

Compliance of platform X with Indonesia's 2024 regulation on hoaxes and hate speech

M Reza Mahdavia¹, Atwar Bajari², Nuryah Asri Sjaifirah³

^{1,2,3}Faculty of Communication, Universitas Padjadjaran, Bandung, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

Digital platform features can be a means of increasing hoaxes and hate speech if not regulated by strict policies. Currently, Indonesia has only implemented Presidential Regulation No. 32 of 2024, which specifically regulates the responsibilities of digital platforms through Article 5, which has six points of regulation. This new regulation can be used as a basis to see the responsibility of digital platforms in overcoming hoaxes and hate speech. This research aims to see to what extent digital platform X has been adequate to the demands of the newly implemented regulations. This research uses a qualitative research method with an interpretative paradigm that collects data through documentation studies. The research was conducted by analyzing the policies that have been available on digital platform X and comparing them with the regulations applied. The findings of this study indicate that digital platform X has made efforts to overcome hate speech and hoaxes in accordance with the regulations applied. The efforts made include implementing clear and firm rules and policies, providing reporting features, and collaborating with creators through partnership services. However, there are some efforts that have not been specifically regulated, so further adjustments are needed in order to optimally meet the demands of the applied regulations.

Keywords: Digital platform; X; hoaxes; hate speech; qualitative policy analysis

Kepatuhan platform X terhadap regulasi Indonesia 2024 tentang hoaks dan ujaran kebencian

ABSTRAK

Fitur platform digital dapat menjadi sarana dalam meningkatnya hoaks dan ujaran kebencian. Hal ini terutama akan terjadi apabila platform tersebut tidak diatur oleh kebijakan yang tegas. Saat ini Indonesia baru menerapkan Peraturan Presiden Nomor 32 Tahun 2024 yang secara spesifik mengatur tanggung jawab platform digital melalui pasal 5 yang memiliki enam point peraturan. Regulasi baru ini dapat dijadikan landasan untuk melihat bagaimana tanggung jawab platform digital dalam mengatasi hoaks dan ujaran kebencian. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk melihat sejauh mana platform digital X (dahulu bernama Twitter) telah memadai tuntutan regulasi yang baru diterapkan. Penelitian ini menggunakan metode penelitian kualitatif dengan paradigma interpretatif, dengan cara melakukan pengambilan data melalui studi dokumentasi. Penelitian dilakukan dengan cara menganalisis kebijakan yang telah tersedia di platform digital X serta membandingkannya dengan regulasi yang diterapkan. Temuan dari penelitian ini menunjukkan bahwa platform digital X telah melakukan upaya-upaya dalam mengatasi ujaran kebencian dan hoaks sesuai dengan regulasi yang diterapkan. Upaya yang dilakukan meliputi penerapan peraturan dan kebijakan yang jelas dan tegas, kemudian menyediakan fitur pelaporan, hingga menjalin kerjasama dengan kreator melalui layanan kemitraan. Namun, penelitian ini menemukan bahwa terdapat beberapa upaya yang belum diatur secara spesifik, sehingga diperlukan penyesuaian lebih lanjut agar dapat memenuhi tuntutan dari regulasi yang diterapkan secara optimal.

Kata-kata kunci: Identitas komunikasi; digital imigran; pelaku usaha mikro; adaptasi; inovasi promosi

Correspondence: Prof. Dr. Atwar Bajari, M.Si. Universitas Padjadjaran, Jalan Raya Bandung Sumedang KM.21, Jatinangor, Sumedang, Jawa Barat. Email: atwar.bajari@unpad.ac.id

Submitted: July 2024, **Revised:** January 2025, **Accepted:** May 2025, **Published:** October 2025

ISSN: 2548-3242 (printed), ISSN: 2549-0079 (online). Website: <http://jurnal.unpad.ac.id/manajemen-komunikasi>

Copyright © 2025 Author(s). This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-SA license

INTRODUCTION

Digital platforms, particularly social media, have become fertile ground for the spread of hoaxes and hate speech, especially in the absence of clear and enforceable regulations. Key features such as rapid information dissemination, user anonymity, and global reach can be misused by malicious actors (Wang et al., 2022). These platforms, when left unregulated, enable large-scale communication that bypasses geographical boundaries and intensifies the spread of harmful content (Elzayady et al., 2023; Schmitz et al., 2022). Popular platforms like WhatsApp, Facebook, and X (formerly Twitter) have played central roles in the dissemination of politically motivated hoaxes aimed at manipulating public opinion (Febriansyah & Muksin, 2021; Yefferson et al., 2024). Anonymity further emboldens users to spread disinformation and hate speech without accountability (Luu et al., 2022).

At the core of the issue lies irresponsible digital behavior. The broad freedom of expression offered by digital platforms is often exploited to circulate deceptive content and incite hostility. Hoaxes defined as intentionally misleading information are frequently used to sway public perception for political or personal gain (Lee, 2022; Santos et al., 2020). Hate speech, meanwhile, targets individuals or groups

based on identity markers such as race, religion, ethnicity, gender, or sexual orientation, aiming to demean or threaten (Gagliardone et al., 2015; Schmid et al., 2022). When left unchecked, these behaviors jeopardize social stability and fuel distrust and conflict within communities.

In Indonesia, hoaxes and hate speech remain persistent problems, particularly during politically sensitive events such as general elections. During the 2024 election period, research by Monash University and AJI Indonesia recorded over 182,000 instances of hate speech online. Additionally, the Ministry of Communication and Digital Affairs (Kemkomdigi) reported more than 12,000 cases of hoax-related content between August and December 2023 (Kementerian Komunikasi dan Informatika, 2024).

The implications are significant. Hoaxes regarding alleged electoral fraud have increased public distrust in electoral institutions like the KPU and Bawaslu, incited protests in major cities, and heightened political tensions (Lee, 2020). Identity-driven hate speech has exacerbated social divisions, as seen in Yogyakarta and West Java, where minority groups faced verbal abuse and exclusion due to misinformation on social media (Bajari et al., 2023). The broader consequences include political polarization, weakened democratic trust, and increased discrimination (Bajari et

al., 2021).

