POLITICAL ECONOMIC MEDIA DISCOURSE

[1]*Kamaruddin Hasan, [2]Ratri Candrasari

ABSTRACT--When the media is controlled by only a few national and global corporations that hegemony the public in the interests of the political economy. When fears of a tendency to diminish public trust in the media and when the ruling party is economically and politically the media owners are involved in practical politics that tends to ignore the public interest, then it will continue to be a problem in the quality of democracy. Media discourse political economy perspective is a study of critical discourse on the political economy of the media which until then continues to hegemony the public. This study aims to obtain an understanding of economic, political power from the media as a literary effort for the public. In addition, efforts to synergize social relations, economic media and power. The synergy of the relationship uses the Vincent Mosco concept; commodification, spatialization and structuration. The perspective of Peter Golding and Graham Murdock who divides the perspective of the political economy of the media into two major perspectives namely liberal and critical. Qualitative descriptive methods become the choice, using a critical paradigm. Data obtained from the study of literature, observation of media discourse analysis phenomena. The findings show the media is still trapped in the political games of oligarchy, dominant ideology, monopoly and hegemony. Media discourse is more determined by political power, owner's economy and media income. The public is still neglected, dominantly used as a media commodity. Public institutions such as the Indonesian Broadcasting Commission (KPI), the Press Council and others to more critically monitor media control. Establish a media monitoring network and active participation. The public needs to fight for and maintain the media remains one of the pillars of democracy, not a pillar of oligarchic politics. This study may be useful in giving birth to media policies that truly belong to the public and at the same time can enrich practical and theoretical findings.

Keywords--Media Discourse, Critical Paradigm, Ideology, Political Economy

I. INTRODUCTION

Understanding in the analysis of media discourse in the perspective of political economy, the paradigm or critical thinking in social science of communication has a place to be adopted. On the one hand as a measure of measurement, the paradigm of critical thinking provides a variety of new perspectives that are often unpredictable, because the fabric of the production, distribution and consumption of media text production does not only serve the economic interests of the producers. Even the political interests of the author are common. In the end the author's ideological position can usually be traced to the analysis of discourse. So that the public position is basically criticizing another reality hidden from the text of a media product. This phenomenon usually

[1] *Communication Science Department, Universitas Malikussaleh,kamaruddin@unimal.ac.id

[2] Communication Science Department, Universitas Malikussaleh.

remains hidden, but as long as the foresight to find it, it will present the ideological fabric that is present behind the representation of media products.

So that the current media discourse analysis can be traced from how the media constellation in the realm of economic and political situations. It is the last criticism that must be answered by the public when they want to end the reading of media products. The next meaning of a spectacle-reading is essentially an explanation of how the media takes a position in the midst of struggles of interests and ideology in the settings of economic ownership and political power settings.

This critical paradigm study seeks to explain the results of observations of the political economy trends of the media by conducting dialectical analysis of ideologies, conditions, economics, politics and social culture in the public sphere. The critical approach is a practical method that combines analysis with real action from the public. Hegel's opinion (Erich Formm; 1969), for him knowledge is not obtained in the position as a subject-object where the object is considered as something separate from and in opposition to humans who have knowledge. To know the world, man must make the world his own. Using a critical paradigm, it is intended to view a media reality critically as its object. That the reality is not in accordance with what should happen to the public. So that ontologically, the existence of reality also occurs within the writer and of course also occurs outside the author. This study is intended to build collective awareness in order to change the structure and substructure for the better. The intended change is an attempt to improve the existing structure and substructure of the media and the public. In this study, subjectivity is naturally very high because the evaluation of reality comes from the author. But in including the evaluation, the writer also sees the evaluation from the public in general. The author sees the appropriateness and accuracy of the theory with the praxis that exists in reality. So, according to McQuail opinion, 2000: 82, that approach the political economy of the media is a study identified as a critical approach group.

