Election Disinformation And Regulatory Frameworks: A Comparative Analysis Of South-East Asian Countries

N Satya Sri[1*], Prof Dr. Seethamanikyam[2]

[1*]Research Scholar, Dr B.R. Ambedkar Law College, Andhra University.
[2]Research Guide, Dr B.R. Ambedkar Law College, Andhra University.

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
	Purpose: This comparative analysis paper aims to investigate the regulatory frameworks addressing election disinformation in three South-East Asian countries: Indonesia, Philippines, and Malaysia. The study seeks to identify the similarities, differences, and factors influencing the effectiveness of these frameworks, as well as to provide recommendations for strengthening them. **Methodology:** The research employs a comparative legal research design, analyzing primary sources such as laws, regulations, and case law, as well as secondary sources including academic literature and research reports. The data is subjected to legal doctrinal analysis, comparative analysis, and thematic analysis (if applicable) to identify patterns, best practices, and lessons learned. **Findings:** The comparative analysis reveals both similarities and differences in the regulatory approaches adopted by Indonesia, Philippines, and Malaysia to combat election disinformation. The effectiveness of these frameworks varies, influenced by factors such as the political will, institutional capacity, and level of media literacy in each country. The study identifies best practices and lessons learned from the experiences of these countries. **Implications:** The findings of this research have important implications for theory and practice. They contribute to the understanding of how regulatory frameworks can be designed and implemented to address the complex challenge of election disinformation in the context of South-East Asia. The recommendations offered in this paper can inform policy development and guide efforts to strengthen the resilience of democratic processes against disinformation. **Keywords**: election disinformation, regulatory frameworks, comparative analysis, South-East Asia, democratic integrity

I. Introduction

Election disinformation has emerged as a significant threat to democratic integrity and public trust in electoral processes worldwide. In South-East Asia, the rapid spread of false or misleading information during election periods has raised concerns about the erosion of democratic norms and the manipulation of public opinion[1]. Countries in the region have grappled with the challenge of balancing the protection of free speech with the need to curb the dissemination of disinformation that can undermine the fairness and legitimacy of elections[2].

This comparative analysis paper focuses on the regulatory frameworks addressing election disinformation in three South-East Asian countries: Indonesia, Philippines, and Malaysia. These countries have been selected due to their shared experiences with the proliferation of disinformation during recent election cycles, as well

---

[1]Ong, J. C., & Cabanes, J. V. A. (2018). Architects of networked disinformation: Behind the scenes of troll accounts and fake news production in the Philippines. The Newton Tech4Dev Network.
[2]Tapsell, R. (2019, May 17). Fake News and Elections in Asia: Malaysia, Indonesia and the Philippines. The Asia Dialogue, University of Nottingham Asia Research Institute. https://theasiadialogue.com/2019/05/17/fake-news-and-elections-in-asia-malaysia-indonesia-and-the-philippines/

as their diverse approaches to regulating this phenomenon[3]. By examining the legal and regulatory measures adopted by these countries, this study aims to identify the similarities, differences, and factors influencing the effectiveness of their frameworks.

The objectives of this research are threefold. First, it seeks to provide a comprehensive analysis of the legal and regulatory landscape concerning election disinformation in Indonesia, Philippines, and Malaysia. Second, it aims to identify best practices and lessons learned from the experiences of these countries in combating disinformation. Finally, it offers recommendations for strengthening the regulatory frameworks to better protect democratic processes and public trust in elections.

The significance of this research lies in its contribution to the understanding of how regulatory approaches can be designed and implemented to address the complex challenge of election disinformation in the context of South-East Asia. As countries in the region continue to grapple with this issue, a comparative analysis of the existing frameworks can provide valuable insights and guidance for policy development and reform efforts. Moreover, the findings of this study can inform broader discussions on the role of regulation in safeguarding democratic integrity in the digital age.

II. Theoretical Framework

This comparative analysis of election disinformation regulatory frameworks in South-East Asian countries is grounded in theories of democratic integrity and free speech. Democratic integrity refers to the principles and practices that ensure the fairness, transparency, and accountability of democratic processes.[4] In the context of elections, democratic integrity is threatened by the spread of disinformation, which can manipulate public opinion, undermine trust in electoral institutions, and distort the outcome of the vote.[5]

The regulation of election disinformation raises Important questions about the balance between protecting democratic integrity and safeguarding the right to free speech. The principle of free speech, enshrined in international human rights law and national constitutions, is a cornerstone of democratic societies. It protects the right of individuals to express their opinions and ideas freely, without fear of censorship or punishment. However, the exercise of free speech is not absolute and can be subject to reasonable restrictions, such as those necessary to protect the rights of others or to maintain public order.[6]

In the context of election disinformation, the challenge lies in developing regulatory approaches that effectively address the harmful effects of false or misleading information while minimizing the infringement on legitimate forms of political expression. This requires careful consideration of the scope and definition of disinformation, the actors involved in its creation and dissemination, and the appropriate legal and institutional mechanisms for enforcing regulations[7].

To analyze the regulatory frameworks in Indonesia, Philippines, and Malaysia, this study employs a conceptual framework that considers the following dimensions:

1. Legal provisions: The specific laws, regulations, and policies that address election disinformation, including their scope, definitions, and penalties.
2. Institutional arrangements: The government bodies, regulatory agencies, and other stakeholders involved in the implementation and enforcement of the regulations.
3. Enforcement mechanisms: The processes and tools used to monitor, investigate, and sanction violations of the regulations, such as content moderation, fact-checking, and legal action.
4. Balancing competing interests: The extent to which the regulatory frameworks strike a balance between protecting democratic integrity and respecting the right to free speech.

By examining these dimensions, this study aims to provide a comprehensive and nuanced understanding of the regulatory approaches adopted by the selected South-East Asian countries and their implications for democratic governance in the digital age.

