

## **The Contestation of Power Between Newsrooms and Media Owners in Television Stations in Indonesia**

**Alem Febri Sonni, Pawennari Hijjang, Tasrifin Tahara,  
and M. Iqbal Sultan**

Doctoral Programme of Anthropology,  
Hasanuddin University, Makassar

### **Abstract**

This article describes the contest for power and influence that goes on behind the scenes of Indonesian television broadcasting stations. There is a dynamic relationship between agent and structure – journalists and media owners – in news broadcasting in Indonesian television stations. The newsroom was previously idealised as an independent, neutral space free from intervention, but its independence has been eroded by political contestations involving media owners. Politics relies greatly on the dissemination of information to rally support from constituents. Television is currently the most powerful medium for that purpose. This research is a qualitative study that obtained data from two of Indonesia's largest television stations, Metro TV and TV One. Data collection involved literature review, observation, and in-depth interviews. The obtained data was analysed in three steps: (1) data processing, (2) data reduction, and (3) data display to allow for conclusion drawing. The results of this research show that media owners have significant influence over the content of news broadcasts. This is largely due to a lack of strict government legislation guaranteeing newsroom independence from capital influences that exist in the television industry. Indonesian culture also plays a role in how powerful the regulations that protect the interests and policies of capitalists are.

**Keywords:** television; broadcasting; newsroom; media owners

### **Introduction**

The development of the media in the context of the dissemination of information in the Reformation Era has led to the proliferation of media stations in various regions of Indonesia. The demands of the 1998 Reformation Movement made freedom of speech the basic right of the whole community. The presence of new media stations was a source of momentum behind the dissemination of information. Unexpectedly, the media has become more associated with breakthroughs in information technology. Media convergence has become a

common term. Information is not spread through mainstream media alone, but also via new chains of communication that link all media affiliates. Control of this information network is the end goal of "world domination".

Television as a visual and auditory medium act as the eyes and ears of the modern information community and has three primary roles: it serves as a medium for information, education, and entertainment. The openness of the media sector to investments, guaranteed by law, has led to its massive development in Indonesia. Broadcasting Law Number 32 of 2002 opened the doors to government interference in response to the rapid growth of the powers of the broadcast media. Control of information was an important foundation of several new regulations.

The development of politics was also affected by these changes in the mechanisms of Indonesian democracy, with potentially significant impact on the ebb and flow of information. The mechanisms of politics naturally place great emphasis on image branding and optics. Such conditions inherently create demand for the involvement of media institutions, as information distributors, in politics. The demand for media as an important tool for branding and optics has led to favouritism in its use for such purposes.

So intense is the democratic process in this country. Due to the demand for branding, there is an ever-increasing focus on television as a popular medium for enhancing an individual's image and branding. At every political level in this country, including elections at the district/city level, provincial elections, legislative elections, and presidential elections, television plays a dominant role in the dissemination of information and how the information is served. Without hesitation, many television stations, such as Metro TV ("Knowledge to Elevate") and TVOne ("Election TV"), have made a brand for themselves as serving purely political content.

According to Graeme Turner (1991:128-129), television programming at its core accommodates social practices that constantly represent social reality. A number of television programmes are capable of producing social reality and involve dynamic and complex interactions and negotiations between a number of parties. Without exception, television programming packaged within the context of political image branding has become the target of complex and dynamic interactions and negotiations.

These interactions and negotiations involve three stages: pre-broadcast, broadcast, and post-broadcast stages. The pre-broadcast stage, for example, involves an in-house or out-house production team. In each stage of production, there are several parties with their own personal interests, such as the editor-in-chief, producers, executive producers, assistant executive producers, coverage coordinator, documentation team, editors, visual and quality control team, editor secretary, news team, and even news sources and informants.

## Research Method

This study used the qualitative research methodology, which puts more emphasis on processes rather than outcomes and tend to involve the relationship of trust between the researcher and the informant. The subjects of this research are news journalists working for television stations in Indonesia, specifically those involved directly in the production process of news coverage on television.

The informants were media workers and owners of television stations. The informants include news producers, legal officers, heads of news agencies, broadcasting regulation makers, and broadcast monitoring teams.

