

Digital Civic Engagement and Policy Misinformation: Hoax Narratives of Indonesia's Free Nutritious Meal Program

Muhamad Handar ^{1*}, Lidwina Hana ², Purbowo ³

¹ Communication Studies, Indonesia Open University, 15437, Indonesia

² Communication Studies, Multimedia Nusantara University, 15810, Indonesia

³ Agribusiness Management, State Polytechnic of Jember, 68121, Indonesia

*Corresponding author's email: muhamadhandar01@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Keywords

Digital civic engagement; food policy;
hoax narratives; Indonesia;
misinformation; public policy
communication

The rapid expansion of digital media ecosystem has accelerated the circulation of misinformation surrounding public policies. In Indonesia, one policy that has recently become the subject of online misinformation is the Free Nutritious Meal Program (Program Makan Bergizi Gratis/MBG), a national initiative aimed at improving children's nutritious and strengthening human capital development. While existing studies on misinformation largely focus on political elections and health crises, limited research has examined misinformation narratives related to welfare and food policy. This study analyzes the characteristics and framing of hoax narratives related to the Free Nutritious Meal Program and explores their implication for digital civic engagement. The research employs a qualitative approach using qualitative content analysis and framing analysis. Data were collected from fact-checking archive of TurnBackHoax, managed by the Indonesian Antihoax Society (Mafindo). Using the keyword "makan bergizi gratis," the dataset consists of 30 verified hoax cases published between 2024 and 2026. The analysis examines narrative structures, content typologies, and dissemination patterns of misinformation across digital platforms. This research contributes to the study of policy misinformation by highlighting how hoax narratives shape public perceptions of food policy and proposes a policy-based hoax literacy approach to strengthen digital civic engagement and public information resilience.

1. Introduction

The proliferation of digital media in the twenty-first century has fundamentally transformed the ecology of public information, enabling both unprecedented citizen participation and the rapid spread of misinformation and disinformation. Scholars across communication studies, political science, and public health have increasingly recognized that false or misleading information does not circulate in a vacuum; rather, it thrives within specific sociotechnical conditions shaped by platform architectures, affective resonance, and pre-existing social anxieties. (Wardle, 2017). The consequences are not merely epistemic but deeply political and social: misinformation can erode public trust in democratic institutions, suppress civic participation, and undermine the implementation of legitimate public policies.

Within the global scholarship on misinformation, food and nutrition have emerged as particularly fertile domains for the circulation of false claims. (Diekman, 2023) argue that food-related topics

enjoy high intrinsic public interest and emotional salience, creating conditions in which both credentialed experts and unverified sources can reach large audiences with equal velocity. (Caballero, 2025) demonstrate in a comprehensive scoping review that misinformation variables are closely and measurably linked to public nutritional health strategies, shaping individual behavior at the household level and influencing policy outcomes at the governmental level. These contributions advance understanding of misinformation as a systemic challenge in health governance; however, they predominantly situate their analyses within pandemic or general health communication contexts, leaving a significant lacuna in the study of misinformation specifically targeting state-led food welfare programs.

Indonesia presents a particularly instructive case for the study of welfare policy misinformation. As the world's fourth most populous democracy and the country with the third-largest social media user base in Southeast Asia. (We Are Social, 2024), Indonesia's digital public sphere is characterized by high connectivity, deep platform penetration, and a historically documented vulnerability to viral hoax campaigns—from the 2016 Jakarta gubernatorial election to the COVID-19 infodemic of 2020–2021. In this context, the launch of the Free Nutritious Meal Program (Program Makan Bergizi Gratis/MBG) under President Prabowo Subianto in January 2025 (Peraturan Presiden No. 83 Tahun 2024) introduced a new focal point for politically motivated misinformation. Designed to provide daily nutritious meals for schoolchildren across the national archipelago at an initial budget allocation of IDR 71 trillion (approximately USD 4.4 billion), the MBG program represents one of the most ambitious social investment initiatives in Indonesian postcolonial history. Its scale and political visibility have made it simultaneously a target and a mirror for competing narratives about governance quality, food safety, and state integrity.