III. Research Methodology

A. Research Design
This study employs a comparative legal research design to analyze the regulatory frameworks addressing election disinformation in Indonesia, Philippines, and Malaysia. The comparative approach allows for the

---

[3]Sinpeng, A., Gueorguiev, D., &Arugay, A. A. (2020). Strong fans, weak campaigns: Social media and duterte in the 2016 Philippine election. Politics and Governance, 8(4), 334-344.
[4]Norris, P. (2017). Strengthening electoral integrity. Cambridge University Press.
[5]*Ibid.*
[6]Rowbottom, J. (2012). To rant, vent and converse: Protecting low level digital speech. The Cambridge Law Journal, 71(2), 355-383.
[7]Marsden, C. (2020). Internet co-regulation: European law, regulatory governance and legitimacy in cyberspace. Cambridge University Press.

systematic examination of similarities, differences, and patterns across the selected countries. The selection of these three countries is based on their shared experiences with the proliferation of disinformation during recent election cycles, as well as their diverse approaches to regulating this phenomenon. The timeframe for the analysis covers the period from 2016 to 2021, which encompasses significant electoral events in each country.

B. Data Collection
The data for this study is collected from both primary and secondary sources. Primary sources include legal and regulatory documents, such as laws, regulations, guidelines, case law, and judicial decisions related to election disinformation in the selected countries. These documents are obtained through systematic searches of legal databases, government websites, and official gazettes. Secondary sources include academic literature, research reports by think tanks, NGOs, and international organizations, as well as media reports and expert commentary. These sources are identified through keyword searches in academic databases, Google Scholar, and specialized research platforms.

C. Data Analysis
The collected data is subjected to legal doctrinal analysis, which involves the interpretation and analysis of legal provisions and their implications. This analysis focuses on identifying the scope, definitions, penalties, and enforcement mechanisms outlined in the relevant laws and regulations. Comparative analysis is then conducted to juxtapose the regulatory approaches across the three countries, identifying similarities, differences, and patterns (Siems, 2018). Factors influencing the effectiveness of the regulatory frameworks, such as political will, institutional capacity, and public awareness, are also examined. If qualitative data, such as interviews or expert opinions, is collected, thematic analysis is employed to identify emerging themes and patterns.

D. Ethical Considerations
This research adheres to the principles of academic integrity and ethical conduct. All data collected from primary and secondary sources is properly cited and referenced to respect intellectual property rights. If interviews are conducted, informed consent is obtained from participants, and their confidentiality is protected. The researcher maintains reflexivity throughout the study to mitigate potential biases and ensure the trustworthiness of the findings.

E. Limitations
The study acknowledges potential limitations, such as the accessibility of certain legal documents or data sources, language barriers, and the dynamic nature of the legal and regulatory landscape in the selected countries. These limitations are considered when interpreting the findings and making recommendations.

IV. Country Analysis
A. Indonesia
1. Legal and regulatory framework
Indonesia has developed a comprehensive legal and regulatory framework to combat election disinformation. The primary legislation governing this area is the Law on Electronic Information and Transactions (Law No. 11 of 2008, as amended by Law No. 19 of 2016)[8][9], which prohibits the distribution of false and misleading information that causes public unrest[10]. The Law on General Elections (Law No. 7 of 2017)[11] further stipulates that election campaigns must not contain elements of disinformation or defamation.[12] In 2018, the Indonesian government also issued a regulation on the Handling of Internet Websites Containing Negative Content (Ministerial Regulation No. 19 of 2018)[13], which empowers the authorities to block websites that spread disinformation.

---

[8]Law on Electronic Information and Transactions (as amended) Republic of Indonesia. (2008). Law No. 11 of 2008 on Electronic Information and Transactions. State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia No. 58 of 2008.

[9]Republic of Indonesia. (2016). Law No. 19 of 2016 on Amendment to Law No. 11 of 2008 on Electronic Information and Transactions. State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia No. 251 of 2016.

[10]Iannone, Aniello. "Democracy Crisis in South-East Asia: Media Control, Censorship, and Disinformation during the 2019 Presidential and General Elections in Indonesia, Thailand and 2019 Local Election in the Philippines." JurnalIlmu Sosial dan Ilmu,Politik 26, No. 1 (2022): 81-97.

[11]Republic of Indonesia. (2017). Law No. 7 of 2017 on General Elections. State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia No. 182 of 2017.

[12]Gazali, Effendi. "Degrading Message and Hate Speech are Now Obligatory in Elections? A Qualitative Research on Post-truth Populism in Sumatera Utara's Local Election." JurnalKomunikasi Indonesia 7, no. 2 (2018): 1.

[13] Ministerial Regulation No. 19 of 2018 on the Handling of Internet Websites Containing Negative Content. Official Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia No. 1432 of 2018.

These legal provisions are complemented by a range of other regulations and guidelines that aim to promote transparency, accountability, and integrity in the electoral process. For example, the General Election Commission (KPU) has issued regulations on campaign finance, media coverage, and the use of social media by candidates and political parties[14]. The Election Supervisory Agency (Bawaslu) has also developed guidelines for monitoring and reporting election violations, including the spread of disinformation.

2. Implementation and enforcement

The implementation and enforcement of Indonesia's legal and regulatory framework against election disinformation involve a multi-stakeholder approach. The Ministry of Communication and Information Technology (MCIT) plays a central role in monitoring and blocking websites that violate the relevant laws and regulations.[15] The MCIT works closely with the KPU and Bawaslu to identify and address cases of disinformation during election periods . These agencies have the authority to issue warnings, impose fines, and refer cases to law enforcement for criminal investigation.