This research was conducted at two national television stations, TVOne and MetroTV. Data was collected through observation, in-depth interviews, and documentation study. Data analysis was done in three stages: data processing, data reduction, and data display with interpretation. A conclusion was drawn from the results of the data analysis.

## Interactions Between Actors, Media, and Politics

The interactions between actors (media owners), media, and politics take place in the news room. As described by George Herbert Mead in his book "Mind, Self, and Society" (1934), the four stages of the social act are (1) impulse, (2) perception, (3) manipulation, and (4) consummation. The impulse stage is the stage in which an individual captures external phenomena and begins at birth. The perception stage begins when individuals actively choose the situations and conditions of their environment. The manipulation stage is formed upon the answer to the question: "What should we do?". How a situation is interpreted is determined by the role of the individual. The consummation stage is the stage when individuals are able to resolve their issues in a variety of ways because their consummation is fitting for the role they hold.

Mead initiated his thinking with the concept of "self", which is seen as one of the forms that creates social growth. Engagement of "self" is the result of social interactions and conditioning and not a biological or logical precondition of any social interaction. Moreover, self is a result of the reflexivity of the subject. For Mead, the reflexivity of self is what "distinguishes it from other objects and the body". The body and other objects are not objects to themselves. Moreover, this reflexivity of self is the cast off point for distinguishing between human and animal consciousness. The term "consciousness" may describe "a certain sense of awareness" that results from an organism's sensitivity to its environment (i.e. animal consciousness only responds to events in the environment). Another definition of "consciousness" describes a form of awareness that instinctively refers to "self" and "conscious" (p.165). In other words, if animals respond more to nature, then human "awareness" is a form of pre-reflexive awareness that refers to the nakedness of the world (p. 135-136). "The individual enters as such into his own experience only as

an object” to itself when he forms relationships and interacts socially or when he deals with other individuals within an organised social environment (p. 225). Self-consciousness is the result of a process in which the individual acts and reacts to other individuals, where he attempts to view himself from the perspective of others (p. 172). "Self" as an object arises from the individual's experience with "selves" other than his own "self".

According to Mead, "self" emerges through social acts of three inter-subjective varieties: language, drama, and play. There are three forms of symbolic interactions (i.e. social interactions that occur through the use of shared symbols, such as words, boundaries, roles, body language, etc.). Language, as Mead views it, is communication through significant symbols. One such form of communication of significant symbols is body language. Body language is delivered through actions and responses. It is assumed that the role and perspective of other individuals is the foundation of objectivity and the realisation of self. When the reactions of others becomes an important part of behaviour, the individual arises from its experiences as self (p. 195), which give birth to social acts.

Mead's description of dialectics between the individual and others fundamentally implies the complexity of the relationships between self and others. The role of each individual "self" is to manipulate group symbols in order to create orderly social life. From this idea came the term symbolic interactionism. Its supporters developed the idea for the analysis of joint action as a creative and cooperative effort. However, it should be realised that social agreements and social control are never complete; the conflict between the individual and the group as well as between groups is a part of the natural order of everyday human society. This happens because each individual assumes the perspective of the generalised other. Human interaction gave rise to the awareness that individuals must assume the role of others, and, thus, scholars of symbolic interactionism analogized social life to theater (see Berger, 1976; Blumer, 1968; and Goffman, 1959).

Referring to Goffman's (1959) approach, the stage is the arena of a show or a play for every individual within a physical or socio-cultural setting. Through this stage, each individual presents their "self" through social acts in the form of impression management. In other words, life is a drama performance packaged in such a way to control the impression of our self upon others or an observation of the expressions of social acts on the stage of social life. The stage (as a physical setting) may be divided into three elements: the front stage, which is formally where actors play their specific social roles and offer the representation of self in a public setting; the back stage, which is informal, a space closed-off to the public that provides the background for the scene; and the audience, who are indirectly involved in the proceedings of the show. Each social actor is attempting to actively shape the meaning of a given situation or how it is perceived. He must give his best performance when interacting with others. To ensure a good performance, there must be harmony between the actors, the property, and the acting on the stage.

