

## Intergeneration Comparison of the Spread Pattern of Hoax

### Perbandingan Pola Penyebaran Hoaks Antargenerasi

Muhammad Edy Susilo<sup>1</sup>, Senja Yustitia<sup>2</sup>, Subhan Afifi<sup>3</sup>

<sup>123</sup>Komunikasi UPN “Veteran” Yogyakarta,  
Jln. Babarsari 2 Tambakbayan Sleman Yogyakarta  
edysusilo@upnyk.ac.id

#### Abstract

*Social media is one of the fields for spreading hoaxes or fake news. This study compared the spread patterns of hoax between Generation X and Generation Z. This study used McPrenski's Generation Theory and the concepts of DeFleur and Ball-Rokeach regarding social categories theory. A survey was conducted in Sleman Regency, Yogyakarta province, and the sample size was 240. The research was held before the Indonesia General Election 2019 due to the high spread of political hoaxes. The hypothesis was tested using the T-test formula. The results showed that there were differences in hoax distribution patterns between both generations. Generation X looked more active in spreading hoax compared to Generation Z. This finding confirmed the Generation Theory and the terminology of digital immigrants and digital natives. The findings can be considered positive since Generation Z, which will be more active in the future, seemed less interested in hoaxes and tended to be more digitally literate. The digital literacy movement should consider the specificities of each target group because each group has different characteristics.*

**Keywords:** *Digital Immigrant; Digital Native; Hoax; Media Literacy; Social Media*

#### Abstrak

Media sosial adalah salah satu media yang menjadi medan bagi tersebarnya hoaks atau berita bohong. Penelitian ini bermaksud membandingkan pola penyebaran hoaks antara Generasi X dan Generasi Z. Penelitian ini menggunakan Teori Generasi dari McPrenski dan konsep DeFleur dan Ball-Rokeach mengenai Teori Kategori Sosial. Metode yang digunakan adalah survei di Kabupaten Sleman Yogyakarta dengan sample size 240. Penelitian diadakan menjelang Pemilihan Umum Indonesia 2019, di mana terjadi penyebaran hoaks yang tinggi. Uji hipotesis dilakukan dengan menggunakan T-test. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa terdapat perbedaan pola penyebaran hoaks di antara kedua generasi. Generasi X tampak lebih aktif dalam menyebarkan hoaks dibandingkan dengan Generasi Z. Temuan ini semakin menegaskan Teori Generasi dan terminologi digital immigrant dan digital native. Temuan penelitian memberikan harapan positif karena Generasi Z yang akan lebih aktif di masa depan tampak kurang tertarik dengan hoaks dan cenderung lebih melek secara digital. Gerakan digital literacy sebaiknya lebih mempertimbangkan kekhasan masing-masing kelompok sasaran karena di mereka memiliki karakteristik yang berbeda.

**Kata Kunci:** *Digital Immigrant; Digital Native; Hoaks; Literasi Media; Media Sosial*

## Introduction

Internet-based digital communication is a revolutionary type of communication. This media is capable of converging different previous media, ranging from telephone, computer, to data. For that reason, David Beer (Beers, 2006) points out the characteristics of the internet, as new media, namely network, interactivity, information, interface, archive, and simulation. Out of the advantages mentioned, interactivity is one of the most prominent features. Interactive means spread (from numerous sources to numerous audiences), and within that sphere, two-way or mutual communication is experienced. It indicates the disappearance of media control, together with a dispensation of control towards sources. Media becomes a tool that facilitates each audience by involving audiences' experiences, both in space and time (Nasrullah, 2016).

In conventional media, audiences (hearer, viewer, or reader) tend to be passive. They are merely objects or targets overwhelmed by message. With interactivity on the internet, the term audience turns to be insufficient since audiences could transform to be the communicators. In the past, mass communicator was identical to large organizations and involved numerous financial sources; nowadays, internet users can also be mass communicator, in terms of having many followers.

In Indonesia, internet users have risen significantly. According to a survey of the Association of Indonesian Internet Provider Service, Indonesian internet users in 2017 had reached 142 million users, with the penetration rate at 54,69% from the total population. Last year, internet users grew by 7,9% compared to the previous year and had surged by more than 600% in the last ten years (Jayani, 2019).

