinions (Chen & Sin, 2013)[23], or to enhance social cohesion between users (Duffy et al., 2019)[24]. Furthermore, users might care about these social benefits more than paying more attention to the accuracy of the news content (Pennycook et al., 2020)[25].

Another possibility is that the participatory users are politically engaged, thus giving into their confirmation bias by believing and sharing misinformation that is supporting their ideological stances (Valenzuela et al., 2020)[26]. This was supported by Laura Brukner (2020)[22], who argued that Twitter gives the perfect condition for people to be trapped in echo chambers, thus spreading incorrect information. This particular study would examine further as to which of these motivations and/or reasons are relevant to Urban Indonesian Gen Z in terms of sharing misinformation online.

Opposing Fake News

In theory, individuals with higher news literacy would be able to identify online misinformation correctly, and thus might be able to give negative responses to fake news through skepticism.

However, a study by Vraga and Tully (2019)[27] suggested that people with higher news literacy engage less in news and political content, nor share such content compared to individuals with lower news literacy. This would simply mean that “people with higher NL (news literacy) are not supplying high-quality content to social media environments, where many get news and political information”, implying that when people with higher news literacy might not necessarily “correct” others by providing the right information.

These two relevant studies might pose a contextual problem of what might be happening in the status *quo*, where knowledgeable users tend to ignore and not share accurate information (Vraga & Tully, 2019)[27]. Yet at the same time, these critical comments and/or corrections are what make Indonesian social media users reduce the spread of fake news. This particular study wishes to confirm whether urban Indonesian Gen Z also has the same

problem in conveying skepticism to fake news, and whether or not they are passive in combating fake news.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research method used in this qualitative study is through **focus group discussions**. According to Gill et al. (2008)[28], a focus group is “a group discussion on a particular topic organized for research purposes” that is “guided, monitored and recorded by a researcher.” Falling under the qualitative approach, this method can be used to “generate information on collective views”, as well as to understand the meaning behind said views (Gill et al., 2008)[28].

The subjects of this study would be focused on **Generation Z**, specifically those who are living in urban areas of the Greater Jakarta Area and those that are active Twitter users.

Through purposive sampling, the qualitative study therefore can reach its specific aim of understanding the behaviors of urban Indonesian Generation Z on Twitter, as well as “select respondents that are most likely to yield appropriate and useful information” (Campbell et al., 2020)[29].

4. FINDINGS

By analyzing the data results from the respondents, it can be concluded that Indonesian Gen Z’s news consumption on Twitter is mostly in the form of incidental news, where they are faced with an overload of information from various information flows. As a consequence, Indonesian Gen Z develops the customized information-filtering mechanism that helps them in navigating the news ecosystem on Twitter, dubbed as the “Interesting” factor. When the news content fulfills the criteria and is seen as “Interesting”, Indonesian Gen Z would engage more with the news content. However, if seen as “Uninteresting”, Indonesian Gen Z would just engage superficially, as described by Boczkowski et al. (2017)[1] regarding incidental news consumption behaviors. Below is an illustration of how Indonesian Gen Z consumes news on Twitter.

With this news consumption behavior as contextualization in mind, the author proceeds to analyze the various metrics used by Indonesian Gen Z in identifying fake news on Twitter. A previous study done by Pazon (2018) [19] suggested that there are five metrics to identifying fake news on Twitter, namely Content, Context, Semantics,

Context, Structure, and Users. Comparatively, the research findings confirmed that Indonesian Gen Z used all five metrics in identifying fake news. Not only the metrics were identified, but they were also further contextualized in this research as follows:

1. Indonesian Gen Z rarely uses **Content** as the main indicator in identifying fake news, yet they seem to be more skeptical when content is “too good to be true”, or when content presents new, shocking information that goes against a previously established truth. In some cases, Indonesian Gen Z also seems to overlook content when the references of a tweet are good.

2. Indonesian Gen Z mostly uses the metric of **Semantics** intuitively, or “by feelings” as they often described, which is based on how they think a hoax is by looking at the choice and use of words in the news content. When the use of words is too “clickbait-y”, they immediately grow skeptical and immediately dismiss the news content.