### The Stage as a Physical Setting

<b>Audience</b> (indirectly acts as event stimulus)
<b>Front stage</b> (formally the place where social events or dynamics occur)
<b>Back stage</b> (formally has nothing to do with events, but in this region occurs the informal formulation of strategies and ideas of an event or social action)

Thus, on the stage, every actor plays many roles throughout his life. On this stage, the connection between the concepts of role, performance, face, and personal space works to analyse self presentation and impression management. On this stage, the complexity of the social interactions between each individual becomes evident.

In his book (1961), Goffman studied patients at St. Elisabeth Washington mental asylum where he could observe the complex social interactions and situations of each individual. With the mental asylum as the "setting", the actors were transformed by the institution into submissive conformists. They performed routine, menial tasks on the basis of reward and punishment. However, even in this kind of situation, the actors carried out hidden symbolic acts – in the name of freedom – as forms of protests against the "regime" of the asylum. Goffman treated the mental asylum as a social space that functioned as a prison of sorts, isolating these individuals (with mental illnesses) from the world at large. He described in great details the daily regimen of the patients there, these isolated peoples (both patients and caretakers), with the intent to understand how human behaviour is influenced by organisational compulsion. Goffman concluded that each person as an actor is always capable of defeating a system that is constructed to limit his/her social acts.

From this conclusion, at their core, social acts spring up from concrete interactions that call for individuals to react to the law. Moreover, every individual relates with others in order to share meaning; thus, their actions are based on the roles of each individual, or free subject, with all the motives and instruments for shaping meaning that they hold. The actor is free to respond to all as they appear (the seeming) and interprets its symptoms (the being) or derives their own meaning from all available truths. Social acts can be more easily understood as how individuals create and make use of meanings, rather than how clues, norms, and cultural values provide explanations for the meanings of social acts (compare Blumer, 1969; Goffman, 1974:247-300; and Sutrisno, 2003:64).

Adherents of symbolic interactionism are aware that customs, roles, and social institutions determine and shape the rules of social interaction. However,

such rules only work to a certain extent, and at a certain level, they become too vague and ambiguous to be defined in details. These social rules act as a framework, allowing space for each individual to interact and discover resolutions to existing problems. Adherents of symbolic interactionism believe that each individual creates his/her own interpretation of social reality based on previous interactions. On the basis of that interpretation, individuals enter into a number of types of social relationships. This is an inter-personal activity. From these inter-personal activities arise a consensus about "what is happening?" and "who" plays which "role" within the "drama". These activities don't always have to end in consensus. Each "self" has their own interpretation of what is happening (compare to Bulmer, 1969).

Each individual, according to supporters of symbolic interactionism, views social reality as an objective fact that must be taken into account alongside the beliefs and behaviours of others. Each individual must interpret these behaviours in order to continue to interact and develop relationships with others. However, no individual is required to accept the views of others, as he plays no part in the relationships that form standard interpretation about social reality. Social meanings are the results of collaborative selection of traits in the external world that the group considers meaningful. Based on this, one could make the metaphoric statement that social life is more of a "game" than it is a mere "play". Individuals are free to act and collaborate within the loose restrictions of social rules. They do not have to create definite lines or pre-conceived behaviours. As subjects, individuals are always capable of defeating systems designed to restrict their social acts. (Blumer, 1969; Goffman, 1974; dan Mead, 1934).

Even so, it must be recognised that such rules and norms are often actively and creatively challenged – even manipulated – by actors in facing their environments as part of social acts. Thus, the social acts of actors can both create or destroy social systems. This occurs because actors are constantly trying to manipulate the normative order. Continuing this line of thought, in daily life, one can see clashes and mutual attraction between normative and pragmatic rules, norms and actions, as well as ideas and social acts (compare with Baily in Siafuddin, 2005:175-180). These push and pull actions between normative and pragmatic rules, norms and actions, as well as ideas and social acts then become subjects of discussion in the sphere of anthropological study.

The implication of the central role of the actor in the symbolic interactionism approach contains a number of perspectives. For example, paying special attention to individuals that utilise social spaces by reading situations and interactions can build discussions about the situation and context of behaviour in the "arena" of social play. In addition, this implies that the relationship between meaning (situation) and the actor is expressed through action, creating meaning, and self-representation of the identity of each individual. From this, we can see the role of semiotics in interaction (verbal), as each actor interprets context and situations differently. On the other hand, a number of these situations and contexts

have a ritualistic aspect within social institutions, which leads to elaboration in the Durkheimian tradition (compare with Astono and Soembogo, 2005:73-85).

