

Question techniques:

Disinformation and fake news concerning Corona virus:

<https://correctiv.org/faktencheck/hintergrund/2020/05/12/datenanalyse-nutzer-finden-fragwuerdige-corona-informationen-vor-allem-auf-youtube-und-vertreiben-sie-ueber-whatsapp>

Why are people in health matters so susceptible to fake news?

This is Sabrina Heike Kessler's opinion:

→ explains itself with the own desire to be healthy, to stay healthy or becoming healthy, and the fear of illness and death

→ When it comes to health, man is evolutionarily designed to rely on what others think, recommend and do .

→ If the information read about the Corona virus is plausible and fits into its own world view, it is directly mentally stored. Once fake news is in the mind of a person, it is relatively stable and difficult to eliminate.

What to do with fake news in the family chat:

Podcast Zeit online: <https://www.zeit.de/politik/2020-03/fake-news-coronavirus-familienchat-nachrichtenpodcast>

- if the person really believes in the news, then no more facts will be enough to dissuade them.
- don't take the person for a fool.
- Approach the topic sensitively

<https://www.zeit.de/digital/internet/2020-03/fake-news-coronavirus-falschnachrichten-luegen-panikmache>

Question techniques:

2.2) second part: How do I respond to friends/relatives/acquaintances who believe in conspiracies (quoted: <https://www.augsburger-allgemeine.de/panorama/Was-tun-wenn-Familie-und-Freunde-an-Verschwoerungen-glauben-id57393861.html>)

Many people who now share conspiracy ideological content, have not yet been drawn into the world, but were only at the beginning. Therefore, they are still accessible for arguments, she says: "The sooner you talk about it to people, the better".

All three experts agree in one point: If you really want to help, you need to take your counterpart seriously – even when you do not share their opinion. Wanting to lecture them, telling the other person they are crazy or treating them from the top down, is no use. Having a conversation on this basis is not easy, says Kockler. "But it is worth trying to search the conversation and sowing doubt", says Klaudia Hartmann from Augsburg. Because then doubt was there.

It was important in such a conversation to stay calm, says Kockler. As soon as one becomes aggressive or angry oneself, or the opposite one, one should break off the discussion and shift on a calm moment, advises the expert. "In such a moment it is also important not to take the absolute opposite position to the opposite", says the Bamberg psychologist Marius Raab. "If someone speaks of a compulsory vaccination and is an opponent, I can say: I don't want an untested vaccine to be tried on me. But is it likely that something like this will happen? A basis for a conversation has already been established. One strategy for such a conversation is to ask questions, the experts say. For example:

„Why do you think so?"

"Where did you get this information?"

"How trustworthy is this source?"

"What other kinds of content does this source share?"

"How plausible do you think it is that there is such a big conspiracy, in which thousands of people must be involved and nobody says anything?"

"Why should a YouTuber of all people get behind this?"

Question techniques:

(quoted after GLL: Strategies in dealing with slogans for regulars)

Recommendation: Do not react immediately with a reply, try asking questions instead!

- Inquire – signalizes your counterpart first: I am listening to you. Targeted questions can show that the conspiracy stories often have little basis. It should be avoided to question the statements immediately, otherwise fronts can quickly form.
- Analytical questions:
 - 1) analysis of the situation: How do you see the situation, how do I see the situation?
 - 2) targets: What are your targets? What are my targets? What is supposed to happen? What do I wish for?
 - 3) strategy: How do you want to reach your targets? How do I want to reach my targets?
- Specification questions:
 - > open questions (How exactly do you mean that? Have you ever experienced that yourself?)
 - > W-questions (Where did you get this information?)
 - > Do not argument/argue!
 - > Aiming to understand the other person.
- Really care about what the other person thinks:
 - > „I did not get/understand it yet. “
 - > „This thought is new to me. I’m curious. Why is this the way you see it?“
 - > „What exactly do you mean by that? I’m not sure how to take/understand it when you say ...“
 - > „I’m having a hard time understanding why ...“
 - > „I’m just thinking. What is so bad about ...?“
- If necessary: Clear differentiation and positioning with statements against democracy and statements violating human rights
 - 1) formulating your own position
 - 2) expressing your own feelings

