ASIAN AND PACIFIC ISLANDER AMERICAN VOTE

Guide: Confronting Disinformation

By: Kyle Van Fleet

Guide: Confronting Disinformation was written with the help of Kelsey Suter, Vice President of GQR Digital, Jimina Afoula, Executive Director of Empowering Pacific Islander Communities, and Sina Uipi, Policy Associate of Empowering Pacific Islander Communities. Thank you for your insight and for your solidarity in confronting disinformation.

Harmful narratives are one of the greatest challenges facing Asian American and Pacific Islander communities in today's world. They are making communities less safe, our trust in the election systems weaker, and tearing some families apart. This includes disinformation which is misleading, incorrect, or false information presented with the intent to mislead an audience. We are also confronted with misleading, incorrect, or false information *not* presented with the intent to deceive, also known as misinformation. With the prominence of the internet and social media, as well as 24-hour news and radio, false and potentially dangerous information is now spreading further, at increasingly alarming rates, than seen in the past. We saw this play a key role in both the 2016 and 2020 presidential elections, and it continues in contemporary issues including vaccinations, immigration, and public safety.

Disinformation is also being used to direct hate towards Asian American and Pacific Islander (AAPI) communities, and wedge our communities against other communities of color. This issue will only continue to grow if big, structural changes are not made, making it critical that we are prepared and able to respond.

Even to the most trained eyes, deciphering dis- and misinformation from good information can be harder than one might imagine. APIAVote has put together this

guide to help our partners and volunteers with this task, and other helpful resources and responses for confronting and combating disinformation, misinformation, and other harmful narratives that arise.

Table of Contents

Background

Key Definitions

News/reporting: Articles or programs that present facts or data

Opinion piece/show: An article or program that analyzes the news or uses facts to support an argument; biased and presented as an opinion.

Misinformation: Misleading, incorrect, or false information; could be caused by human error, faulty fact-checking. Not intended to deceive.

Malinformation: Genuine information that is shared to cause harm; often de-contextualized information used to promote an argument or perspective.

Disinformation: Misleading, incorrect, or false information presented with the intent to mislead an audience.

Problematic Narrative: Narratives that fall under the misinformation, malinformation, and/or disinformation umbrella; narratives that have the potential to cause harm in general.

Where is Disinformation Coming From?

When discussing disinformation, bad actors in Russia often come to mind. This is only a fraction of the story. The truth is a significant portion of disinformation in the United States has domestic origins.[1] Disinformation is a well-funded industry that ranges from hyperpartisan news outlets masquerading as unbiased local media, to bot accounts manipulating dialogue on social media platforms, to the organic promotion of extremist voices without consequence by social media companies. It may also originate from ordinary users and persons, who may or may not know the consequences of their actions, but by sharing it allow problematic narratives to spread through the communities they are a part of.[2]

Not all disinformation has domestic origins, however. There is overwhelming evidence some Russian-based groups, often with ties to the Kremlin, have promoted disinformation in American spaces with the goal of polarizing the United States and degrading faith in our democratic institutions – as well as to promote a pro-Russian and

---

[1] NPR
[2] Michigan Institute of Technology

pro-Putin worldview.[3] Tactics have often included the creation of fake social media accounts and fake news sites posing as Americans, accomplished through troll farms – an institutionalized group of internet provocateurs that seek to interfere in political opinions and decision-making.

There is also evidence Chinese and Vietnamese governments have been actively pushing disinformation campaigns in the United States. These two governments use similar tactics as Russian-based actors, creating fake accounts to manipulate public opinion and disseminate disinformation to the benefit of the governing parties through troll farms. In contrast to Russian-based actors, these operations are more interested in shifting public opinion to promote their governments' worldview, rather than to divide Americans.[4] Despite having the technology and resources, however, they also do not yet have the know-how to imitate Americans and our social cleavages to the same precision Russian-based actors are able to.