To that end, the symbolic interactionism approach is just one microsocial sphere that forces full and intense observation of the social acts of the actor. For example, themes such as political conflict, determining public policy, the growth of social movements, organisational dynamics, and even trends in the world of the arts cannot be expressed in details or comprehensively without direct observation of the process conducted by the actor. This is done to view the inter-role relationships between actors in social interaction. Similarly, when examining the social acts of actors (individuals) in social spaces as they go about their daily activities, a researcher must use high-intensity data collection methods. One high-intensity data collection method for viewing research subjects is participant observation.

Also, the symbolic interactionism approach at the micro level studies the social acts of individuals – though it begins from a different starting point – and also intersects with a number of other perspectives. Discussions on the relationship between "role" and "action" also intersect with function analysis, the theory of voluntary action, and Parsons' social order (1949, 1951, and 1966). When placing the positions of actors or the setting of a social act, symbolic interactionism shares similarities with Anthony Giddens' concepts of "space-time" and "structuring" (1979, 1981, 1984, and 2000). Likewise, when actors (agents) attempt to define self within social and structural spaces, symbolic interactionism intersects with the concepts of habitus and Bourdieu's domain (1977 and 1983). Such intersections of thought are further discussed below.

### **Media As The Intersection Between Habitus And Bourdieu's Fields**

There is some overlap between symbolic interactionism and the thoughts of Bourdieu (1977), primarily with regards to the question of the role of the actor or agent in defining his "self". Bourdieu (1977) attacked the structuralist thought for creating what he felt was a distorted objectivity and placing the "stranger" (i.e. observer or social scientist) in a position of mapping out agents and institutions in abstract social space. In Bourdieu's opinion, such thinking ignored the role of the actor and practical action in social life, particularly questions of strategy and subjective emotions. This argument is similar to that of symbolic interactionism, which states that each individual interacts with others in the act of creating shared meaning (compare with Blumer, 1969 and Goffman, 1974).

Agents or individuals use habitus in responding to social reality, where habitus is a subjective structure – or interpretive schemes that work implicitly – formed from the experiences of the individual in their interactions with other individuals within a network of objective structure in social spaces. In other words, habitus is identified by the schemes that make up the conceptual representation of objects in social reality. For example, an individual will internalise a collection of schemes throughout his/her life. Through the said schemes, the individual

perceives, understands, values, and evaluates social reality. These schemes interweave to form a cognitive structure that provides a framework of action for each individual in his/her everyday interactions with others.

In other words, Bourdieu's concept of habitus attempts to reconcile the idea of structure with the idea of practice by offering numerous habitus in a variety of ways. Such ways include the conceptualisation of the habitus as empirical tendencies to act in specific ways (lifestyles): as motivation, preferences, tastes, and emotions; as deeply ingrained behaviours; as a means of viewing the world (cosmology); as practical social skills and capabilities; and as aspirations and hopes relating to life changes and careers. These many different aspects indicate that habitus is a disposition that may vary based on the situation at hand. Thus, Bourdieu associated habitus with sub-conscious or non-reflexive activity. Habitus is not based on reasoning but impulsive action. Habitus allows individuals to react efficiently in all aspects of life.

In addition, Bourdieu revealed a link between habitus and field. Fields, according to Bourdieu (1977), are networks of relations between objective positions within a social order independent of individual consciousness. A sphere is not an intersubjective bond between individuals but rather a type of structured relationship where the positions and hierarchy of individuals within it are determined spontaneously; this is because habitus allows individuals to spontaneously create relationships with external parties. These interactions with external parties form fields, or networks of relations between objective positions. Thus, fields are a metaphor used by Bourdieu to describe the condition of a structured and dynamic society with all the resources contained within.