Question techniques:

3) formulating a wish, concerning the solution desired

debunk conspiracy theories with fact checks:

If you are really looking for a discussion of content, you should be well prepared. Because a lot of conspiracy theorists throw around alleged facts so that it is difficult for an unprepared amateur to compete with him. „You can also research together whether there is anything to such facts,“ says Kockler. Or, dealing with videos, to see if there are already fact checks that deal with such films.. The Internet page Mimikama or the ARD fact finder offer good clues. The Augsburg sect commissioner Klaudia Hartmann adds: “I can try making that person see that there are also counter arguments. And that they should also take a look at those”. Because everyone needed to be able to deal with criticism

<https://www.amadeu-antonio-stiftung.de/fake-news-im-familienchat-was-kann-ich-tun-56301/>

Fake news spread faster than the virus, and is just as dangerous: A lot of people experience that such statements are also shared in their immediate environment – for example in their family WhatsApp group.

→A lot of people find it hard to respond

Question techniques:

What is the reason for that?

The information seems trustworthy to a lot of people, because it is spread by the people who they also trust in other life situations. And while the quality media and public administrations describe some disturbing developments, it is also comforting to hear from one's own aunt: It is enough to hoard toilet paper and drink a lot. But this particular difficulty in refuting false information in the personal environment is also their strength: They have a personal connection to these people and therefore the best chances that their voice is heard and their objections are taken seriously

What to do - Non-confrontational: It is helpful to be as non-confrontational as possible

It is helpful to first assume that the person had good intentions in replies and corrections, but that they were badly implemented. Also, try to understand why someone might have shared the misinformation and formulate your answer as empathetically as possible: "I am worried and insecure, just like you. But especially in such a situation we have to be careful what information we share. I believe that we should rely on information that is disseminated by government agencies, the Robert Koch Institute or quality media". Suggest better places to get information:

Zum Beispiel:

- Daily Briefing of the Robert-Koch-Institute
- Federal Center for Health Education
- The daily Corona podcast with Christian Drosten, virologist at the Charité in Berlin

Stay personal

no one likes to be corrected or admit to have made a mistake –. Especially not in a bigger group of co-readers. Was the rumor or the fake news posted in a personal chat? Then it is enough to put it right in a private chat and ask who else has received the false information. Ask them to inform the other addressed people.. At this point, it is worth being persistent: Point out that false information could be a danger to the other person's health. If you are in closer contact to that person, it would be even better to say the things you have to say in person, in a video chat or on the phone. Should the information have been shared in a group chat, putting things right should also happen here, in order to reach the other group members.

Contradict them in public!

: Even though a personal conversation should be preferred in most cases, is it possible that public contradiction could be worth it. For example if the post of an acquaintance has generated a big range or many reactions – for example in a big chat group with your colleagues in or your sports team. Auch hier gilt: What applies here as well: Be as non-confrontational as possible. Take the poster's fears and the people's positive reactions seriously. But do contradict the statement – by offering an

Question techniques:

alternative look at the core arguments. A lot of myths circling around Corona have already been debunked by journalists.

Understanding needs to stop with right-wing extremism, xenophobia, and antisemitism and a clear line needs to be drawn. „I'd be happy to talk about the Corona virus and which measures are sensible. But you walk the line with racist statements”.

How do I check if news is true

For children and young people:

Sogehmedien.de – by ARD und ZDF

- ➔ How to deal with media is explained in simple language (also appropriate for young people)

How can I protect myself?

<https://www.sueddeutsche.de/medien/coronavirus-informationstipps-1.4846836>

<https://swrfakefinder.de/fakefinder/>

3 steps to recognize fake news

- 1. source**
- 2. Fact check**
- 3. image research (upload image backwards)**