Much of this problem is rooted in Indonesia's weak and outdated regulatory framework. Research shows that vague, inadequate policies have accelerated the spread of harmful content, highlighting the urgency for stricter, more targeted legal instruments (Pamungkas et al., 2023; Rahmi, 2024). The absence of digital platform regulation during the 2017–2019 elections further illustrate how regulatory gaps enabled unchecked disinformation (Nurhajati et al., 2023). Existing laws, such as the Electronic Information and Transaction Law (UU ITE), lack the clarity and scope necessary to curb online hoaxes and hate speech effectively (Bawono & Glaser, 2023). This regulatory ambiguity continues to fuel the widespread circulation of harmful content, underscoring the urgent need for coordinated, comprehensive policy reform in Indonesia's digital governance landscape.

The highest number of hate speech and hoaxes on digital platforms in Indonesia occurred on digital platform X (formerly Twitter). At certain moments, such as the 2024 general election, which attracts a lot of user attention. The number of hoaxes and hate speech can reach 120,381 tweets. This figure is very lame compared to other digital platforms such as Facebook with only 56,780 uploads, and Instagram with 4,472 uploads (Kementerian

Komunikasi dan Informatika, 2019). The highest number that occurs on digital platform X will be a potential in influencing the opinions and behavior of other users (Bajari et al., 2021; Barsaiyan & Sijoria, 2021). Without binding regulations, these digital platforms will become the center of hate speech and hoaxes.

Making efforts to combat hate speech and hoaxes is important in order to realize a conducive digital space (D'Sa et al., 2022). Seeing the phenomenon that still occurs on digital platform X. Making the handling of acts of hate speech and hoaxes an urgent matter. If this phenomenon remains unchecked, hate speech and hoaxes will trigger violence and conflict in social life (Allcott & Gentzkow, 2017). When hoaxes and hate speech are massively practiced on digital platforms, public discussion will decline (Awan, 2014). As a result, hate speech and hoaxes can damage the system in social and political structures, which will certainly affect aspects of people's lives (Imaroh et al., 2023).

Several approaches have been attempted to address hate speech and hoaxes that occur on digital platforms. Some studies recommend a comprehensive approach. The approach includes the existence of strict regulations, monitored policies, the availability of sophisticated technology, and intervention from the community or community environment. These steps must be taken by digital platforms

to overcome these problems (Elzayady et al., 2023). Another effort is to conduct content moderation by the government to digital platform companies (Hangartner et al., 2021). However, the most important and urgent aspect is the existence of regulations that specifically regulate social media, considering that hate speech and hoaxes occur online by digital platform users (Lima et al., 2018).

Tackling hoaxes and hate speech requires a comprehensive strategy that blends cultural literacy, technology, and legal measures (Febriansyah & Muksin, 2021). In Indonesia this effort must be reinforced through collaboration among legal institutions, technological solutions, and community-based initiatives (Rahmi, 2024). Ensuring respectful digital spaces also demands clear policies and strict enforcement (D'Sa et al., 2022).

Problems in the digital space that occur in Indonesia today are due to the fact that the regulations used are still not specific. Some regulations that are often used include the Electronic Information and Transaction Law (UU ITE) in Article 28 paragraph (2) jo. Article 45A paragraph (2) of Law 1/2024 and several provisions in the Criminal Code (Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Pidana) such as Article 14 and Article 15 of Law 1/1946. However, in mid-2024 a new regulation was implemented that regulates the activities of digital spaces and

digital platforms. The regulation is designed to regulate the responsibilities of digital platforms, including social media, in addressing illegal content and supporting quality journalism. The regulation is in the form of Presidential Regulation Number 32 of 2024 through article 5, paragraphs a to f. This regulation can be used as a foundation in looking at the responsibilities of digital platforms in overcoming hoaxes and hate speech.

Presidential Regulation No. 32 of 2024 can be used as a guideline in examining how a digital platform is responsible for ensuring that its digital space is conducive. The form of responsibility includes how digital platforms solve the problem of hate speech and hoaxes circulating on digital platforms. Article 5 paragraph 1 states that digital platforms are obliged not to facilitate the dissemination and/or commercialization of news content that is not in accordance with the law on the press after receiving a report. In addition, article 5 emphasizes that the form of responsibility of digital platforms is to provide the best efforts in designing news distribution algorithms that support quality journalism in accordance with the values of democracy, diversity, and laws and regulations. The presidential regulation emphasizes that digital platforms have an active responsibility in ensuring that the content circulating on their platforms not only supports

quality journalism but also prevents the spread of hoaxes and hate speech.

Presidential regulation number 32 of 2024 also mentions quality journalism. This quality journalism can be used as a guideline in ensuring the responsibility of digital platforms in overcoming hate speech and hoaxes. One type of quality journalism is journalism that is free from hoaxes and hate speech. In fact, quality journalism is not only about ensuring that the information conveyed to the public is accurate and balanced. It is also about how information is delivered in a way that promotes democratic values and is committed to human rights to be in a conducive atmosphere (Kovach & Rosenstiel, 2017). Journalism that is free from hoaxes will be useful for the public in helping them make decisions (Waisbord, 2018). Therefore, quality journalism is the main basis for eradicating hate speech and hoaxes.

Communication science is inherently multidisciplinary, encompassing various aspects of social life beyond just media use. It also explores the media industry and the regulatory frameworks that shape it. As digital platforms like social media grow more dominant, effective regulatory oversight becomes increasingly vital (Picard, 2020). Media plays a crucial role in shaping public opinion, influencing policy, and guiding decision making across sectors (Dempster, 2020). Media studies an essential

branch of communication research examines how media functions, impacts audiences, and adheres to regulations (van Dijck & Alinejad, 2020).

To investigate media regulation, communication scholars often employ content analysis. This method helps assess how media messages are delivered and perceived, while also evaluating the effectiveness of existing policies (Abraham & Khatra, 2022). Content analysis can be a method to conduct research related to media regulation, research on media regulation can be the basis for recommendations to improve the implementation of a regulation (Suleiman, 2018).

