



THE DIGITAL PUBLIC SPHERE UNDER THREAT OF DISINFORMATION A LITERATURE STUDY ON HOAX DISSEMINATION DYNAMIC AND VULNERABILITY FACTORS

Ella Anastasya Sinambela

Universitas Sunan Giri Surabaya

correspondence: easinemabela@gmail.com

Abstract

This literature study examines the mechanics of hoaxes and disinformation within the digital public sphere, highlighting their design to exploit emotional triggers and mimic credible sources. Advancements in technology, such as deepfakes and sophisticated bot networks, have amplified the reach of false narratives. Furthermore, platform algorithms inadvertently prioritize sensationalist content to maximize engagement, allowing misinformation to outpace factual corrections within closed messaging groups. The research identifies significant psychological vulnerabilities, noting that cognitive biases such as confirmation bias and the illusory truth effect make individuals susceptible to repeated falsehoods. Vulnerability is exacerbated by multidimensional factors, including low media literacy, institutional distrust, and hyper-partisan identities. The study concludes that no single remedy exists. Effectively countering disinformation requires a comprehensive, multidimensional strategy. This includes robust platform regulation, enhanced media literacy education, the development of advanced verification tools, and a fundamental shift in digital culture. Ultimately, this analysis provides a theoretical framework for understanding disinformation dynamics and offers practical insights for developing systemic counter-strategies.

Keywords: hoaxes, disinformation, digital public sphere, social media, cognitive bias, media literacy, platform governance

Introduction

The digital public sphere has become the primary arena for citizens to interact, share information, and form collective opinions. Social media platforms, online news sites, discussion forums, and instant messaging applications have fundamentally changed how humans communicate. This shift directly influences online communication patterns and the dynamics of how virtual communities are formed today (Darmawan, 2021). While traditional public spaces such as markets, cafes, or town squares are limited by space and time, the digital public sphere allows for instantaneous conversations across geographical boundaries. Everyone with a smartphone and an internet connection can produce and distribute information to a global audience. This democratization of access was initially welcomed as an expansion of the democratic space, giving a voice to those who were previously marginalized (Papacharissi, 2002).

However, this democratization has also brought unanticipated consequences. The flood of information inundating the digital public sphere is not always accompanied by quality and accuracy. Hoaxes and disinformation have become a global epidemic infecting every platform and reaching billions of users. False information spreads faster, wider, and deeper than true information because it is designed to trigger emotions and exploit human cognitive biases (Vosoughi et al., 2018). The digital public sphere, which should be an arena for rational discussion, has turned into a narrative battlefield where truth is the first victim. This phenomenon is closely related to how individuals build self-identity and how social perceptions are formed through interactions on social media (Darmawan & de Jesus Isaac, 2022).

Hoaxes and disinformation have a highly destructive impact on various aspects of social life. In the field of health, disinformation about vaccines causes the public to refuse immunization and triggers outbreaks of diseases that should be preventable. In politics, hoaxes about candidates or election processes manipulate citizens' choices and undermine the legitimacy of democracy (Bennett & Livingston, 2018). In the social sphere, hoaxes about specific groups trigger hatred, discrimination, and communal violence. In the economic field, hoaxes about products or companies can destroy businesses and livelihoods. Data security issues and privacy violations on social media also weaken mutual trust between

individuals, especially among the younger generation (Negara et al., 2022). The damage caused is very real and widespread.

The characteristics of the digital public sphere exacerbate the spread of hoaxes. Platform algorithms designed to maximize user engagement inadvertently prioritize sensational and provocative content, which are often hoaxes. Anonymity and pseudonymity allow perpetrators to spread disinformation without fear of accountability. The extraordinary speed of dissemination ensures that corrections are always late. Audience fragmentation into echo chambers reinforces beliefs in false information because users are only exposed to confirmation from their own groups (Cinelli et al., 2021). The ideal digital public sphere turns out to be highly vulnerable to manipulation. Therefore, an approach to building technology that is more ethical, fair, and responsible is needed to protect users (Radjawane & Mardikaningsih, 2022).

The speed of production and dissemination of hoaxes far exceeds the speed of verification and correction. Digital technology allows for the creation of fake content in minutes, with quality that is increasingly difficult to distinguish from the original. Deepfakes, sophisticated photo manipulation, and the creation of fake news sites are becoming easier to execute (Vaccari & Chadwick, 2020). Meanwhile, the verification process by professional journalists or fact-checking agencies requires time, resources, and expertise. This gap in digital skill mastery is also a major challenge in creating inclusive technology-based services that are healthy (Ramle & Mardikaningsih, 2022). By the time a correction is finally published, the hoax has already reached millions of people and become embedded in their minds. Even after being corrected, hoaxes can continue to circulate because not everyone sees the correction. This disparity in speed is a structural challenge.