3. **Context** plays a huge role in the way that Indonesian Gen Z identifies fake news on Twitter. There are two important parts of the context, namely Social Affirmations and Credibility of Source.

a. **Social Affirmations** talks about the way that the news content was affirmed by others. Hence, when identifying fake news, Indonesian Gen Z often read replies to the news content and/or share the news content to their peers to ask for confirmation. Moreover, a tweet with higher interactions with no negative comment can even be considered as “truth” for some people. This was done to save effort and time compared to personally cross-checking the news themselves.

b. The idea of **Credibility of a Source** may vary from person to person. However, generally speaking, there are four criteria to a credible source, such as (1) Whether the sources were media accounts; (2) Whether the sources are verified; (3) Other people’s opinion on the credibility of a source, including the quantity and quality of their followers, the engagement that they receive, and the reputation of the source; (4) The source’s digital reputation; and (5) The references that the source used in their news content.

4. An equally important metric is **Structure**, which is often taken by Indonesian Gen Z as “evidence”. The structure includes References and Contradicting Title & Content, explained in the following:

a. **References** act as the main part of Structure, which serves as evidence. This might include links, pictures, and videos to support the news content. References can also boost the

Credibility of the Source, which can be dangerous as some people tend to overlook other metrics once the references are valid.

b. Indonesian Gen Z showed a tendency to be skeptical and not believe news content at face value due to **Contradicting Title & Content**. A majority of them acknowledged that the news content should not be trusted just by its headlines, but also by reading the full article. Indonesian Gen Z would usually proceed to read the whole article (in the case that the news content is deemed “Interesting”) before making any rash judgment whether or not to believe.

5. The last metric, **Users**, gives out three factors that might affect how Indonesian Gen Z identify fake news on Twitter, namely Literacy & Knowledge, Critical Thinking, and User’s Belief / Bias.

a. **Knowledge**, defined as a person’s intake of information, is shown to help a User’s ability in identifying fake news. However, Indonesian Gen Z admitted that the generation has low reading interest and Media **Literacy**. Additionally, Indonesian Gen Z is also still struggling with figuring the right metrics in identifying fake news as there is little to no education on how to filter information.

b. In the era of post-truth, where facts and opinions are intertwined, opposing opinions may have their facts to support, and facts are often overlooked by opinions, a **User’s Belief / Bias** can affect how Indonesian Gen Z identify fake news.

c. With the overload and high speed of information, information can be updated and therefore changed faster. With this in mind, the Users need to have the ability to have a flexible mindset and reevaluate previously established information. This skill is called **Critical Thinking**. Furthermore, Critical Thinking might be able to reduce the effects of User Beliefs / Bias.

Irrespective of whether Indonesian Gen Z can identify fake news correctly, a variety of responses towards fake news were identified. This particular point was originally based on a study done by Geeng, et al. (2020)[21], where they identified five responses, namely ignoring, sharing/liking, believing content at face value, skepticism to content, and skepticism to context. All five responses are identified within the research results, however, they are divided into two types: **Active Engagement** and **Passive Engagement**.

Active Engagement is typically done when the news content has previously passed the “Interesting” factor, where the news content is deemed to be worth the effort. Components of

Active Engagement include Replying, Sharing, and Reporting.

1. At times, Indonesian Gen Z might feel morally obliged to correct or clarify fake news content by **Replying**. However, the interaction usually happens when they are knowledgeable enough about the topic when they know that other people are not aware that it was a hoax, and/or the topic of the hoax is important and affects many people.

2. There are two scenarios where Indonesian Gen Z would interact with fake news by **Sharing**: (1) They are not aware that it was a hoax due to limited credible information available concerning a developing situation, yet everyone is talking and they are momentarily fooled to misidentify the trending fake news as real news, and/or (2) They are asking for other people’s confirmation on the accuracy of information. While the first scenario suggests that Indonesian Gen Z lacks Critical Thinking, it rarely occurs. The second scenario, however, is potentially dangerous in the context of a like-minded social circle that may create small bubbles of echo chambers.