The political economy perspective of the media introduced by Vincent Moscow in his book The Political Economy of Communication, 1998, is essentially based on the understanding of political economy as a study of social relations and power, both in the production, distribution and consumption of resources. His attention is directed to ownership, control and operational strength of the media market. Media institutions are considered as an economic system that is closely related to the political system. Garnham (McQuail, 2000: 82); mention the main character lies in the production of media which is determined by the exchange of values of various media contents under conditions of market expansion pressure and also determined the political economic interests of capital owners and media policy makers. These various interests are related to the need for profit, as a result of monopolistic trends and integration processes, both vertically and horizontally.

II.   SOCIAL, ECONOMIC AND POWER RELATIONS

When, when trying to understand the relations between the economic and political systems that are scattered in the process of production and distribution of media products, the actual reading or interpretation made by the public has entered the realm of political economy of the media. The synergy of economic and political fervor in

media text products enables the integration of media texts into the economic, political, social and cultural processes in society.

The political economy of communication media - the media strives to make the media not only the center of attention, but as part of a structure related to economics and politics. Therefore, starting the study of media political economy from the study of media texts is a form of critical analysis, because from the analysis of texts it is possible to raise attention to criticism of the economic and political aspects of media.

So it is natural, if Mohammadi and Mohammadi stated that the point of view of the political economy of the media is part of a critical perspective in addition to cultural studies, critical theory of the Frankfurt School, message reception theory, and semiotics. (Downing, 1990: 15). From the structure of language texts to economic and political structures. Thus the flow of question formulation that is worth putting forward in viewing media texts as an infrastructure of economic and political interests. Than just a question aroundhow the structure of the language text and the cognitive structure of the creator, the attention of the political economy of the media then shifts to how and to what extent ownership, control and operational power of the media market.

In fact, by reading that context, the public consumer will understand that it turns out that the political interests of the authorities and the economic interests of the capital owners take the main role in creating euphemisms. In Ben Anderson's perspective, the euphemistic reality in the language of the New Order is actually a concealment of reality that is actually so "hard" (Latif and Ibrahim, 1996: 36). Euphemistic language actually not only covers the real reality, but creates a new reality for its creator. The concealment of reality actually shows the ideology of the use of language texts or media producers. Regarding ideology, there are many variants of understanding, but in short it can be understood that ideology refers to a series of ideas that make up group reality, a system of representation or code that determines how a person depicts the world or its environment. Other variants can also be taken from classical Marxism which portrays ideology as false consciousness or perpetuated by dominant forces in society (Littlejohn, 1996: 228). Including can also be taken from the perspective of post-Marxism, which became the forerunner to critical theory.

In contemporary critical theorists tend to believe that at present there is no longer a single ideology playing in society. Ideology is not something singular and championed in a heroic atmosphere so that it seems separated from the social system of society. In the critical terotisi view, ideology is inherent in all social and cultural processes, and language texts are the most important characteristics for the operation of an ideology. Ideology moves through language texts, so that what appears from the structure of language texts is assumed to be the structure of a society that embodies a particular ideology. Louis Althusser, a well-known Marxist, stated that ideology appears in the structure of society and arises in real practice carried out by various institutions in society (Littlejohn, 1996: 29).

Althusser's thought was strongly influenced by structuralism, especially on the view that the essence of ideology can be identified through the structure of language tests. Ideology plays behind the determination of representation. Ideological meaning begins with understanding how the language system works in social structures. Combination and disposition become key words to describe how ideology plays in language, so to dismantle ideological language, a representation must be dismantled first, then the meaning of the structure is

related to the existence of social structures that underlie the use of language structure or the principle of intertextuality.

However, in this case there is nothing truly objective or neutral, it cannot be said that the dismantling of the structure of language texts along with ideological findings in language texts is a guarantee of the final certainty of an ideology. Changing structure may change ideological meaning, because in Althuserrian terms ideology is determined by its structure (Takwin, 1999). So ideology is a subjective reality that is present in society, flexible, fluid and ready to change.

