Research Article

The potential and Limits of Slovak Students' Engagement in the Fight Against Hoaxes and Disinformation: An Instructive Look Back at the Infodemic Accompanying the COVID-19 Pandemic

Pavol Rankov and Milan Regec*

Department of Library and Information Science, Faculty of Arts, Comenius University in Bratislava, Slovakia

Abstract.

During the COVID-19 pandemic, the rise of misinformation and hoaxes reached unprecedented levels, earning a new label, “infodemic”. This study investigates the information behavior of undergraduate students in Slovakia and the Czech Republic from autumn 2020 to summer 2022, focusing on their discourse concerning misinformation and hoaxes. Using a combination of autobiographical essays, online interviews, and open-ended questionnaires, data from 147 students were analyzed through inductive content analysis. Conducted research demonstrates that activism against misinformation and hoaxes, while initially high, is limited in the long term, with disgust, contempt, and isolationism prevailing. A sense of futility quickly overcomes the willingness to fight, and even rational students are not prepared for a substantive discussion with their opponents and are very skeptical and dismissive towards them. The effectiveness of any measures for building resistance and resilience of society against hoaxes is dependent on systematic work with the wider public, continuously reaching all age groups and education levels. Information education should be directed not only at the rational layer of the personality, where the relevance, timeliness, and truthfulness of information are crucial, but also at the emotional side of the person.

Keywords: COVID-19, infodemic, misinformation

Corresponding Author: Milan Regec; email: milan.regec@uniba.sk

Published: 2 October 2026

Publishing services provided by Knowledge E

© Rankov, Regec. This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use and redistribution provided that the original author and source are credited.

Selection and Peer-review under the responsibility of the 4th International Seminar on Promoting Local Resources for Agriculture and Development: Social, Education, Governance & Digital Society Studies Conference Committee.

OPEN ACCESS

1. Introduction

During the COVID-19 pandemic, the amount of misinformation and hoaxes of all kinds increased to such an extent that several authors claim that the COVID-19 pandemic was also accompanied by a wave of infodemic [1], [2], [3]. There has been an unprecedented popularization of expert medical knowledge and mass publication of scientific research results. The time to transform information from raw data found by laboratory research through a scientific study to a secondary popular science article has been reduced to a point when it even raised doubts about the traditional quality control process

in scientific publishing. In the past, medical knowledge was disseminated at such a rapid pace only in the environment of virtual medical communities and even there the median time to acceptance has been 11.5 shorter for COVID-19 articles than for human influenza research reduced just to 8 days [4] accompanied with rapidly rising number of retractions. Throughout the pandemic period (e.g. on the onset and spread of the disease, the emergence of new variants of COVID-19, the effectiveness of anti-pandemic measures and quarantine, treatment, or vaccination), scientific information from researchers' studies was immediately disseminated to the mass media. There, their scientific language with elaborate medical terminology was transformed into a journalistic style, which not only simplified complex findings, but also sometimes led to their misinterpretation. It is safe to assume that this was unintentional and mainly caused by time constraints, inadequate background knowledge on the topic as well as the fact that mass media require simplification of the content for their audience. Moreover, above mentioned retractions did not reach as wide an audience as the original news (if they were covered in the first place). However, the simplification of original scientific knowledge continued further in the environment of social networks. There, vast numbers of non-experts fragmented the information even more and augmented it with their own commentary. Short excerpts from original scientific texts were also used as slogans in dilettante verbal clashes with equally lay opponents. Non-experts were exposed during the pandemic to a myriad of fragments of medical information, which they were unable to transform into real knowledge, as they lacked the expertise and necessary foundations created by specialized study on the matter. And so the minds of lay people were troubled by isolated quasi-specialist information fragments, misinformation, and outright untruths, as people on social media are not necessarily focused on seeking the truth, but rather on getting followers, likes, comments, or shares. Today, social media can be considered an important factor in public health safety. An analysis of the dissemination of information and articles on preventive measures in relation to COVID-19 showed that the 30 most shared articles reached almost 5 million shares. However, while 80% of them were accurate, they accumulated only 64% of shares, while the rest was misleading information. [5, p. 183] This further proved the phenomenon of false information spreading online more easily than truth. The scale of this is logarithmic, according to a study by [6] virality of mostly distributed false information is significantly faster and cascades hundreds of times further than the virality of comparatively successful true information.