3. **Reporting** doesn’t come naturally for Indonesian Gen Z in responding to fake news, unless when the fake news is offensive and/or when the fake news is gaining popularity. It is unclear, however, as to why Indonesian Gen Z doesn’t interact by Reporting a lot.

Moreover, Passive Engagement is the popular choice for most Indonesian Gen Z as they fear the repercussions that may come from engaging with fake news. Passive Engagement can be divided into 5 components, namely Ignoring, Cross-checking, Reading, Skepticism to Content, and Skepticism to Context. Further explanation can be seen below:

1. **Ignoring** is a popular response among Indonesian Gen Z, as most news content that is deemed “Uninteresting” by their criteria, regardless of whether they are real or fake news, would automatically be ignored. In the case where the news content was “Interesting”, Indonesian Gen Z might believe yet at the same time ignore it, which can be dangerous as they allow no external feedback loop to correct them. In the case where Indonesian Gen Z are aware that the news content is fake news, there are numerous reasons as to why they ignore it, namely:

a. They assumed everyone else knows that it was a hoax by observing the interactions/engagement on the news content;

b. They fear that interacting with the fake news would only worsen the spread of fake news;

c. They feel like interacting wouldn't have a significant impact anyway.

2. Although it is the more accurate way of identifying fake news, Cross-checking doesn't come naturally for Indonesian Gen Z. Instead, they tend to rely upon other metrics, such as Credibility of Sources and References, only using Cross-checking as a final resort.

3. Irrespective of whether Indonesian Gen Z can identify fake news or not, they often interact just by **Reading**, which includes checking out the article link of the news content and also replying to the tweet. Indonesian Gen Z might not need to interact further with certain news content and would only passively absorb the information from the tweet.

4. As previously mentioned in the metric of Content, Indonesian Gen Z rarely shows **Skepticism to Content**, unless the news content was "too good to be true" and/or contradicts previously shockingly established information.

5. On the other hand, Indonesian Gen Z shows **Skepticism to Context** as they tend to value and be more critical towards the context, such as Credibility of Source, References, and Social Affirmations, rather than the content itself.

6. CONCLUSION

In the era of information overload, there are current efforts to combat fake news, such as creating better social media algorithms in fake news detection and creating laws to deter perpetrators. However, fake news is still rampant on social media. In that case, it becomes crucial to educate people, especially the younger generation, to be able to self-identify fake news. This study aims to find out how Indonesian Generation Z, specifically university students in the Greater Jakarta Area, is currently handling fake news, specifically on Twitter.

The research has two objectives, which are to analyze how Indonesian Gen Z identifies fake news on Twitter and to find out the different responses of Indonesian Gen Z when encountering fake news on Twitter.

This research used the qualitative approach with two different research methods, such as focus group discussions and written interviews. The focus group discussion was done in 4 sessions that were done on 27 December 2020, 28 December 2020, and 2 January 2021 through Google Meet. Meanwhile, the written interviews were done during the period of 24 December 2020 until 3 January 2021 through Google Form. The focus group discussion also had interactive exercises through Google Jamboard,

where the respondents could write what they would think, feel, and do about the five sample tweets anonymously.

The main theories in the research were based on a 2018 study on Socioscientific Perspectives on 'Fake News' in the Era of Social Media among Generation Z Filipinos by Andy Nestor Ryan Pazon[19], which proposed the five different metrics used in identifying fake news, as well as a 2020 study on "Fake News on Facebook and Twitter: Investigating How People (Don't) Investigate" by Geeng, et al. (2020)[21] on various responses towards fake news.

To sum up the research findings based on the research questions, the answers are as follows:

How does Indonesian Gen Z identify fake news on Twitter?

Indonesian Gen Z identifies fake news based on five metrics, namely Content, Context, Semantics, Structure, and User. Content refers to the information and/or substantial content of the tweet, Context refers to the supporting elements of the content, such as Social Affirmations, the sentiment around the news content, as well as Credibility of the Source. Semantics refers to the choice and use of words that are associated with fake news. Structure refers to the evidence that supports the content, such as References and Contradicting Title & Content. Users refer to the internal factors that affect the identification process of fake news, such as their media Literacy & knowledge, Critical Thinking, and their Belief / Bias. The main metrics that Indonesian Gen Z mostly used are Context and References.