One of the facilities that the internet offers is social media. This media refers to new media that emphasize interactive participation. At least, there are two noticeable characteristics of this new media. Firstly, it enables users' participation and, secondly, consistent with its participative nature, necessitates interaction. This interaction can be an interaction with friends, families, or acquaintances (Manning, 2014).

A study conducted by We Are Social and Hootsuite reported that in January 2018, 130 million Indonesian people had been actively using social media, including Instagram, Twitter, and Facebook. If it is compared with the number of internet users, 97,9% of Indonesian internet users had used social media. If it is compared with the number of Indonesian people, 48% of Indonesian people had used social media. Not to mention that around 120 million users (92% of total social media users) accessed the internet through their mobile, while Indonesian mobile users had hit 177,9 million people. In other words, Indonesian mobile users had touched 49% of the total population of Indonesian people (Dikdok, 2018).

Apart from social media, chatting application or instant messenger is also prevalent. This platform primarily attempts to facilitate the users to communicate privately through the internet. WhatsApp (WA), Line, and WeChat are some of the examples. The differences between social media and chatting applications are merely accessibility. While, generally, social media could be accessed by anyone, except if it is set private, chatting application is limited to only people that have listed in the contact list.

Indonesian people are highly active in sending messages through social media. A report entitled "Survey on Information Technology Use in 2017," published by Indonesia Ministry of Communication and Information, stated that 84,6% of respondents affirmed that they were active in using instant messenger (IM). Based on regions, the number of

IMs in rural and urban areas witnessed no differences, and compared to other IM applications, WhatsApp (WA) was ranked first.

WA's popularity as the most preferred IM can also be seen in "Online Mobile Instant Messaging Survey 2017" conducted by DailySocial that found that 97,24% of respondents admitted that they used WhatsApp at least once, and 61,81% confirmed that WhatsApp was instant messenger they use the most. Another preferred IM was Line with 88,49%, Blackberry Messenger with 88,82%, and Facebook Messenger (77,26%) (Utami, 2017). However, during the writing process of this article, Blackberry Messenger has ended its service in Indonesia, starting from May 31, 2019. They announced that they could not compete with other providers that have controlled the market (Franedya, 2019).

Granted, through social media and IM, the users do not only interact but also open other modalities, for example, in the economy. Nevertheless, this media cannot be separated from the negative consequences. One essential phenomenon appearing concurrently with the advent and development of social media is the ubiquity of hoax. In general, hoax means fake news, or "an act that is intended to trick people into believing something is real when it is not" (wordinfo, n.d.), and etymologically stems from "hocus or something that is spoken quickly, and there is also hokum, which is a blend of hocus-pocus and "bunkum" or "bunk."

Fake news or hoax has existed since a long time ago. However, with the advent of the internet, hoax finds its new field that is fertile and green despite artificial. Studies on fake news on social media are still relatively new and, therefore, mostly, researchers in this field focus on the message or content of the hoax (Allcott & Gentzkow, 2017). For example, Mavridis that described social media as a place for the hoax to develop (Mavridis, 2018), and Salam that studied how hoax in Indonesia develop by researching anti-diversity meme (Salam, 2018).

Another research scrutinizes hoax or fake news based on the national defense perspective in the context of Singapore (Vasu, Ang, Jayakumar, Faizal, & Ahuja, 2018). It is relevant to the Indonesian condition since hoax containing false information can divide national unity. This symptom seems to appear globally. In an article entitled "Fake News Detection on Social Media: a Data Mining Perspective" (Shu, Sliva, Wang, Tang, & Liu, 2017), some consequences of fake news were explained. Firstly, fake news could impair balance in the news ecosystem as happened on Facebook, where the news was spread wider than the news produced by mainstream media during the American presidential election 2016. The expansion of fake news breeds severe negative consequences for individuals and society. However, studies on the culprit of the hoax spread on social media have not been conducted, although the distribution of hoax depends on the response of social media user that is planning on sharing the content.

One of the reasons for which hoax is prevalent is internet anonymity. Cirucci defined anonymity as incapability to attach a property or a set of property to the source of the property itself. A person will stay anonymous when an identification cannot be returned to other identifications. When a social media user makes a fake account, she has entered anonymity. The account cannot be linked to real identity in the real world (Cirucci, 2015).