Digital platforms have economic incentives that conflict with efforts to handle hoaxes. Platform algorithms are designed to maximize the time users spend on the platform because more time means more advertisements can be displayed. Emotional, controversial, and sensational content including hoaxes has proven more effective at attracting attention than boring factual content (Zuboff, 2019). On the other hand, digital marketing communications, such as the use of email, remain relevant in the communication mix amidst this information noise

(Sinambela & Darmawan, 2021). Platforms face a dilemma between the social responsibility to limit hoaxes and the business interest of maintaining user engagement. Adequate regulations to force platforms to act more firmly are still non-existent in many countries. Commercial interests and the health of the public sphere collide.

Internet and social media penetration in Indonesia is very high, especially among the younger generation. On average, people spend hours every day on digital platforms, consuming and sharing information. However, the level of digital literacy in society remains low, making them vulnerable to hoaxes and disinformation. Many users lack the ability to distinguish between true and false information, between news and opinion, or between facts and propaganda (Guess et al., 2019). While broad technological access is important, digital skills remain the primary key to closing the opportunity gap in the worlds of work and education (Arifin & Darmawan, 2021). The combination of high exposure and low literacy creates a highly vulnerable condition. Hoaxes spread widely and quickly, especially through family groups on instant messaging applications. Understanding these dynamics is essential for designing effective literacy programs.

The crisis of trust in institutions and mainstream media is further exacerbated by the prevalence of hoaxes. A public constantly exposed to false information may lose the ability to distinguish what can be trusted. They may withdraw from the public sphere or instead become trapped in echo chambers that reinforce irrational beliefs. A healthy democracy requires citizens who have access to accurate information and are capable of making rational decisions (Lewandowsky et al., 2017). Principles of ethics and professional integrity, similar to honesty in legal defense, are desperately needed to maintain justice and truth within society (Saktiawan et al., 2021). Hoaxes and disinformation erode this foundation. Understanding how hoaxes work and how to combat them is part of the effort to defend democracy in the digital age.

This study aims to analyze the characteristics of hoaxes and disinformation as well as their dissemination mechanisms in the digital public sphere. The research will explore forms of hoaxes, their production and distribution techniques, and the roles of algorithms, bots, and social networks in the dissemination process. Furthermore, this

study aims to identify factors that make individuals and society vulnerable to hoaxes and disinformation, covering psychological aspects such as cognitive bias, social aspects such as polarization and trust, and structural aspects such as platform design and regulation. The analysis will examine the interaction between various factors and how they create a fertile ecosystem for hoaxes. The theoretical contribution of this study is to present a conceptual mapping of disinformation dynamics in the digital age, which can serve as a foundation for future empirical research. Practically, the results of the study are expected to provide input for policymakers, digital platforms, media literacy activists, and the general public to formulate strategies for the prevention and handling of hoaxes.

Method

This research is structured as a literature study with a qualitative approach. This method was chosen because the main objective of the study is to understand and interpret the phenomena of hoaxes and disinformation within the digital public sphere through the analysis of relevant literature. As explained by Walliman (2021), research is essentially a systematic process to find answers to questions, and a literature study is an appropriate choice when data sources originate from written documentation. The research process follows the guidelines of Snyder (2019), which emphasize that a literature review as a method must be conducted systematically, transparently, and accountably. The initial step involved identifying and collecting relevant library materials, including textbooks, scientific journal articles, research institute reports, and results of previous studies discussing hoaxes, disinformation, the digital public sphere, cognitive psychology, and the intersection of these four areas. Data collection was performed using a structured approach with specific keywords to ensure the scope of the study remained focused on the problem formulation.

Data analysis in this literature study utilizes qualitative content analysis techniques. Gupta and Gupta (2022) assert that in library research, the researcher acts as the key instrument performing the interpretation of the text. Data is not analyzed statistically but rather by reading, understanding, and making sense of the arguments within the literature. This process involves data reduction, namely selecting essential

parts that answer the research questions, and then organizing them into thematic categories. Mohajan (2018) explains that a qualitative approach in the social sciences aims to understand phenomena from the perspective of the idea producers, which in this study are the authors and researchers whose works are being reviewed. The researcher must be able to capture the nuances of thought and academic debate within the literature regarding hoaxes and disinformation. Frank and Hatak (2014) underscore that a literature review is not merely a summary, but an effort to build new arguments based on a critical evaluation of existing works. The synthesis of various sources is then compiled into a coherent analytical narrative regarding hoaxes and disinformation in the digital public sphere.