Civil society organizations and media outlets have also been actively involved in combating election disinformation in Indonesia. Fact-checking initiatives, such as Cekfakta and Mafindo, have played a crucial role in verifying information and debunking false claims[16]. These initiatives often collaborate with government agencies and media organizations to raise public awareness and counter the spread of disinformation[17]. Media organizations have also contributed by adopting strict editorial standards, providing accurate and reliable election coverage, and partnering with fact-checking initiatives to verify information[18].

3. Effectiveness and challenges

Indonesia's efforts to combat election disinformation have yielded some positive results, but significant challenges remain. The government's proactive approach to blocking websites and penalizing offenders has helped to limit the spread of false information and maintain public order . Collaboration between government agencies, civil society, and media outlets has also contributed to increased public awareness and resilience against disinformation[19].

However, the rapid proliferation of disinformation on social media platforms, particularly through closed messaging apps like WhatsApp, has made it difficult for authorities to monitor and control the spread of false information[20]. The enforcement of existing laws and regulations has also been criticized for being selective and politically motivated, with concerns raised about the potential for censorship and the suppression of legitimate political speech. Moreover, the effectiveness of fact-checking initiatives and media literacy efforts has been limited by the uneven access to reliable information, the persistence of deeply entrenched political polarization, and the lack of resources and capacity among some stakeholders[21].

To address these challenges, experts have recommended a range of measures, including strengthening the capacity and independence of regulatory bodies, improving coordination among stakeholders, and investing in digital literacy and public education programs[22]. There is also a need for greater transparency and accountability in the enforcement of laws and regulations, as well as more robust mechanisms for appeals and redress. Ultimately, combating election disinformation in Indonesia will require sustained efforts by all stakeholders to build a more resilient and informed citizenry.

---

[14]Iannone, Aniello. "Democracy Crisis in South-East Asia: Media Control, Censorship, and Disinformation during the 2019 Presidential and General Elections in Indonesia, Thailand and 2019 Local Election in the Philippines." JurnalIlmu Sosial dan Ilmu,Politik 26, No. 1 (2022): 81-97.

[15]Ong, J. C. &Taspell, R. Mitigating Disinformation in South Asia Elections: Lessons from Indonesia, Philippines, and Thailand. NATO Strategic Communications Centre of Excellence, 2020.

[16]*Ibid.*

[17]Gazali, Effendi. "Degrading Message and Hate Speech are Now Obligatory in Elections? A Qualitative Research on Post-truth Populism in Sumatera Utara's Local Election." JurnalKomunikasi Indonesia 7, no. 2 (2018): 1.

[18]Iannone, Aniello. "Democracy Crisis in South-East Asia: Media Control, Censorship, and Disinformation during the 2019 Presidential and General Elections in Indonesia, Thailand and 2019 Local Election in the Philippines." JurnalIlmu Sosial dan Ilmu,Politik 26, No. 1 (2022): 81-97.

[19]*Ibid.*

[20]Gazali, Effendi. "Degrading Message and Hate Speech are Now Obligatory in Elections? A Qualitative Research on Post-truth Populism in Sumatera Utara's Local Election." JurnalKomunikasi Indonesia 7, no. 2 (2018): 1

[21]Iannone, Aniello. "Democracy Crisis in South-East Asia: Media Control, Censorship, and Disinformation during the 2019 Presidential and General Elections in Indonesia, Thailand and 2019 Local Election in the Philippines." JurnalIlmu Sosial dan Ilmu,Politik 26, No. 1 (2022): 81-97.

[22] Ibid.

B. Philippines
1. Legal and regulatory framework
The Philippines has a range of laws and regulations that address election disinformation, although their effectiveness has been the subject of debate. The primary legislation governing this area is the Cybercrime Prevention Act of 2012 (Republic Act No. 10175)[23], which criminalizes cyberlibel and the spread of false information online. The Act has been criticized for its broad provisions and potential impact on free speech, with some arguing that it could be used to suppress legitimate political expression[24].

In addition to the Cybercrime Prevention Act, the Philippines also has a range of election-specific laws and regulations that aim to promote fairness and transparency in the electoral process. The Omnibus Election Code[25] prohibits the use of campaign materials that contain false or misleading information. The Commission on Elections (COMELEC) has also issued resolutions and guidelines on the use of social media in election campaigns[26], requiring candidates and political parties to register their official accounts and disclose their spending on online advertising[27].

2. Implementation and enforcement
The implementation and enforcement of the Philippines' legal and regulatory framework against election disinformation have been challenging. The COMELEC is the primary agency responsible for overseeing the conduct of elections and enforcing election laws and regulations[28]. However, the COMELEC has been criticized for its limited capacity and resources, as well as its perceived lack of independence and impartiality[29].

The enforcement of the Cybercrime Prevention Act has also been problematic, with concerns raised about selective prosecution and the potential for abuse[30]. The Department of Justice (DOJ) is responsible for investigating and prosecuting cybercrime cases, but it has been accused of targeting political opponents and critical media outlets[31]. Moreover, the government's efforts to combat disinformation have been undermined by the active participation of some public officials and political actors in spreading false or misleading information online[32].

Civil society organizations and media outlets have played an important role in monitoring and countering election disinformation in the Philippines. Fact-checking initiatives, such as Vera Files and Rappler's Fact Check, have been at the forefront of efforts to verify information and debunk false claims. However, these initiatives have faced significant challenges, including limited resources, legal harassment, and online attacks by trolls and supporters of political figures[33].

---

[23]Republic of the Philippines. (2012). Republic Act No. 10175: An Act Defining Cybercrime, Providing for the Prevention, Investigation, Suppression and the Imposition of Penalties Therefor and for Other Purposes. Official Gazette of the Republic of the Philippines, 158(18), 5808-5824.

