

# 0070. How Susceptible Are You to Misinformation? There's a Test You Can Take 您对错误信息有多敏感？您可以参加一项测试

## Table of Contents

1. How Susceptible 易受影响（或伤害等）；敏感；过敏 Are You to Misinformation (n.)(常指故意提供的) 虚假消息? There's a Test You Can Take 您对错误信息有多敏感？您可以参加一项测试
2. How Susceptible Are You to Misinformation? There's a Test You Can Take

## 1. How Susceptible 易受影响（或伤害等）；敏感；过敏 Are You to Misinformation (n.)(常指故意提供的) 虚假消息? There's a Test You Can Take 您对错误信息有多敏感？您可以参加一项测试

Contrary (a.)相对立的；相反的 to popular belief, Gen Zers (Z世代,指出生在1995年至2010年之间的一代人) and millennials 千禧世代 could be more susceptible to online misinformation than older adults, according to a poll **published online** on June 29 by the research agency YouGov. What's more, people who spend more time online had more difficulty distinguishing (v.)区分；辨别；分清 between real and fake news headlines（报纸的）大字标题. “We saw some results that are different from the **ad hoc** 临时安排的；特别的；专门的 kinds of tests that [previous] researchers have done,”

### Example 1. 标题

*ad hoc*

adj. /,æd 'hɒk/ ( from Latin) arranged or happening when necessary and not planned in advance 临时安排的；特别的；专门的

→ 来自拉丁短语。前缀ad-, 去，往。hoc, 这个。词源同here, 这里。

• **an ad hoc meeting** to deal with the problem 处理此问题的**特别会议**

• The meetings will be held **on an ad hoc basis** . 会议将**根据需要**, 随时举行。

研究机构 YouGov 6 月 29 日在网上发布的一项民意调查显示，与普遍看法相反，Z 世代和千禧一代可能比老年人更容易受到网络错误信息的影响。更重要的是，上网时间越长的人就越难以区分真假新闻标题。“我们看到的一些结果与[以前的]研究人员所做的临时测试不同。

To create their test, Maertens and his colleagues carefully selected 10 actual headlines and 10 artificial-intelligence 人工智能-generated false ones — similar to those you might encounter (v.)遭遇，遇到（尤指令人不快或困难的事）online — that they then categorized (v.)将...分类；把...加以归类 as “real” or “fake.” Test takers 接受者 were asked to sort the real headlines from the fake news /and received a percentage score at the end for each category （人或事物的）类别，种类.

### *Example 2. 标题*

为了进行测试，Maertens 和他的同事精心挑选了 10 个真实的标题和 10 个人工智能生成的虚假标题（类似于您在网上可能遇到的标题），然后将其归类为“真实”或“虚假”。考生被要求将假新闻中的真实标题进行排序，并在每个类别的最后获得百分比分数。

the YouGov poll was given to 1,516 adults who were all U.S. citizens. On average, in the YouGov poll, U.S. adults correctly categorized about 65 percent of the headlines. However, age seemed to impact (v.)（对某事物）有影响，有作用 accuracy. Only 11 percent of Americans ages 18 to 29 correctly classified 17 or more headlines, and 36 percent got no more than 10 correct. That's compared with 36 percent of the 65-and-older crowd 人群；观众 who accurately assessed (v.)评估，评定（性质、质量）at least 16 headlines. And only 9 percent in the latter age group got 10 or fewer correct. On average, Americans below age 45 scored 12 out of 20, while their older counterparts scored 15.

### *Example 3. 标题*

YouGov 民意调查针对的是 1,516 名成年人，他们都是美国公民。平均而言，在 YouGov 民意调查中，美国成年人对大约 65% 的头条新闻进行了正确分类。然而，年龄似乎会影响准确性。

18 至 29 岁的美国人中，只有 11% 的人，正确分类了 17 个或更多标题，36% 的人，他们的正确分类数量，不超过 10 个。

相比之下，65 岁及以上人群中，有 36% 的人准确评估了至少 16 个头条新闻。在后一个年龄段中，只有 9% 的人答对了 10 个或更少。

平均而言，45 岁以下的美国人，得分为 12 分（满分 20 分），而年长的美国人得分为 15 分。

Additionally, 主 people who reported spending three or more leisure 闲暇；空闲；休闲 hours a day online 系 were more likely to **fall for** 信以为真 misinformation (false headlines), compared with those who spent less time online. And 主 where people got their news 谓 made a difference: 主 folks who read **legacy** 遗留；遗产 **publications** such as **the Associated** 有关联的；相关的 **Press** 美联社 and Politico 政客；热衷政治的人 谓 had better misinformation detection 探测；察觉；发现, while 主 those who primarily 主要地；根本地 got their news from social media sites such as TikTok, Instagram and Snapchat 谓 generally scored lower.