Regarding social media, Susanto studied social media as a supporter of a political communication network. He found that social media users, whether individually, in a group, or institutionally, can act as a sender or receiver of communication on cyberspace. The flexibility of social media use cannot be constrained by social, economic, and

political status in society (Susanto, 2017). However, this research did not analyze the interconnection between the age and the time spent by social media users. Mafe found that research explaining the correlation between demography and internet use was still rare (Mafe & Blas, 2006). Luthfia, Triputra, Pinckey, Triputra, and Hendriyani showed that adolescent study in lower and higher secondary school was very active internet users with high duration and frequency in accessing the internet from their smartphone. In addition, the number of contents and applications accessed and used by adolescents was also high (Luthfia, Triputra, & Hendriyani, 2019). Although the survey was done in Jakarta, it can be a reference that adolescent in other urban area has a relatively similar pattern in internet diet.

Each generation has its own experience regarding familiarity with the internet. According to Manheim, generation is a social construction for a group of people sharing the same ages and historical experience. Furthermore, Manheim explained that people that are part of the generation are those who are born in the same period of twenty years and have the same social and historical dimension. This definition is mainly developed by Ryder that says that a generation is a group of individuals that witness the same experience in the same period (Putra, 2016).

For Generation Z, they have been familiar with the internet. Since they are born, the internet has been a part of their lives. Indeed, because they are considerably close to the internet-based digital world, they are commonly called digital natives. This term is delivered by Marc Prensky (Prensky, 2001: 1).

As shown in the table, some experts said that Generation Y is born at least in 1978 (Martin & Tulgan, 2012) while others (Howe & Strauss, 2000) stated that at least since 1982. Interestingly, those two defined the end line of Generation Y in 2000. On the other hand, this research used Reeven and Oh distinctions that state that mature generation was born since 1925 to 1945, boom generation was born since 1946 to 1964, Generation X was born since 1965 to 1980, millennial generation or Generation Y was born since at least 1981 to 2000, and Generation Z was born since 2001 to present.

Different from Generation Z, Generation X, who was born from 1965 to 1980, for example, had not recognized the internet when they were in their childhood. They used the internet at least when they were 15 years old. If Generation Z is called the digital natives, Generation Y can be called the immigrant natives.

Studies on generation have a long history. Since 1928 when Manheim published his essay "Das Problem der Generationen," concepts of generations have been discussed in terms of the sociology of knowledge, sociology of culture, and in the past couple years, sociology of media and audiences. The concept of generations has been useful to explain social differentiation (Cavalli, 2004) and social transformation that supplement group demography concepts.

On the other hand, a cohort can be defined as an individual group (in some population definition) that experiences the same experience in the same interval, such as their birth time. By contrast, a generation is a group that passes later time to share the same habit and culture and a function that gives them collective memory figuring in integrating the group for a specified period (Siibak, Vittadini, & Nimrod, 2014).

There is no same standardization yet in determining nomenclature needed to label generations. Different researchers use different labels to determine generation division. The differences are quite significant, notably on how many years that should be covered for a generation. Reeves and Oh (Reeves & Oh, 2008) create a table that summarizes various researcher theory on generation division, as seen below:

Table 1. The label of generation based on various sources

**Generational Labels and Dates Reported in Different Sources**

Source	Labels				
Howe and Strauss (2000)	Silent Generation (1925–1943)	Boom Generation (1943–1960)	13th Generation (1961–1981)	Millennial Generation (1982–2000)	—
Lancaster and Stillman (2002)	Traditionalists (1900–1945)	Baby Boomers (1946–1964)	Generation Xers (1965–1980)	Millennial Generation; Echo Boomer; Generation Y; Baby Busters; Generation Next (1981–1999)	—
Martin and Tulgan (2002)	Silent Generation (1925–1942)	Baby Boomers (1946–1960)	Generation X (1965–1977)	Millennials (1978–2000)	—
Oblinger and Oblinger (2005)	Matures (<1946)	Baby Boomers (1947–1964)	Gen-Xers (1965–1980)	Gen-Y; NetGen; Millennials (1981–1995)	Post-Millennials (1995–present)
Tapscott (1998)	—	Baby Boom Generation (1946–1964)	Generation X (1965–1975)	Digital Generation (1976–2000)	—
Zemke et al. (2000)	Veterans (1922–1943)	Baby Boomers (1943–1960)	Gen-Xers (1960–1980)	Nexters (1980–1999)	—