Result and Discussion

Characteristics and Mechanisms of Hoax Dissemination in the Digital Space

To understand the phenomenon of hoaxes comprehensively, recognizing their characteristics is essential. Hoaxes possess characteristics that distinguish them from mere ordinary misinformation (Zannettou et al., 2019). First, hoaxes are intentionally created to mislead, rather than being the result of ignorance or carelessness. There is malicious intent behind their production. Second, hoaxes are often designed to trigger strong emotions such as anger, fear, or hatred, because emotional information spreads more easily and is harder to forget. This condition demonstrates how vital it is for today's younger generation to understand digital literature so they do not easily fall into the trap of misleading information flows (Kurniawan et al., 2021). Third, hoaxes usually simplify complex realities into black-and-white narratives with clear scapegoats, facilitating ease of understanding and acceptance. Fourth, hoaxes often utilize formats that mimic trusted sources, such as official media logos, quotes from officials, or scientific references, to enhance their false credibility. Fifth, hoaxes are designed to be easily remembered and shared, featuring short messages, sensational headlines, and attractive visuals. Consequently, these characteristics can make hoaxes more effective in attracting attention while simultaneously misleading the public.

In addition to their characteristics, technological developments have also accelerated the production of hoaxes. Hoax production technology is becoming increasingly sophisticated and easily accessible. Photo and video manipulation can now be performed using free applications available on mobile phones. Deepfakes, a technology that uses artificial intelligence to create fake videos that appear authentic, are becoming harder to detect with the naked eye (Maras & Alexandrou, 2019). Fake news sites can be created within hours using available templates. Fake social media accounts can be purchased in large quantities at low prices. This poses a significant challenge in managing the reputation of institutions and companies in the digital era, where maintaining a positive image becomes increasingly difficult due to attacks of false information (Darmawan et al., 2022). These technological advancements lower the entry barriers for hoax creators. What once required specialized expertise and substantial resources can now be done by almost anyone with malicious intent. The democratization of content production has a dark side. Therefore, technological progress not only brings benefits but also increases the risk of spreading false information.

On the other hand, the role of digital platforms cannot be ignored in accelerating the spread of hoaxes. Digital platform algorithms play a central role in hoax dissemination. Algorithms are designed to maximize user engagement by displaying content most likely to attract attention. Because hoaxes are designed to trigger strong emotions, they tend to garner many likes, comments, and shares (Ghanem et al., 2020). Popular culture consumed by young people through digital content also shapes their values, attitudes, and behavior in responding to such information (Kurniawan & Khayru, 2021). Algorithms interpret these signals as indicators that the content is relevant and important, thus further prioritizing it. This positive feedback loop causes hoaxes to spread exponentially. Platform recommendation systems also create echo chambers where users who have previously shown interest in certain hoaxes will continue to be presented with similar content. In this situation, good communication functions are highly necessary to build and maintain the quality of healthy relationships within society (Gardi et al., 2021). Thus, algorithms are not neutral; they actively facilitate the

spread of hoaxes. Consequently, the algorithmic design of platforms indirectly reinforces the dissemination of hoaxes.

Beyond algorithms, the use of automated technology further exacerbates the distribution of hoaxes. Networks of bots and fake accounts are used to artificially amplify the spread of hoaxes. Thousands of automated accounts can be created to like, comment on, and share hoax content, creating the illusion that the content is popular and enjoys widespread support. This illusion of popularity then attracts the attention of real users, who are more likely to believe information that appears to already be trusted by many others. Bots are also used to attack accounts that criticize or verify hoaxes, creating a hostile environment for correction efforts. Organized bot networks can become highly effective propaganda machines, creating a virtual reality that does not reflect actual public opinion (Chen et al., 2022). Therefore, the existence of bots and fake accounts can pose a serious threat to the authenticity of information in the digital space.