Media policy research in communication science will be useful to provide recommendations as a basis for improving regulations. Of course, these recommendations will increase the transparency and accountability of media oriented towards the public as users. Media policy research can also provide an understanding of how media can be used to support social goals and sustainable development (Alam et al., 2023). Not only that, but this study will also provide an understanding of the role of social media in crisis situations and how the media can contribute to rapid and effective policy responses (Suzor, 2018). Through this study, it is expected to create a more responsive and responsible media in carrying out its

function as a provider of information for the community.

It is important for a nation to have strict regulations regarding digital platforms. Strict regulation of digital platforms is essential, given their broad influence on public opinion, information flow, and user behavior (Shao et al., 2021; Zhong et al., 2021). Effective oversight helps prevent potential harm such as hate speech, misinformation, and online violence particularly against vulnerable groups while promoting ethical digital practices (Gerungan et al., 2023).

Without clear regulations, nations may face serious consequences. Unchecked platforms can threaten freedom of expression by enabling harmful content. During the COVID-19 pandemic, for example, digital media became a hub for hoaxes, negatively affecting users' mental health (Zhong et al., 2021). In Nigeria, the lack of effective regulation has created tension between free speech and hate speech, hindering preventive efforts (Mohammed, 2021).

Regulation is a long-term investment for a more conducive digital space. Good regulation protects vulnerable users from harmful content that can affect their personal lives. It can also encourage users to be more ethical and ensure that information is disseminated more responsibly (Gerungan et al., 2023; Venegas-

Vera et al., 2020). Effective regulation can also improve safety in various industries, such as ridesharing, by integrating best practices and clear guidelines (Gao et al., 2018; Sun et al., 2020). With strict regulation in place, digital platforms can become more useful and less harmful tools for society. Exploring the implementation of digital platform regulations in a country is important to ensure the purpose of enacting a regulation can be realized.

Presidential Regulation No. 32 of 2024 also states that a digital platform is a private electronic system provider that provides and runs digital platform services and utilizes them for various purposes. Twitter, which has changed its name to X, is a digital platform that meets the criteria in the regulation. So that as a digital platform, the policies in X must be adequate to the regulations that will apply. Moreover, X is a digital platform with the highest number of hoaxes and hate speech in Indonesia.

Through the explanation of the urgency of the research explained earlier, this research aims to examine how Digital Platform X implements policies in dealing with hoaxes and hate speech and to what extent this platform has fulfilled the provisions in Presidential Regulation No. 32 of 2024. So that this research can contribute to the realm of digital communication policy by focusing on the implementation of regulations in the digital era. The results will provide insights

for future policies and stakeholders in evaluating and refining future regulations. By detailing the dynamics of digital platform regulation and compliance, this research provides academic contributions in communication studies as well as practical relevance for stakeholders in designing more comprehensive policies.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study employs a qualitative methodology rooted in an interpretive framework to assess the degree of compliance of Digital Platform X with Indonesian rules, namely Presidential Regulation No. 32 of 2023, concerning the mitigation of hoaxes and hate speech. This research utilizes qualitative document analysis to interpret the meanings inherent in legal frameworks and platform policies, facilitating a comprehensive understanding of the normative alignment between regulation and digital governance practices (Creswell & Creswell, 2017; Mulyana, 2018).

The primary aim of this study is to evaluate the responsibility of Platform X through a comparison analysis of the particular stipulations of Article 5 in the Presidential Regulation and the platform's established policy. The examination focuses on the platform's interpretation and execution of regulatory obligations, specifically around content

moderation, user reporting systems, algorithmic transparency, and institutional collaboration. This approach does not include interviews with platform representatives or regulators; rather, it only depends on the textual analysis of official documents and policy declarations.

The documents chosen for examination consist of official regulatory texts and publicly available internal policies of Platform X, along with peer-reviewed literature on digital regulation and governance. A primary criterion for document selection was recency only; sources published within the last decade were included, guaranteeing conformity with the growing landscape of digital communication governance. The data were subsequently coded and analyzed through a comparative thematic framework, aligning Platform X's policies with six regulatory dimensions specified in Article 5, which encompass equitable content dissemination, promotion of quality journalism, and collaboration with press institutions (Bowen, 2009; Bryman, 2008).

This research seeks to deliver a thorough and comprehensive evaluation of Platform X's regulatory compliance by utilizing verifiable and authoritative sources. The findings provide insights into how digital platforms incorporate external legal obligations, therefore adding to wider conversations on media accountability, digital policy enforcement, and platform

governance in Indonesia.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This study contributes fresh perspectives on the ways in which Digital Platform X aligns its internal policy framework with the stipulations of Presidential Regulation No. 32 of 2024. It identifies existing regulatory shortcomings and proposes actionable policy enhancements to strengthen content moderation practices. Unlike earlier studies that tend to adopt a broader lens on misinformation governance, this research presents a more focused analysis anchored in a defined legal and regulatory context.

Under the scope of Presidential Regulation No. 32 of 2024 concerning the obligations of digital platform providers in promoting quality journalism Platform X qualifies as a digital platform. The regulation characterizes a “Digital Platform Service” as one operated by a digital platform entity, encompassing functions such as the aggregation, processing, distribution, and digital presentation of news content. It also includes facilitating user interaction with news content in ways that support news dissemination, especially for commercial purposes. Given that Platform X, as a social media network, routinely engages in the collection, processing, and dissemination of digital content including news it clearly falls within the definitional boundaries of a digital platform as outlined in

the regulation.

Referring to Presidential Regulation No. 32 of 2024 on the Responsibilities of Digital Platform Companies to Support Quality Journalism, X as a digital platform has significant obligations in maintaining a healthy news business ecosystem. One important aspect of this responsibility is to address the issue of hoaxes and hate speech that often appear on digital platforms. In the context of this presidential regulation, X is expected not only as a provider of space for interaction but also as a guardian of the quality of information presented. This includes filtering and identifying false and harmful information, as well as taking effective measures to reduce its spread.