1. How does Indonesian Gen Z respond to fake news on Twitter?

Regardless of whether Indonesian Gen Z can identify fake news accurately, they give responses to this fake news. The responses themselves are affected by the "Interesting" factor of each person. If deemed "Interesting", Indonesian Gen Z would do Active Engagement, while if not, they might do Passive Engagement. In doing Active Engagement, they might choose to Reply, Share, and/or Report the fake news. Meanwhile, in doing Passive Engagement, they might choose to ignore, cross-check with other sources, passively read articles and replies, and remain skeptical towards the content and context.

Therefore, this research did not only identify the various metrics used by Indonesian Gen Z to identify fake news on Twitter and their responses towards said fake news, this research also contributed to previous studies by providing contextualization of the scenarios in which the

factors might play out.

2. What types of sources produce fake news on Twitter?

Based on the answers from the respondents, it can be concluded that fake news can be produced by many types of sources, from the credible account to personal and non-credible and lesser known personal Twitter account. Even if the Twitter account shared link from respected news media, but when they put it in a different context and created a misleading to the readers, then it is also considered as disinformation. On the other hand, it is also possible for the personal or the “lesser-known” account shared content based on fact and, therefore, not a hoax. It heavily depends on the structure, context and credibility of the information on the Twitter accounts.

Lastly, many further research recommendations can be done to complement the research gap in this study, and they are welcome to use this study as a reference in the future. As fake news keeps evolving, it is important to not only the various responses to fake news but also the impacts of these responses in the context of the war against hoaxes. Another interesting angle would be to see how the metrics used in identifying fake news might affect and/or interact with the variable of responses towards fake news, and vice versa. Furthermore, the research can be shifted to a different target audience, such as Generation Z in general or Generation Z in rural areas of Indonesia, or a different social media platform, such as TikTok, YouTube, or Instagram.

REFERENCES:

- [1] P. Boczkowski, E. Mitchelstein, and M. Matassi, “Incidental News: How Young People Consume News on Social Media,” in *50th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*, 2017, pp. 1785–1795.
- [2] H. Alcott and M. Gentzkow, “Social Media and Fake News in the 2016,” *J. Econ. Perspect.*, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 211–236, 2017.
- [3] C. Wardle, “Understanding information Disorder,” in *Essential Guide to Understanding Information Disorder*, First Draft, 2019.
- [4] S. Kemp, “Digital 2020: Global Digital Overview,” 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://wearesocial-net.s3-eu-west-1.amazonaws.com/wp-content/uploads/common/reports/digital-2020/digital-2020-global.pdf>.
- [5] E. Wong, “How Indonesians Embrace the Digital World,” *The Jakarta Post*, Mar. 18, 2019.
- [6] World Health Organization, “Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV): Situation Report 13,” 2020.
- [7] A. Turner, “Generation Z: Technology and Social Interest,” *J. Individ. Psychol.*, vol. 71, no. 2, pp. 103–113, 2019.
- [8] A. (2018) Dolot, “Characteristics of Generation Z,” *e-mentor*, vol. 2, no. 74, pp. 44–50, 2018, doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15219/em74.1351>.
- [9] J. PrakashYadav. Gyan; Rai, “The Generation Z and their Social Media Usage: A Review and a Research Outline.,” *Glob. J. Enterp. Inf. Syst.*, vol. 9, no. 2, 2017, doi: 10.18311/gjeis/2017/15748.
- [10] S. Vosoughi, Soroush; Roy, Deb; Aral, “The spread of true and false news online,” *Science (80-.)*, vol. 359, no. 6380, pp. 1146–1151, 2018, doi: 10.1126/science.aap9559.
- [11] Barkley and FutureCast, “Getting to Know Gen Z: How The Pivotal Generation is Different From Millennials,” *Millennialmarketing.com*, 2017.
- [12] Statista, “Leading countries based on number of Twitter users as of October 2020.” [Online]. Available: <https://www.statista.com/statistics/242606/number-of-active-twitter-users-in-selected-countries/>.
- [13] R. Salinas, “How social media has changed the way injustice is resolved,” *Highlander News*, 2020.
- [14] S. Wineburg, “How We Can Teach Gen Z A Better Kind of Media Literacy,” *Pacific Standard*, 2019.
- [15] K. Kovacks, “Gen Z has a Misinformation Problems,” 2020. <https://digitalcontentnext.org/blog/2020/06/04/gen-z-has-a-misinformation-problem/>.
- [16] A. Guess, J. ; Nagler, and J. ; Tucker, “Less than you think: Prevalence and predictors of fake news dissemination on Facebook.,” *Sci. Adv.*, vol. 5, no. 1, 2019, [Online]. Available: 10.1126/sciadv.aau4586.
- [17] S. . Kight, “Gen Z is eroding the power of misinformation.,” *Axios*, 2020. <https://www.axios.com/2020/09/15/gen-z-is-eroding-the-power-of-misinformation>.
- [18] C. Thorson, Kjerstin ; Wells, “Curated Flows: A Framework for Mapping Media Exposure in the Digital Age,” in *Communication Theory*, 2015.