[24]Centre for Law and Democracy. (2012, November 22). Philippines: Analysis finds major problems in Cybercrime Law. https://www.law-democracy.org/live/philippines-analysis-finds-major-problems-in-cybercrime-law/

[25]Republic of the Philippines. (1985). Batas Pambansa Blg. 881: Omnibus Election Code of the Philippines. Official Gazette of the Republic of the Philippines, 81(1), 1-164.

[26]Nazario, D. (2021, December 11). Comelec expands rules on social media campaigning. Manila Bulletin. https://mb.com.ph/2021/12/11/vlogger-type-campaigning-candidates-can-go-live-through-comelec/

[27]Centre for Law and Democracy. (2012, November 22). Philippines: Analysis finds major problems in Cybercrime Law. https://www.law-democracy.org/live/philippines-analysis-finds-major-problems-in-cybercrime-law/

[28]Tapsell, R. (2019, May 17). Fake News and Elections in Asia: Malaysia, Indonesia and the Philippines. The Asia Dialogue, University of Nottingham Asia Research Institute. https://theasiadialogue.com/2019/05/17/fake-news-and-elections-in-asia-malaysia-indonesia-and-the-philippines/

[29]Ong, J. C., & Cabanes, J. V. A. (2018). Architects of networked disinformation: Behind the scenes of troll accounts and fake news production in the Philippines. The Newton Tech4Dev Network.

[30]Combinido, P., & Curato, N. (2021). Curing "Patient Zero": Reclaiming the Digital Public Sphere in the Philippines. In From Grassroots Activism to Disinformation: Social Media in Southeast Asia (pp. 198-220). Cambridge University Press.

[31] Ibid.

[32]Sinpeng, A., Gueorguiev, D., &Arugay, A. A. (2020). Strong fans, weak campaigns: Social media and duterte in the 2016 Philippine election. Politics and Governance, 8(4), 334-344.

[33]ISEAS-Yusof Ishak Institute. (2023, June 23). Webinar on "The Future of Fact-Checking in the Philippines". Retrieved from https://www.iseas.edu.sg/media/event-highlights/webinar-on-the-future-of-fact-checking-in-the-philippines/

3. Effectiveness and challenges

The effectiveness of the Philippines' efforts to combat election disinformation has been limited by a range of factors, including the complex political environment, the widespread use of social media, and the limited capacity of regulatory and enforcement agencies[34].The country has a highly polarized political landscape, with deep divisions along socioeconomic, regional, and ideological lines[35]. This polarization has been exacerbated by the proliferation of disinformation and hate speech on social media platforms, which have become a key battleground for political campaigns.

To address these challenges, experts have recommended a range of measures, including strengthening the capacity and independence of the COMELEC and other regulatory agencies, improving coordination among stakeholders, and investing in media literacy and public education programs[36]. There is also a need for greater transparency and accountability in the funding and conduct of political campaigns, as well as more robust mechanisms for monitoring and sanctioning violations of election laws and regulations[37]. Ultimately, combating election disinformation in the Philippines will require sustained efforts by all stakeholders to build a more informed, engaged, and critical citizenry.

C. Malaysia
1. Legal and regulatory framework

Malaysia has a complex legal and regulatory framework that addresses election disinformation, with a mix of general and election-specific laws. The primary legislation governing this area is the Communications and Multimedia Act 1998 (CMA), which regulates the use of online platforms and prohibits the dissemination of false or misleading information[38]. The CMA has been criticized for its broad and ambiguous provisions, which have been used to prosecute individuals for political speech and satire[39].

In addition to the CMA, Malaysia also has a range of election-specific laws and regulations that aim to ensure free and fair elections. The Election Offences Act 1954 prohibits the publication of false statements or information related to elections, candidates, or political parties[40]. The Malaysian Communications and Multimedia Commission (MCMC) has also issued guidelines on the use of social media during election periods, requiring political actors to register their accounts and disclose their spending on online advertising[41].

2. Implementation and enforcement

The implementation and enforcement of Malaysia's legal and regulatory framework against election disinformation have been uneven and controversial. The MCMC is the primary agency responsible for regulating online content and enforcing the CMA[42]. However, the MCMC has been accused of selective enforcement and political bias, with critics arguing that it has targeted opposition figures and activists while turning a blind eye to disinformation spread by government supporters[43].

The Election Commission of Malaysia (EC) is responsible for overseeing the conduct of elections and enforcing election laws and regulations[44]. However, the EC has been criticized for its lack of independence

---

[34]Sinpeng, A., Gueorguiev, D., &Arugay, A. A. (2020). Strong fans, weak campaigns: Social media and duterte in the 2016 Philippine election. Politics and Governance, 8(4), 334-344.

[35]Ong, J. C., & Cabanes, J. V. A. (2018). Architects of networked disinformation: Behind the scenes of troll accounts and fake news production in the Philippines. The Newton Tech4Dev Network.

[36]Tapsell, R. (2019, May 17). Fake News and Elections in Asia: Malaysia, Indonesia and the Philippines. The Asia Dialogue, University of Nottingham Asia Research Institute. https://theasiadialogue.com/2019/05/17/fake-news-and-elections-in-asia-malaysia-indonesia-and-the-philippines/

[37]Ong, J. C., & Cabanes, J. V. A. (2018). Architects of networked disinformation: Behind the scenes of troll accounts and fake news production in the Philippines. The Newton Tech4Dev Network.

[38]Cheong, Niki. "Disinformation as a Response to the 'Opposition Playground' in Malaysia." From Grassroots Activism to Disinformation: Social Media in Southeast Asia, Cambridge University Press, 2021, pp. 122-139

[39]Sannusi, S. N., Seman, A. A., & Ishak, M. B. (2019). Truth Tampering Through Social Media: Malaysia's Approach in Fighting Disinformation & Misinformation. International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 9(6), 1069-1078.