There is one specific article that spells out the responsibilities that digital platforms must fulfill. This is Article 5 of Presidential Regulation No. 32 of 2024. This article will be used as a regulatory basis that will be used as a guide in seeing the extent to which Policy X fulfills regulatory demands. Based on this article, there are several demands that must be carried out by digital platforms to support quality journalism and implicitly deal with hoaxes and hate speech. The following is the content of the article from Presidential Regulation Number 32 of 2024:

Table 1 delineates Article 5 of Presidential Regulation No. 32 of 2024, which delineates essential obligations for digital platforms in addressing hoaxes and hate speech. The policy

Table 1 Content of Regulations

Article	Content
Article 5 Letter a	Digital platforms must not facilitate the dissemination or commercialization of news content that does not comply with press laws after receiving a report through the reporting means provided by the digital platform company.
Article 5 Letter b	Provide the best efforts to help prioritize the facilitation and commercialization of news produced by press companies.
Article 5 Letter c	Provide fair treatment to all press companies in offering digital platform services.
Article 5 Letter d	Implement training and programs aimed at supporting quality and responsible journalism
Article 5 Letter e	Provide the best efforts in designing news distribution algorithms that support the realization of quality journalism according to democratic values, diversity, and legislation.
Article 5 Letter 5	Cooperate with press companies.

Source: Presidential Regulation No. 32 of 2024

forbids platforms from enabling the distribution or monetization of news information that contravenes press laws, particularly following user reports. It urges platforms to promote content from reputable press organizations, guarantee equitable treatment for all media entities, provide training programs to foster responsible journalism, and develop algorithms that embody democratic principles, diversity, and legal adherence. Finally, it promotes active collaboration with media groups. Collectively, these provisions provide a thorough framework for assessing Digital Platform X’s compliance with regulatory requirements. This section delineates the conclusions about Platform X’s responses to each of these duties. The following are the findings that explain how X digital platforms are carrying out their responsibilities:

Table 2 shows that Presidential Regulation No. 32 of 2024 stipulates several demands that

Digital Platform X must fulfill in order to create quality journals that can later be used to address hoaxes and hate speech, and the research findings show the extent to which X fulfills these demands. To fulfill responsibilities such as Article 5 letters a to f, Digital Platform X has implemented a number of policies and features that reflect serious efforts to comply with the regulations. However, there are still some areas that need to be adjusted to align with the demands of more comprehensive regulations.

Article 5 Letter a of Presidential Regulation No. 32 of 2024 stipulates that digital platforms are prohibited from facilitating the dissemination or monetization of news material that contravenes national press rules, especially following the submission of user reports. This legislative obligation necessitates that platforms have comprehensive moderation mechanisms that react promptly and efficiently to such

Table 1 Content of Regulations

Regulation	Requirement	Implementation	Disparity
Article 5 Letter a:	X must ensure that they do not facilitate the dissemination or profit from content that does not comply with applicable laws. If there are reports regarding such content, they must act quickly to remove or deactivate it. This shows X's responsibility to monitor and take action on deviant news content, including hoaxes and hate speech.	X has clear and firm policy regulations governing the types of content prohibited on X, including hoaxes and hate speech. X provides user-friendly reporting features for users to report inappropriate content. Using a "symptoms-first" approach, reporters are given several options of past incidents to help them describe their reports. X has monitoring and enforcement standards for user reports, with reviews conducted within 24 hours. Actions taken by X after the review include issuing warnings to permanently suspending reported accounts.	X has implemented content moderation policies and reporting features. However, transparency in the report review process could be improved to align more closely with regulatory expectations.
Article 5 Letter b:	X must prioritize and provide more space for news produced by legitimate and verified press companies (creators/users). This means content produced by credible media will be prioritized, helping to prevent the spread of hoaxes by increasing the visibility of true and reliable news.	X has Creator Monetization Standards that regulate how content creators can monetize their content on digital platforms. These standards are designed to ensure that content uploaded by creators meets certain requirements that guarantee ethical quality and compliance with platform policies. X has collaborated with creators through paid partnership services. This partnership facilitates the identification of more credible information sources.	X has standards for monetization and partnerships, but there is no explicit policy ensuring verified press companies receive prioritized visibility as required by the regulation.
Article 5 Letter c:	X must be fair and not discriminate against any press company (creator) when providing their digital platform services. All press companies (creators/users) must have equal opportunities to utilize services to prevent information monopolies and ensure diverse perspectives are accessible to users.	X has clear and firm policies and regulations ensuring that all press companies (creators/users) have equal access to their platform. These policies and regulations are accessible to the public to ensure adherence by all X users. X has a dedicated page providing information about their efforts to maintain platform integrity and security. This page contains reports and data related to various operational aspects. This transparency demonstrates X's commitment to being a fair platform for all users.	While X has clear policies on equal access, the lack of a direct mechanism to ensure all press companies receive fair treatment as required by the regulation may require further clarification.
Article 5 Letter d:	X must be committed to supporting quality journalism by providing training and programs that help enhance the skills and responsibilities of journalists. This includes all forms of education and professional development aimed at ensuring journalists can produce accurate, balanced, and ethical content.	X has service pages such as https://business.x.com/ and X Ads Academy, which provide education to content creators on their platform. Although these policies do not specifically address X's commitment to supporting quality journalism, these services help creators understand how to effectively use X's business and advertising tools, ultimately contributing to the improvement of the quality of content produced, including journalistic content. By providing access to information and technology, X helps content creators, including journalists, to be more professional and responsible in their work.	X provides general educational resources for content creators, but a dedicated training program explicitly supporting quality journalism, as mandated in the regulation, has not been established.

Article Letter e:	5	X must design their algorithms to support high-quality journalism that reflects democratic values and diversity while complying with applicable laws. These algorithms must help prevent the spread of hoaxes by prioritizing accurate and quality news content.	X has designed algorithms by adjusting content recommendations for their users. Every day, X's algorithms consider user preferences, such as followed accounts and topics and interactions with content, to determine what appears in the user's timeline. Additionally, X uses machine learning technology and user reports to prevent the amplification of potentially harmful or offensive content, ensuring that recommended content aligns with democratic values and diversity.	X's algorithm align with content moderation needs, but there is no explicit mechanism ensuring that high-quality journalism is prioritized, as required by the regulation.
	5	X must cooperate with press companies (creators/users) to ensure the dissemination of accurate and responsible information. This cooperation can include various aspects such as fact-checking, journalist training, or other initiatives supporting a healthy and trustworthy media ecosystem.	X has a Partnership Program with press companies (creators/users) aimed at supporting fact-checking and journalist training. Through this program, X collaborates with journalism organizations to provide the necessary resources and training to ensure accuracy and integrity in news reporting. This helps journalists verify information before dissemination, reducing the risk of spreading false information. However, this policy has not specifically focused on preventing hate speech and hoaxes.	X collaborates with press companies for fact-checking and training, but there is no specific initiative aimed at proactively preventing hoaxes and hate speech, as outlined in the regulation.