Despite its policy significance, the MBG program remains virtually unaddressed in the misinformation literature. Prior research on Indonesian disinformation has concentrated on electoral hoaxes (Yumitro, 2022), religious and identity-based misinformation (Lim, 2017), and pandemic health communication (Rasyid, 2019). The gap in welfare policy misinformation is not merely topical but analytical: it reflects a broader tendency within the field to associate misinformation with spectacular political events rather than with the quotidian operations of welfare governance, where public trust and behavioral compliance are equally, if not more, consequential. This oversight leaves policy communicators, civil society organizations, and scholars without the empirical foundations necessary to diagnose and counteract misinformation as it shapes the reception of social programs.

This study addresses that gap by analyzing the characteristics and framing of hoax narratives related to the MBG program, using the verified archive of TurnBackHoax managed by Masyarakat Antifitnah Indonesia (Mafindo) as its primary data source. Drawing on 30 verified hoax cases published between 2024 and 2026, the research employs qualitative content analysis and framing analysis to examine narrative structures, content typologies, platform distribution patterns, and rhetorical strategies in MBG-related misinformation. The study situates its analytical framework at the intersection of framing theory (Entman, 1993), digital media ecology (Couldry, 2017), and Media and Information Literacy (UNESCO, 2018), arguing that welfare policy hoaxes constitute a specific genre of digital misinformation that operates through affective mechanisms and demands a policy-responsive literacy intervention.

The specific objectives of this research are fourfold: (1) to map the characteristics of MBG hoax narratives by content typology, platform, and dissemination pattern; (2) to analyze the framing constructions and rhetorical strategies embedded in these hoaxes; (3) to identify the implications of these narratives for public perceptions of food policy and civic trust; and (4) to propose a policy-based hoax literacy model as an intervention framework for strengthening digital civic engagement and public information resilience in the Indonesian context. The study's contribution lies not only in its empirical documentation of a new domain of policy misinformation but in its proposal of an integrated theoretical and practical model that connects hoax literacy with the broader project of democratic participation and welfare governance.

2. Method

This study adopts a qualitative research design integrating qualitative content analysis and framing analysis as its core methodological approaches. Qualitative content analysis enables

systematic, interpretive examination of textual and visual data to identify recurring patterns, themes, and meaning structures (Schreier, 2012). Framing analysis, operationalized through Entman's (Entman, 1993) four-dimensional model, provides a structured framework for decoding how specific elements of hoax content construct politically and socially consequential interpretations of the MBG program. The integration of these two approaches allows for both inductive pattern recognition and deductive theoretical application, ensuring analytical rigor while maintaining sensitivity to the contextual specificity of Indonesian digital media culture.

The choice of a qualitative paradigm is epistemologically justified by the nature of the research object: hoax narratives are not simply countable units of misinformation but complex discursive artifacts whose meaning is constituted through rhetorical strategies, emotional appeals, and intertextual references that require interpretive engagement rather than mere enumeration. This does not preclude systematic enumeration where appropriate; the study combines descriptive quantification (frequency distributions, platform data) with in-depth qualitative interpretation to provide both breadth and depth of analysis.

The primary data source for this study is the TurnBackHoax digital archive (<https://turnbackhoax.id>), maintained by Masyarakat Antifitnah Indonesia (Mafindo)—the largest fact-checking civil society organization in Indonesia, affiliated with the International Fact-Checking Network (IFCN). TurnBackHoax constitutes one of the most systematically curated archives of verified digital hoaxes in Southeast Asia, employing trained fact-checkers who verify claims through cross-referencing with official sources, expert consultation, and reverse image/video analysis. Each archived entry includes the original hoax content (screenshot or description), the fact-checker's verification and refutation, the hoax category classification, the platform(s) on which the content circulated, and publication dates.

The corpus was constructed through a keyword search using the term 'makan bergizi gratis' (free nutritious meal), yielding 30 verified hoax entries published between January 2024 and early 2026. This time range encompasses the policy design phase (2024), the program launch (January 2025), and the initial implementation period (2025–2026), capturing the full arc of hoax production from pre-launch speculation to post-launch evaluative claims. The corpus represents the complete population of MBG-related hoaxes verified by Mafindo within this period, rather than a sample, lending the dataset high internal validity as a primary evidentiary base.