Ideology is present in everyone as something subtle and often unconscious, so ideology is no longer seen in the tradition of classical Marxism which says it is false consciousness or false conciousness. This is what then distinguishes the ideological understanding between Marx and Althusser. Althusser, as the last figure who precisely interpreted ideology as a profound unconsciousness or profoundly unconciousness that practices in humans take place in everyday life.

Furthermore, Althusser saw that ideology was often spread by social structures such as what he called the ideological state apparatus / ISA and reppresive state apparatus / RSA (Althusser, 1994: 151). Through this idea, Althusser wants to say that all social and political institutions involved have a share in the spread of ideology and the dominance of the distribution of meaning.

So, through Althusser, a structural analysis model can be developed in the sense of how power relations work between the structures of society, which of course is limited to its use in language texts. Thus, the media, as part of the structure that produces language texts are often designated as scapegoats of ideological spreaders. In Althusser's view, communication media are ISA communication, where they work in the private sphere or without using physical violence. Ideological work in this area takes place as is the process of brainwashing that drowns public awareness so that the community is brought to such profound unconsciousness. Indeed, Althusser's theory is built from the Marxist tradition of ideology as false consciousness, which emphasizes the role of ideology in maintaining political and economic power related to its non-coercive use.

Besides Althusser, a second-generation Marxist, Antonio Gramsci, then introduced this ideological concept in a different term, hegemony. Hegemony is an ongoing winning and rewards winning consensus for the majority of the system under it (Kleden,

1987: 176). Gramsci himself views that society consists of two main structures, namely the dominant class and the subordinate class. The dominant class is stated as the leading and dominant class. (Gramsci, 1994: 215). In relation to the work of the media, the media is a tool to fight for consensus to be in line with the wishes of the authorities in determining who friends who are opponents, what is good and what is bad.

In relation to the political context of the media, Gramsci put this notion of hegomony into two meanings, namely in acts of violence and intellectual control. In the context of intellectual mastery, Gramsci places ideological work as a tool to stifle critical critical public. So that the media becomes one of the instruments used by the ruling class to impose its ideology.

With this concept of hegemony, Gramsci rejects ideology as the result of arbitrary and psychological individual creation. The public actually does not have the freedom to interpret what they consume from the media, because meaning has been forced into the mind through the structure of language. From the perspective

of media politics, media relations vis a vis the country is very likely to show the workings of the media as stewards of the interests of state ideology as the most dominant class in political structures. One time the media is very likely to produce an integrated set of ideologies, assembling reasonable values and norms, even though it is actually only to legitimize the socio-political structure in which the controlled class ultimately unconsciously participates in a dominant class environment. Taking Gitlin's language, hegemony takes place through "systematic expertise to enforce 'rules' through mass agreement" (Shoemaker and D. Reese: 1996: 237).

III.   THE PERSPECTIVES OF VINCE MOSCO, PETER GOLDING AND GRAHAM MURDOCK

IV.   **In con**nection with the explanation of the relationship mentioned above, Vincent Mosco offers three important concepts to approach it, namely: commodification, spatialization and structuration (Mosco, 1996: 139). While Peter Golding and Graham Murdock (James Currant & Michael Gurevitch, 1991: 15) divides the perspective of the political economy of the media into two major perspectives namely the liberal perspective and the critical perspective.

The first Vincent Mosco concept is commodification related to how the process of transformation of goods and services and their use value into a commodity that has a market exchange rate. Although it feels strange, given the media products in general in the form of information and entertainment. While the two types of forms of media products cannot be measured as moving goods in ordinary or conventional economic measures. The tangibility angle is certainly relatively different from other goods and services.

Even though this measurability can be felt physically, media products are still a merchandise that can be exchanged and have economic value for the media. Within the scope of media institutions, journalists or media crews are involved in producing and distributing them to heterogeneous publics. It may be that the public is a conventional media product audience print media readers, television viewers, radio listeners, or at the same time social media audiences even countries that have interests with it. Its added value will largely be determined by how media products meet individual and social needs.