[40]

[41]Gomez, J. (2014). Social media impact on Malaysia's 13th general election. Asia Pacific Media Educator, 24(1), 95-105.

[42]Cheong, Niki. "Disinformation as a Response to the 'Opposition Playground' in Malaysia." From Grassroots Activism to Disinformation: Social Media in Southeast Asia, Cambridge University Press, 2021, pp. 122-139

[43]Sannusi, S. N., Seman, A. A., & Ishak, M. B. (2019). Truth Tampering Through Social Media: Malaysia's Approach in Fighting Disinformation & Misinformation. International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 9(6), 1069-1078.

[44]Cheong, Niki. "Disinformation as a Response to the 'Opposition Playground' in Malaysia." From Grassroots Activism to Disinformation: Social Media in Southeast Asia, Cambridge University Press, 2021, pp. 122-139

and impartiality, with concerns raised about its ability to effectively monitor and sanction electoral misconduct[45]. Moreover, the government's efforts to combat disinformation have been undermined by the involvement of some politicians and public officials in spreading false or misleading information online[46].

Civil society organizations and media outlets have played a crucial role in monitoring and countering election disinformation in Malaysia. Fact-checking initiatives, such as Sebenarnya.my and Faqcheck.my, have been established to verify information and debunk false claims[47]. However, these initiatives have faced challenges, including limited resources and the reluctance of some politicians and media outlets to engage with fact-checkers[48].

3. Effectiveness and challenges

The effectiveness of Malaysia's efforts to combat election disinformation has been limited by a range of factors, including the political polarization, the concentration of media ownership, and the lack of public trust in institutions[49]. Malaysia has a history of ethnic and religious tensions, which have been exploited by political actors to spread disinformation and hate speech online[50]. The country also has a highly concentrated media landscape, with most mainstream outlets owned or controlled by political parties or business interests aligned with the government[51].

The 2018 general election, which saw the historic defeat of the long-ruling Barisan Nasional coalition, was marked by a surge of disinformation and online manipulation[52]. Both sides of the political divide engaged in the spread of false and misleading information, with social media platforms becoming a key battleground for political campaigns[53]. This experience highlighted the challenges of regulating online speech in a highly polarized and distrustful political environment[54].

To address these challenges, experts have recommended a range of measures, including reforming the legal and regulatory framework to provide clearer and more proportionate rules, strengthening the capacity and independence of the MCMC and EC, and promoting media literacy and public awareness[55]. There is also a need for greater transparency and accountability in the funding and conduct of political campaigns, as well as more robust mechanisms for monitoring and sanctioning violations of election laws and regulations[56]. Ultimately, combating election disinformation in Malaysia will require sustained efforts by all stakeholders to build a more resilient and informed democracy.

---

[45]Gomez, J. (2014). Social media impact on Malaysia's 13th general election. Asia Pacific Media Educator, 24(1), 95-105.

[46]Sannusi, S. N., Seman, A. A., & Ishak, M. B. (2019). Truth Tampering Through Social Media: Malaysia's Approach in Fighting Disinformation & Misinformation. International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 9(6), 1069-1078.

[47]Cheong, Niki. "Disinformation as a Response to the 'Opposition Playground' in Malaysia." From Grassroots Activism to Disinformation: Social Media in Southeast Asia, Cambridge University Press, 2021, pp. 122-139

[48]Sannusi, S. N., Seman, A. A., & Ishak, M. B. (2019). Truth Tampering Through Social Media: Malaysia's Approach in Fighting Disinformation & Misinformation. International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 9(6), 1069-1078.

[49]Cheong, Niki. "Disinformation as a Response to the 'Opposition Playground' in Malaysia." From Grassroots Activism to Disinformation: Social Media in Southeast Asia, Cambridge University Press, 2021, pp. 122-139

[50]Gomez, J. (2014). Social media impact on Malaysia's 13th general election. Asia Pacific Media Educator, 24(1), 95-105.

[51]Sannusi, S. N., Seman, A. A., & Ishak, M. B. (2019). Truth Tampering Through Social Media: Malaysia's Approach in Fighting Disinformation & Misinformation. International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 9(6), 1069-1078.

[52]Tapsell, R. (2019, May 17). Fake News and Elections in Asia: Malaysia, Indonesia and the Philippines. The Asia Dialogue, University of Nottingham Asia Research Institute. https://theasiadialogue.com/2019/05/17/fake-news-and-elections-in-asia-malaysia-indonesia-and-the-philippines/

[53]Sannusi, S. N., Seman, A. A., & Ishak, M. B. (2019). Truth Tampering Through Social Media: Malaysia's Approach in Fighting Disinformation & Misinformation. International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 9(6), 1069-1078.

[54]Gomez, J. (2014). Social media impact on Malaysia's 13th general election. Asia Pacific Media Educator, 24(1), 95-105.

[55]Cheong, Niki. "Disinformation as a Response to the 'Opposition Playground' in Malaysia." From Grassroots Activism to Disinformation: Social Media in Southeast Asia, Cambridge University Press, 2021, pp. 122-139

[56]Gomez, J. (2014). Social media impact on Malaysia's 13th general election. Asia Pacific Media Educator, 24(1), 95-105.

V. Comparative Analysis

A. Similarities and differences in the regulatory frameworks

Indonesia, Philippines, and Malaysia share some common features in their regulatory frameworks addressing election disinformation. All three countries have general laws that prohibit the dissemination of false or misleading information online, such as the Electronic Information and Transactions Law in Indonesia, the Cybercrime Prevention Act in the Philippines, and the Communications and Multimedia Act in Malaysia. These laws provide a legal basis for prosecuting individuals or entities that engage in the spread of disinformation, although their broad and ambiguous provisions have also raised concerns about potential overreach and abuse.