Source: Analysis of X digital platform policies and presidential regulation, 2024

infractions. According to Gorwa (2019) content governance under this regulatory framework entails not just passive compliance but also proactive intervention, ensuring platforms promote the public interest by eliminating misinformation and damaging narratives. In accordance with this directive, Platform X has implemented explicit content moderation standards that expressly address hoaxes and hate speech. An essential element of its strategy is a “symptoms-first” reporting system, enabling users to classify problematic content, thereby assisting moderators in taking prompt and precise action. The platform pledges to assess all reports within 24 hours, imposing punishments that vary from warnings to permanent account suspensions, thus demonstrating a clear dedication to upholding a secure and legally compliant digital environment.

Notwithstanding these gains, a crucial element remains inadequately developed: the transparency of the report evaluation process. Presently, users submitting content reports receive scant feedback concerning the reasoning behind moderation choices. The absence of clarification may deter user engagement and undermine confidence in the platform’s equity and responsibility. Improving transparency, via comprehensive alerts or report histories, could substantially bolster user confidence and encourage more responsible participation.

According to Gorwa (2019) effective platform governance beyond mere technical compliance; it necessitates the cultivation of user trust through transparency, consistency, and communication. Consequently, to adhere to Article 5(a), Platform X must prioritize openness as a fundamental aspect of its content control strategies. Such actions will not only satisfy regulatory requirements but also enhance the platform’s reputation as a guardian of ethical and legal digital communication.

Article 5 Letter b of Presidential Regulation No. 32 of 2024 requires digital platforms to facilitate and commercialize press company or credible user news. Platforms must build methods to verify information sources and govern interactions to encourage trustworthy content. Gul (2023) stresses the importance of credibility indicators and governance measures on platforms to help users select trustworthy content and build confidence in the information ecosystem. Gorwa (2019) further claims that platform providers, as essential stakeholders in digital communication, must monitor content practices in their ecosystems to promote verifiable and ethical information. Digital platforms are crucial to content authenticity and public trust in news dissemination due to regulatory expectations.

Platform X has responded by tying content creator monetization to quality and ethics. This

standard restricts monetization to content that meets factual accuracy, policy compliance, and ethical standards. The platform promotes and rewards reputable information by tying financial incentives to content quality. Platform X also offers a paid partnership service that rewards productive users and identifies approved content as “promoted,” making high-quality sources easier to spot. Digital content curation and credibility-building are improved by these efforts. These mechanisms meet Article 5 b’s mandate, but clearer public communication of credibility standards and greater collaboration with professional press institutions could strengthen Platform X’s role in fostering a trusted, journalism-supportive online environment.

Article 5 Letter c of Presidential Regulation No. 32 of 2024 mandates that digital platforms guarantee equitable treatment for all press entities and users in the delivery of their services. This regulatory obligation underscores the significance of fair access to digital infrastructure, content exposure, and interaction strategies. Researchers have highlighted that platforms can fulfill these expectations by utilizing modern technologies, such artificial intelligence and big data analytics, to enhance service delivery and tailor user experiences impartially (Parida et al., 2019). Furthermore, enhancing information management systems

facilitates prompt and equitable access to content, hence diminishing discrepancies in visibility and dissemination (Hartanto & Wahyuningtyas, 2023). Guaranteeing universal accessibility and platform inclusivity is essential for promoting equity, particularly for underrepresented voices and marginalized groups in digital environments (Ramírez-Saltos et al., 2023). Collectively, these methodologies establish a holistic framework for ensuring equity while fostering platform sustainability and democratic engagement.

In compliance with this objective, Platform X has implemented many initiatives to enhance service equity. A formal policy has been established to provide equitable access for all users, integrating the concepts of justice and non-discrimination into platform governance. This dedication is additionally demonstrated in the platform’s publicly available documentation, which delineates its position on inclusive service delivery. X has established a specialized information site that includes reports and operational updates about platform integrity and user protections. These initiatives correspond effectively with Article 5 c, indicating a robust regulatory commitment. Nonetheless, despite these advancements, the platform might further augment its fairness initiative by implementing quantifiable metrics of service equity, doing regular audits, and including varied stakeholder

groups to evaluate perceived fairness among user segments. These measures would enhance compliance while fostering a more inclusive, transparent, and accountable digital landscape.

Article 5 Letter d of Presidential Regulation No. 32 of 2024 says that digital platforms must help active users and content authors by offering training programs that support responsible and high-quality journalism. As part of a larger regulatory effort to make sure that platforms not only moderate material but also help their users learn how to be journalists, this rule is meant to do just that. Ahmed et al. (2020) say that ethics training in the form of lectures and workshops is a key part of making sure that content creation is in line with professional standards. In the same way, Galipeau et al. (2013) stress how important it is to teach writing, peer review, and printing through hands-on experience in order to improve the quality and reliability of journalism. These academic findings show that platform-led educational efforts can directly affect the quality of information shared online, which promotes democratic discourse and lowers the risk of spreading false information.

As a result of this order, Platform X has created learning tools like the X Ads Academy and business tools on pages like <https://business.X.com/> to teach content makers how to use the platform effectively. These services are useful, especially because they help users

make their content more visible and interesting, but they don't directly address the main goals of Article 5 d. Platform X has not fully met this legal requirement yet because it does not have a training program for journalistic ethics, investigative writing, or fact-checking. To close this gap, the company needs to create structured learning programs that are specific to journalism. Modules on responsible reporting, digital verification tools, and ethical standards in media creation could be some of these. By making these kinds of programs official, Platform X would not only show that it follows the rules, but it would also help stop the spread of fake news and hate speech, making the internet a better place for everyone.