Furthermore, private communication channels also serve as a highly effective medium for the spread of hoaxes. Closed groups on instant messaging applications like WhatsApp have become highly effective channels for hoax dissemination that are difficult to monitor. In family, friendship, or community groups, hoaxes circulate under the assumption that messages from known individuals are more trustworthy. The sense of trust within these groups becomes an effective vector for hoaxes because people tend not to verify information received from those closest to them. Additionally, the closed nature of these groups makes it difficult for researchers and regulators to measure the scale of dissemination and to intervene. Unverified chain messages spread from one group to another, creating an epidemic of false information beyond the reach of public oversight (Van Der Linden, 2022). Consequently, private communication spaces represent one of the greatest challenges in controlling the spread of hoaxes.

The phenomenon of virality is also a major factor that can accelerate the spread of hoaxes in the digital era. Virality is a key mechanism for hoax dissemination. A piece of content can go viral within hours, reaching millions of people before it can be verified. Factors that trigger virality include emotional resonance, relevance to

trending issues, endorsement from influential figures, and luck (Basri, 2023). Hoaxes that successfully touch the public's sensitive nerves for example, regarding threats to identity groups or conspiracies behind major events have high viral potential. Virality creates a snowball effect where the more people share, the more people see, and the more people share again. This speed is the primary enemy of verification. Therefore, virality is also a crucial factor that can make hoaxes difficult to control.

In addition to technology and distribution factors, human psychological aspects also play a role in the spread of hoaxes. Human cognitive bias is a fundamental factor that makes hoaxes effective (Dror, 2020). Confirmation bias makes people more likely to accept information that aligns with their existing beliefs and reject information that contradicts them. A hoax that vilifies a group already disliked will be easily believed. The availability heuristic leads people to judge the truth of information based on how easily examples come to mind. Hoaxes that are frequently repeated will feel more true. The Dunning-Kruger effect causes individuals with limited knowledge of an issue to be more confident in judging the truth of information, making them more vulnerable to hoaxes. These biases are inherent human weaknesses exploited by hoax creators. Thus, psychological factors are one of the primary reasons why hoaxes are easily believed and can spread widely.

Another psychological phenomenon that reinforces hoaxes is the repetition of information. The illusory truth effect is a phenomenon where repetition makes a statement feel more true, regardless of its accuracy (Mattavelli et al., 2023). The more often someone is exposed to a claim, the more likely they are to believe it, even if the claim is false. Hoaxes that are repeated across various platforms, by various sources, and in various formats become increasingly embedded in the public mind. A correction that appears only once will not be able to offset the effect of this repetition. This is why hoaxes are difficult to combat; they use human psychology against itself. Therefore, the repetition of information becomes an effective strategy in strengthening the perception of a hoax's truth.

Overall, the spread of hoaxes is the result of an interaction between various interconnected factors. Regarding the characteristics and mechanisms of hoax dissemination in the digital space, it was found that

hoaxes are a complex phenomenon involving technology, psychology, and social dynamics (Cano-Oron et al., 2021). Their emotional and simple characteristics, as well as their resemblance to trusted sources, make them effective. Increasingly sophisticated production technology and platform algorithms that prioritize engagement facilitate their spread. Bot networks and closed groups reinforce distribution. Virality and human cognitive biases create ideal conditions for hoaxes. The digital public sphere, with its specific characteristics, turns out to be highly vulnerable to manipulation. Thus, handling hoaxes requires a comprehensive approach that simultaneously covers socio-technological and psychological aspects.

Factors of Individual and Societal Vulnerability to Disinformation

Vulnerability to disinformation stems not only from external factors but also from an individual's cognitive capacity to manage information. A person's level of education and media literacy significantly influences their susceptibility to disinformation. Individuals with higher education and an understanding of how media operates are better equipped to perform verification, recognize biases, and evaluate source credibility. They are also more likely to seek information from various sources before making a decision. Conversely, those with low media literacy tend to accept information at face value, especially if it comes from a seemingly convincing source or is shared by a trusted individual. This digital divide often creates an inequality of opportunity for everyone in utilizing the online economy fairly (Sinambela et al., 2022). Media literacy is not just about the technical ability to use devices, but about the capacity for critical thinking toward content (Jandric, 2019). The low level of media literacy across many circles is a primary vulnerability factor. Thus, increasing media literacy will be a strategic and direct step to strengthen community resilience against disinformation.