The unit of analysis for qualitative content analysis is the individual hoax entry, comprising the original claim as documented by Mafindo, associated visual or audiovisual content where present, and metadata (date, platform, hoax category). The unit of analysis for framing analysis is the narrative structure of each hoax—specifically, the way each item constructs problem definitions, assigns causal attribution, expresses moral evaluation, and implies treatment recommendations in relation to the MBG program.

3. Result and Discussion

3.1 Corpus Overview: Categories and Distribution

The 30 verified hoax cases in the MBG corpus represent a diverse range of content types, platform origins, and information disorder categories. Table 1 presents the distribution of the corpus by hoax category and content format.

Table 1. MBG Hoax Corpus: Distribution by Category, Platform, and Content Format (TurnBackHoax, 2024–2026)

No.	Hoax Category	No. of Cases	Platform	Content Format
1	Misleading Content	14 (46.7%)	Facebook, WhatsApp	Image meme, screenshot, text post

2	Fabricated Content	8 (26.7%)	TikTok, YouTube	Video, edited poster, manipulated photo
3	False Context	6 (20.0%)	WhatsApp, Facebook	Screenshot repurposed caption
4	Satire / Parody (misinterpreted)	2 (6.6%)	Twitter/X, Instagram	Satirical post, parody account
Total	4 Categories	30 (100%)	Multi-platform	Text, image, video, composite

Source: TurnBackHoax.id (Mafindo, 2024–2026). N = 30 verified hoax entries.

Misleading content constitutes the largest category (46.7%, n = 14), comprising cases where factually accurate elements—authentic photographs of school lunches, genuine health statistics, or real government statements—are manipulated through decontextualization, selective framing, or misleading captions to imply hazardous or politically damaging conclusions. Fabricated content (26.7%, n = 8) involves wholly invented claims, including digitally altered images of MBG meals, forged official documents, and staged video testimonials from purported program participants. False context (20.0%, n = 6) presents genuine content—such as photographs of food quality failures from unrelated events or countries—reframed as evidence of MBG implementation failures. Satire or parody misinterpreted as genuine news (6.6%, n = 2) represents the smallest category, reflecting instances where satirical social media content about MBG was shared and received as factual reporting.

3.2 Platform Distribution and Dissemination Patterns

Table 2 presents the distribution of MBG hoax dissemination across digital platforms. Facebook and WhatsApp together account for 66.7% of documented dissemination channels, reflecting their dominant positions in Indonesia's social media landscape and their particular affordances for the viral spread of visual and text-based misinformation.

Table 2. Platform Distribution of MBG Hoax Dissemination (TurnBackHoax, 2024–2026)

Digital Platform	Frequency (n=30)	Percentage (%)	Dominant Hoax Format
Facebook	11	36.7%	Image post, screenshot
WhatsApp	9	30.0%	Forwarded text, broadcast
TikTok	5	16.7%	Short video, voice overlay
YouTube	3	10.0%	Vlog commentary, edited clip
Twitter/X & Instagram	2	6.6%	Parody, satirical post
Total	30	100%	Multi-format

Source: TurnBackHoax.id (Mafindo, 2024–2026). Platform data based on metadata recorded in verified hoax entries.

Facebook's prominence as a dissemination channel (36.7%) reflects the platform's continued centrality as a public information source for Indonesian adults, particularly in suburban and rural areas where it functions as a primary news feed for communities with limited access to independent journalism. WhatsApp (30.0%) enables intimate, trust-network-based dissemination: hoax content forwarded through family and neighborhood groups carries implicit social endorsement, reducing

recipients' critical scrutiny. TikTok (16.7%) represents the most rapidly growing dissemination channel for MBG hoaxes, with short-form video content combining emotionally resonant visuals, simplified narrative, and algorithmic amplification to reach audiences extending far beyond the creators' immediate networks.

3.3 Narrative Themes and Typology

Thematic categorization of the 30 hoax entries reveals four dominant narrative themes: (1) health and food safety claims, (2) political framing and electoral association, (3) budget conspiracy and corruption allegations, and (4) implementation failure narratives. Table 3 presents the distribution and characteristics of these themes.