Article 5 letter e provides responsibility for digital platforms to be able to design algorithms that support quality journalism in the digital space. Digital platforms must build algorithms that actively promote quality content in digital settings under Presidential Regulation No. 32 of 2024 Article 5 Letter e. These algorithms must reflect Indonesian democratic principles and ethical norms while embracing its population's diverse sources and opinions (Mihelj et al., 2019). Scholars say algorithms should prioritize credible information and avoid reinforcing filter bubbles, which limit access to various opinions (Just & Latzer, 2016). According to Suzor (2018), platforms should include monitoring

and control tools to verify user compliance with content regulations and prevent the spread of misleading or dangerous content. These algorithmic measures protect journalistic integrity and counteract online hoaxes and hate speech.

To comply with this rule, Platform X has implemented many algorithm changes. It customizes material based on user choices like following accounts, interaction patterns, and topic involvement and lets users switch between algorithmic and chronological timelines. This feature lets users choose their content and may reduce filter bubbles. X also allows users to report hazardous content for moderation. These actions make the platform safer and more responsive, but there is no publicly available evidence that the algorithm specifically favors excellent journalism in accordance with Indonesian legal criteria. Without algorithmic transparency, the platform may not comply with Article 5 e. Platform X must perform algorithm audits, implement journalistic content-ranking criteria, and partner with reputable media organizations to elevate credible news content to strengthen its role in shaping an informed and democratic digital public sphere.

Article 5 Letter f of Presidential Regulation No. 32 of 2024 requires digital platforms to collaborate with press businesses and content creators to encourage responsible journalism.

This obligation highlights platforms' importance in effective news delivery and media sector digital transformation. Digital platforms allow press organizations to quickly and widely distribute news, enhancing public access to reputable information, according to Suzor (2018). Cooperation also encourages press companies to innovate and adapt to the digital ecosystem, improving journalistic reach and sustainability (Restianty, 2018). Platform–press coordination is crucial to information integrity and disinformation prevention, as this regulatory approach shows.

Platform X's Partnership Program provides fact verification and journalist training to content creators and news organizations. These activities show a commitment to improve platform information quality and accuracy. The initiative promotes media literacy and verification, but it does not address hoaxes and hate speech, two of the biggest digital issues today. Platform X shall integrate harmful content prevention activities in its partnerships to comply with Article 5 f. Collaborative fact-checking, anti-hate speech campaigns, and instructional content with trusted journalism organizations are possible. Such advancements would show regulatory compliance and a proactive approach to creating a more credible, inclusive, and safe digital communication space.

The analysis demonstrates that Digital

Platform X needs revisions to comply with Presidential Regulation No. 32 of 2024 Article 5 letters (a), (d), (e), and (f). More transparency, journalistic training, algorithm checks, and collaboration are needed in moderation. Content regulation mechanisms and user involvement have enhanced the platform, but digital hoaxes and hate speech require further enhancements.

Results support platform governance, which views regulation as a collaboration between platforms, governments, civil society, and users. Platform X uses moderation, reporting, and media cooperation to comply with external rules (Gorwa, 2019). Lack of transparency, algorithmic preference for reliable media, and training programs to maintain a high-quality information ecosystem remain concerns.

Formal legislation cannot guarantee platform responsibility, says one study. The platforms succeed due to ethical governance and aggressive stakeholder engagement. The research highlights a full regulatory strategy that fosters algorithmic accountability, enforcement openness, and partnership with trustworthy media organizations using Gorwa (2019) theoretical framework. Indonesia needs these initiatives for safer, more reliable, democratic digital communication.

CONCLUSION

This study evaluated the degree of compliance of Digital Platform X with Presidential Regulation No. 32 of 2024, specifically regarding the management of hoaxes and hate speech. Despite the platform's noteworthy initiatives, including user-friendly reporting capabilities and the enforcement of content standards, deficiencies persist in the transparency of moderation processes, algorithmic monitoring, and support for excellent journalism. The platform must significantly improve adherence to Articles 5 (a), (d), (e), and (f), incorporating more transparent review methods, training initiatives for journalists, and algorithmic prioritizing of reputable news sources.

This research examines X's present initiatives, contributing to the discourse on digital platform governance and highlighting the necessity for external legislation to be complemented by proactive internal policy. Enhancing openness, promoting ethical content creation, and performing frequent audits are essential for sustaining a secure and reliable digital environment. The report emphasizes the necessity of cooperation among regulators, media organizations, and platforms to guarantee that online content adheres to democratic principles and journalistic integrity.