Beyond individual capacity, the factor of trust in institutions also plays a vital role in shaping attitudes toward information. Trust in institutions and mainstream media also affects vulnerability. Individuals who have lost trust in the government, mainstream media, or science will be more open to alternative sources, including those that spread disinformation (Ognyanova et al., 2020). They view hoaxes as "alternative

truths" that have been hidden by elites. This distrust is often born from real experiences of injustice or constant exposure to conspiracy narratives. In this regard, literary works can serve as a good alternative medium to form and maintain national identity through positive narratives and cultural symbols (Kurniawan et al., 2021). Rebuilding trust is a long process, but without it, efforts to combat disinformation will be difficult. People who do not trust official sources will reject corrections from those same sources. Therefore, restoring public trust will be key in fighting the spread of disinformation.

The socio-political dimension also largely determines how someone accepts or rejects information. Political identity and group affiliation heavily dictate vulnerability to disinformation (Disha et al., 2023). People more easily believe information that strengthens their group identity and disparages opposing groups. Political hoaxes that vilify opponents are readily accepted by supporters of a certain party, regardless of the truth. Conversely, positive information about opponents is often rejected. Group affiliation creates deep-seated biases that are difficult to overcome with facts. In situations of high polarization, truth becomes less important than loyalty. Believing a certain hoax can become a marker of identity—a way to show that someone is part of the "right" group. Thus, disinformation is not only an information problem but also a problem of identity and group loyalty.

Individual life experiences also provide a significant contribution to shaping how information is perceived. Personal experiences and past traumas also influence vulnerability. Individuals who have experienced traumatic events may more easily believe information that reinforces their fears (Lis et al., 2020). For example, someone who has been a victim of a crime might more readily believe hoaxes about rising criminality, even if data suggests otherwise. Personal experience is a powerful shaper of belief and is often more influential than statistical data. Hoaxes that are emotionally resonant with personal experience are very difficult to combat because they contradict "what I have experienced myself." Therefore, a rational approach is often insufficient to counter disinformation based on emotional experiences.

The social environment where someone interacts daily also plays a major role in shaping their attitude toward handling information. The

social environment and friendship networks shape exposure and attitudes toward information (Yang & Wu et al., 2021). People in environments where hoaxes are frequently shared and believed will be more vulnerable. Social pressure for conformity can make individuals reluctant to question information received in family or friendship groups. They fear being seen as "know-it-all," disloyal, or even enemies if they criticize information believed by many. A politically homogeneous social environment also reinforces echo chambers where there is no challenge to existing beliefs. Breaking away from this environment is difficult to do. Consequently, the social environment can act as both a reinforcer of and a barrier to efforts in fighting disinformation.

Demographic factors such as age and generation can exert a complex influence on vulnerability. Age and generation affect vulnerability in intricate ways (Parra et al., 2023). Older generations may be less skilled in using technology for verification but possess life experiences that help them avoid being easily provoked. The younger generation is more technically skilled but may lack the experience to distinguish between what is plausible and what is not. Both groups have their respective vulnerabilities. The elderly are often targeted by hoaxes in family groups because they are perceived as less critical. Teenagers are vulnerable to dangerous trends and challenges on social media. Literacy approaches need to be adapted to the characteristics of each generation. Therefore, disinformation handling strategies must be contextual and age-group based.

Psychological aspects also play a vital role in determining how a person responds when processing information. The emotional state when receiving information affects vulnerability. People who are angry, fearful, or anxious will be less capable of thinking critically. Hoaxes are often designed to create these emotional conditions first, then present a false "explanation" (Juez & Mackenzie, 2019). In crisis situations such as disasters or pandemics, when anxiety levels are high and the need for information is urgent, people become highly vulnerable to hoaxes. They want immediate answers, and hoaxes offer simple answers that are emotionally satisfying. Managing emotions is a crucial part of resilience against disinformation. Thus, emotional control becomes one of the essential keys in facing the abundance of information in this digital era.

In addition to psychological factors, the level of issue complexity also influences how individuals understand information. Issue complexity also affects vulnerability. Highly complex issues, such as climate change or economic policy, are difficult for laypeople to understand. Hoaxes offer attractive simplifications: one cause, one scapegoat, and one simple solution (Diepeveen, 2019). These simple explanations are easier to digest and more psychologically satisfying than complex scientific explanations with many uncertainties. People choose a false certainty over a true uncertainty. The more complex an issue, the more vulnerable it is to disinformation. Therefore, simplifying information while remaining accurate becomes a significant challenge in public communication.