Table 3. Dominant Narrative Themes in MBG Hoaxes: Distribution and Characteristics

Narrative Theme	Health Claims	Political Framing	Budget Conspiracy	Implementation Failure
Frequency (n)	11 (36.7%)	9 (30.0%)	6 (20.0%)	4 (13.3%)
Dominant Platform	WhatsApp, Facebook	Facebook, Twitter/X	WhatsApp, YouTube	TikTok, Facebook
Main Claim Type	Food contamination, nutritional harm	Vote buying, political elite agenda	Corruption, fund diversion	Rotten food, poor management
Affected Community	Parents, school health advocates	Opposition voters, political skeptics	Taxpayers, anti-corruption activists	School communities, local authorities

Source: Authors' thematic analysis of TurnBackHoax corpus. N = 30; percentage reflects dominant classification.

Health and food safety claims constitute the most prevalent narrative theme (36.7%), encompassing hoaxes alleging that MBG meals contain harmful chemical additives, are prepared in unsanitary conditions, or are nutritionally inadequate. These claims frequently deploy visual evidence—photographs of discolored or unappetizing food—to achieve emotional impact without requiring textual elaboration. Political framing narratives (30.0%) associate the MBG program explicitly with electoral interests, characterizing it as a vote-buying mechanism deployed by the Prabowo administration or as a political project designed to benefit affiliated contractors. Budget conspiracy narratives (20.0%) allege financial misappropriation, claiming that program funds are being diverted to political allies or private interests, with WhatsApp and YouTube serving as primary dissemination channels for long-form conspiratorial content. Implementation failure narratives (13.3%) focus on specific alleged failures in program delivery, including rotten or expired food, insufficient quantities, and unequal distribution across regions.

3.4 Framing Analysis: How Hoax Narratives Construct the MBG Program

The application of Entman's (Entman, 1993) framing analysis to the MBG hoax corpus reveals systematic patterns in how these narratives construct politically consequential interpretations of a welfare program. Table 4 presents the dominant framing functions identified across the corpus.

Table 4. Framing Analysis of MBG Hoax Narratives (Entman, 1993 framework)

Framing Element (Entman)	Dominant Narrative in MBG Hoaxes	Example Claim Type
Problem Definition	MBG framed as dangerous, wasteful, or politically motivated	'Food contains harmful chemicals'

Causal Attribution	Government incompetence or corrupt procurement	Budget diverted to political allies'
Moral Evaluation	Children as victims of state negligence	Students forced to eat rotten food'
Treatment Recommendation	Reject the program / distrust authorities	Parents should not let children eat MBG food'

Source: Authors' framing analysis of TurnBackHoax corpus. Illustrative examples are anonymized and translated.

The problem definition function in MBG hoaxes overwhelmingly frames the program not as a beneficial social investment but as a source of risk—to children's health, to public finances, or to democratic integrity. This framing inversion is analytically significant: it transforms a program designed to address childhood malnutrition into a problem requiring public vigilance and resistance. Causal attribution systematically directs responsibility toward the state—specifically to government incompetence, corrupt procurement practices, or deliberate political manipulation—rather than to external factors or structural constraints. This attribution pattern aligns with what (Scheufele, 2007) identify as responsibility framing in political communication, wherein blame is assigned to specific identifiable actors rather than systemic forces, thereby enabling the personalization of public anger.

The moral evaluation function is perhaps the most emotionally powerful element of MBG hoax framing. By positioning schoolchildren as innocent victims of state negligence—through narratives of children falling ill after consuming MBG meals, or parents discovering rotten food in their children's lunch boxes—these hoaxes mobilize parental protectiveness as an affective engine for virality.

(Vosoughi, 2018) demonstrate empirically that emotionally negative, surprising, or novel content spreads significantly faster on social networks than accurate information; MBG health scare narratives exploit precisely these emotional valences to achieve disproportionate reach. The treatment recommendation function, finally, consistently steers audiences toward distrust of official communications and, in some cases, active withdrawal from the program—advising parents not to permit children to consume MBG meals, or urging communities to reject program implementation entirely.