REFERENCES

- Abraham, A., & Khatra, K. (2022). Media and urban governance: The quest for sustainable cities and communities. *ECS Transactions*, 107, 16639. <https://doi.org/10.1149/10701.16639ecst>
- Ahmed, K. A., Ahmed, K. A., Abdulbaqi, S. S., & Aliagan, I. Z. (2020). Corruption in the media: Implications for ethical and socially responsible journalism. *Jurnal Pengajian Media Malaysia*, 22(2), 49–59. <https://doi.org/10.22452/jpmm.vol22no2.4>
- Alam, B., Dubey, P. K., Shukla, A. K., & Rohit, S. kumar. (2023). Media narratives and tribal development in Jharkhand: Unravelling socio-economic realities. *European Chemical Bulletin*, 12(8), 9988–9995. <https://doi.org/10.53555/ecb/2023.12.8.823>
- Allcott, H., & Gentzkow, M. (2017). Social media and fake news in the 2016 election. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 31(2), 211–236. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.31.2.211>
- Awan, I. (2014). Islamophobia and Twitter: A typology of online hate against Muslims on social media. *Policy & Internet*, 6(2), 133–150. <https://doi.org/10.1002/1944-2866.POI364>
- Bajari, A., Koswara, I., & Erlandia, D. (2021). Hatenography: An Analysis of hate speech on Facebook in 2019 Indonesian Presidential campaign. *Jurnal Komunikasi: Malaysian Journal of Communication*, 37(4), 122–141. <https://doi.org/10.17576/JKMJC-2021-3704-08>
- Bajari, A., Suryana, A., Wahyudin, U., Mulyana, S., & Rakhmaniar, A. (2023). Hate speech through identity politics on social media ahead of the 2024 presidential election. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 15(2), 368–382. <https://doi.org/10.24912/jk.v15i2.25836>
- Barsaiyan, S., & Sijoria, C. (2021). Twitter Blue tick - a study of its impact on society. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 51(11), 27–40. <https://doi.org/10.17010/ijom/2021/v51/i11/159441>
- Bawono, B. T., & Glaser, H. (2023). The urgency of restorative justice regulation on hate speech. *Bestuur*, 11(2), 364–383. <https://doi.org/10.20961/bestuur.v11i2.82508>
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27–40. <https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027>
- Bryman, A. (2008). *Social research methods* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Creswell, D., & Creswell, J. W. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed method approaches* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.
- D'Sa, A. G., Illina, I., Fohr, D., & Akbar, A. (2022). Exploration of multi-corpus learning for hate speech classification in low resource scenarios. In *Text, Speech, and Dialogue* (Sojka, P., pp. 238–250). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-16270-1_20
- Dempster, G. (2020). The communication of scientific research in news media: Contemporary challenges and opportunities. *Journal of Science Communication*, 19(03), C06. <https://doi.org/10.22323/2.19030306>
- Elzayady, H., S. Mohamed, M., Badran, K., & Salama, G. (2023). A hybrid approach based on personality traits for hate speech detection in Arabic social media. *International Journal of Electrical and Computer Engineering (IJECE)*, 13(2), 1979–1988. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijece>

- v13i2.pp1979-1988
- Febriansyah, F., & Muksin, N. N. (2021). Hoax distribution in social media after ratification of omnibus law. *Jurnal ASPIKOM*, 6(2), 315–328. <https://doi.org/10.24329/aspikom.v6i2.871>
- Gagliardone, I., Gal, D., Alves, T., & Martinez, G. (2015). *Countering online hate speech*. UNESCO Publishing.
- Galipeau, J., Moher, D., Skidmore, B., Campbell, C., Hendry, P., Cameron, D. W., Hébert, P. C., & Palepu, A. (2013). Systematic review of the effectiveness of training programs in writing for scholarly publication, journal editing, and manuscript peer review (protocol). *Systematic Reviews*, 2(1), 41. <https://doi.org/10.1186/2046-4053-2-41>
- Gao, S., Ling, S., & Liu, W. (2018). The role of social media in promoting information disclosure on environmental incidents: An evolutionary game theory perspective. *Sustainability*, 10(12), 4372. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su10124372>
- Gerungan, L. K. F. R., Hehanussa, D. J. A., & Lewerissa, Y. A. (2023). Social media and violence against women in terms of human rights perspective (HAM). *Law and Humanities Quarterly Reviews*, 2(2), 25–28. <https://doi.org/10.31014/aior.1996.02.02.56>
- Gorwa, R. (2019). What is platform governance? *Information, Communication & Society*, 22(6), 854–871. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2019.1573914>
- Gul, M. (2023). Investigating governance mechanism of multi-sided platforms in a down trodden economy: A case study analysis. *Journal of Development and Social Sciences*, 4(4), 161–172. [https://doi.org/10.47205/jdss.2023\(4-IV\)15](https://doi.org/10.47205/jdss.2023(4-IV)15)
- Hangartner, D., Gennaro, G., Alasiri, S., Bahrich, N., Bornhoft, A., Boucher, J., Demirci, B. B., Derksen, L., Hall, A., Jochum, M., Munoz, M. M., Richter, M., Vogel, F., Wittwer, S., Wüthrich, F., Gilardi, F., & Donnay, K. (2021). Empathy-based counterspeech can reduce racist hate speech in a social media field experiment. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118(50). <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2116310118>
- Hartanto, A., & Wahyuningtyas, R. (2023). Market share improvement strategy formulation through application digital platform in Sharia Bank of Indonesia. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science* (2147- 4478), 12(7), 114–125. <https://doi.org/10.20525/ijrbs.v12i7.2817>
- Imaroh, Z., Hamzani, A. I., & Aryani, F. D. (2023). Criminal accountability for spreading hoax news on social media in the construction of criminal law. *Journal of Legal Subjects*, 3(3), 14–21. <https://doi.org/10.55529/jls.33.14.21>
- Just, N., & Latzer, M. (2016). Governance by algorithms: Reality construction by algorithmic selection on the internet. *Media, Culture & Society*, 39(2), 238–258. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0163443716643157>
- Kementerian Komunikasi dan Informatika. (2019). *Siaran pers no. 51/hm/Kominfo/03/2019 tentang 771 hoaks berhasil diidentifikasi Kemkominfo sejak Agustus 2018 hingga Februari 2019*. Kementerian Komunikasi Dan Informatika RI. <https://www.komdigi.go.id/berita/siaran-pers/detail/siaran-pers-no-51-hm-kominfo-03-2019-tentang-771-hoaks-berhasil-diidentifikasi-kemkominfo-sejak-agustus-2018-hingga-februari-2019>
- Kementerian Komunikasi dan Informatika.