Technical factors and accessibility also help determine the extent to which individuals are able to verify the information received. The availability of verification tools and their ease of access also influence vulnerability (Mishra et al., 2021). If verification is difficult to perform, requiring specialized skills or access to limited sources, people will be reluctant to do it. Conversely, if there are verification tools that are easy to use and integrated into platforms, people are more likely to utilize them. Developing user-friendly verification tools is an important investment. However, tools alone are not enough; they must be accompanied by the motivation to use them. Many people prefer the instant gratification of sharing information over the hard work of verifying it. Consequently, ease of access to verification must be accompanied by behavioral nudges to encourage its use.

Overall, vulnerability to disinformation is the result of an interaction between various interconnected factors. Regarding the factors of individual and societal vulnerability to disinformation, it was found that vulnerability is multidimensional (Pantazi et al., 2021). Media literacy, trust in institutions, political identity, personal experience, social environment, age, emotional state, issue complexity, and the availability of verification tools all play a role. There is no single determining factor; vulnerability is the result of a complex interaction of various factors. Understanding this vulnerability is essential for designing targeted interventions. An approach that only focuses on one aspect, such as only on individual literacy, will fail if it ignores social and structural factors.

Conclusion

This literature study has analyzed hoaxes and disinformation in the digital public sphere by exploring their characteristics, dissemination mechanisms, and the factors of individual and societal vulnerability. Hoaxes and disinformation possess characteristics that make them effective in the digital space: they are intentionally created to mislead, trigger strong emotions, simplify complex realities, mimic trusted sources, and are easy to remember. Hoax production technology is becoming increasingly sophisticated with photo and video manipulation, deepfakes, and easily created fake websites. Digital platform algorithms designed to maximize engagement inadvertently prioritize hoaxes due to their emotional and sensational content. Bot networks and fake accounts create an illusion of popularity. Closed groups in messaging applications become channels that are difficult to monitor. Virality allows hoaxes to spread faster than corrections. Human cognitive biases such as confirmation bias, availability heuristic, and the Dunning-Kruger effect are exploited by hoax creators. The illusory truth effect ensures that repetition reinforces belief in false information. Factors of individual and societal vulnerability are highly complex. Low media literacy, loss of trust in institutions, strong political identity, personal experience, homogeneous social environments, age, emotional states, issue complexity, and the lack of easy verification tools all contribute to vulnerability. There is no single solution to this problem. Handling hoaxes and disinformation requires a multidimensional approach involving platform regulation, media literacy education, institutional strengthening, the development of verification technology, and changes in digital culture.

The findings of this study imply the need for a comprehensive strategy to handle hoaxes and disinformation. Digital platform regulations need to be strengthened to enforce algorithmic transparency and accountability for disseminated content. Platforms must be responsible not only for illegal content but also for system designs that facilitate the spread of hoaxes. Media literacy education must become a national priority, integrated into formal education curricula and community programs. Literacy is not just about technical ability but

about critical thinking, understanding bias, and managing emotions. Strengthening institutions such as mainstream media, fact-checking agencies, and information authorities is necessary so the public has trusted sources. The development of user-friendly verification technologies integrated into platforms must be encouraged. Civil society needs to play an active role in educating the public and monitoring the spread of hoaxes. A shift in digital culture, where verification before sharing becomes the norm, needs to be instilled.

Further research is suggested to conduct longitudinal studies on the effectiveness of various media literacy interventions in reducing vulnerability to hoaxes. Comparative studies between platforms with different policies will provide insights into best practices for handling disinformation. Research on factors that cause people to believe in hoaxes despite being corrected needs to be conducted. For policymakers, it is recommended to formulate regulations requiring digital platforms to be transparent about their algorithms, provide data access for researchers, and take responsibility for the content they promote. For digital platforms, it is suggested to redesign algorithms to not prioritize sensational content, develop easy verification features, and collaborate with fact-checking agencies. For educators, it is recommended to integrate media literacy into the curriculum using approaches that are relevant and engaging for the younger generation. For journalists, it is suggested to continue improving the quality of verification and transparency in reporting. For civil society, it is recommended to develop creative public education programs that reach various circles. For individuals, it is advised to always verify before sharing, remain wary of information that triggers strong emotions, and seek sources from various perspectives.

References

- Arifin, S., & Darmawan, D. 2021. Technology Access and Digital Skills: Bridging the Gaps in Education and Employment Opportunities in the Age of Technology 4.0. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(1), 163-168.
- Basri, W. S. 2023. Emotional Dynamics in Viral Marketing: Unravelling the Impact of Content, Audience, Platform, and Timing. *International Journal of Ebusiness and Egovernment Studies*, 15(3), 1-22.