In summary, there is an intersection of thought between symbolic interactionism as described by Goffman (1971 and 1974) and the ideas of Bourdieu (1977 and 1983), especially regarding the subjectivist-interactionist perspective centered on analysis of the individual. However, the two concepts differ on how the individual responds to the presence of structure in daily life. Goffman (1971 and 1974) placed these structures in a position far from the individual because individuals are free to respond to all that is apparent and create their own meaning from the truths they receive. In line with the adherents of other symbolic interactionism arguments, social action can be understood more from how people create and use meanings rather than how the instructions, norms and cultural values provide explanations for the meaning of social action. However, Bourdieu (1983) argues that social structures have the power to force and direct social agents in reacting to and evaluating their environment. In addition, structural properties are inherent in the everyday life of each individual as they are implicit with fields where contestations of position and power occur. These contestations have the power to transform or preserve fields of power, and positions determine how capital is distributed specifically among the actors within the sphere. Each individual may interact with the habitus, formulated as follows: (habitus and capital) + field = practice.

Bourdieu's thinking responds to modes of theoretical knowledge between subjectivism and objectivism. Although it arises from a different way of thinking, such thought does somewhat overlap with the interpretive anthropology approach that gave birth to symbolic form theory. Geertz (1973) – who is considered an adherent of interpretive anthropology or symbolic interpretivism – attempted to reformulate concepts of culture, thought, and ideology in opposition to subjectivism and objectivism. Geertz also avoided mentalistic conceptions on culture, thought, and ideology that leaned toward extrinsic theory, i.e. the theory that considers such concepts as public reality. He also avoided any connotations that may be associated with these concepts, categorising them under the realm of personal feelings that are vague and inaccessible. It is shown that these concepts make up the world of objects that are bright enough to be observed. Meanwhile, culture is essentially a publicly portrayed document. According to Geertz (1973:10), though it is idealistic, it is not in a person's mind; it is not physical; and it is not supernatural. When human behaviour is viewed as symbolic action, "...the question as to whether culture is a patterned conduct or a frame of mind, or even whether the two are somehow mixed together, loses sense".

The intersection between Bourdieu (1977) and Geertz (1973) can also be seen in how the two argued the concept of disposition, which they considered the result of organised action based on meanings that are similar to the meaning of words like structure. For example, Geertz (1973) studied the social acts of actors without denying the importance of structure (both objective and subjective), an idea supported by Bourdieu (1977). Also, structure will always be "negotiated" by actors, thus creating a system of order based upon meanings and symbols. With these meanings and symbols, individuals communicate, establish, and develop ideas about life. Symbolic tools in symbolic interpretivism are considered behaviour controllers, while cultural processes are considered as negotiations of systems of meanings and symbols that must be interpreted by each actor (agent).

This is different from symbolic interactionism, which tends to deny the structural frame. Actors create their own interpretation of social reality based on the social interactions they experience. On the basis of this interpretation, individuals enter into a number of types of social relationships. This is an inter-personal activity, and these inter-personal activities lead to a level of consensus about "what is happening" and "who plays which role" in this "drama". These activities don't have to produce consensus as each "self" has its own perspective. Social action can be understood as a description of the actor creating and utilising meanings, and not instructions, norms, and cultural values that provide explanations for the meanings of the said social actions (compare with Blumer 1969 and Goffman 1974). From this, we can see the differences in the arguments between symbolic interpretivism and symbolic interactionism regarding the social actions of actors in their daily lives.

## Mapping Media Capital

"Diversity of Ownership" is not an alien term to those in the business of broadcasting. Law 32 of 2002 sets firm regulations on ownership of media, specifically broadcast media, with particular reference to the social side effects. Regulations on ownership are critical in this era of democracy and freedom of information.

Law 32 was passed in response to the development of the broadcasting industry, particularly television, which spread quickly to regions throughout Indonesia. Programming was relayed from a central hub, usually a single-owner business located in Jakarta. The implementation of Law 32 has encountered challenges, especially considering the sizable influence and capital power of media owners.

Agus Sudibyo and Nezar Patria conducted a study mapping out ownership of media in Indonesia. This study, titled "The Television Industry in Post-Authoritarian Indonesia", revealed the composition of media company ownership in Indonesia. Most media businesses were founded and owned by a few companies, including Kompas Group, Trans Corp, MNC Group, and Bakrie & Brothers Group. Sudibyo and Nezar's most important discovery (2013:272) was the prevalence of TV station owners who held positions of power in political parties. Aburizal Bakrie, the owner of TV One and AnTV, is the General Chairman of the Golkar Party. Meanwhile, Surya Paloh, who owns Metro TV and Media Indonesia Group, is the founding Chairman of the Democratic National Party (Nasdem). Surya Paloh formed an alliance with the owner of MNC Group, Hary Tanoesoedibyo, in managing his party.