- (2024). *Siaran pers no. 02/hm/Kominfo/01/2024 tentang hingga akhir tahun 2023, Kominfo tangani 12.547 isu hoax*. Komdigi. <https://www.komdigi.go.id/berita/pengumuman/detail/siaran-pers-no-02-hm-kominfo-01-2024-tentang-hingga-akhir-tahun-2023-kominfo-tangani-12-547-isu-hoaks>
- Kovach, B., & Rosenstiel, T. (2017). *The elements of journalism: What newspeople should know and the public should expect*. Three Rivers Press.
- Lee, A. (2020). Online hoaxes, existential threat, and internet shutdown: A case study of securitization dynamics in Indonesia. *Journal of Indonesian Social Sciences and Humanities*, 10(1), 17–34. <https://doi.org/10.14203/jissh.v10i1.156>
- Lee, A. (2022). Hybrid activism under the radar: Surveillance and resistance among marginalized youth activists in the United States and Canada. *New Media & Society*, 26(7), 3833–3853. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14614448221105847>
- Lima, L., Reis, J. C. S., Melo, P., Murai, F., Araujo, L., Vikatos, P., & Benevenuto, F. (2018). Inside the right-leaning echo chambers: Characterizing gab, an Unmoderated Social System. *IEEE/ACM International Conference on Advances in Social Networks Analysis and Mining (ASONAM)*, 515–522. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ASONAM.2018.8508809>
- Luu, S. T., Nguyen, K. Van, & Nguyen, N. L.-T. (2022). Impacts of transformer-based language models and imbalanced data for hate speech detection on Vietnamese social media texts. *Research Square*. <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-2242843/v1>
- Mihelj, S., Leguina, A., & Downey, J. (2019). Culture is digital: Cultural participation, diversity and the digital divide. *New Media & Society*, 21(7), 1465–1485. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444818822816>
- Mohammed, A. (2021). Regulating social media in Nigeria: A quantitative perception study. *Nile Journal of Political Science*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.20321/njps.2021.01.03>
- Mulyana, D. (2018). *Metodologi penelitian kualitatif: Paradigma baru ilmu komunikasi dan ilmu sosial lainnya*. Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Nurhajati, L., Wijayanto, X. A., Fitriyani, L. R., & Rachmawati, D. (2023). Building democracy and freedom of expression by fighting the COVID-19 infodemic in the digital space among the younger generation in Indonesia. *Jurnal Komunikasi Ikatan Sarjana Komunikasi Indonesia*, 8(1), 239–249. <https://doi.org/10.25008/jkiski.v8i1.861>
- Pamungkas, E. W., Putri, D. G. P., & Fatmawati, A. (2023). Hate Speech detection in Bahasa Indonesia: Challenges and opportunities. *International Journal of Advanced Computer Science and Applications*, 14(6). <https://doi.org/10.14569/IJACSA.2023.01406125>
- Parida, V., Sjödin, D., & Reim, W. (2019). Reviewing literature on digitalization, business model innovation, and sustainable industry: past achievements and future promises. *Sustainability*, 11(2), 391. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11020391>
- Picard, R. G. (2020). *Media and communications policy making: Processes, dynamics and international variations*. Springer International Publishing.
- Rahmi, K. H. (2024). Empathy and hate speech in social media: The case of Indonesia. *International Journal of Social Science and Human Research*, 07(03). <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444818822816>

- org/10.47191/ijsshr/v7-i03-29
- Ramírez-Saltos, D., Acosta-Vargas, P., Acosta-Vargas, G., Santórum, M., Carrion-Toro, M., Ayala-Chauvin, M., Ortiz-Prado, E., Maldonado-Garcés, V., & González-Rodríguez, M. (2023). Enhancing sustainability through accessible health platforms: a scoping review. *Sustainability*, 15(22), 15916. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su152215916>
- Restianty, A. (2018). Literasi digital, sebuah tantangan baru dalam literasi media. *Gunahumas: Jurnal Kehumasan Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia*, 1(1), 72–87. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ghm.v1i1.28380anja>
- Santos, S., Amaral, I., & Basílio Simões, R. (2020). Hate speech in social media: Perceptions and attitudes of higher education students in Portugal. *14th International Technology, Education and Development Conference*, 5681–5686. <https://doi.org/10.21125/inted.2020.1533>
- Schmid, U. K., Kümpel, A. S., & Rieger, D. (2022). How social media users perceive different forms of online hate speech: A qualitative multi-method study. *New Media & Society*, 26(5), 2614–2632. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14614448221091185>
- Schmitz, M., Burghardt, K., & Muric, G. (2022). Quantifying how hateful communities radicalize online users. *IEEE/ACM International Conference on Advances in Social Networks Analysis and Mining (ASONAM)*, 139–146. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2209.08697>
- Shao, R., Shi, Z., & Zhang, D. (2021). Social media and emotional burnout regulation during the COVID-19 pandemic: Multilevel approach. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 23(3), e27015. <https://doi.org/10.2196/27015>
- Suleiman, J. (2018). The media, implementation of the nigerian national communication policy, and citizens' participation in development. *European Scientific Journal, ESJ*, 14(26), 193. <https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2018.v14n26p193>
- Sun, Q., Li, T., Ma, F., Guo, X., & Wang, S. (2020). Dynamic evolution of safety regulation of the ridesharing industry under social media participation. *Symmetry*, 12(4), 560. <https://doi.org/10.3390/sym12040560>
- Suzor, N. (2018). Digital constitutionalism: Using the Rule of law to evaluate the legitimacy of governance by platforms. *Social Media + Society*, 4(3). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305118787812>
- van Dijck, J., & Alinejad, D. (2020). Social media and trust in scientific expertise: Debating the COVID-19 pandemic in the Netherlands. *Social Media + Society*, 6(4). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305120981057>
- Venegas-Vera, A. V., Colbert, G. B., & Lerma, E. V. (2020). Positive and negative impact of social media in the COVID-19 era. *Reviews in Cardiovascular Medicine*, 21(4), 561–564. <https://doi.org/10.31083/j.rcm.2020.04.195>
- Waisbord, S. (2018). Truth is what happens to news: On journalism, fake news, and post-truth. *Journalism Studies*, 19(13), 1866–1878. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1461670X.2018.1492881>
- Wang, X., Qiao, Y., Li, W., & Dong, W. (2022). How is online disinhibition related to adolescents' cyberbullying perpetration? empathy and gender as moderators. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 42(5), 704–732. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02724316211064515>
- Yefferson, D. Y., Lawijaya, V., & Girsang, A.

- S. (2024). Hybrid model: IndoBERT and long short-term memory for detecting Indonesian hoax news. *IAES International Journal of Artificial Intelligence (IJ-AI)*, 13(2), 1913. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijai.v13.i2.pp1913-1924>
- Zhong, B., Huang, Y., & Liu, Q. (2021). Mental health toll from the coronavirus: Social media usage reveals Wuhan residents' depression and secondary trauma in the COVID-19 outbreak. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 114, 106524. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2020.106524>