To this point, what also differentiates entities like the Chinese and Vietnamese governments from Russia is in lieu of being able to imitate Americans, they target diaspora communities. [5] Again, the narratives they push towards these communities are less about stoking divisions among the American population, but rather promoting propaganda and getting them to turn them against any United States policies they find unfavorable or negatively portrays the United States. This has had limited success thus far. However, with the Chinese government's full control of social media platforms such as WeChat, one of the most common platforms Chinese-speaking people use to connect with their community and coordinate everyday life, for example, the potential for this problem to grow is concerning

EXAMPLES OF FOREIGN DISINFORMATION:

- **[OceanLotus: Extending Cyber Espionage Operations Through Fake Websites](#) (Vietnam)**
- **[Who Are the Chinese Trolls of the '50 Cent Army'?](#) (China)**
- **[Russian election meddling is back -- via Ghana and Nigeria -- and in your feeds](#) (Russia)**

Regardless of its country of origin, problematic narratives can come from the top-down and bottom-up. Over the past few years, we have seen disinformation come directly from elected officials, political commentators, musicians, and others with name

---

[3] [Brookings.edu](#)
[4] [Brookings.edu](#)
[5] [ZDNet](#)

recognition – domestic and foreign alike. These top-down narratives are shared with a large audience due to the entity's already-existent wide reach, allowing it to quickly disseminate.

Bottom-up narratives, however, do not have as clear of a path. A common tactic is the artificial promotion of a narrative. In this scenario, bad actors coordinate the amplification of an article, post, or general talking point in large numbers in order to inject it into the national dialogue. This may be done through a network of media entities and influencers, as well as through bots.

The organic traction of narratives is also common, in which either a minor article, post, or other type of content/talking point manages to receive significant attention without artificial or coordinated intervention. These narratives can sometimes be harder to track, as they are often screenshotted or re-posted from the original post, or sometimes passed along like word of mouth – morphing into something new as it makes its way through the digital landscape.

Social media's algorithms and automation only worsen the problem. Once a user has started engaging with certain types of content, algorithms start feeding users more similar content. If a user has already been exposed and engaged with problematic content, they are significantly more likely to be pushed more of the same. This may cause a user to go down the rabbit hole of a dangerous echo chamber, distorting reality with no real mechanism to keep it in check.

How Does Disinformation Impact Asian and Pacific Islander American Communities?

Asian and Pacific Islanders, like other Americans, may find disinformation in their daily lives as they scroll through social media. There are several key factors that differentiate how disinformation impacts our communities in comparison to others, however.

Firstly, AAPIs are spread out across more platforms, often in-language, in comparison to other demographics. Some of these include Line, Kakao, WhatsApp, WeChat, Weibo, and Viber – which many AAPIs use as a main source of news. Effectively tracking the variety of narratives that may be disseminating is difficult, as a result of the numerous platforms AAPIs use. This issue is compounded by the fact these platforms heavily utilize private, closed spaces.

These in-language platforms also often have little to no infrastructure to combat disinformation, and typically face less public scrutiny to do anything about it, in comparison to social media companies such as Facebook. Even mainstream platforms such as Facebook, Instagram or Twitter, which AAPIs also use, already have relatively weak policies regarding disinformation and are inconsistent in enforcing said policies. The truth is, most social media platforms, whether it is Facebook or WeChat, are not doing enough to counter disinformation.

To make matters more difficult, the AAPI communities encompasses over 50 languages. Fully understanding the diversity of disinformation in AAPI communities requires the capacity to monitor sources in this wide array of languages. This issue is intensified by the fact platforms are less likely to flag disinformation in foreign languages, meaning AAPIs are potentially being exposed to more false and misleading narratives than the average user.

Fully understanding disinformation in AAPI spaces also requires a knowledge of the cultural context. Asian American population growth is led by immigration, and many new citizens come with different experiences and cultures that frame their understandings of "democracy" and "government," and what it means to be "American". Consequently, some may not understand certain things in an American context – causing a susceptibility to disinformation.

This is also true for some in Pacific Islander communities, despite Pacific Islander population growth not being driven by immigration. Views, values, and sentiment are passed down from generation to generation for some, shaped by the forms of government, political landscapes, and historical relationships with the United States their islands experienced. These cultural contexts can shape the kinds of problematic narratives specific communities are exposed to, and how any given narrative is understood.

One of the main reasons disinformation is able to disseminate so widely in AAPI spaces is often because there is a lack or absence of any good information at all, specifically in-language. With a large portion of AAPI populations having limited English proficiency and little to no in-language resources, a vacuum is created – allowing bad actors to seize an opportunity. Pacific Islanders especially face this problem, due to their small population size, are already overlooked even when distributing and publishing information in English. The amount of in-language materials is even less.

It is also important to note disinformation in AAPI spaces is not limited to social media. In addition to problematic cable news networks, with the number of older AAPIs who have limited English proficiency and who may not use the internet as often, the need for in-language radio and newspapers is high in comparison to other groups. Unfortunately, this vacuum is sometimes filled by local outlets and radio personalities who spread false information – these are sometimes domestic, sometimes foreign. These entities are often overlooked, as result of being in-language and and small size, making efforts to confront disinformation in our communities all the more strenuous.