2. Methods

From autumn 2020 to summer 2022, we used a series of 6 follow-up research probes to sequentially investigate the information behavior of undergraduate students in the context of the ongoing evolution of the COVID-19 pandemic. We focused on student discourse. Data were collected using 3 different methods (autobiographical-reflective essay, standardized structured online interview, open-ended questionnaire). In terms of implementation, several phases of the studied pandemic period (autumn 2020, spring 2021, summer 2021, autumn 2021, spring 2022, summer 2022) are covered. The demography of the respondents includes undergraduate and graduate students from 19 faculties of Slovak universities and 1 Czech faculty, a total of 147 respondents. The corpus of texts generated by the statements of all respondents was processed by inductive content analysis using open-coding methodology.[7] We observed individuals' statements in the context of all other statements. Content-related remarks and later related data (phrases, sentences, sentence clusters from respondents) were grouped in a second step. Then, in a third step, we merged these groups into consistent categories or subcategories with associated codes. The first level - D relation to hoaxers and those who believe hoaxes; its lower second level - D1 irony, ridicule, superiority, D2 criticism of ignorance, of information illiteracy, D3 attempts at polemics, D4 passivity, disgust, D5 fear, D6 others. A partial statement could also be classified into several categories.[7, p. 22]

3. Results

The fundamental change brought to the Internet environment by the COVID-19 pandemic was the dramatic increase in the amount of disinformation and hoaxes, as well as their rather significant impact on social events. False content covered a wide range of topics during the pandemic period. Initially, they denied the very existence of the disease or, on the contrary, brought shocking news about its origin, later they questioned the real mortality rate of COVID-19, then they rejected the sense of testing or quarantine, and finally the effectiveness of vaccination – in addition to falsely reporting on the effectiveness of treatment with unproven drugs. Although the relationship between the terms **misinformation** (false information that is spread unconsciously and without the intent to harm) and **disinformation** or **hoax**(unsolicited, alarmist, purposefully edited, and half-truthful) is distinguishable, we will use them synonymously when interpreting

the research findings because none of our respondents pointed out or explained the difference between them. We conclude that the respondents were treating these terms as synonyms in their statements.

Virtually all our respondents agreed that the amount of misinformation and hoaxes has tremendously increased. We believe that young people became more sensitive to false information during the pandemic, also because they were aware that it threatened the health and lives of themselves or their loved ones. Although students are not unanimous in terms of dating and describing the course of the wave of hoaxes associated with the pandemic, there is a consensus, both regarding the unprecedentedly large number of hoaxes and the high frequency of their occurrence on the Internet during the pandemic, but also about their absurdity and meaninglessness:

... the advent of a really huge number of hoaxes, conspiracy theories, fake news, **suddenly everybody was trained virologist or immunologist** (male, essay, autumn 2021).

I have been picking up daily how some of the misinformation has been spread through social media. A lot of people were also developing discussions that should be best left to experts (male, essay, autumn 2021).

... misinformation has shaken the internet and social media, and **it is not as easy to fight it as it is to succumb to it** (male, essay, autumn 2021).

The hoaxes have spread terribly (female, interview, spring 2021).

I have never seen such a crazy and dangerous spread of lies, hoaxes and misinformation (female, essay, autumn 2021).

The level of the hoaxes just kept getting higher and higher, more and more absurd (male, interview, spring 2022).

In any case, we consider the increase in misinformation and hoaxes during the pandemic (and pandemic-related topics), which was also pointed out by respondents, to be part of the global infodemic. According to our respondents, the main channel spreading hoaxes is social media, especially Facebook (compare with [5]):

Every other sentence on Facebook is misinformation (female, interview, spring 2021).

... Facebook [is] literally infested with misinformation (female, interview, summer 2022).

Social networks tried to spread panic and alarm (female, interview, spring 2022).

[Source of the hoaxes] it was Facebook. *Also on Instagram, but less so there* (female, interview, spring 2022).

... most of it [hoaxes] spread on Facebook (female, interview, summer 2022).

It's definitely spreading the most on those social networks, be it **Instagram or Facebook, or even TikTok** (female, interview, summer 2022).