In this transformation process, the media always involve the crew of the media, the media public, the market, and the state if each of them has an interest. Form of commodification in communication itself basically there are also 3 (three) types namely; intrinsic commodification (intrinsic commodification), extrinsic commodification (extrinsic commodification), and cybernetic commodification.

As an explanation, where the process of changing messages from a collection of data into a meaning system in the form of products that can be marketed, such as product packages marketed by the media by loading the writings of an article writer and advertisements in a package that can be sold is an intrinsic commodity or content commodification . While the extrinsic commodification or public commodification is the process of modifying the role of readers by media companies and advertisers from their initial function as consumers of the media to non-media public consumers. Media companies produce the public and then hand it over to advertisers. This situation and conditions occur mutually beneficial cooperation between media companies with advertisers, where media companies are used as a means of attracting the public to be sold to advertisers who will pay to the media

company. While cybernetics commodification is related to the basic process of overcoming control and space by the media and the public.

Second, spatialization, related to how the media are able to present their products in public in terms of space and time. In this realm, the institutional structure of the media determines its role in meeting the network and the speed at which media products are delivered to the public. The discussion about spatialization is related to the form of media institutions, whether it is a large-scale corporation or vice versa, whether networked or not, whether it is monopolistic or oligopolistic, conglomerate or not.

Often these institutions are politically regulated to avoid the ownership of a very large and monopolizing media products. For example, the issuance of Broadcasting Law No. 32 of 2002 is a form of political interference to eliminate the monopoly on information and capital ownership. This law also requires that national television no longer broadcasts in the regions before networking with local television stations. Politically, this policy is implemented to guarantee diversity of content, because as long as national television stations are still operating in the regions, the broadcast content will only be dominated by content from the center of Jakarta.

While on the other hand, economically the enactment of this law is to provoke the presence of new media at the local level. So that in the future diversity of ownership will occur. However, the current condition in which television media ownership seems to be only controlled by a small portion of capital owners based in the political center - power.

Spatial process is best said to be the transformation of space and time boundaries in public life. That spatialization is a process of media institutional extension through a corporate form and the size of the media business entity. The size of the media business entity can be horizontal or vertical. Horizontally means that the forms of media business entities are forms of conglomeration and monopoly. While the vertical process is an integration process between the parent company and its subsidiaries carried out in one business line to obtain synergy, especially to gain control in media production.

Processes to overcome space and time barriers by media companies in the form of business expansion, such as horizontal, vertical and internationalization integration processes. In practice, horizontal integration is a cross-ownership of several types of mass media as well as newspapers,magazines, tabloids, radio, TV, online media by a group of large media companies. While the integration of internationalization or globalization from an economic perspective is a conglomeration of space for capital carried out by transnational companies and countries, which change space through the flow of resources and commodities including communication and information. The result is a literal transformation product from a map of the communication and information area for a particular space and the relationship between these spaces.

Furthermore, thirdly, structuration deals with the relation of ideas between public agents, social processes and social practices in structural analysis. Structuring can be described as the process by which social structures are upheld by social agents, and even each part of the structure is able to act to serve the other parts. The next result of structuration is a series of social relations and processes of power organized between classes, gender, race and social movements, each of which is related to one another. The idea of structuration was originally developed by Anthony Giddens (Mosco, 1996: 212).

Structuration is the interdependent interaction between agents and the social structures that surround them. Structuring is the process of combining human agency with the process of social change into analysis. Structuration is the interdependent interaction between agents and the social structures that surround them. Structuring is the process of combining human agencies with the process of social change into structural analysis. An important characteristic of structuration theory is basically the power given to social change, which illustrates how structures are produced and reproduced by human agents who act as structures. This structuring is what balances the tendency in political economy media analysis to describe structures such as business institutions and government by showing and describing agency ideas, fundamental social relations that refer to the role of individuals as social actors whose behavior is built by the matrix of social relations and positioning, including class, race and gender.

The perspective offered by Mosco, in principle, is relevant in reviewing all media activities and formulating a holistic model from the entire production cycle to its acceptance. This study of media political economy does not use reductionist principles and linear cause-and-effect relationships, but tends to be critical in assessing knowledge that is always associated with values of participation and equality with a greater emphasis on aspects of the process than with institutional problems.