3.5 Digital Media Ecology and the Amplification of Welfare Policy Hoaxes

The platform distribution data illuminate how Indonesia's specific digital media ecology shapes the production and amplification of MBG hoax narratives. (Couldry, 2017) concept of deep mediatization provides a framework for understanding why these hoaxes are not random artifacts of digital circulation but rather products of specific platform logics that systematically favor emotionally resonant, visually compelling, and socially shareable content over factually accurate but less affectively engaging information.

WhatsApp's architecture of closed groups and broadcast lists creates what researchers have termed 'echo chambers of trust' (Guess, 2019) : content forwarded within family or community groups carries implicit endorsement from trusted social contacts, significantly reducing recipients' likelihood of critical evaluation. The closed nature of WhatsApp dissemination also renders hoax content largely invisible to public monitoring systems, including fact-checking organizations, until it has achieved significant reach within private networks. Facebook's engagement-maximizing algorithm privileges content that generates reactions, comments, and shares—metrics that emotionally charged misinformation consistently outperforms on—creating a structural incentive for the production and amplification of sensational health or political claims about MBG. TikTok's ascending prominence as a MBG hoax vehicle (16.7%) reflects a generational dimension: its primary user demographics include both secondary school students, who are direct MBG beneficiaries and potential disseminators of program-related content, and young adult observers whose impressions of the program are substantially shaped by algorithmic content recommendation.

This ecology of digital amplification interacts with a specific feature of Indonesian political culture that compounds misinformation risk for welfare programs: the historically deep distrust of

state institutions and elite political actors, documented extensively in post-New Order Indonesian political sociology. (Mietzner, 2020). When hoax narratives frame MBG as an extension of elite political interests or as a manifestation of bureaucratic incompetence, they activate pre-existing cultural priors that make skeptical framings credible to substantial segments of the population even without evidentiary support. This interaction between platform affordances and cultural-political context suggests that misinformation countermeasures focused exclusively on cognitive fact-checking will be insufficient; effective interventions must also address the affective and cultural dimensions of hoax susceptibility.

3.6 Implications for Digital Civic Engagement

The study's findings have significant implications for theoretical understandings of digital civic engagement in the context of welfare policy. (Ekman, 2012) distinguish between active civic engagement—characterized by deliberative participation in public affairs—and civic disengagement—characterized by withdrawal, cynicism, and passive non-participation. MBG hoax narratives function as powerful drivers of the latter: by systematically delegitimizing the program through narratives of food safety failure, political manipulation, and financial corruption, they cultivate a disposition of informed disengagement in which citizens' apparent knowledge about the program becomes an obstacle to their participation in it.

This mechanism of hoax-induced civic disengagement has particular salience in the Indonesian context because MBG, as a school-based program, depends on community trust and parental compliance for its implementation. A parent who has been exposed to and accepts hoax claims about food safety will logically withdraw their child from the program, not out of civic apathy but out of what they perceive to be informed parental responsibility. The civic disengagement produced by policy misinformation is therefore not characterized by indifference but by misguided agency—the application of active decision-making capacity to information that has been deliberately constructed to mislead.

This analysis extends prior scholarship on misinformation and civic life (Roozenbeek, 2020) by demonstrating that welfare policy hoaxes specifically target the trust infrastructure upon which participatory welfare governance depends. These findings also dialogue with Tandoc, Lim, and Ling's (Lim, 2017) typology of fake news in digital journalism, which identifies satire, parody, fabrication, manipulation, advertising, and propaganda as distinct genres of news falsity. The MBG hoax corpus demonstrates that welfare policy misinformation draws on multiple genres simultaneously—fabricated visual evidence, misleading contextual framing, and politically motivated disinformation—suggesting that single-category typologies are insufficient for characterizing the complex, hybrid character of policy-targeted hoaxes. The analytical contribution of this study lies in demonstrating that these hoax genres operate not in isolation but in coordinated narrative ecosystems that reinforce one another across platforms and over time.

3.7 Toward a Policy-Based Hoax Literacy Model

In response to the multidimensional character of MBG hoax narratives and their civic implications, this study proposes a policy-based hoax literacy model (PBHL) that extends conventional fact-checking literacy approaches in three directions: from cognitive to affective literacy, from individual to participatory practices, and from generic media literacy to policy-specific information competence. Table 5 presents the five-component model.