Respondents agree that this large amount of misinformation and hoaxes has caused and is causing division in the whole society. First respondents pointed this out as early as the fall of 2020; later, the polarization of society was already a natural part of students' thinking about misinformation during the pandemic:

As the threat of contagion [in the summer of 2020] waned, people forgot that we need each other. More than usual, we became irritable and sassy with each other. Especially on social media. **We had always differed in our opinions, but now we were able to swear [at someone] in the comments, wish [someone] death!!!***, take a stance on a complex topic in the blink of an eye, and be experts on everything* (male, essay, autumn 2020).

Personally, it seems to me that this pandemic has started to polarize our society a lot because of information and misinformation [...] **When I compare it to big events worldwide, for example the attack of the Twin Towers in 2001, after which society became more united, today's pandemic has the opposite effect on society, i.e. it is polarizing it more and more** (male, essay, autumn 2020).

... **misinformation***, which is spread incessantly and* **causes the polarization of society** (female, essay, autumn 2021).

Comparison with attitude of the discourse after the terrorist attacks on 9/11 draws attention. These events also generated a large amount of conspiracy theories that live up to this day, but as such they were unable to significantly alter the public discourse at that moment. And while it is tempting to finger-point social media as being the key difference, other factors are at play, especially proximity – while 9/11 induced "collective trauma" (hence the sense of "togetherness"), for most of the population the tragedy was psychologically distant. COVID, in comparison, represented a major threat directly to us or our loved ones, often resulting in many personal traumas, fear, and prolonged stress exposure. People tend to discount distant issues whereas they are much more invested in discourse about something that is personally affecting, more so threatening, them.

The severity and the depth of the social divide is also indicated by the means of expression used by our respondents. They speak of a "war" between "camps":

The name-calling, the insults, the death wishes [...] **The pandemic itself is one big sadness, let alone the internet war it has unleashed** (female, essay, autumn 2021).

... I've watched an absolute split in society. On the internet, but also offline (male, essay, autumn 2021).

Unfortunately, the internet and social networks have become a space for the spread of conspiratorial messages, and it has become almost impossible to avoid them. The online space has therefore become toxic in many ways and filled with hate, hate-speech, and division into "two camps" (female, essay, autumn 2021).

Already politically divided society in our country has begun to split even more, mainly because of fake news and hoaxes (male, questionnaire, summer 2021).

Hoaxes and misinformation thus divide people into two camps. *Often hateful arguments arise* (female, questionnaire, summer 2021).

[On hoaxes] it was the kind of topic that divided people into two camps, which hadn't happened before (female, interview, spring 2022).

4. Opinions on Hoaxers

Student discourse shows very critical views about the disseminators of hoaxes and disinformation. We uncovered several intersecting types of this criticism. The most common is irony, which is a mode of contempt. In this context, student discourse also contains stereotypical adjectives, which became widespread during the COVID-19 pandemic in Slovakia ("school of life", "expert on everything", etc.):

The opinions of scientists, epidemiologists, and experts were often replaced by the claims of ``school of life'' graduates who were sure of their truth and fearlessly ``pushed'' it into everyone's head (male, essay, autumn 2021).

... everyone was suddenly a trained virologist or immunologist, and an overall huge increase in misinformation (male, essay, autumn 2020).

Now they are all scientists or infectologists [...] **people are so stupid and comment on everything** (female, interview, spring 2021).

*... t***he often toxic content of millions of virologists***, sages and experts, which* **posed a challenge -- to judge which content was hoax and delusion** (female, essay, autumn 2021).

This type of mockery of the disseminators of false information includes ironic comments about the thought and psycho-social coherence of the hoaxers as a group:

...they share a common trait of cohesion [...] they cooperate and agree with each other. **As soon as someone else comes to them with an opposing view, they immediately start attacking** ... (male, interview, spring 2022).

[Hoaxers] kick-boosting each other's little egos (male, interview, spring 2022).

Another common form of criticism of hoaxers focuses on the lack of critical thinking or information literacy as the ability to seek out and verify information. Irony can be present in this part of the discourse as well:

... it's not their fault anyway. Or they just don't have the critical thinking (female, interview, summer 2022).

... they see the first thing and immediately go and share it and don't verify it [...] **maybe he doesn't have the critical thinking** *on such a level that he would say [...] it doesn't have to be true* (female, interview, summer 2022).

... the whole pandemic situation has clearly shown us how easily people are manipulated and that a large part of them cannot filter and select information at all (male, essay, autumn 2020).

... they probably lack critical thinking [...] **they only draw resources from one perspective** (male, interview, spring 2022).