Common Themes in AAPI Communities:

AAPIs come in contact with many of the same disinformation narratives that other Americans do. However, there are sometimes narratives that either are directly targeted towards AAPIs or resonate more strongly with AAPIs. The following are a few examples of problematic narratives:

- Anti-Affirmative action.
- Disaggregated data
- Placing blame for anti-Asian hate crimes, other societal woes on Black, Latino communities.
- COVID-19, vaccine disinformation.
- Conspiracy theories regarding 2020 election, QAnon, Antifa, voting-by-mail, and voter machines.
- Misleading anti-Communist, anti-Socialist narratives.
- Anti-Critical race theory.

Different ethnic groups may also be exposed to specific narratives related to the communities they are a part of. For example, there is a higher level of anti-President Xi Jinping content in Chinese and Vietnamese diaspora spaces versus others.

Combating Anti-Asian Hate & Disinformation

AAPIs are not only exposed to disinformation, but are increasingly the subject of disinformation as well – especially Asian Americans. This is a "double whammy" our communities face. These types of narratives often include:

- Placing blame for anti-Asian hate crimes, other societal woes on Black, Latino communities.
- Placing blame for COVID-19 on Asian Americans, particularly Chinese.

- Claiming an Asian American, particularly Chinese, are not truly American and are in fact loyal to the Chinese government.
- Claiming an Asian American is "communist."
- "Social justice initiatives" are discriminatory towards AAPIs.

Again, different groups of people may be exposed to specific anti-AAPI narratives related to the communities they are a part of. For example, there have been instances of problematic bad actors claiming "Asians are white-adjacent and do not care about Black people."

Detecting Disinformation:

If the information in something you are reading or hearing **seems too good to be true, is inconsistent with what other sources are saying, there are no other sources discussing this story, or appears to be overblown, exaggerated, or lacking in specific evidence** – these are tell-tale signs that disinformation or another type of problematic narrative might be at play.

Below are other tips to help identify problematic narratives.

Does the Post Make You Emotional?

Bad actors rely on emotional responses for their fake or misleading stories to gain traction. Does an article, post, or narrative you heard is provocative, and makes you want to take immediate action? If so, this may be the first hint you should consult multiple sources regarding the story. Sensational language evoking emotions from the reader may be exaggerating, or distorting the truth, about a story.

Can you find the same topic covered by other, reputable sources? Can you fact-check yourself?

One of the most important things one can do if something seems suspicious is check to see if other reputable sources are covering the narrative or assertion. This may include well-known national news outlets, trusted local news media, government websites, encyclopedias, and non-partisan fact-checking websites. Verifying a narrative can be a simple Google search away.

If something seems like big news but there is only one source of coverage, take caution.

Check the Source!

If you cannot find other reputable sources about what you are researching, check the source of the information! If it appears to be a news outlet or blog, use **MediaBiasFactcheck.com** or **AllSides.com** to determine if it is a trustworthy source.

If it is coming from an individual, account, or group, investigate them. See what other types of things they are saying and posting; oftentimes, it becomes obvious that this person or group may be hyper-partisan or conspiratorial with an agenda. Additionally, if they are associating with other established bad actors, this is a strong indicator their narrative/s should be taken with caution.

Other hints include checking to see if the account has any real photos of them, when an account was created, and organic engagement. Accounts without any real photos of the person that were created recently, and if the post at hand has significantly more engagement than they usually receive, there is a very high chance this may be part of a push to artificially promote a problematic narrative.

If a source does not appear to be identifiable, take the information with extreme caution.

Does the information fit comfortably into your belief system?

Identifying disinformation can be difficult if something appears believable, especially if it already fits into our existing belief system. When consuming any information from a source you are unfamiliar with or does not have any sourcing, ask yourself if this fits too comfortably into your belief system. This allows us to challenge our assumptions and catch us from making the mistake of believing something untrue or misleading.

Examples of Disinformation:

Now that you have read about how to detect disinformation, let's put it to the test!

We have compiled various headlines and online accounts to see if you can identify what is real, what's false, and what's misleading.

Example 1

Is this story REAL or DISINFORMATION?