A vast majority of print and electronic mass media businesses in Indonesia are controlled by only 13 giant companies. The MNC Group, owned by Hary Tanoesoedibyo, owns 20 television stations, 22 radio stations, 7 print media businesses, and 1 online media business; Kompas Gramedia Group, owned by Jacob Oetomo, has 10 television stations, 12 radio stations, 89 print media companies, and 2 online media businesses; Elang Mahkota Teknologi, owned by Eddy Kusnadi Sariaatmadja, owns 3 television stations and 1 online media business; Mahaka Media, owned by Abdul Gani and Erick Tohir, owns 2 television stations, 19 radio stations, and 5 print media companies; CT Group, owned by Chairul Tanjung, owns 2 television stations, and 1 online media business.

Berita Satu Media Holdings/Lippo Group, owned by James Riady, has 2 television stations, 10 print media companies, and 1 online media company; Media Group, owned by Surya Paloh, has 1 television station and 3 print media companies; Visi Media Asia (Bakrie & Brothers), owned by Anindya Bakrie, has 2 television stations and 1 online media business; Jawa Pos Group, owned by Dahlan Iskan and Azrul Ananda, owns 20 television stations, 171 print media businesses, and 1 online media company; MRA Media, owned by Adiguna Soetowo and Soetikno Soedarjo, owns 11 radio stations and 16 print media companies; Femina Group, owned by Pia

Alisyahbana and Mirta Kartohadiprodjo, owns 2 radio stations and 14 print media companies; Tempo Int Media, owned by the Tempo Group, owns 1 television station, 1 radio station, 3 print media companies, and 1 online media business; Meda Bali post Group (KMB), owned by Satria Narada, has 9 television stations, 8 radio stations, 8 print media companies, and 2 online media businesses.

### **The Newsroom as An Arena for Cultural Reproduction**

The newsroom is the kitchen where all information is processed, from raw data to distribution-ready content, and it is inseparable from the influence of the media culture formed when television first entered Indonesia as a means of information dissemination. The beginning of cultural reproduction in the television industry is closely associated with the behaviours of its actors.

The process of cultural reproduction is an active process that confirms its existence in social life, so adaptation occurs for groups that have different cultural backgrounds. Similarly, journalists in the television industry come from all kinds of educational backgrounds. This diversity of educational backgrounds among journalists is what has allowed the television industry to become an arena of cultural reproduction.

This is an important cultural-social process because the domination and subordination of culture at the community level is dynamic and allows for in-depth explanation of dynamics. At the individual level, resistance processes can be observed in the reproduction of the cultural identities of a group of people in the socio-cultural context that is formed. This adaptation process is related to aspects of cultural expression and gives meaning to individual actions. So, it can be known how a group of people can maintain their identity as an ethnic group in a different socio-cultural environment.

Habitus is a "mental or cognitive structure" that makes people relate to the social world. The newsroom has become an internalised scheme because it is used to perceive, understand, appreciate and spread events repeatedly. The activities in the newsroom are a routine and are continuously recurring, so it becomes an arena in which there are different habitus of each individual, depending on the position and intensity in formulating journalism concepts in the newsroom.

An arena is a type of competitive market in which there are various types of capital; the arena of the newsroom has become increasingly prevalent with the presence of competitors from different arena. The development of the television industry and the importance that people of different circles attach to news stories has certainly brought about a dynamic atmosphere in the newsroom.

The process of understanding culture in the newsroom cannot be separated from the roles of the actors in it; one actor that has a large input in the culture brought in and represented is the media owner. Television as a capital-intensive industry, which leads to capitalism, makes capital owners the central axis in the process of cultural reproduction.