I was surprised how many people really believe the crazy scenarios [...] **it's important to check information, to thoroughly verify. And I don't think many people can or want to do that** (female, interview, summer 2021).

... various dubious websites take advantage of the fact that people do not know how to verify informatio*n and spread hoaxes or misinformation. Unfortunately, people believe it, they panic and argue more* (female, interview, summer 2021).

... these are actually maybe **people who are probably unable to find the information and are thus easily influenced** (female, interview, summer 2022).

Closely related to the previous approach to hoaxers is the part of the discourse that generally emphasizes their lack of education (de facto understood as stupidity):

[Hoaxers] have two main problems: lower ability to evaluate things, to use common sense [...] they have a problem to admit a mistake, they take it as a weakness (male, interview, spring 2022).

... they are easily influenced or rather uneducated [...] **they are simpletons** (female, interview, spring 2022).

... they are definitely less educated people, they don't have a general outlook [...] **they don't realize that they can't see beyond their horizons***, thus they think they know everything best* (female, interview, spring 2022).

... people are often naive, and there are those who believe theories such as there is no pandemic, we don't need to wear masks, or perhaps the most famous one, which claims that by vaccinating against the disease we will be injected with a micro-chip [to control us] (female, essay, autumn 2021).

However, people who share such views do not think and there is nothing we can do about it unfortunately (female, essay, autumn 2021).

... there are plenty of smart-asses and nitwits spouting misinformation. And now we need critical thinking to be able to wade through it. Unfortunately, some people believe even the stupid things (female, questionnaire, summer 2021).

Another large group of respondents considered fear of COVID-19 as a key factor in why people believe hoaxes and misinformation:

A common feature [of hoaxers] was the fear of covid (female, interview, spring 2022).

They are people who are afraid *[...] and that* **fear causes them to adopt some theory***, which they modify in a certain way and start spreading* (female, interview, spring 2022).

They are maybe, let's say, **paranoid about what actually is happening** *in our country or in the world [...] And* **e***ven if they didn't believe it at the beginning, then over time maybe they internalize the opinions that they actually heard from someone else, and tell themselves – aha, that could really be the case. And after a while, they are again pushing these opinions into the heads of others* (male, interview, summer 2022).

... they are so easily influenced and uneducated that they don't know what they are talking about [...] **Maybe they also do it out of fear of new things** (female, interview, spring 2022).

The noisy people who are like actively spreading it are **too much controlled by anger or emotions** *[...] some are so downright evil that they just spread it on purpose, on purpose [...] they spread most of that hate too, you can't even open the comments [...]* **It always puts me in such a bad mood, I always lose faith in humanity** (female, interview, summer 2022).

The targeted spread of misinformation is also assumed by other interviewees. However, this type of criticism of hoaxers also reveals elements of conspiratorial thinking on the part of the quoted respondents:

... [they are trying to] **seek to spread misinformation to induce others to behave in a certain way**. *For example, they want to induce some fear or some other emotion in them* (female, interview, spring 2022).

... **they profit from it and create hoaxes on purpose** *and use the second group of people who will believe anything that has some label of alternativeness [...] these people act as useful idiots* (male, interview, spring 2022).

... maybe they get paid to spread the information in this way *[...]* **they have been bribed to stir up society** (female, interview, spring 2022).

... maybe they get paid for just sharing things like that, but maybe their opinion might be completely different (male, interview, summer 2022).

On the other side, it must be noted that there are individuals openly spreading misinformation and hoaxes for whom donations from their followers are the main source of income. Not only are their supporters victims (and further disseminators) of their lies, but they are also being taken advantage of financially. It was observed that more polarizing and controversial content leads to greater interaction and thus greater financial gains not only for this type of "content creators", but also for the platform they are using for the distribution.

A milder version is also marginally found to explain the motivations of hoaxers. Two interviewees believe that the aim is to draw attention to themselves. Incidentally, the principle of attention-grabbing (getting likes, followers, or shares) is the backbone of how social media works:

[hoaxers] want to somehow attract attention *[...] people, who [normally] can't attract attention, so they are trying to do it some other way* (female, interview, spring 2022).

So maybe they are the ones who want some attention, and either the good kind or the bad king (from their point of view). (female, interview, summer 2022).

In student discourse, senior age is another typical characteristic of people who believe and spread hoaxes. Many interviewees claim that the tendency to trust misinformation and hoaxes is mainly among the older generations. The first quote is interesting, in which the respondent tries to explain the information behavior of seniors by saying that they experienced censorship in their youth under communism, so nowadays they want to fight for the free dissemination of "classified" information.