At first glance, this story was posted by a verified account. A quick Google search shows Ben Shapiro is a far-right political commentator, and The Daily Wire, the news outlet the article is from, has a history pushing problematic right-wing narratives. Media Bias/Fact check ranks The Daily Wire as an extreme and questionable right-wing source. These are tall-tale signs this story needs to be investigated.

Upon opening the article, the story is attacking Stop AAPI Hate and its co-founders on two fronts:

- ○ Criticizing a letter they sent to President Joe Biden regarding the Department of Justice's "China Initiative" pending an independent review if the program has unfairly targeted individuals based on their race
- ○ Claiming at least two organizers with a group partnered with Stop AAPI Hate were journalists for Chinese state-controlled media that came to the US on a visitor student visa – theremore meaning Stop AAPI Hate has ties to the Chinese Communist Party. This "finding" was from a Daily Wire "investigation."

The article also indirectly questions if Stop AAPI Hate and associated groups are actually "advocacy" groups and if they are actually "Asian *American*."

The investigation they refer to in the article is linked. Upon review, it purports that because two Chinese journalists worked for Chinese state-run media that this means they have ties to the Chinese Communist Party, and by working with Chinese for Affirmative Action, a partner of Stop AAPI Hate – that means Stop AAPI Hate does too.

There is no indication in the articles that Stop AAPI Hate has worked *directly* with the Chinese Communist Party, nor is it clear that Chinese for Affirmative Action has either. Moreover, a quick Google search finds the only others reporting this story also have right-wing ties, and no mainstream outlet or commentator is discussing the story. This assertion is racist and a stretch. However, the story contains some truths – meaning it is **disinformation**.

Example 2

[Above](#)

Is this story REAL or DISINFORMATION?

First things first, this page has no verified symbol. Upon googling the outlet, it is clear this is an established conservative media outlet. Checking through Media Bias/Fact Check, the site is ranked as right-wing with a mixed history of factual reporting. This is not a good sign for the story, but let's investigate further.

Upon opening the story, it claims that a board member of Fair Fight Action, a voting rights group founded by Stacey Abrams, once claimed mail-in ballots are the most vulnerable to voter fraud. This may be hard to believe, and seems sensational. In the

article, they cite a Fox News article as evidence. Within the Fox News article, there is a link to the NPR interview the board member previously stated.[6] It should be noted the interview is not about absentee voting but rather expanding access to voting; the Human Events article extracts a single quote to make a story.

While this story clearly has partisan intentions to discredit Abrams and Fair Fight Action, it is a *real* story.

Example 3

[Above](#)

Is this story REAL or DISINFORMATION?

This post and article's language is sensational and feels impossible. That is the first sign this is a post of concern. Upon looking at the account that tweeted it, it lacks any photos of the user and its posts and description show it is a hyper partisan account. Beyond that, the user does not tweet any of their own thoughts – they largely only retweet content from other questionable accounts. There is reason to believe this is not a real person, meaning this might be part of an attempt to artificially amplify a narrative, although we are unable to confirm this.

---

[6] [NPR](#)

Second, putting LawEnforcementToday.com through Media Bias/Fact Check reveals the outlet is right-wing and has a mixed history of factual reporting. Upon reading the article, it claims "illegal immigrants" will be able to vote in two Vermont municipalities. It goes on to discuss some Republicans' backlash to the measure and how the ordinances came to pass.

This article appears to be using some factual information, but should be double checked. Upon looking to see if other outlets are reporting on the story, it appears several partisan outlets have reported on the story. Avoiding these and using non-partisan outlets such as *The Associated Press* or *Burlington Free Press* instead, it becomes clear that only noncitizens under a federally sanctioned legal category may vote.[7] Therefore, the claim that illegal immigrants are able to vote in these two municipalities' elections is undeniably false. This is blatant **disinformation**.

How to Converse with Others Pushing Problematic Narratives:

It happens to all of us. Your Aunt posts false information about COVID-19, your friend mentions they heard "illegal immigrants" voted in an election, or your old high school classmate unknowingly retweets a well-known bad actor.

Knowing how to navigate these conversations can be tricky. Our initial instinct may be to scream and ask how they could say or post such a thing, but of course this is a poor decision. We encourage you to have these important conversations with friends and family, and to stay vigilant about what they are talking about in their circles you do not have access to, but there are best practices. We've provided some tips on how to tackle these types of situations:

Know What You're Talking About *Before* Engaging

Suspecting something is misleading or false is not the same as *knowing* something is misleading or false. Confronting disinformation without the correct information is not constructive. If this interaction is online, try fact-checking the claim yourself. Remember to look for authoritative and reliable sources.