source: Reeves & Oh, 2008

Generation theory has similarities with individual media dependency theory, which means “connection between individual capacity to attain a goal, depending on a certain limit on informational sources (Ball-Rokeach, 1985). Meanwhile, internet dependency is defined as “a connection among individual capacities to attain a goal, depending on how far informational source on the internet.” In marketing, some researcher has shown that interdependence on the internet is highly associated with online shopping, as shown by Kent Grant et al. (Grant, Cravens, Low, & Moncrief, 2001), Stephanie A. Skumanich and David P. Kintsfather (Skumanich & Kintsfather, 1998), and Patmini Patwardhan (Patwardhan & Yang, 2003).

Furthermore, Generation theory has another relevance when it is used to analyze the social media diet. DeFleur and Ball-Rokeach saw an encounter between audience and media based on tree theoretical framework: individual differences perspective, social category perspective, and social relation perspective.

Individual perspective theory shows that the attitude and personal organization of individual psychology determine how humans choose and give meaning to stimuli from the environment. This perspective assumes that society from the same group tends to act similarly. The groups are split based on age, sex, pay, education, accommodation, and religiosity. That is the reason for which this perspective emphasizes the importance of informal social relations in affecting people's reactions to media (Rakhmat, 2012). However, audience concepts delivered by deFleur and Rokeach are different from the concept of audiences in the internet era. One of the most prominent characteristics of internet-based media is the degree of interactivity that is high.

With the theory in mind, each generation – as one social category – tend to act uniformly in using social media. For that reason, the hypothesis in the research is that “there are differences between Generation X and Z in the spread of hoax,” and the research question is that how is the spread pattern of hoax in Generation X and X?

**Methodology**

This research was a survey conducted in Sleman regency, Special Region of Yogyakarta. The location was chosen since Sleman, coupled with Indonesia Ministry of Communication and Information, was attempting to eradicate hoax. This city also had a

mechanism of residents' online hoax reporting. The other reason is that Sleman was a city with 46 universities, together with the abundance of students. The groups were decided to be samples of Generation Z.

The respondents were individuals from two different generations, namely Generation X and Z, both women and men. It was carried out in time before the Indonesian Presidential Election 2019 because the dissemination of hoax was skyrocketing at that time (Sucahyo, 2019). The hoax analyzed in this research was only hoax on politics. Not only was that hoax being ubiquitous around election time, but the hoax also had negative consequences on national integration.

Since there was no specific data on how many Generation Z living in the research location, the sampling frame was not possible to design. The study, therefore, used accidental sampling by picking respondents who were suitable to study needs (Prijana, 2005). The number of samples was 240, divided into two groups, Generation X and Generation Z. According to Bagus, the number was already sufficient (Bagus, 2016) because "if the number of population is unknown, the number of the respondent can be determined by referring to the requirement of minimum samples in each analysis, such as SEM-AMOS analysis that requires 100 to 200 sample."

The instrument was questionnaires containing concepts relating to the spread of hoax. The data were analyzed by using the T-test statistic formula to find differences in the mean between the two generations examined. The basis of this formula was independent interval data, meaning that there was no correlation between the average population and the value of each sample in the populations. Also, there was no outlier or extreme data; it was normally distributed.

## Results and Discussion

The researchers did not make a strict distinction between chatting applications or instant messaging and social media. This is because, based on observation and experience, the applications were also places to channel hoax, whether personally or in a group chat. For social media, the researchers included popular social media, ranging from Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, and YouTube. Each social media has its characteristics and aims. For example, while Instagram is mostly exploited for displaying beautiful pictures, and therefore recommended for selling, Twitter is preferred to share serious information that is urgent to understand. Facebook, on the other hand, is capable of displaying pictures and videos with unlimited characters of text.