[Disinformers] are people who are basically like ``strong'' patriots *[...] It's because when there was a previous regime, when there was socialism, they just didn't have such good information back then, and nowadays they have access to that information,*

so **now they actually want to spread the ``truth'', since back then the truth wasn't spread that much** (female, interview, summer 2022).

Just as older adults used to teach us, "Don't believe everything you read on the internet," so now we, sometimes have to keep reminding them (female, essay, autumn 2020).

... **by the fact that Facebook is mostly used by older people, so it [hoaxes] spread more there** (female, interview, spring 2022).

I **see them [hoaxers] as bitter people mostly maybe of older age** (male, interview, spring 2022).

... the naivety, we see it with retired people, for example, that **they just take the first opinion as the right one because it is written somewhere** (female, interview, summer 2022).

The validity of the assumption that seniors are susceptible to the spread of misinformation is confirmed by the respondents' own family experiences:

My experience of misinformation is mainly with seniors (specifically my parents) *(female, questionnaire, summer 2021).*

[My mother] is not the kind of a person who can filter out true, false, and distorted information from the internet. *Many times, she believed hoaxes* (female, essay, autumn 2021).

There was always information that was not true [...] **My grandparents had a big problem with this and had to have the information to them regularly explained** (female, questionnaire, summer 2021).

But **grandma, I even can't really talk to her [about it]** (female, interview, summer 2022).

... especially the middle-aged people are the ones sharing the hoaxes and fake news and hoaxes. And then among the senior citizens, I usually see emails. For example, **my own grandfather often sends various articles like that, which he doesn't even know where they're from** (male, interview, summer 2022).

My aunt is quite naive and keeps sharing things like this on Facebook (female, interview, summer 2022).

One respondent was also skeptical about the future development of the disinformation wave that the pandemic has triggered:

I think it persists, **I think there's more misinformation [...] The pandemic has now set a new bar that we're sticking to** (female, interview, summer 2022).

5. Active and Passive Attitude Towards Hoaxes

Interesting are the students' statements about their own active speaking out against misinformation. In this theme, the discourse covers the whole spectrum of opinions from real active participation in fact-checking, to fact-checking limited to communication with those closest to them, to apathy towards misinformation.

I'm in a group right now that deals with this kind of thing [...] we're going to report it all. I had a friend, for example, who shared just that kind of stuff. **I have been reporting it all on Facebook with a high success rate, she basically got it all deleted** (male, interview, summer 2022).

I hope to be able to play my part *not only in the future but also now* **in making the fight against conspirators threatening people's health more effective** (female, essay, autumn 2020).

It is extremely important to check the credibility of sources and not to be tempted and misled by misinformation... **It is necessary to learn to filter out misleading demagogues and together prevent them from spreading harmful lies** (female, essay, autumn 2021).

Social networks have become a bit disgusting and embarrassing for me at this point [...] **I fight with reasonable and decent arguments and comments, but I feel like a drop in the ocean** (male, essay, autumn 2020).

... **I'm trying to spread some awareness, so to speak, but it doesn't have much effect** (female, interview, summer 2022).

But the only option I see is to try to be informed, try not to believe every article and be critical of it and try to somehow support it or verify it from multiple sources. And to suggest the same to those around me (female, interview, summer 2022).

For example, on Instagram, **I try to share, like, an article or a post that somehow combats it**, *the misinformation [...] But that's like everything I do.* **I rarely hear back** (female, interview, summer 2022).

However, the sense of futility of fighting hoaxes is more common than the willingness to fight them:

At first **I had the urge to fight them and go to refute it to them, but there's no chance**, *just weave my hand [I just move on]* (male, interview, spring 2021).

You can't out-yell them [...] I wanted too, but it was extremely difficult, **you have no chance to convince** (male, interview, spring 2022).

Anyone who has been in a debate with a conspirator at least once knows that there is no point in having a conversation with these people *because they are not at all interested in changing their minds or admitting they are wrong* (male, essay, autumn 2020).

... I am no longer annoyed at the simplicity of the views of some of my fellow citizens. **Let each live and die as they wish. I simply have no energy to spare for people who violently debate and impose their incompetent opinions** (male, essay, autumn 2021).