Journalism puts forward the sense of independence as a social responsibility, but on the other hand, the journalists in the newsroom cannot release the habitus that has been created by the interests of the media owner. In this regard, it is noteworthy that Metro TV, the first news television station, is under the influence of a dominant owner. As evidence, due to the involvement of the owner of the station in politics, it would be difficult for him to allow the station operate independently. Metro TV has undergone several changes in newsroom leadership, replacing their editor-in-chief multiple times over the years. This is different from TV One. There has never been a change of editor-in-chief at TV One.

Current and Former Editors-in-Chief of Metro TV and TVOne

METRO TV		TV ONE	
Editor-in-Chief	Period	Editor-in-Chief	Period
Andi F Noya	2000-2003	KarniIlyas	2006-2018
Don Bosco Selamun	2003-2006		
Elman Saragih	2006-2011		
Putra Nababan	2012-2017		
Don Bosco Selamun	2017-2018		

The influence of editors-in-chief on the angle or direction of news content is quite strong. The personal idealisms of an editor-in-chief determines how news content is packaged and served with regards to how the content is worded and the political and ideological leanings of the delivery. There is a great intersection between the influence of owners and editors-in-chief on the process of cultural reproduction done by actors. Changes in the habitus of the owners will always lead to changes in the established culture of the newsroom.

Technically, the editor-in-chief is the final authority on content and programming, but this is hardly the reality. They are also susceptible to influence from external factors and powers. Advertisers are an external factor that may influence editors. Whether consciously or unconsciously, products advertised on a given television station are not given the appropriate treatment and considerations when such products are involved in public issues (such as health hazards) that require objective coverage from the media. There is no doubt, however, that the greatest challenge to the editing room is the handling of media owners and their partners.

**Increasingly Restrictive Regulations**

The growth of the television industry cannot be separated from its ability to influence public opinion. At present, it is difficult to distinguish whether communication companies are built for the basis of business or whether they are



established for the benefit of certain groups. The shifting of the function of this industry is becoming increasingly clear with the absence of legal certainty in protecting the public from the influence of information that is not substantially in accordance with the philosophy of the nation, which is to educate the nation's life.

Starting from the arrangement of broadcast content diversity (diversity of content) to the diversity of ownership (diversity of ownership), the problems with regulation increased with the change in the world broadcasting system from analog to digital. At present, the television stations that are Network Broadcasting System (SJJ), formerly known as National television, comprise a total of 14 main networks and nearly 500 children's stations networked throughout the archipelago. Local television is made up of around 600 stations. Apparently, if digital television system had been operating in Indonesia, the number of television stations or broadcast content providers would amount to over 2,000.

The most problematic issue of the future is not a technical issue but rather a business aspect of this capital-intensive industry, i.e. to finance programmes that can provide added value to the development of the country and not convey contents that can divide the nation by propagating each group according to the interests of the television station they have.

Unfortunately, Law 32 of 2002 explicitly and clearly only regulates the Indonesian television system in an analogue manner; the digital system does not in any way come up in the language of the regulation of this broadcasting master. Television management today collides with political and business interests; this does not lead to an improvement in the quality of broadcast content but clashes with technical substance and legal certainty.

In the 1945 constitution, Article 28 Paragraph states that "the land, ground water and air is controlled by the state and utilised to the maximum extent for public interest". This rule is very clear; the state through the government has the right to regulate specific frequencies that are the property of the public. Instead, it gives the industry great authority to manipulate how information is packaged.

Television broadcasts can penetrate everywhere, from the living room to the bedroom and can expand (pervasive presence theory). With regards to whether the current contents of our television broadcasts have good security for the mental interests of the generations that exist, the reality is that at present, television owners, who use frequencies that are publicly owned, are more likely to use their television station for their personal and group interests. This is very detrimental to the people's need for important information.

### **“Politicamedia Authoritarianism”**

Television information dissemination is currently controlled by 14 television stations, with a Network Broadcast System (SSJ) license, which give the authority to relay broadcasts from their parent station to a variety of other stations in the network. The broadcast contents that dominate television broadcast in

Indonesian, from Sabang to Merauke, only contain information about the area of the parent station in the network (Read: Jakarta); this is not in line with the concept of diversity as well as the philosophy of “unity in diversity”. The pattern of information received by the community is also more pro-power and centralised; this is not in accordance with the development and maintenance of a very diverse Indonesian culture.