If this interaction is in-person, read the situation. If it is someone you are comfortable with, consider asking where they heard what they shared. Consider suggesting you

---

[7] [The Associated Press](#)

should *both* fact-check the story, or politely say you're unsure that is true but you are not certain. This allows you to sow some doubt without being declaratory or inflammatory, and encourages the other to re-examine what they have shared.

Know When, and When Not, to Engage

Not all battles are worth fighting. If it is someone you know is open to feedback or conversation, privately message or tell them what they have shared is false, misleading, or offensive. For example, this could be done by saying, "I was curious about what you posted, so I did some research and I found this…and wanted to let you know" or "I know you did not mean it, but the post you shared is problematic/offensive. This is why…I'm happy to discuss more." Open with empathy and try to understand where they are coming from. It is also important to respond in good faith, and truly *listen* to the person – making sure they feel heard and understood. Ask questions, lay common ground, and try to understand where the person is coming from. People are significantly more likely to be receptive with this type of response.[8]

If this person is known to be argumentative, aggressive, and/or set in their beliefs, it may be better to avoid the conversation. You can still try kindly messaging or telling them what they have shared is flawed, but if it escalates, know when to disengage.

Avoid publicly commenting on or engaging with someone's post – this can be shameful and embarrassing for the person, and make them less receptive to your point. Moreover, engaging with a problematic post, whether it is positive or negative, helps fuel the reach the post achieves. It is only suggested to do this if a post has received a lot of engagement; a public correction can help reduce the harm the post may already be doing.

Be a Resource!

Share your knowledge of how to detect disinformation! Fact-checking a story is only part of the solution. It requires improved media literacy across the board. Give your friends and family the tips you've learned in this guide so they may detect disinformation on their own in the future!

---

[8] First Draft News

Combatting Disinformation

Understanding where problematic narratives come from, how they disseminate, how to detect it, and how to converse with others about it are only the first steps towards confronting this pandemic of disinformation we are facing. There must be policy change to hold social media companies accountable, and to restructure the ways in which they handle disinformation and other problematic content. There must also be societal-level improvement in media literacy, and consequences for problematic entities who knowingly push out and profit from disinformation.

These changes will not happen overnight, however. In the meantime, there are important steps you can take to combat disinformation in your everyday lives – and as an organization or influencer.

Do Not Engage with Problematic Posts

The number one rule of combatting disinformation is DO NOT DIRECTLY ENGAGE WITH PROBLEMATIC POSTS. As mentioned earlier, engaging with a problematic post, whether it is positive or negative, gives them a wider audience due to the way algorithms work. There are very few instances where directly engaging with disinformation is constructive. Avoid at all costs.

Inoculation

One of the most effective ways to prevent the spread of problematic narratives is to put out *good* information before bad information reaches a person. Those who are exposed to problematic information but were previously exposed to countering good information are more likely to be skeptical of something that contradicts something they already know. This process is known as *inoculation*.

A key to successful inoculation is anticipating narratives. Getting out good information before bad information spreads requires having an understanding of what to be prepared for. To do this, we can look back and see what types of narratives and information have spread in the past and when. For example, we know attacks on voting-by-mail are likely to pop up around election time. To combat this, posting and sharing information on the benefits and effectiveness of voting-by-mail *before* the anti-vote-by-mail conversation gains steam is critical.

Not everything can be predicted ahead of time, however. That is why being able to respond quickly is crucial. If a problematic narrative has only recently begun to gain momentum, it is likely there are many people who have not yet been exposed. At the end of the day, making sure good information is getting out there is one the best things you can do.

Is a Response Necessary?

In the midst of all the disinformation chaos we face everyday, we may often feel compelled to try and speak out. Oftentimes, there may be no need to. Bad actors rely on engagement, positive and negative, to get their message out to more people. Taking a minute to assess how widespread and dangerous a narrative actually is critical to determining if engaging with the narrative is more helpful than harmful.

Making this determination may be difficult. Some key things to consider when making this decision include:

- How many times has this content been shared?
  - If content has not been shared several times, this might mean its reach is low – meaning few people have seen it. Boosting it might mean unintentionally causing more people to be exposed to it.

- How long has this content been posted for?
  - If something was posted a few days ago, and still does not appear to receive widespread attention – the narrative is likely dead. Bad actors often push out several narratives in an attempt to see what gains traction; many of these narratives never go anywhere. Narratives not receiving organic traction do not need responding to. It is important to note these stories, however, because they can always be resuscitated.