Table 5. Policy-Based Hoax Literacy (PBHL) Model: Components, Dimensions, and Strategies

Component	Dimension	Strategy / Activity	Target Actor
Cognitive Literacy	Fact-checking skills	Media literacy workshops in schools and communities	Students, parents, teachers
Affective Literacy	Emotional regulation	Recognizing fear/anger triggers in viral content	General public, social media users

Participatory Literacy	Civic reporting	Community-based reporting to TurnBackHoax / Kominfo	Civil society organizations
Policy Literacy	Understanding policy intent	Transparent MBG implementation communication by BPMP	Government communicators
Digital Ecology Literacy	Platform awareness	Understanding algorithmic amplification of emotional content	Educators, researchers, platform users

Source: Authors' own model, derived from UNESCO (2018) MIL framework, Wardle & Derakhshan (2017), and Couldry & Hepp (2017).

Cognitive literacy, the foundational component, encompasses the fact-checking competencies conventionally associated with media literacy: the capacity to verify sources, identify manipulated images, and cross-reference claims with authoritative evidence. In the MBG context, this includes familiarity with TurnBackHoax and the Badan Gizi Nasional's official communication channels. However, the PBHL model treats cognitive literacy as necessary but insufficient: the emotional resonance of health scare narratives and political conspiracy claims requires affective literacy—the ability to recognize and critically evaluate the emotional triggers embedded in hoax content.

Affective literacy addresses the observation, supported by (Vosoughi, 2018) empirical data, that emotional content spreads faster and more widely than neutral information regardless of its veracity. Training in affective literacy involves sensitizing citizens to the specific emotional appeals—fear for children's safety, anger at political corruption, disgust at food quality—that MBG hoaxes deploy, and developing reflective strategies for decelerating sharing behavior when strong emotional responses are triggered. This approach draws on prebunking and inoculation theory (Roozenbeek, 2020), which demonstrates that preemptive exposure to the rhetorical techniques of misinformation increases resistance to subsequent false claims.

Participatory literacy emphasizes active citizen engagement with fact-checking ecosystems: reporting suspicious content to TurnBackHoax, contributing community-level observations to civil society monitoring networks, and engaging constructively with peer corrections of misinformation. Policy literacy, a distinctive component of the PBHL model, involves educating citizens about the actual content and implementation mechanisms of the MBG program—its legal basis, funding structure, nutritional standards, and oversight mechanisms—to reduce susceptibility to narratives that exploit informational gaps about program design. Digital ecology literacy, the final component, develops citizens' understanding of platform affordances, algorithmic logic, and the structural incentives that make social media environments conducive to hoax amplification, enabling more critical and intentional information consumption and sharing practices.

4. Conclusion

This study has examined the characteristics, framing strategies, and civic implications of hoax narratives related to Indonesia's Free Nutritious Meal Program (MBG), drawing on 30 verified cases from the TurnBackHoax archive (2024–2026). The analysis reveals that MBG-related misinformation is not a monolithic or random phenomenon but a structured discursive practice organized around four dominant narrative themes—health and food safety claims, political framing, budget conspiracy, and implementation failure—distributed primarily across Facebook, WhatsApp, and TikTok. These narratives systematically deploy Entman's four framing functions to transform a social welfare program into a source of public risk, political suspicion, and civic disengagement.

Three principal theoretical contributions emerge from this research. First, it extends the study of policy misinformation beyond its conventional focus on electoral and health-crisis contexts to encompass welfare governance, demonstrating that the civic trust infrastructure of social programs is as vulnerable to misinformation as electoral institutions or public health systems. Second, it advances the application of digital media ecology theory to misinformation analysis by showing how platform-specific affordances—WhatsApp's trust networks, Facebook's engagement algorithms, TikTok's emotional video format—interact with Indonesian political culture to amplify welfarist

hoax narratives in distinctive ways. Third, it contributes an original analytical framework—the Policy-Based Hoax Literacy (PBHL) model—that integrates cognitive, affective, participatory, policy, and digital ecology dimensions into a comprehensive intervention strategy for strengthening information resilience in welfare governance contexts.