This matter has also become a concern in the formulation of state regulations; the authorities always tend to uniformise Indonesia absolutely, but it should be understood that information will vary in context among faithful elements of an existing culture. Looking at the facts as they are, contestation of ownership will become very dominant.

The media (press) should act as a watchdog, as the “fourth estate of democracy” doctrine. It should be isolated from other estates, or branches, of democracy, and their relationships should work as a system of checks and balances. Political powers and organisations should understand the role of the press as an impartial and independent party. Hence, media owners should constantly strive to remain impartial in order to maintain their status as the fourth estate of democracy. If it failure, borrowing the term coined by the Chairperson of the Indonesian Broadcasting Commission for the period of 2013 – 2016, Judhariksawan, he calls it "Politicamedia (Politic and Media) Authoritarianism" which is looked down upon in democratic states.

At present, the rulers represented in political parties are making conscious efforts to own or, at the very least, control television broadcasting agencies. The sway these television broadcasting agencies hold can influence the public agenda in subtle ways. “Politicamedia authoritarianism” occurs when political powers and media owners form coalitions – with common goals, interests, even structures and capital. These coalitions lead to the press sacrificing their impartiality, constriction of the freedom of the press, and destruction of democracy. At this point, the press is no longer the fourth estate of democracy, and the system of checks and balances is non-existent.

## Conclusion

Newsrooms are very dependent on groups with a mastery of hardware to deliver news products, such as radio and television transmission and media transportation. Newsrooms are also highly dependent on maintaining cordial relationships with advertising agencies, advertisers, and other institutions.

At this time, journalists in the broadcast media in Indonesia are under pressure from two opposing forces. On one hand, their conscience and journalistic integrity supported by their idealism constitutes a force. This drives journalists to search for and report facts in honest and objective ways. On the other hand, media is a massive industry and must, thus, adhere to the realities of the business world. These business realities drive news broadcasters to compile agendas and construct a version of reality that is attractive to the market they are selling their news

products to. Through legislation, codes of ethics, and the pressure of public opinion, the interaction between business interests and objective structures can achieve balance.\*\*\*

## References

- Berger, Peter dan Thomas Luckman. 1996. *The Social Construction of Reality*. Translated edition: *Tafsir Sosial Atas Kenyataan: Sebuah Risalah tentang Sosiologi Pengetahuan*. Jakarta: Gramedia
- Blumer, Herbert. 1969. *Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method*. London: University of California Press.
- Bourdieu, P. 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. 1983. *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature*. France: Columbia University Press
- Bourdieu, P. 1984. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Cambridge: Harvard University.
- Bruner, 2005. *Culture on Tour*. Chicago: Chicago University.
- Geertz, Clifford, 1973. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books
- Goffman, Erving. 1961. *Asylum*. Chichago : Aldine Publishing
- Goffman, Erving. 1971. *Relations in Public*. New York : Harper Colophon Books
- Goffman, Erving. 1974. *Frame Analysis. An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. London: Harper & Row Publishers
- Irianto, Agus Maladi. 2014. *Media dan Kekuasaan. Antropologi Membaca Dunia Kontemporer* (Media and Power. Anthropology Read the World of Contemporary). Gigih Pustaka Mandiri.
- Ishadi, SK. 2014. *Media & Kekuasaan, Televisi di Hari-hari Terakhir Presiden Soeharto* (Media and Power, Television in the Last Days of President Soeharto). Jakarta: Kompas Penerbit Buku.
- McQuail, Dennis. 2000. *McQuail's Mass Communication Theory*. London: Sage Publications Merleau-Ponty, M.
- Mead, George Herbert. 1934. *Mind, Self and Society* (ed. Charles W. Morris). Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- Merleau-Ponty, M. 1974. *Phenomenology of Perception*. London : Routledgem
- Parsons, Talcott. 1951. *The Social System*. New York : Free Press

Parsons, Talcott. 1966. *Societies, Evolutionary and Comparative Perspectives*. Englewood: Prentice-Hall.

Smith, Philip. 2001. *Cultural Theory: An Introduction*. Oxford & Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers.

Sutrisno, Mudji. 2003. *Diktat Filsafat Kebudayaan* (Dictat of Philosophy of Cultural). Jakarta: STF Driyarkara.