

EVENT DESCRIPTION SHEET

PROJECT	
Participant:	KENTRO MERIMNAS OIKOGENEIAS KAI PAIDIOU (KMOP)
PIC number:	PIC 969224486
Project name and acronym:	[An intergenerational active debate on how countering disinformation to empower citizens] – [MEDIWISE]

EVENT DESCRIPTION			
Event number:	WP13		
Event name:	Local Event in Greece "Intergenerational Dialogue and fake news"		
Type:	Mutual learning		
In situ/online:	in-situ		
Location:	Greece, Athens		
Date(s):	11th April 2024		
Website(s) (if any):	https://www.mediawise-project.eu/		
Participants			
Female:	37		
Male:	13		
Non-binary:			
From country Greece:	50		
...			
Total number of participants:	50	From total number of countries:	1
Description			
<i>Provide a short description of the event and its activities.</i>			
The event was organized with 40 participants, including 16 young people and 34 older adults (65+), at the "Open Centre for the Protection of the Elderly (OCPE)" in Piraeus, Attica Region, specifically at OCPE- A2. The event included interactive sessions where younger participants guided older adults in identifying fake news. Participants were divided into small groups to facilitate intergenerational interaction, exchange thoughts and ideas about fake news as well as find common ways to tackle disinformation.			
Agenda:			
09:30–10:00	Registration		

10:00–10:30	Introduction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Welcoming; - About MEDIAWISE/event; - Structure of the event.
10:30–11:30	Greek disinformation and fake news landscape <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Basic definitions; - Current situation in Greece; - Recent examples of fake news.
11:30–11:45	Break
11:45–12:45	<i>Interactive session 1 (1 young people per 1 person 65+)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Case study analysis;</i>
12:45 – 13:45	Interactive session 2 (1 young people per 1 person 65+) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fake news game
13:45-14:15	Open discussion session <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Specific needs and ideas; - Recommendations;
14:15 – 14:45	Conclusions

The main attempt was to realise interactive sessions that would engage both groups and via their social interaction would lead to a better understanding for the topic of fake news. Besides the initial speeches that were organised in the beginning of the event the remaining components of the agenda were interactive sessions intermingling the two target groups. The envisaged interactive sessions were the following: (a) Interactive session 1 “Setting the criteria to identify fake articles”, (b) interactive session 2 “Deem fakes: Online game to identify fake videos” and (c) Open discussion session. For the successful implementation of the first two specific material was prepared, while also a meeting with the young people was realised to inform them and coordinate the realisation of the interactive sessions prior to the local event. The prepared material entailed titles, pictures and a brief paragraph from fake news that could be found on the Greek media (blogspots, news platforms, social media) with a prompt question below the article asking if the news were true or not (see Picture 1). In total, ten (10) such articles were identified and prepared for the interactive session. In the beginning of the document which included the fake news, a set of criteria were presented regarding the way that fake news can be identified. Indicatively, the criteria concerned the use of capital letters in the title; the prompt for sharing/spreading news (“Send this to X number of friends to win a coupon”); cross-checking the author/publisher; being cautious when incredible or vague claims were made, and also when emotional discourse was utilised. Similarly, at the end of the same document practical instructions were adapted from existing debunking platforms in Greece such as [“Ellinika Hoaxes”](#). Additionally, a second piece of material was also prepared which presented a table with “usually more credible” and “usually less credible” news platforms and an additional table which presented debunking platforms in Greece. Lastly, for interactive session 2 an online game that was prepared for a fake news exhibition ([“Fakeless”](#)) under the auspices of the Goethe Institute Athens was utilised. The online game “ORIGINAL OR NOT?” presented real and fake videos to help the participants identify deepfakes via specific ques that were connected to the underlying technology.