The research found that the gap between generation was apparent, as showed by table no 1. Generation X mostly only used two social media platforms, namely Facebook and Instagram. Indeed, many social media users from Generation X only used one social media platform. Instagram users only accounted for 16%, while Facebook only amounted to 32%. In general, Facebook was chosen because of the flexibility, including capable of combining pictures, videos, and texts. Instagram, on the other hand, prioritized the visual to be palatable for presenting pictures or photos. These two social media were also often exercised for online business purpose.

**Table 2. Social media possession**

No	Social Media	Generation X		Generation Z	
		N	%	N	%
1	Instagram only	19	16	23	19
2	Facebook only	38	32	2	2

3	Twitter only	0	0	17	15
4	Facebook and Twitter	0	0	11	9
5	Instagram and Twitter	0	0	13	12
6	Instagram and Facebook	63	52	34	29
7	Instagram, Facebook, and Twitter			20	14
	Sum	120	100	120	100

source: primary data 2019

Initially, Facebook and Instagram were owned by different owners. However, in 2012, Facebook acquired Instagram since Facebook believed that the platform was beneficial to share pictures. The merge of Facebook and Instagram eased users to access both platforms. These two social media also offered a synchronization facility to synchronize data on both Facebook and Instagram. Respondents from Generation X that had two social media was 52% while Generation Z was 29%.

The synchronization between Facebook and Instagram did not easily tempt Generation Z. It what made the number was limited. This limited number were also split with Twitter, social media that was not used by Generation X in this research. Table 2 shows that the distribution of respondents using twitter was only in Generation Z. It indicates that each social media has its independent characteristics and users (to no call it audiences).

In this research, 100% of respondents of Generation X used WhatsApp, while there were 78% of Generation Z used WhatsApp. According to App Annie Research, in September 2018, the number of monthly active users (MAU) of WhatsApp had exceeded Facebook. In 24 months, since 2017, the growth of WhatsApp users attained 30%, while Facebook only 20%. App Annie did not announce specific numbers of the number of monthly active users of both applications. However, in January 2018, Facebook CEO Mark Zuckerberg claimed that monthly active users of WhatsApp reached almost 1.5 billion users (Pertwi, 2019).

Hoax spreading in chatting application was difficult to track, including for the government, because of its confidential nature. Different from social media where most of the users have the flexibility to access different types of information, messages in the chatting application can only be read by users that have been included in the contact list. Based on profound observation, a hoax was spread rapidly through group chatting. When this research was written, the maximum number of WhatsApp group was 256 members. With that numbers, a hoax-carrying message could be disseminated fast.

Regarding the spread pattern, a hoax was perceived similarly to two generations, as fake news. However, there ware respondents that considered that the information might be correct in the future. It was the reason for which some of the respondents kept spreading the hoax. They believed that they were sharing essentials information that should be listened to by other people.

There were differences in the types of medium in receiving hoax in the two generations. The differences can be seen in table 3:

**Table 3. Differences in the mean of the type of hoax in Generation X and Z**

Generation	Text	Picture	Video	Mean
X	2,98	2,95	2,50	2,81
Z	2,89	2,78	2,62	2,76

source: primary data 2019

On a scale of 1 to 3, Generation X received more hoax with a mean of 2,81 while Generation Z received 2,76. It showed that Generation X was exposed by hoax more frequent. The number was uniquely allocated because while Generation X received more hoax in the form of text and picture, Generation Z elicited more hoax in the form of video with a mean of 2,62. This finding is in agreement with the behavior of social media use in which young generations preferred audiovisual, such as YouTube or Line.

During hoax exposure, users had many experiences available, such as ignoring, erasing, and other choices, such as giving like, comment, and share through a share, forward, or retweet button. The behavior of each generation showed a different response, as depicted in table 4.

**Table 4. Differences in the mean response during hoax exposure**

Generatio n	Analyzing	Checking	Giving like	Comment ing	Sharing	Mean
X	1,91	1,44	2,95	2,75	2,64	2,34
Z	2,35	2,89	1,28	1,08	1,18	1,76

source: primary data 2019

Differences in these two generations examined becomes more apparent when their response during receiving hoax is seen. Generation Z seemed more critical in dealing with a hoax. The total mean of Generation Z was 1,76, while Generation X was 2,34.