In addition to these general laws, Indonesia, Philippines, and Malaysia also have election-specific regulations that aim to promote fairness and transparency in the electoral process. These regulations typically prohibit the use of campaign materials that contain false or misleading information, and require political actors to disclose their spending on online advertising . However, the effectiveness of these regulations has been limited by a range of factors, including the lack of enforcement capacity, the involvement of public officials in spreading disinformation, and the use of covert or anonymous online campaigns.

Despite these similarities, there are also significant differences in the regulatory frameworks of the three countries. Indonesia has a more centralized approach to regulating online content, with the Ministry of Communication and Information Technology (MCIT) playing a central role in monitoring and blocking websites that violate the law. In contrast, the Philippines and Malaysia have more decentralized frameworks, with multiple agencies and stakeholders involved in the regulation and enforcement of election laws.

Moreover, the political and social contexts of the three countries have shaped their regulatory approaches in different ways. Indonesia's experience with sectarian conflicts and terrorism has led to a greater emphasis on maintaining public order and national security, sometimes at the expense of free speech and political expression. The Philippines' highly polarized and personality-driven political culture has made it more difficult to build consensus around the need for stronger regulation of online speech. Malaysia's ethnic and religious divides have been exploited by political actors to spread disinformation and hate speech, undermining efforts to promote a more inclusive and democratic public sphere.

B. Factors influencing the effectiveness of regulatory approaches

The effectiveness of the regulatory approaches adopted by Indonesia, Philippines, and Malaysia in combating election disinformation has been influenced by a range of factors, both internal and external to the regulatory frameworks themselves.

One key factor is the capacity and independence of the regulatory and enforcement agencies tasked with implementing the laws and regulations. In all three countries, concerns have been raised about the limited resources, technical expertise, and political autonomy of these agencies, which have hindered their ability to effectively monitor and sanction violations. The perception of selective enforcement and political bias has also undermined public trust in these institutions, making it more difficult to build support for their efforts.

Another factor is the role of political actors and public officials in spreading disinformation and undermining the integrity of the electoral process. In the Philippines and Malaysia, some politicians and government supporters have been actively involved in online manipulation and hate speech, using their positions of power and influence to shape public opinion and discredit their opponents. This has created a climate of impunity and polarization that makes it more difficult to enforce regulations and promote responsible political discourse.

The influence of social media platforms and their content moderation policies is also a significant factor. In all three countries, Facebook and other platforms have become key channels for political communication and mobilization, with a significant impact on the electoral process. However, these platforms have struggled to effectively combat disinformation and hate speech, often relying on opaque and inconsistent moderation practices that have failed to prevent the spread of false or misleading content. The lack of transparency and accountability in the decision-making processes of these platforms has also made it more difficult for regulators to hold them accountable and ensure compliance with local laws and regulations.

C. Best practices and lessons learned

Despite the challenges and limitations of their regulatory approaches, Indonesia, Philippines, and Malaysia have also developed some best practices and lessons learned that can inform efforts to combat election disinformation in other contexts.

One key lesson is the importance of multi-stakeholder collaboration and coordination in addressing the complex and multifaceted nature of disinformation. In all three countries, civil society organizations, media outlets, and fact-checking initiatives have played a crucial role in monitoring and countering false or misleading information, often in partnership with government agencies and international organizations. These collaborations have helped to build public awareness, promote media literacy, and provide credible and timely information to voters, complementing the efforts of regulators and enforcement agencies.

Another best practice is the use of proactive and preventive measures to mitigate the impact of disinformation, rather than relying solely on reactive and punitive approaches. In Indonesia, for example, the

General Election Commission (KPU) has conducted voter education campaigns and worked with social media platforms to promote official sources of information and counter false narratives. In the Philippines, media organizations have adopted fact-checking and verification practices to ensure the accuracy and reliability of their election coverage. These efforts have helped to create a more resilient and informed public that is better equipped to detect and reject disinformation.

Finally, the experiences of Indonesia, Philippines, and Malaysia highlight the need for a more holistic and long-term approach to combating disinformation, beyond the immediate context of elections. This includes addressing the underlying drivers of disinformation, such as political polarization, social inequalities, and media concentration, and investing in the development of a more diverse and independent media ecosystem. It also requires a sustained commitment to promoting digital literacy, critical thinking, and civic engagement among citizens, especially youth, to build a more resilient and participatory democratic culture.

VI. Discussion

A. Implications for theory and practice

The comparative analysis of the regulatory frameworks and experiences of Indonesia, Philippines, and Malaysia in combating election disinformation has several implications for both theory and practice.

From a theoretical perspective, the findings highlight the complex and multidimensional nature of disinformation as a social and political phenomenon. Disinformation is not simply a matter of false or misleading content, but is deeply embedded in the broader context of political power, social inequalities, and cultural identities[57]. The spread of disinformation is facilitated by the affordances of digital platforms, which enable the rapid and targeted dissemination of messages, but also by the underlying motivations and incentives of political actors, who may see it as a tool for mobilization and persuasion. This suggests that a purely technical or legal approach to combating disinformation is likely to be insufficient, and that a more holistic and contextual understanding is needed.

From a practical perspective, the experiences of the three countries underscore the challenges and limitations of existing regulatory frameworks in addressing the evolving threat of disinformation. Despite having a range of laws and regulations that prohibit the spread of false or misleading information, the effectiveness of these measures has been hindered by factors such as selective enforcement, political interference, and lack of public trust[58]. This suggests that the design and implementation of regulatory frameworks need to be more responsive to the political and social realities on the ground, and that greater efforts are needed to build the capacity and independence of regulatory and enforcement agencies[59].