- Is this content something new, or is it another variation of something we have seen before?
  - Narratives pushed online are often a variation of a pre-existing narrative; same story with different details. The key to combating these types of stories is not to respond to these specific stories, but continued inoculation. For example, we often see bad actors trying to pit Black and Asian communities against each other by solely sharing incidents where a Black person attacks an Asian person. Rather than responding to these

individual stories, continuing to push out talking points such as "research confirms white Americans are the largest perpetrators of anti-Asian violence" or "Black and Asian Americans are both victims of white supremacy, and we must stand together to dismantle systemic racism" will be significantly more constructive. The more a point is driven home, the stronger the impact it will have.

- Are you seeing this on your friend's, family's, or acquaintances' feeds?
  - Consider where you saw this narrative. Was it an account you've never heard of, someone with few followers, or someone you know is waist-deep in problematic content? If so, this is likely a narrative isolated in fringe spaces – not something that has penetrated mainstream conversation. If it is someone you would not normally see share or be exposed to problematic content, this is a strong indicator the narrative has gone mainstream and may require a response.

- Who is the source? Have notable entities shared this?
  - Consider the source of the information. Again, if it is an account you've never heard of, someone with few followers, or someone you know is waist-deep in problematic content – it likely does not require a response. If the source is a notable figure, organization, or outlet – this does mean there is a good chance many people have encountered their problematic information. Depending on the entity and other factors, this may be a time to respond.

Truth Sandwich

If you have come to the conclusion a response is necessary, George Lakoff, an esteemed cognitive linguist and philosopher, suggests using a "Truth Sandwich" to talk about it.

A **truth sandwich** includes:

1. Starting with the truth. People are likely to remember the first (and last) thing they read or hear.
2. Identify the lie. Avoid amplifying the specific language of the narrative, if possible.
3. Return to the truth. Make sure to always repeat truths more than lies.

Using this method will leave an audience more likely to remember the truth, rather than the lie – while still allowing one to debunk and discuss the problematic disinformation at-hand.

Example:

Asian Americans have faced increased discrimination and hate since the beginining of the pandemic.

Many are pointing fingers, trying to pit Asian Americans against other communities of color.

Let us be clear. Studies show again and again what we know to be true: anti-asian hate is driven by white perpetrators and white supremacy.

Trusted Messengers

Inoculation and a truth sandwich may fall flat if the person sharing good information is unknown, has no clear credibility on the issue, or at worst: is viewed as untrustworthy – regardless of their agency. One of the most critical parts of reaching an audience is being a trusted messenger.

It is important to have a realistic conversation with oneself with your standing among a target audience, and if you are the trusted messenger that meets the moment. If the audience you are trying to reach does not recognize your agency on an issue, it may be more useful to enlist others.

Who in the community do people look up to? Who is a well-regarded individual in a given topic area? Who is a notable person people listen to? Who is a friend or family member people respect? These are the figures people will listen to, and have a higher chance of getting a message through to those who may need to hear it the most. Consider working with these figures, and have them go to their communities, following, or audience to disseminate good information.

That said, everyone is a trusted messenger among their own network – those who already trust them.[9] This may include friends, family, co-workers, acquaintances, supporters, etc. Leveraging this influence cannot be understated.

---

[9] USA Today

Undermine Bad Actors' Platform

Another one of the most effective ways to stop disinformation in its tracks is to undermine the problematic messenger/s. Avoid arguing about specific claims if possible. Instead, emphasize this messenger or messengers are not reliable sources. This may include pointing out they lack the medical credentials, have a history of making false claims, or have ties to well-known problematic and/or conspiratorial entities. This can be more productive than attempting to convince people which "facts" are correct.

In-Language, In-Language, In-Language!

As mentioned earlier, one of the reasons for a proliferation of problematic narratives in AAPI spaces is the lack of *good* information. One of the best solutions to this is making sure good information gets promoted in these spaces, but it means nothing if people are unable to understand it. With many in AAPI communities having limited English proficiency, it is *crucial* efforts to confront disinformation in AAPI communities incorporate translated materials.

Reporting Posts

One of the simplest ways to combat disinformation is just a few clicks away. If you come across problematic content, you are often able to report it – in the hopes that it gets taken down. Getting others to report the same post increases the chances it will be taken down, or at least flagged, by social media companies. This cannot be a means to an end, however. Reporting posts has mixed results of success.