- Bennett, W. L., & Livingston, S. 2018. The disinformation order: Disruptive communication and the decline of democratic institutions. *European Journal of Communication*, 33(2), 122-139.
- Cano-Orón, L., Calvo, D., Llorca-Abad, G., & Mestre-Pérez, R. 2021. Media Crisis and Disinformation: The Participation of Digital Newspapers in the Dissemination of a Denialist Hoax. *El Profesional De La Información*, 30(4), 1-13.
- Chen, L., Chen, J., & Xia, C. 2022. Social Network Behavior and Public Opinion Manipulation. *Journal of Information Security and Applications*, 64, 103060.
- Cinelli, M., De Francisci Morales, G., Galeazzi, A., Quattrociochi, W., & Starnini, M. 2021. The echo chamber effect on social media. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences (PNAS)*, 118(9), e2023301118.
- Darmawan, D. 2021. Social Interaction in Digital Society: Changes in Online Communication Patterns and Dynamics of Virtual Communities, *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 1(1), 325-350.
- Darmawan, D., & de Jesus Isaac, A. 2022. Self-identity formation and social perception of individuals through interaction on social media in a digital world. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 2(2), 273-278.
- Darmawan, D., Mendonca, C. N., & de Jesus Isaac, A. 2022. Managing Corporate Reputation in the Digital Age: Challenges and Solutions for Maintaining a Positive Image on Social Media. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 2(1), 283-288.
- Diepeveen, L. 2019. *Modernist Fraud: Hoax, Parody, Deception*. Oxford University Press. United Kingdom.
- Disha, E. P., Halili, A., & Rustemi, A. 2023. Vulnerability to Disinformation in Relation to Political Affiliation in North Macedonia. *Media and Communication*, 11(2), 42-52.
- Dror, I. E. 2020. Cognitive and Human Factors in Expert Decision Making: Six Fallacies and the Eight Sources of Bias. *Analytical Chemistry*, 92(12), 7998-8004.
- Frank, H., & Hatak, I. 2014. Doing a Research Literature Review. Dalam *How to Get Published in the Best Entrepreneurship Journals*, 94-117.
- Gardi, B., Udjari, H., & Darmawan, D. 2021. Understanding the Function of Communication in Building and Sustaining Quality Relationships Across Organizational Boundaries. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(2), 245-252.
- Ghanem, B., Rosso, P., & Rangel, F. 2020. An Emotional Analysis of False Information in Social Media and News Articles. *ACM Transactions on Internet Technology (TOIT)*, 20(2), 1-18.
- Guess, A. M., Nagler, J., & Tucker, J. A. 2019. Less than you think: Prevalence and predictors of fake news sharing on Facebook. *Science Advances*, 5(1), eaau4586.
- Gupta, A., & Gupta, N. 2022. *Research Methodology*. SBPD Publications.
- Jandrić, P. 2019. The Postdigital Challenge of Critical Media Literacy. *The International Journal of Critical Media Literacy*, 1(1), 26-37.

The Digital Public Sphere Under Threat of Disinformation a Literature Study on Hoax
Dissemination Dynamic and Vulnerability Factors
(Ella Anastasya Sinambela)