... some people have the cells for it, like they can explain it, or even argue about it, but I'm not really in the mood for that (female, interview, summer 2022).

There is no point in engaging in online debates because life is too short for that (male, interview, spring 2022).

... I usually ignore such people (female, interview, spring 2022).

6. Discussion

The COVID-19 pandemic will remain in the collective memory of the Generation Z (to which the researched students belong) associated with the infodemic, which saw an unprecedented increase in disinformation and hoaxes in terms of their "thematic" diversity, number, and frequency of occurrence in the Internet environment. In particular, respondents point to the spread of misinformation in social networks (especially Facebook), as noted by [8]. This means that disinformation sites, blogs, and portals achieve their social influence through a two-stage flow via social media. Students encountered hoaxes and misinformation continuously and in such quantity that no consensus could emerge within the discourse as to when the wave of "pandemic" hoaxes began in the first place and when it reached its peak. One explanation may be that the infodemic, accompanied by an unprecedented number of hoaxes, came almost simultaneously with the pandemic, as pointed out by several authors [1], [2], [3], Tardáguila quoted in [9].

Student discourse reflects the polarization of society caused by misinformation and hoaxes as well as the use of radical metaphors ("war", "two camps"). A pattern of group-generational insight towards an us vs. them dichotomy is present in the discourse, which is evident in the evaluation of hoaxers. Such a division of society as a result of hoaxers is described, for example, by [10]. Student characterization of hoaxers is based on intellectual superiority and contains a confrontational tone. The discourse in relation

to hoaxers includes disdain coupled with irony (stereotypical adjectives such as “expert in everything”, “graduate of the school of life”) or pointing out the absence of critical thinking and information literacy. Respondents point out that hoaxers are quite often seniors, which they have also experienced within their own families. Such a tendency of seniors to trust and spread misinformation is confirmed by several authors [11], [12], [13]. However, also present in the respondents’ discourse is the notion that hoaxers have a purposeful intent to do harm; in this, the students approach the conspiratorial mindset of their opponents.

In terms of commitment to fighting hoaxes, the effort of fact-checking is present, although largely limited to the immediate social environment, especially seniors in one’s own family. There is a prevailing sense of futility in combating the barrage of misinformation, which leads to ignoring the hoaxers. This is not a good starting point for future pluralistic social debate and dialogue aimed at overcoming divisions in society.

Conducted research demonstrated that activism against hoaxes and disinformation is limited, with disgust, contempt, and isolationism prevailing. The limit of one’s commitment to fight hoaxes can be overcome by group efforts and fact-checking initiatives. However, these only tend to help people seeking trustworthy sources of information already. The might of disinformation can be demonstrated by a survey conducted with seniors by the author in separate research. When seniors attending IT courses (2023, n=40) were asked about their opinion on the fact-checking website (www.konspiratori.sk), those prone to share hoaxes and disinformation considered persons or websites flagged by fact-checkers as even more credible. The fact that they have been on the list of conspiracy sources was, from their point of view, a sign of recognition of their influence and commendation for going “against the mainstream”.

Health organizations and state governments in reaction to the spread of both – the COVID-19 pandemic and the infodemic are working on raising awareness, resilience, and measures for addressing the viral spreading of mis- and disinformation.

7. Conclusions

Health organizations and state governments in reaction to the spread of both – the COVID-19 pandemic and the related infodemic, are working on raising awareness, resilience, and measures for addressing the viral spreading of mis- and disinformation [14]. However, the effectiveness of these measures is dependent on systematic work

with the wide public and continuous education efforts reaching all age groups and education levels.

Infodemic is a call to rethink information literacy education. The notion of information education primarily focused on vocational training and professional life is incomplete. Even an expert in a particular field has a life outside work and private life in which information plays an important role. It is in this sphere that he may be influenced by misinformation from areas in which he is a layman, especially through over-exposure to the messages circulating in closed groups on encrypted communication platforms such as WhatsApp, Telegram, or Signal. Information education should be directed not only at the rational layer of the personality, where the relevance, timeliness, and truthfulness of information are crucial but also at the emotional side of the person.

We expect that the experience with infodemics and hoaxes will increase the vigilance of the young generation in their future lives towards disinformation as a potential social threat or part of hybrid conflicts. On the other hand, however, it appears that it will be necessary to look at all levels (from educational, to mass media and politics) for ways to establish and support ongoing society-wide dialogue and pluralistic debate since even rational students are not prepared for a substantive discussion with their opponents and are so far very skeptical and dismissive towards them.