Of course, the concept can be studied as texts of the reality of life values that are sacred and even taboo for example religion, spirituality, beliefs, especially economic politics packed into a variety of conventional media shows such as television, or through media convergence, by combining conventional media with new media, the internet, is a form of commodity created by the media industry that gave birth to the culture industry. Mass media programs, for example television with various shows; advertisements, soap operas, reality shows, other trivial programs are forms of text that are produced to benefit massively. In the hands of any media industry elite, it can be constructed into a product that is highly attractive and will benefit from the advertising that they obtain economically and even political profits.. The relationship between the public and the media takes place in a reification manner, because the public is actually controlled by market law. In it, media and public relations actually place the public as a commodity or merchandise. Reification law presupposes that a commodity contains a fetish or fetish value. The media industry makes the public as a commodity that is traded in the interests of capital accumulation. High and low ratings automatically become a kind of talisman for media managers to determine the value of commodity events that are appropriate prices for the implementation of an advertising space. Adorno (Strinati 1995; 57); mention the value of fetishes when money becomes the main benchmark in the triangle of media relations, especially television, advertisers, and the public.

The development of continued capitalism is marked by the commodification of all artifacts of human cultural life by a handful of elite rulers in the media industry. Phenomenon, the relationship between the public and the media is intertwined within the scope of 'public commodities'. The erosion of identity, alienation, and ignorance of which norms must be held causes the public to be so easily influenced by the media. The media becomes a means of giving identity, providing friends, displaying interpretations of events, and indirectly directing the public to decision making. The media also gives satisfaction to human needs and influences the way of thinking. Imagery images - simulacrum often appear through justification that a mass media work is presented based on a

true story. This depiction of the guise of a true story is what makes it problematic, because basically media content is not an objective entity.

In fact, without being realized by the public, swept away in the preoccupation and fascination with the spectacle without reconsidering the hidden values behind each show. The climax is the ongoing situation of public hyperreality, which develops when the media are controlled by economic and political interests. In this case the relationship between the media and the public is marked by political signification, which is a situation where media texts become an arena for controlling the public. In Baudrillard's language (Agger, 2005: 284), this simulation model succeeded in spreading the discourse of power and control directly to the public environment. Public awareness is controlled by means of representation to confirm that what they consume is objective truth and not subjective engineering. Furthermore, it illustrates a number of crucial perspectives when placing the scattered media with a political economy dimension. If Mosco offers three perspectives, then Peter Golding and Graham Murdock (James Currant & Michael Gurevitch, 1991: 15) divide the perspective of the political economy of the media into two large perspectives namely a liberal perspective and a critical perspective. Liberal perspective which tends to focus on the issue of market exchange where the public - consumers will freely choose the media commodity media in accordance with the level of usefulness and satisfaction they can achieve based on the offer of existing media products. The greater the market plays a role, the wider the choices that can be accessed by the public consumer. Media as a cultural, social, economic and political product should be given the widest possible opportunity for media to be freely owned by anyone who knows no boundaries.

The next perspective Golding and Murdock then put more weight on the study of the political economy of the media from a critical perspective. The consideration is that the media should be seen more holistically, because the production, distribution and consumption of media are in a social, economic and political environment whose structures influence and influence one another. It may be that the media then take on roles and functions in dominating the message content and legitimizing the dominant class. The capital owner can take advantage of his preference for the commodification of media products. It is in this realm that the actual conversation about ideology, the interests of power have a place. In a Marxist point of view, the preferences of capital owners enable media institutions to take on the role of spreading false consciousness that lulls consumers into the audience. In fact, the media can be used to wage hegemony by covering up or representing the interests of the ruling class. In this last area, the production of media texts is essentially a latent form of power at work in the media sphere.