- Juez, L. A., & Mackenzie, J. L. 2019. Emotion, Lies, and “Bullshit” in Journalistic Discourse: The Case of Fake News. *Ibérica: Revista De La Asociación Europea De Lenguas Para Fines Especificos (AELFE)*, (38), 17-50.
- Kurniawan, Y, D. Darmawan, & R. K. Khayru. 2021. Social Media and Contemporary Youth Digital Literature, *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 1(2), 109-124.
- Kurniawan, Y. & R. K. Khayru. 2021. Popular Culture and Youth: Value, Attitude, and Behavior Formation Through Music, Film, and Digital Content, *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 1(1), 303-324.
- Kurniawan, Y., Rojak, J. A., Darmawan, D., & Fajar, A. S. M. 2021. Exploration of Literary Works as Media to Form and Maintain National Identity through Narratives and Cultural Symbols. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(2), 187-192.
- Lewandowsky, S., Ecker, U. K. H., & Cook, J. 2017. Beyond Misinformation: Understanding and Coping with the “Post-Truth” Era. *Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition*, 6(4), 353-369.
- Lis, S., Thome, J., Kleindienst, N., Mueller-Engelmann, M., Steil, R., Priebe, K., ... & Bohus, M. 2020. Generalization of Fear in Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder. *Psychophysiology*, 57(1), E13422.
- Maras, M. H., & Alexandrou, A. 2019. Determining Authenticity of Video Evidence in the Age of Artificial Intelligence and in the Wake of Deepfake Videos. *The International Journal of Evidence & Proof*, 23(3), 255-262.
- Mattavelli, S., Corneille, O., & Unkelbach, C. 2023. Truth By Repetition... Without Repetition: Testing the Effect of Instructed Repetition on Truth Judgments. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, And Cognition*, 49(8), 1264.
- Mishra, S., Alowaidi, M. A., & Sharma, S. K. 2021. Impact of Security Standards and Policies on the Credibility of E-Government. *Journal of Ambient Intelligence and Humanized Computing*, 1-12.
- Mohajan, H. K. 2018. Qualitative Research Methodology in Social Sciences and Related Subjects. *Journal of Economic Development, Environment and People*, 7(1), 23-48.
- Negara, D. S., Darmawan, D., & Saktiawan, P. 2022. Privacy Violations on Social Media and Interpersonal Trust Among Young Generations. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 2(2), 151-156.
- Ognyanova, K., Lazer, D., Robertson, R. E., & Wilson, C. 2020. Misinformation in Action: Fake News Exposure is Linked to Lower Trust in Media, Higher Trust in Government When Your Side is in Power. *Harvard Kennedy School Misinformation Review*. 1(4), 1-19.
- Pantazi, M., Hale, S., & Klein, O. 2021. Social and Cognitive Aspects of the Vulnerability to Political Misinformation. *Political Psychology*, 42, 267-304.

- Papacharissi, Z. 2002. The virtual sphere: The internet as a public sphere. *New Media & Society*, 4(1), 9-27.
- Parra, G., Leone Jr, C., & Pimentel, R. M. 2023. Transmission of Moral Values Between Generations of Families in Conditions of Social and Economic Vulnerability. *Journal of Human Growth and Development*, 33(2), 213-221.
- Radjawane, L. E., & Mardikaningsih, R. 2022. Building Ethical and Fair Technology: Approaches to Responsible Technology Development and Application. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 2(1), 189-194.
- Ramle, N. L. B., & Mardikaningsih, R. 2022. Inclusivity in Technology-Based Services: Access and Skills Challenges. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 2(2), 225-230.
- Saktiawan, P., Hardyansah, R., Darmawan, D., & Putra, A. R. 2021. Ethical Principles in Indonesian Legal Advocacy: Sustaining Justice in Adversarial Systems Through Professional Integrity. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(2), 239-244.
- Sinambela, E. A. & D. Darmawan. 2021. Relevance of Email Marketing in the Contemporary Digital Marketing Communication Mix, *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 1(2), 301-324.
- Sinambela, E. A., Darmawan, D., & Halizah, S. N. 2022. Digital Inequality and Unequal Opportunity for Young Entrepreneurs in Online Economies. *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 2(1), 169-190.
- Snyder, H. 2019. Literature Review as a Research Methodology: An Overview and Guidelines. *Journal of Business Research*, 104, 333-339.
- Vaccari, C., & Chadwick, A. 2020. Deepfakes and Disinformation: Exploring the Impact of Synthetic Political Video on Deception, Uncertainty, and Trust in News. *Social Media + Society*, 6(1).
- Van Der Linden, S. 2022. Misinformation: Susceptibility, Spread, and Interventions to Immunize the Public. *Nature Medicine*, 28(3), 460-467.
- Vosoughi, S., Roy, D., & Aral, S. 2018. The spread of true and false news online. *Science*, 359(6380), 1146-1151.
- Walliman, N. 2021. *Research Methods: The Basics* (2nd Ed.). Routledge.
- Yang, Q., & Wu, S. 2021. How Social Media Exposure to Health Information Influences Chinese People's Health Protective Behavior During Air Pollution: A Theory of Planned Behavior Perspective. *Health Communication*, 36(3), 324-333.
- Zannettou, S., Sirivianos, M., Blackburn, J., & Kourtellis, N. 2019. The Web of False Information: Rumors, Fake News, Hoaxes, Clickbait, and Various Other Shenanigans. *Journal of Data and Information Quality (JDIQ)*, 11(3), 1-37.
- Zuboff, S. 2019. Surveillance Capitalism and the Challenge of Collective Action. *New Labour Forum*, 28(1), 10-29.