Acknowledgments

The research was supported by Slovak Research and Development Agency grant no.: APVV-19-0074. The publication of this paper was kindly supported by H. E. Pribadi Sutiono, Ambassador of the Republic of Indonesia to the Slovak Republic, as part of his ongoing efforts to develop academic and research partnerships between the two countries.

References

[1] Dubey S, Biswas P, Ghosh R, Chatterjee S, Dubey MJ, Chatterjee S, et al. Psychosocial impact of COVID-19. Diabetes Metab Syndr. 2020;14(5):779–88.

[2] Islam AK, Laato S, Talukder S, Sutinen E. Misinformation sharing and social media fatigue during COVID-19: an affordance and cognitive load perspective. Technol Forecast Soc Change. 2020 Oct;159:120201.

[3] Radu R. Fighting the 'Infodemic': Legal Responses to COVID-19 Disinformation. Soc Media Soc. 2020 Jul;6(3):2056305120948190.

[4] Schonhaut L, Costa-Roldan I, Oppenheimer I, Pizarro V, Han D, D'iaz F. Scientific publication speed and retractions of COVID-19 pandemic original articles. Rev Panam Salud Publica. 2022 Apr;46:e25.

[5] Obiała J, Obiała K, Ma'nczak M, Owoc J, Olszewski R. COVID-19 misinformation: accuracy of articles about coronavirus prevention mostly shared on social media. Health Policy Technol. 2021 Mar;10(1):182–6.

[6] Vosoughi S, Roy D, Aral S. The spread of true and false news online. Science. 2018 Mar;359(6380):1146–51.

[7] Rankov P. *Informačn'e spr'avanie študentov počas pand'emie*. STIMUL, Univerzita Komensk'eho v Bratislave, Filozofick'a fakulta, 2023. Accessed: Sep. 07, 2024. [Online]. Available: https://dspace.uniba.sk/xmlui/handle/123456789/186

[8] Rebrov'a M. "Hľadanie pravdy v časoch pand'emie – boj nenovin'arov proti dezinform'aci'am," in *Fenom'en 2021. Pand'emia covidu-19 a m'edi'a*, 1. vyd., A. S'amelov'a, M. Stankov'a, and J. Hacek, Eds., Bratislava: Univerzita Komensk'eho, 2021, pp. 138–158. Accessed: Jan. 12, 2022. [Online]. Available: https://fphil.uniba.sk/fileadmin/fif/katedry_pracoviska/kzur/Publikacie_pdf/fenomen_2021.pdf

[9] Su'arez E. "How fact-checkers are fighting coronavirus misinformation worldwide | Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism," Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism. Accessed: Sep. 07, 2024. [Online]. Available: https://reutersinstitute.politics.ox.ac.uk/news/how-fact-checkers-are-fighting-coronavirus-misinformation-worldwide

[10] Mathiasov'a A. Infod'emia v onlinovych m'edi'ach ako sprievodn'y jav pand'emie covid-19. In: S'amelov'a A, Stankov'a M, Hacek J, editors. Fenom'en 2021. Pand'emia covidu-19 a m'edi'a. Volume 1. Bratislava: Univerzita Komensk'eho; 2021. pp. 127–37. [Online, [cited 2022 Jan 12]], Available https://fphil.uniba.sk/fileadmin/fif/katedry_pracoviska/kzur/Publikacie_pdf/fenomen_2021.pdf

[11] Brashier NM, Schacter DL. Aging in an Era of Fake News. Curr Dir Psychol Sci. 2020 Jun;29(3):316–23.

[12] Guess A, Nagler J, Tucker J. Less than you think: prevalence and predictors of fake news dissemination on Facebook. Sci Adv. 2019 Jan;5(1):eaau4586. https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aau4586.

[13] Pennycook G, McPhetres J, Zhang Y, Lu JG, Rand DG. Fighting COVID-19 Misinformation on Social Media: Experimental Evidence for a Scalable Accuracy-Nudge Intervention. Psychol Sci. 2020 Jul;31(7):770–80.

[14] World Health Organization and United Nations Children's Fund. *How to build an infodemic insights report in six steps*. Accessed: Sep. 08, 2024. [Online]. Available: https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/370317/9789240075658-eng.pdf?sequence=1