V. THE FACE OF MEDIA IN THE POLITICAL DOMAIN

In the political sphere, the media plays a very important role in conveying political messages to the public. The main goal is to influence the public and get public opinion then to choose the figure. Politicians clearly utilize political marketing in delivering their messages. Popularity is certainly not enough if it is not accompanied by a good track record. Popularity is a level of fame in the eyes of the public. Politicians can gain popularity which means they have a level of fame in the public eye because of their profession, and are supported by frequent appearances on the public surface; on television, the internet, newspapers, magazines and others. Likewise, popularity in the political sphere, such as being the leader of political parties, legislative officials, executives, and judiciaries, so that the applicable political sphere is probability theory is that various possibilities

can occur. The popularity category is based on how someone was born with his new identity that can be associated with his dramatic role as a hero. This situation has become a model for fame seekers such as politicians who suddenly get celebrity class coverage in their political activities. The media becomes a strategic land in conveying political messages to the public, in forming public opinion and in building a political image. The role of the media becomes so dominant compared to other elements, such as communication that is oration. The political image of a character is built through various media, regardless of his skills, leadership, and political achievements.

In this case, there are at least three reasons why the media becomes a political choice, first, the media has a powerful effect to be able to influence public opinion so that it is willing to support political ideas and agendas. According to the study of Phillipe J. Maarek (Malik: 999, 54), public opinion developed through the media is so strong. Second, media messages are general in nature so that they can reach a very large and relatively widespread public and are able to reach all levels of public with a variety of diversity. This allows political parties to do message penetration reaches remote areas hard to reach. Third, in modern democracies, portrayed in political activities including political campaigns through the media is the primary way in which political parties and candidates promote the political products to be marketed.

The contemporary political world relies heavily on the existence of imaging technology in shaping political imagery. This phenomenon then gives rise to hyper-reality in politics, referring to artificially distorted realities. The term hyper-reality was first used by Jean Baudrillard, a French sociologist, in his book In the Shadow of the Silent Majorities, 1983, to explain engineering in terms of the distortion of meaning in the media. Yasraf Amir Pilliang, (Transparency 2005), refers to hyper-reality as the creation of reality which no longer refers to reality in the real world as a reference, so that it becomes a kind of second reality or second hand reality whose reference is itself. Hyper-reality, according to him, appears like the real reality, even though it is an artificial reality, that is the reality created through simulation technology. So, at a certain level, he seems to be believed to be more real than real reality. Creating a condition, in which the image is considered as "reality", artificiality is considered reality, falsehood is considered truth, issues are more trusted than information and rumors are considered more true than truth. In this state of hyper reality, the public is no longer aware that what is seen as a reality is actually the construction or fabrication of reality. This political model is currently being developed, which emphasizes images and simulations rather than reality, where the image engineering of individual contestants becomes more important than the platforms and issues the party stands for. This in turn gives rise to aspects that have an impact on image engineering. Even with the hyper-reality method, 'corrupt politicians' can be marketed in the packaging of a hero from the past that has nothing to do with the present. They manipulate their self-image, by presenting a very positive self-image, so that it can move the public to voluntarily lift it and of course choose it. So it is difficult for the public to distinguish between corrupt politicians who have undermined state finances to enrich themselves and their groups, for example with heroes who have sacrificed themselves and their groups for the nation and state. Plus, the development of communication and information technology with the emergence of new media, cyber media, digital world, convergence, has produced major changes in the political and economic experience of the media and the public as consumers. New media designed to increase the reach, speed and efficiency of human communication have the potential to strengthen and improve the quality of democracy and

vice versa. The new media has a significant impact on the development of the political economy and democracy. That democracy can be maintained because there is active political participation of citizens and care about the problems of state and citizenship. New media is a new intermediary tool, in terms of time, benefits, production, and distribution by leaving technology that is still analogous, mechanical, wasteful of energy, not environmentally friendly. With characteristics can be manipulated, are networked, dense, incompressible and interactive. Communication and information technology has changed the world of media in Indonesia from massive conventional telecommunications technology that has been able to be combined with interactive computer technology. Analog systems are replaced by digital systems, with convergence. Convergence or new media is the joining of traditional telecommunications media with the internet as well. Computers can function as television sets, or mobile phones can receive sound, text, data and three-dimensional (3G) images. In the world of broadcasting, digitalization allows television broadcasting to have program services like the internet. With just one device, a person can access newspapers, enjoy television entertainment, listen to the radio, find information according to taste, and even call.