It can be said, considering the mean of Generation Z, that their value in analyzing hoax was 2,35. This value was high as opposed to the score of Generation Z that was only 1,91. Analyzing means thinking, considering, and comparing with other information and action, indicating skeptical attitude. Although hoax seemed indistinguishable with non-hoax information, Generation Z tended to analyze the information they obtained beforehand.

Different engagement on hoax demonstrated a range in analytic competence. On the internet, analytical competence needed became more complicated, as opposed to printed and audiovisual media. High competence can make the users interpret and draw a conclusion about the hoax content they received.

People who believed in hoax were likely not to seek information to verify the validity of the message. He believed in the validity of the message. It can be seen in Generation X with a mean of 1,44. This number was categorized small since it was below the overall mean, and not only since it was small compared to Generation Z mean that was of 2,89. Generation X seemed not interested in seeking other information since they have trusted the message they received. In some social media, supporting a message can be done by giving a like button. A message can be categorized as successful if it reaps many likes. The quantitative aspect appears prominent in social media communication.



In the research, Generation X looked more active in giving likes rather than Generation Z. The mean was of 2,95 and 1,28, respectively. This difference was apparent, and it demonstrated that while the former liked to pour likes, the latter was parsimonious about likes towards the information they thought was a hoax. However, Generation Z probably would be more comfortable in pouring likes in, for example, entertainment topics.

Apart from being easy to push a like button, Generation X was also charitable in giving comments with a mean of 2,75. Generation Z, on the other hand, was selective in commenting, even it seemed to be more selective than their preferences on giving likes. Their mean in commenting was of 1,08. Generation X quickly went for being active in social media discussion. When a person gave comments on social media, she had to be ready to interact with other people, including from other users. Generation Z was inclined not to comment on social media, especially political topics. Indeed, many social media users from this group never typed any comments. They prefer only to read and be silent readers.

Another standard of success of a message on social media, coupled with like, was the number of people who shared the message. The more a message shared, the more people exposed by the information. Many producers seemed to prefer it.

Generation X seems more active in spreading messages with a mean of 2,64 than Generation Z that had a smaller mean, 1,18. When a person perceives information as a truth, she tends to share it. The reason can be varied, but mostly the person wants to share the information since she wants her followers to be more alert with what was indicated in the message. She might want to be laudable because of sharing essential knowledge. Showing that she is the first person who knew that information was also one of the possible reasons.

Furthermore, data obtained from the respondents were tested to be compared with the two age groups. The result can be seen in table 5:

**Table 5. Hypothesis testing using T-test**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Rata2	Equal variances assumed	2,376	,125	14,328	238	,000	,27083	,01890	,23360	,30807
	Equal variances not assumed			14,328	237,079	,000	,27083	,01890	,23360	,30807

---

es not  
assume  
d

---

source: primary data 2019

The T-test showed a significant difference if the value of significance  $< 0,05$ . In other words, there were significant differences in hoax spreading between Generation X and Z. It can be seen from the typical value of each. While Generation X had an average rate 2,370, an average rate of Generation Z was 2.099 (it does not show in the table)

In light of that, the hypothesis in this research was proven; namely, there was a difference in the pattern of hoax spreading in Generation X and Z. The result also demonstrated that Generation X was more active in spreading the hoax.

Findings in the research corroborate Generation Theory in which each generation has its unique characteristics, including social media use. It also supports McPrenski theory on digital native and digital immigrant. Their behaviors in using social, media, and hoax spreading were distinctive (Prensky, 2001).

Generation X is a digital immigrant since they use social media when they have been mature. Therefore, they are prone to recklessly spread hoax-carrying information, although their real intention probably is to give caveats on the importance of information in their circle. Without performing in-depth analysis and information spreading, they disseminate hoax-indicated information.

McPrenski explained that when digital immigrants learn in adapting towards the new environment, they often keep up to a point their accent, namely their past, although it should be admitted there are some immigrants that can deal with it well and adapt successfully. The accent of digital immigrants can be seen in prioritizing internet use than gain information from it to use it. It is similar to read a manual for a program and assumes that the program will explain how to use it automatically (Prensky, 2001). Probably because Generation X used to be familiar with confirmed information from mass media, such as television, newspaper, and radio, consequently, when they receive information from social media, they directly assume that the information is right and therefore needs to be disseminated although the information might be a hoax.