Moreover, the findings highlight the importance of multi-stakeholder collaboration and coordination in combating disinformation. While government regulation is necessary, it is not sufficient on its own, and needs to be complemented by the efforts of civil society, media, and technology companies[60]. This requires a more proactive and engaged approach from all stakeholders, as well as greater transparency and accountability in the decision-making processes of platforms and regulators (Navallo, 2021). It also requires a shift towards more preventive and empowering measures, such as media literacy education and fact-checking initiatives, that can help to build resilience and critical thinking skills among citizens.

B. Recommendations for strengthening regulatory frameworks

Based on the comparative analysis and best practices identified, several recommendations can be made for strengthening the regulatory frameworks for combating election disinformation in Indonesia, Philippines, and Malaysia, as well as in other contexts.

First, there is a need for greater clarity and specificity in the legal and regulatory provisions related to disinformation. The current laws and regulations in the three countries are often broad and ambiguous, leaving room for interpretation and abuse[61]. This can be addressed by developing more precise definitions and criteria for what constitutes disinformation, as well as by providing clearer guidance on the roles and

---

[57]Bennett, W. L., & Livingston, S. (2018). The disinformation order: Disruptive communication and the decline of democratic institutions. European Journal of Communication, 33(2), 122-139.

[58]Combinido, P., & Curato, N. (2021). Curing "Patient Zero": Reclaiming the Digital Public Sphere in the Philippines. In From Grassroots Activism to Disinformation: Social Media in Southeast Asia (pp. 198-220). Cambridge University Press.

[59]Iannone, Aniello. "Democracy Crisis in South-East Asia: Media Control, Censorship, and Disinformation during the 2019 Presidential and General Elections in Indonesia, Thailand and 2019 Local Election in the Philippines." JurnalIlmu Sosial dan Ilmu,Politik 26, No. 1 (2022): 81-97.

[60]Ong, J. C., & Cabanes, J. V. A. (2018). Architects of networked disinformation: Behind the scenes of troll accounts and fake news production in the Philippines. The Newton Tech4Dev Network.

[61]Combinido, P., & Curato, N. (2021). Curing "Patient Zero": Reclaiming the Digital Public Sphere in the Philippines. In From Grassroots Activism to Disinformation: Social Media in Southeast Asia (pp. 198-220). Cambridge University Press.

responsibilities of different stakeholders in preventing and mitigating its spread (Wardle & Derakhshan, 2017).

Second, there is a need for stronger mechanisms for enforcing and monitoring compliance with the regulations. This includes providing adequate resources and training to regulatory and enforcement agencies, as well as establishing clear protocols and procedures for investigating and sanctioning violations[62]. It also requires greater transparency and accountability in the decision-making processes of these agencies, as well as more effective channels for public participation and oversight.

Third, there is a need for more proactive and coordinated efforts to promote media literacy and digital citizenship among citizens. This includes integrating media literacy education into school curricula, as well as supporting community-based initiatives and fact-checking organizations that can help to build critical thinking skills and counter false narratives[63]. It also requires greater collaboration and information-sharing among stakeholders, including government, civil society, media, and technology companies, to ensure a more comprehensive and effective response to disinformation[64].

Finally, there is a need for a more holistic and long-term approach to addressing the root causes and drivers of disinformation. This includes tackling issues such as political polarization, social inequalities, and media concentration, which create a fertile ground for the spread of false and misleading information[65]. It also requires investing in the development of a more diverse and independent media ecosystem, as well as in the strengthening of democratic institutions and civic culture[66].

C. Potential challenges and future directions

While the recommendations above provide a roadmap for strengthening the regulatory frameworks for combating election disinformation, there are also several potential challenges and future directions that need to be considered. One key challenge is the rapidly evolving nature of disinformation tactics and techniques, which can quickly outpace legal and regulatory responses (Wardle & Derakhshan, 2017). As new technologies and platforms emerge, such as deepfakes and encrypted messaging apps, the ability of regulators to monitor and control the spread of false information becomes increasingly difficult. This requires a more agile and adaptive approach to regulation, as well as greater investment in research and innovation to stay ahead of the curve[67]. Another challenge is the potential for unintended consequences and backlash from efforts to regulate online speech. In all three countries, concerns have been raised about the impact of disinformation laws on freedom of expression and political dissent, as well as the risk of government overreach and abuse This requires a more nuanced and proportionate approach to regulation, one that balances the need to combat disinformation with the protection of fundamental rights and freedoms[68].

Finally, a key future direction is the need for more comparative and cross-national research on the regulation of disinformation. While the experiences of Indonesia, Philippines, and Malaysia provide valuable insights and lessons, they are also shaped by their specific political, social, and cultural contexts[69]. To develop a more comprehensive and generalizable understanding of the challenges and opportunities for combating disinformation, there is a need for more comparative analysis across different regions and contexts, as well as greater collaboration and knowledge-sharing among researchers, policymakers, and practitioners.

VII. Conclusion

In conclusion, the comparative analysis of the regulatory frameworks and experiences of Indonesia, Philippines, and Malaysia in combating election disinformation highlights both the challenges and opportunities for strengthening democratic resilience in the face of evolving threats.

---

[62]Datta, A., Feryadi, H., &Sinpeng, A. (2021). The politics of disinformation in Indonesia. In J. Ong & R. Tapsell (Eds.), *Disinformation and democracy in Indonesia* (pp. 21-38). ISEAS Publishing.

[63]Ong, J. C., & Cabanes, J. V. A. (2018). Architects of networked disinformation: Behind the scenes of troll accounts and fake news production in the Philippines. The Newton Tech4Dev Network.

[64]Tapsell, R. (2019, May 17). Fake News and Elections in Asia: Malaysia, Indonesia and the Philippines. The Asia Dialogue, University of Nottingham Asia Research Institute. https://theasiadialogue.com/2019/05/17/fake-news-and-elections-in-asia-malaysia-indonesia-and-the-philippines/

[65]Bennett, W. L., & Livingston, S. (2018). The disinformation order: Disruptive communication and the decline of democratic institutions. European Journal of Communication, 33(2), 122-139.