VI.   CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Analysis of media discourse in a political economy perspective cannot be separated from the three important concepts of Vincent Mosco's offer, namely commodification; spatialization; and structuration. Then the thoughts of Peter Golding and Graham Murdock who divided the political economy of the media into two major perspectives namely the liberal perspective and critical perspective. The media is economically and politically likely to create hegemony, monopoly, advanced capitalism, conglomeration, new dominant groups who become the rulers of the public market. Investors affiliated with political groups can provide more open opportunities to transform certain political ideas to win public votes. So that the media, has become a new medium of hegemony for political and economic forces to achieve unilateral gains. This kind of power configuration can threaten the implementation of democratic life, therefore, the nature of the public vote tends to be controlled by the dominant power of the capital owner as well as the interest groups. Therefore, media literacy needs to be developed, with an inoculation approach. Inoculation is a popular communication approach. If you are dealing with persuasive media messages, the public needs to be inoculated by injection immunity. Thus, the public will not fall victim to the media. Media literacy is a skill to understand the nature of communication, especially in relation to mass media. Media literacy is a skill that is needed by the public to interact properly with the media, and use it with confidence. These skills are actually considered important for anyone. But the main target of media literacy is millennials who are in the process of mental and physical edification. The public has extended literacy skills in all forms of messages, including writing and reading, speaking and listening, watching critically, and the ability to write messages by themselves using various technologies. Media literacy is a kind of code of conduct for people in the Information and digital Age.

The media should not fall too deeply into the political games of oligarchy, monopoly and hegemony. The public needs to realize that media conglomeration is a political-economic problem. Critical to all media conglomerates. The public has the right to correct information, so public institutions such as the Indonesian Broadcasting Commission (KPI), the Press Council and other related institutions to be more critical in

monitoring and controlling so as not to bias the interests of media owners. Establish a media monitoring network, active public participation in policy, revision of the Broadcasting Law and the convergence of Telematics. The public needs to maintain that the media remains one of the pillars of democracy, not a pillar of oligarchic politics. Media literacy is urgently needed by the public, both in the informal and formal domains. In the formal domain it can be realized through educational institutions at all levels. With the hope that this will not only be done on a temporary basis, but will be conducted on a regular and structured basis. Increasing discussion forums, seminars, conventional media socialization and new media at all levels of the public, especially the younger generation. Next it needs to be done by including media literacy lessons in the curriculum of schools, at all levels of the school including tertiary institutions.

REFERENCE

1. Baran, Stanley J., 2000, Mass Communication Theory: Foundation, Ferment and Future, New York:Wadsworth

2. Burton, Graeme. 2000. Talking Television: An Introduction to The Study of Television. London: Arnold

3. Currant, James and Michael Gurevitch, Mass Media and Society, Edward Arnold, London, 1991

4. Downing, John, Ali Mohammadi & Annabele Srebery-Mohammadi (Eds.), Questioning The Media: A Critical Introdustion, Sage Publication, Newbury Park, California, 1990.

5. Dominic, Strinati, 2004, An Introduction to Theories of Popular Culure, New York: Routledge

6. Dominick, Joseph R. 2005. The Dynamics of Mass Communications: Media in the Digital Age. 8th Edition. New York: McGraw Hill.

7. Dwyer, T. (2010). Media Convergence: Issues in Cultural and Media Studies, London: McGraw Hill & Open University Press

8. Eriyanto, Analisis Wacana: Pengantar Analisis Teks Media, LkiS, Yogyakarta, 2001.

9. Edwards, D. & D. Cromwell, 2005. Guardians of power: the myth of the liberal media. London: Pluto Press.

10. Fiske, John,Introductions to Communication Studies, Routledge, London, 1990.

11. Giddens, Anthony, 2000, Sociology, Cambridge:Polity Press

12. Hall, Stuart (Ed.), Representation: Cultural Representations dan Signifying Practices, Sage Publications, London, 1997.