The research also affirmed DeFleur and Ball-Rokeach's conception on the encounter of audiences with media based on three theoretical frameworks: individual difference perspective, social category perspective, and social relation perspective. Generation X, as a group of age, tended to be active in sharing hoax than Generation Z. They appeared to pick similar stimuli and respond with relatively similar means. Probably, their circles of friends in social media were dominated by people of similar ages.

For Generation Z as a digital native, they were active in using social media, but they were skeptical of messages carrying hoax. They used social media for different purposes compared to the previous generations, such as productive economic activities or entertainment. Another possibility is that they were more digitally literate. Digital literacy is a vital issue when it comes to social media. Regularly, Illiterate users unconsciously became hoax spreaders and trapped in others' narratives. This research, however, showed that to increase the digital literacy of society, seeing the character of the social group, in this term: generation or groupage is crucial.

## Conclusion

The research has demonstrated that there were different patterns or habits of the spread of hoax in Generation X and Y. With this in mind, the generation theory underlying this research was confirmed. The findings also corroborated DeFleur and Ball-Rokeach's conception on the audience encounter with media that is based on theoretical frameworks: individual differences perspective, social category perspective, and social relation perspective. It implies that Generation Z is likely to be not interested in a hoax.

If the government plan to conduct a hoax eradication program, each social group should receive unique treatment since each group has a distinctive characteristic. Treatment on hoax should be done by considering the differences in the audience characteristic, including generation. It is recommended that the next researchers expand the object of the research not only to be limited in hoax but also other modal activities that can be done in social media, ranging from business, friendship, and entertainment.

## Acknowledgment

The researchers thank Directorate-General for Research Advancement of the Ministry of Research, Technology, and Higher Education that has funded the research. The researchers also want to show their sincere gratitude to LPPM UPN "Veteran" Yogyakarta that has facilitated the researcher, also for the reseacher assistants, and respondents that has provided the data.

## References

- Allcott, H., & Gentzkow, M. (2017). Social Media and Fake News in the 2016 Election. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 31(2), 211–236. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.31.2.211>
- Bagus, R. U. I. G. (2016). Teknik Sampling dan Penentuan Jumlah sampel. <https://doi.org/DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.1.5187.0808>
- Ball-Rokeach, S. J. (1985). The Origins of Individual Media-System Dependency: A Sociological Framework. *Communication Research*, 12(4), 485–510. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/009365085012004003>
- Beers, D. (2006). The Public Sphere and Online, Independent Journalism. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 29(1), 109–130. <https://doi.org/10.2307/20054149>
- Cavalli, A. (2004). Generations and Value Orientations. *Social Compass*, 51(2), 155–168. <https://doi.org/DOI: 10.1177/0037768604043003>
- Cirucci, A. M. (2015). Redefining privacy and anonymity through social networking affordances. *First Monday*, 20(7). <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.5210/fm.v20i7.5465>
- Dikdok. (2018). Totalnya, Berapakah Jumlah Pengguna Media Sosial di Indonesia? Retrieved September 10, 2018, from Jurnalapps website: <https://jurnalapps.co.id/totalnya-berapakah-jumlah-pengguna-media-sosial-di-indonesia-13238>
- Franedy, R. (2019). Ini Alasan Resmi Blackberry Messenger Tutup. Retrieved June 12, 2019, from CBC Indonesia website: <https://www.cnbcindonesia.com/tech/20190418201017-37-67683/ini-alasan-resmi-blackberry-messenger-tutup>
- Grant, K., Cravens, D. W., Low, G. S., & Moncrief, W. C. (2001). The Role of Satisfaction with Territory Design on the Motivation, Attitudes, and Work