During the implementation of the sessions the participants were divided into smaller groups of 3-5 persons with at least one of the participants being a young individual. In this manner it was possible to ensure that all older adult individuals were able to interact with young people and vice versa. Young participants provided guidance to the older participants by supporting them in identifying fake news based on the criteria that were previously set within the provided document. Similar to this, the second interactive session also had a common structure, with younger individuals acting in a way like “mentors” for the target group of 65+. In the end of each session all participants were able to share their stories, opinions and thoughts for both the process and the general topic. The two interactive sessions facilitated the dialogue that took place during the last interactive phase of the local event. Due to the fact that participants had already met each other in smaller groups and had shared their ideas openly based on the provided material, they were able to engage in discussions more actively.

Results

Similar to the first local event, a comparable distinction between two groups was observed. Participants were grouped into two categories – especially for the group 65+. The first category mentioned that they did not utilise the internet (much or at all), and for that, they reasoned that they were more secure than those who utilised it. Part of the older people in this group mentioned that they do not have any access to computers, laptops, tablets or smartphones. The second group (which also included all the young people) made use of smartphones and had access to the internet. The older people in the second group shared with us their experience and their fears, especially in terms of online and offline scams and difficulty in identifying fake news, even in cases when they were visible to

younger people. Both groups stressed and shared their fear in terms of offline deception and scams (e.g., SMS and MMS from a seemingly real bank; phone call from relatives who were in a car accident and needed help etc.). The second group in this event differed to a certain extent in comparison to the first event's second group because had a higher degree of familiarisation with scams and some criteria for identifying fake news (e.g.,

Participants categorised in the first group, did not showcase much interest to the event's topics. Similar to the first event they also mentioned that they did not practically utilise any technological equipment. In effect, this part of the group was neither willing, nor interested to accept that it could fall victim of disinformation, or any scams.

The participants in the second group had a decent level of familiarity with technological devices like smartphones, tablets, and personal computers. Many were comfortable troubleshooting basic tech issues and navigating various applications and online platforms. They used the internet for a variety of activities, such as making internet phone calls through services like, WhatsApp and Viber; searching for and watching videos and news on platforms like YouTube and major news websites and using social media like Facebook. Many participants actively used social media and reported being influenced by fake news, whether they realized it or not. They expressed concerns about how misinformation affects public opinion and decision-making. This group appreciated the guidelines provided for identifying fake articles and found practical examples and checklists particularly helpful. Some of the participants were already familiar with several of the criteria for identifying fake news that were set. All participants in this group showed a strong interest in fact-checking platforms and websites, wanting to learn more about how they work and how to use them to spot fake news. They expressed a desire for more training sessions on using these platforms effectively. In this context, analysing specific examples of fake news, such as particular fake videos or articles, in smaller groups was seen as a useful practice for improving the abilities of the participants to identify fake news. Similar to the first local event, participants recommended follow-up discussions and feedback sessions to reinforce what they learned, and suggested incorporating real-life scenarios and role-playing exercises to make the learning process more engaging. Lastly, participants preferred intergenerational workshops, noting that interacting with younger individuals enhanced their learning experience and made discussions more engaging. They believed that these workshops fostered mutual respect and understanding between different age groups.

In the same regard, the need for local community involvement in an intergenerational manner was equally stressed. As previously mentioned, both young and older individuals enjoyed this engagement and were eager to pursue this type of activity more often. In this, a suggestion that could be interesting refers to the creation of community support "chats" where older individuals and younger ones also participate and questions about fake news, scams, etc., can be answered by the young people directly. In a way, the young individuals will function as "digital mentors" for older people who need support. Nonetheless, it was stressed that the relationship between young and older individuals should not become digitalised; physical encounters are crucial.

Lastly, some common points mentioned by both the young people and the older individuals were connected to (a) the lack of frequent trainings, with an intergenerational approach, for the topic; (b) the limited or relatively unknown debunking platforms and tools, and (c) the lack of specific rankings for news platform based on their credibility. Especially the last two points, were deemed as important due to the fact that they can create a baseline via which all individuals, regardless of their age, can compare the news platforms and decide the most credible ones to follow them more actively.