13. Hasan, Kamaruddin (2008), Libidinal Economic dalam Media Televisi:Analisis Postmodernisme Dekonstruktif Televisi Indonesia, Penulis Tunggal, Fak. ISIP Univ. Baturaja Sumatera Selatan, Vol. 1, No. 1, ISSN 1979-0899, Juni 2008.

14. Hasan, Kamaruddin (2010), Imperialisme Budaya Melalui Televisi, Penulis Tunggal, Fak. ISIP Univ. Muhammadiyah Lampung, Vol. 1, No. 1, ISSN 1979-1186, Juli 2008

15. Hasan, Kamaruddin, (2010), Kapitalisme dalam Persfektif Ekonomi Politik Media, Penulis Tunggal, Vol. VIII, No.1, Hal. 25-48, ISSN 1693-8569, April 2010

16. Hasan, Kamaruddin (2010), Mengkaji Globalisasi Media di Akhir Tahun 1990-an, Penulis Tunggal, Fak. ISIP Univ. Baturaja Sumatera Selatan, Vol. 3, No. 6, ISSN 1979-0899, Desember 2010

17. Hasan, kamaruddin (2014), Ekonomi Politik Media Dan Konvergensi Media Di Indonesia (Menuju Publik Yang Kritis), Proseding FE Unimal 2014

18. Habermas, J. 1989. The structural transformation of the public sphere: an inquiry into a category of Bourgeois society. Cambridge: Polity Press.

19. Hall, Stuart (Ed.), 1997, Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices,Sage Publications, London.

20. Hidayat, Dedy. N., 2000, Pers dalam Revolusi Mei: Runtuhnya Sebuah Hegemoni, Jakarta:PT. Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

21. Kleden, Ignas, Sikap Ilmiah dan Kritik Kebudayaan, LP3ES, Jakarta, 1987

22. Latif, Yudi dan Idi Subandi Ibrahim, Bahasa dan Kekuasaan: Politik Wacana di Panggung Orde Baru, Mizan, Bandung, 1996.

23. Lichtenberg, Judith, 1990, Democracy and The Mass Media, London:Cambridge

24. Littlejohn, Stephen W., Theories of Human Communication, Wardsworth, Belmont, California, 1996.

25. Livingstone, Sonia, The Changing Nature and Uses of Media Literacy. Diakses dari www. lse.ac.uk/collections/media@lse/mediaWorkingPaper/ewpNumber4. Tanggal akses terakhir 10 November Juni 2013.

26. McQuail, Denis, 2005, McQuail's Mass Communication Theory, London, Sage Publications

27. McQuail, Denis & Sven Windahl, Communication Models for The Study of Mass Communications, Longman, London, 1993.

28. Mosco, Vincent, 1998, The Political Economy of Communication: Rethinking and Renewal, London:Sage Publications

29. Potter, James W. 2002. Media Literacy. New York: SAGE Publication

30. Storey, John (ed.), Cultural Theory and Popular Culture, Harvester Wheatsheaf, New York, 1994

31. Shoemaker, Pamela J. & Stephen D. Reese, Mediating The Message: Theories of Influences on Mass Media Content, Longman, 1996

32. Sudibyo, Agus. 2004. Ekonomi Politik Media Penyiaran. Jogjakarta: LkiS.

33. Straubhaar, Joseph, dan Robert LaRose. 2002. Media Now: Communications Media in the Information Age. Third Edition. Belmont: Wadsworth Group.

34. Schiller, Herbert, 1997, Whose New International Economics and Information Order, in Golding, Peter (eds), The Political Economy of The Media, Brookfield: Edward Elgar Publishing.

35. Takwin, Bagus: "Cuplikan-cuplikan Ideologi", dalam Jurnal Filsafat Universitas Indonesia Volume I No. 2, Agustus 1999.