- [19] A. . Pazon, “Socioscientific Perspectives on ‘Fake News’ in the Era of Social Media among Generation Z Filipinos,” *Asian J. Multidiscip. Stud.*, vol. 1, no. 2, 2018.
- [20] A. Oeldorf-Hirsch, “The Role of Engagement in Learning from Active and Incidental News Exposure on Social Media,” *Mass Commun. Soc.*, vol. 21, no. 2, 2019, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/15205436.2017.1384022>.
- [21] F. Geeng, Christina; Yee, Savanna; Roesner, “Fake News on Facebook and Twitter: Investigating How People (Don’t) Investigate,” in *CHI ’20: Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 2020, pp. 1–14, [Online]. Available: <https://dl.acm.org/doi/abs/10.1145/3313831.3376784>.
- [22] L. Brukner, “Digital Activism in Online Communities and the Spread of Misinformation on Twitter,” 2020, [Online]. Available: <https://networkconference.netstudies.org/20200UA/2020/04/26/digital-activism-in-online-communities-and-the-spread-of-misinformation-on-twitter/>.
- [23] X. Chen and S.-C. J. Sin, “‘Misinformation? What of it?’ Motivations and Individual Differences in Misinformation Sharing on Social Media,” 2013, [Online]. Available: <https://asistdl.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/meet.14505001102>.
- [24] A. Duffy, E. ; Tandoc, and R. ; Ling, “Too good to be true, too good not to share: the social utility of fake news,” *Information, Commun. Soc.*, vol. 23, no. 13, 2019, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2019.1623904>.
- [25] G. Pennycook, J. McPhetres, Y. ; Zhang, J. G. Lu, and D. G. Rand, “Fighting COVID-19 Misinformation on Social Media: Experimental Evidence for a Scalable Accuracy-Nudge Intervention,” *Psychol. Sci.*, vol. 31, no. 7, pp. 770–780, 2020, [Online]. Available: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/epub/10.1177/0956797620939054>.
- [26] J.-P. Valenzuela, Sebastian; Halpern, Daniel; Katz, James.E; Miranda, “The Paradox of Participation Versus Misinformation: Social Media, Political Engagement, and the Spread of Misinformation,” *Digit. Journal.*, vol. 7, no. 6, pp. 802–823, 2019, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2019.1623701>.
- [27] E. K. Vraga and M. ; Tully, “News literacy, social media behaviors, and skepticism toward information on social media,” *Information, Commun. Soc.*, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 150–166, 2019, doi: [doi:10.1080/1369118X.2019.1637445](https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2019.1637445).
- [28] P. Gill, K. Stewart, E. Treasure, and B. Chadwick, “Methods of data collection in qualitative research: interviews and focus groups,” *Br. Dent. J.*, pp. 291–295, 2008, doi: [10.1038/bdj.2008.192](https://doi.org/10.1038/bdj.2008.192).
- [29] S. Campbell, M. Greenwood, S. Prior, T. Shearer, and K. Walkem, “Purposive sampling: complex or simple? Research case examples,” *J. Res. Nurs.*, vol. 25, no. 8, pp. 652–661, 2020, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1744987120927206>.