#### Example 4. 标题

##### *fall for sth*

[ no passive] ( informal ) to be tricked into believing sth that is not true 信以为真

• I'm surprised you fell for that trick. 我感到惊奇，你竟中了那个诡计。

##### *the Associated Press*

美联社

此外，与那些上网时间较少的人相比，那些每天在网上花费三个或更多休闲时间的人，更有可能受到错误信息（虚假标题）的影响。人们获取新闻的渠道也有所不同：阅读美联社和 Politico 等传统出版物的人，能够更好地发现错误信息，而主要从 TikTok、Instagram 和 Snapchat 等社交媒体网站获取新闻的人，得分通常较低。

Personality traits also impacted a person's susceptibility to fake news. Conscientiousness 尽责；凭良心办事, for instance, was associated with higher scores in the study conducted (v.)组织；安排；实施；执行 by Maertens and his team, while neuroticism 神经质 and narcissism 自恋，自我陶醉 were associated with lower scores.

#### Example 5. 标题

人格特质也会影响一个人对假新闻的敏感度。例如，在马尔滕斯和他的团队进行的研究中，责任心与较高的分数相关，而神经质和自恋则与较低的分数相关。

What's more, Osman points out, the study does not differentiate (v.) 区分；区别；辨别 which topics of misinformation different groups are more susceptible to. Younger people might be more likely than their parents to believe misinformation about sexual health or COVID but less likely **to fall for** fake news about climate change, she suggests.

#### Example 6. 标题

此外，奥斯曼指出，这项研究，并没有区分不同群体更容易受到哪些错误信息的影响。她表示，年轻人可能比父母更有可能相信有关性健康或新冠疫情的错误信息，但不太可能相信有关气候变化的假新闻。

“The test shouldn't be taken as a 100% reliable individual-level test. Small differences can occur,” Maertens wrote in an e-mail to Scientific American. “Someone who has 18/20 could **in practice** 实际上 be equally resilient (a.)有弹性（或弹力）的；能复原的 as someone scoring 20/20. However, it is more likely that a 20/20 scorer is effectively 有效地；实际上,事实上 better than let's say a 14/20 scorer.”

#### Example 7. 标题

“该测试不应被视为 100% 可靠的个人水平测试。可能会出现微小的差异，”马尔滕斯在给《科学美国人》的电子邮件中写道。“在实践中，得分为 18/20 的人可能与得分为 20/20 的人一样有弹性(即对个体来说, 成绩会上下波动)。然而，20/20 的得

分手实际上比 14/20 的得分手更有可能更好。”

## 2. How Susceptible Are You to Misinformation? There's a Test You Can Take

Contrary to popular belief, Gen Zers and millennials could be more susceptible to online misinformation than older adults, according to a poll published online on June 29 by the research agency YouGov. What's more, people who spend more time online had more difficulty distinguishing between real and fake news headlines. “We saw some results that are different from the ad hoc kinds of tests that [previous] researchers have done,”

To create their test, Maertens and his colleagues carefully selected 10 actual headlines and 10 artificial-intelligence-generated false ones—similar to those you might encounter online—that they then categorized as “real” or “fake.” Test takers were asked to sort the real headlines from the fake news and received a percentage score at the end for each category.

the YouGov poll was given to 1,516 adults who were all U.S. citizens. On average, in the YouGov poll, U.S. adults correctly categorized about 65 percent of the headlines. However, age seemed to impact accuracy. Only 11 percent of Americans ages 18 to 29 correctly classified 17 or more headlines, and 36 percent got no more than 10 correct. That's compared with 36 percent of the 65-and-older crowd who accurately assessed at least 16 headlines. And only 9 percent in the latter age group got 10 or fewer correct. On average, Americans below age 45 scored 12 out of 20, while their older counterparts scored 15.

Additionally, people who reported spending three or more leisure hours a day online were more likely to fall for misinformation (false headlines), compared with those who spent less time online. And where people got their news made a difference: folks who read legacy publications such as the Associated Press and Politico had better misinformation detection, while those who primarily got their news from social media sites such as TikTok, Instagram and Snapchat generally scored lower.

Personality traits also impacted a person's susceptibility to fake news. Conscientiousness, for instance, was associated with higher scores in the study conducted by Maertens and his team, while neuroticism and narcissism were associated with lower scores.

What's more, Osman points out, the study does not differentiate which topics of misinformation different groups are more susceptible to. Younger people might be more likely than their parents to believe misinformation about sexual health or COVID but less likely to fall for fake news about climate change, she suggests.

"The test shouldn't be taken as a 100% reliable individual-level test. Small differences can occur," Maertens wrote in an e-mail to Scientific American.

"Someone who has 18/20 could in practice be equally resilient as someone scoring 20/20. However, it is more likely that a 20/20 scorer is effectively better than let's say a 14/20 scorer."

---