- Outcomes of Salespeople. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 29(2), 165–178. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03079459994533>
- Howe, N., & Strauss, W. (2000). *Millennials Rising: The Next Great Generation (Third)*. New York: Vintage.
- Jayani, D. H. (2019). Berapa Pengguna Internet di Indonesia? Retrieved from Databoks website: <https://databoks.katadata.co.id/datapublish/2019/09/09/berapa-pengguna-internet-di-indonesia>
- Luthfia, A., Triputra, P., & Hendriyani. (2019). Indonesian Adolescents' Online Opportunities and Risks. *Jurnal ASPIKOM*, 4(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.24329/aspikom.v4i1.445>
- Mafe, C. R., & Blas, S. S. (2006). Explaining Internet dependency. *Internet Research*, 16(4), 380–397. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1108/10662240610690016>
- Manning, J. (2014). Definition and Classes of Social Media. *Encyclopedia of Social Media and Politics*, (January 2014), 1158–1162. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452244723.n485>
- Martin, C. A., & Tulgan, B. (2012). Managing the Generation Mix™ - From Collision to Collaboration. In *Proceedings of the Water Environment Federation* (Vol. 2003). <https://doi.org/10.2175/193864703784755210>
- Mavridis, G. (2018). Fake news and Social Media How Greek users identify and curb misinformation online. 1–43.
- Nasrullah, R. (2016). *Teori dan Riset Media Siber (CYBERMEDIA)*. Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Media.
- Patwardhan, P., & Yang, J. (2003). Internet Dependency Relations and Online Consumer Behavior. *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, 3(2), 57–69. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/15252019.2003.10722074>
- Pertiwi, W. K. (2019). WhatsApp Kini Lebih Populer dari Facebook. Retrieved June 16, 2019, from Kompas.com website: <https://tekno.kompas.com/read/2019/01/18/09260907/whatsapp-kini-lebih-populer-dari-facebook?page=all>
- Prensky, M. (2001). Digital Natives, Digital Immigrants. *On the Horizon*, 9(5), 1–6. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1108/10748120110424816>
- Prijana. (2005). *Metode Sampling Terapan Untuk Penelitian Sosial*. Bandung: Humaniora.
- Putra, Y. S. (2016). Theoretical Review : Teori Perbedaan Generasi. *Among Makarti*, 9(18), 123–134.
- Rakhmat, J. (2012). *Psikologi Komunikasi*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Reeves, T. C., & Oh, E. G. (2008). *Handbook of Research on Educational Communications and Technology* (Third; M. J. Spector, M. D. Merrill, J. Van Merriënboer, & M. Driscoll, Eds.). Abingdon: Taylor & Francis Group.
- Salam, A. (2018). The Hoax Phenomenon in Indonesian Society: Observing Anti-Diversity Memes since 2014. *Jurnal Humaniora*, 30(3), 315. <https://doi.org/10.22146/jh.v30i3.38891>
- Shu, K., Sliva, A., Wang, S., Tang, J., & Liu, H. (2017). Fake News Detection on Social Media. *ACM SIGKDD Explorations Newsletter*, 19(1), 22–36. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3137597.3137600>
- Siibak, A., Vittadini, N., & Nimrod, G. (2014). Generations as media audiences: An introduction. *Participations*, 2014(2), 100–107.
- Skumanich, S. A., & Kintsfather, D. P. (1998). Individual Media Dependency Relations

- Within Television Shopping Programming: A Causal Model Reviewed and Revised. *Communication Research*, 25(2), 200–219. <https://doi.org/10.1177/009365098025002004>
- Sucahyo, N. (2019). Hoaks Makin Merajalela Jelang Pemilu. Retrieved June 4, 2019, from VOA website: <https://www.voaindonesia.com/a/hoax-makin-merajalela-jelang-pemilu/4835646.html>
- Susanto, E. H. (2017). Media Sosial Sebagai Pendukung Jaringan Komunikasi Politik. *Jurnal ASPIKOM*, 3(3), 379. <https://doi.org/10.24329/aspikom.v3i3.123>
- Vasu, N., Ang, B., Jayakumar, S., Faizal, M., & Ahuja, J. (2018). Fake News : National Security in the Post-Truth Era. *S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies*, (January), 3–32.
- Wordinfo. (n.d.). Hoax, Hocus. Retrieved April 22, 2019, from English Word Information website: <https://wordinfo.info/unit/3408/s:hoax>.