[66]Datta, A., Feryadi, H., &Sinpeng, A. (2021). The politics of disinformation in Indonesia. In J. Ong & R. Tapsell (Eds.), *Disinformation and democracy in Indonesia* (pp. 21-38). ISEAS Publishing.

[67]*Ibid.*

[68]Bennett, W. L., & Livingston, S. (2018). The disinformation order: Disruptive communication and the decline of democratic institutions. European Journal of Communication, 33(2), 122-139.

[69]Datta, A., Feryadi, H., &Sinpeng, A. (2021). The politics of disinformation in Indonesia. In J. Ong & R. Tapsell (Eds.), *Disinformation and democracy in Indonesia* (pp. 21-38). ISEAS Publishing.

While all three countries have legal and regulatory measures in place to address the spread of false and misleading information, the effectiveness of these measures has been limited by a range of factors, including political polarization, lack of enforcement capacity, and the rapid evolution of disinformation tactics and techniques. The involvement of political actors and the influence of social media platforms have further complicated efforts to promote a more informed and deliberative public sphere.

Despite these challenges, the experiences of Indonesia, Philippines, and Malaysia also offer valuable lessons and best practices for other countries seeking to combat election disinformation. These include the importance of multi-stakeholder collaboration and coordination, the use of proactive and preventive measures, and the need for a more holistic and long-term approach that addresses the underlying drivers of disinformation.

To strengthen the regulatory frameworks for combating election disinformation, several recommendations have been proposed, including greater clarity and specificity in legal provisions, stronger enforcement and monitoring mechanisms, more proactive efforts to promote media literacy and digital citizenship, and a more comprehensive approach to tackling the root causes of disinformation. However, the implementation of these recommendations is likely to face several challenges and unintended consequences, such as the potential for government overreach and the impact on freedom of expression. As such, a more nuanced and proportionate approach to regulation is needed, one that balances the need to combat disinformation with the protection of fundamental rights and freedoms.

Looking forward, there is a need for more comparative and cross-national research on the regulation of disinformation, as well as greater collaboration and knowledge-sharing among researchers, policymakers, and practitioners. By learning from the successes and failures of different approaches and contexts, we can develop a more comprehensive and effective strategy for safeguarding the integrity of democratic processes in the digital age.

Ultimately, the fight against election disinformation is not just a matter of regulation and enforcement, but also of building a more informed, engaged, and resilient citizenry. This requires a sustained commitment from all stakeholders to promoting media literacy, critical thinking, and civic participation, as well as a willingness to adapt and innovate in the face of evolving challenges. Only by working together can we hope to create a more transparent, accountable, and inclusive democratic future.

Bibliography

1. Cheong, Niki. "Disinformation as a Response to the 'Opposition Playground' in Malaysia." From Grassroots Activism to Disinformation: Social Media in Southeast Asia, Cambridge University Press, 2021, pp. 122-139.
2. Combinido, P., & Curato, N. (2021). Curing "Patient Zero": Reclaiming the Digital Public Sphere in the Philippines. In From Grassroots Activism to Disinformation: Social Media in Southeast Asia (pp. 198-220). Cambridge University Press.
3. Gazali, Effendi. "Degrading Message and Hate Speech are Now Obligatory in Elections? A Qualitative Research on Post-truth Populism in Sumatera Utara's Local Election." JurnalKomunikasi Indonesia 7, no. 2 (2018): 1.
4. Gomez, J. (2014). Social media impact on Malaysia's 13th general election. Asia Pacific Media Educator, 24(1), 95-105.
5. Iannone, Aniello. "Democracy Crisis in South-East Asia: Media Control, Censorship, and Disinformation during the 2019 Presidential and General Elections in Indonesia, Thailand and 2019 Local Election in the Philippines." JurnalIlmu Sosial dan Ilmu, Politik 26, No. 1 (2022): 81-97.
6. ISEAS-Yusof Ishak Institute. (2023, June 23). Webinar on "The Future of Fact-Checking in the Philippines". Retrieved from https://www.iseas.edu.sg/media/event-highlights/webinar-on-the-future-of-fact-checking-in-the-philippines/
7. Marsden, C. (2020). Internet co-regulation: European law, regulatory governance and legitimacy in cyberspace. Cambridge University Press.
8. Norris, P. (2017). Strengthening electoral integrity. Cambridge University Press.
9. Ong, J. C., & Cabanes, J. V. A. (2018). Architects of networked disinformation: Behind the scenes of troll accounts and fake news production in the Philippines. The Newton Tech4Dev Network.
10. Ong, J. C. &Taspell, R. Mitigating Disinformation in South Asia Elections: Lessons from Indonesia, Philippines, and Thailand. NATO Strategic Communications Centre of Excellence, 2020.
11. Rowbottom, J. (2012). To rant, vent and converse: Protecting low level digital speech. The Cambridge Law Journal, 71(2), 355-383.
12. Sannusi, S. N., Seman, A. A., & Ishak, M. B. (2019). Truth Tampering Through Social Media: Malaysia's Approach in Fighting Disinformation & Misinformation. International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 9(6), 1069-1078.
13. Siems, M. (2018). Comparative law. Cambridge University Press.
14. Sinpeng, A., Gueorguiev, D., &Arugay, A. A. (2020). Strong fans, weak campaigns: Social media and duterte in the 2016 Philippine election. Politics and Governance, 8(4), 334-344.

15. Tapsell, R. (2019, May 17). Fake News and Elections in Asia: Malaysia, Indonesia and the Philippines. The Asia Dialogue, University of Nottingham Asia Research Institute. https://theasiadialogue.com/2019/05/17/fake-news-and-elections-in-asia-malaysia-indonesia-and-the-philippines/