The study's practical implications are directed at three stakeholder communities. For government communicators, the PBHL model recommends proactive, transparent, and affectively calibrated communication strategies that anticipate and preemptively address the specific narrative frames most likely to be exploited by hoax producers—particularly health safety, budget accountability, and equitable distribution. For civil society organizations, including Mafindo and allied fact-checking networks, the findings support the continued development and expansion of community-embedded fact-checking ecosystems, with particular attention to the WhatsApp dissemination channels that currently remain largely beyond the reach of public fact-checking visibility. For educators and curriculum developers, the PBHL model provides a structured framework for integrating policy-specific information literacy into school and community-based digital citizenship curricula.

The study acknowledges several limitations that open directions for future research. The corpus is limited to hoaxes verified and archived by Mafindo, which, while ensuring high data quality, necessarily excludes misinformation content that did not come to Mafindo's attention—potentially underrepresenting hoaxes confined to private WhatsApp groups. Future research using computational methods for large-scale social media monitoring could complement the civil society archive approach employed here. Additionally, the study does not measure the actual behavioral impact of MBG hoaxes on parental or community decision-making, an empirical question that warrants dedicated survey or experimental research. Finally, comparative analysis across Southeast Asian welfare policy communication contexts—particularly Malaysia's BR1M program or the Philippines' 4Ps—would enrich understanding of whether the patterns identified here reflect Indonesia-specific dynamics or broader regional tendencies in welfare policy misinformation.

5. Acknowledgement

The authors wish to express their gratitude to Masyarakat Antifitnah Indonesia (Mafindo) for maintaining the TurnBackHoax archive as an open-access civic resource, and to the Jogjakarta Communication Conference 2026, organized by ASPIKOM, Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta, and Universiti Muhammadiyah Malaysia, for providing the scholarly forum within which this research was first presented. The authors declare no external funding for this study.

6. References

- Caballero, A., C.-N. C., V. L., F. A., & H.-R. J. (2025). Relationships between misinformation variables and nutritional health strategies: A scoping review. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 22(6).
- Couldry, N., & H. A. (2017). *The mediated construction of reality*. Polity Press.
- Diekman, C., R. C. D., & O. T. L. (2023). Misinformation and disinformation in food science and nutrition: Impact on practice. *The Journal of Nutrition*, 153(1), 3–9.
- Ekman, J. , & A. E. (2012). Political participation and civic engagement: Towards a new typology. *Human Affairs*, 283–300.
- Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51–58.
- Guess, A., N. J., & T. J. (2019). Less than you think: Prevalence and predictors of fake news dissemination on Facebook. *Science Advances*, 5.
- Lim, M. (2017). Freedom to hate: Social media, algorithmic enclaves, and the rise of tribal nationalism in Indonesia. *Critical Asian Studies*, 49(3), 411–427.

-
- Mietzner, M. (2020). Authoritarian innovations in Indonesia: Electoral narrowing, identity politics and executive illiberalism. *Democratization*, 27(6), 1021–1036.
- Rasyid, E., P. P., H. F. T., & Z. A. (2019). Jaringan komunikasi dalam pengelolaan perencanaan program penanggulangan kemiskinan di Provinsi Sulawesi Barat. *Kajian Komunikasi*, 7(2), 133–144.
- Roozenbeek, J., S. C. R., D. S., K. J., F. A. L. J., R. G., van der L. S., & D. S. (2020). Susceptibility to misinformation about COVID-19 across 26 countries. *Royal Society Open Science*, 7(10).
- Scheufele, D. A., & T. D. (2007). Framing, agenda setting, and priming: The evolution of three media effects models. *Journal of Communication*, 57(1), 9–20.
- Schreier, M. (2012). *Qualitative content analysis in practice*. SAGE Publications.
- UNESCO. (2018). *Media and information literacy: Policy and strategy guidelines*. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.
- Vosoughi, S., R. D., & A. S. (2018). The spread of true and false news online. *Science*.
- Wardle, C., & D. H. (2017). *Information disorder: Toward an interdisciplinary framework for research and policymaking*. Council of Europe.
- We Are Social. (2024). *Digital 2024: Indonesia*.
- Yumitro, G., K. D. E., A. E. A., & S. S. F. M. (2022). The influences of social media toward the development of terrorism in Indonesia. *Studi Komunikasi (Indonesian Journal of Communications Studies)*, 6(1), 16–31.