Questioning on Pers Role Toward Publik Interests and The Need of Media Literacy

Jonas Klemen Gregorius Dori Gobang[1]

Universitas Nusa Nipa, Maumere, Indonesia

ABSTRACT. The relationship that occurs between the media and the public does not always lead to a symbiotic mutualism. The media and the public in some relations give rise to tug of war interests, sometimes they are balanced, sometimes they overlap. Ideally, the media position themselves as providers of content that are proportionate to the public. Proportional here in the sense of according to what is needed by the public. However, in practice, the political economy of the media is an unavoidable problem because the relationship between the media and the public also involves industry as the environment in which the media is located. When industrialization is attached to the media, the relationship between the media and the public is very likely to run unequally. The public is no longer positioned as accessing information that must be served and considered. In fact, the public is placed as a commodity whose interests in the media seem to have been neglected. As a result, there is a lot of media content that overrides the public interest because it is merely pursuing capital. From this point, the demand for the public to be active and critical becomes important. In the end, the media literacy movement is no longer a made-up demand, but a necessity so that the public, as the owner of resources, has their interests protected.

KEYWORDS: media, public, political economy, media literacy, public empowerment

INTRODUCTION

There are many perspectives on the role of the media in voicing the public interest. However, it is undeniable that the presence of news media is also co-opted by the political economy interests of media supply companies. As a result, the voice of the press is reopened to the voice of the people, which through this research has been co-opted by various political and economic interests behind the scenes. McQuails in Mass Communication Theory states that what is seen as public in the relationship between the media and society is the general body of free citizens of a given society or some smaller geographical space. This connotation is also related to the public in the concept of democracy (McQuails, 2010: 567). The public in the general concept is seen as society in general. For some other concepts, the public is in a gray sense because the public can also be seen as media stakeholders, media policy holders, and so on. However, in this article, the public concept that will be discussed here is the public concept in the sense of the media accessing audience. These media accessors are the general public who watch, read, listen, and listen to the media.

In ideal conditions, the relationship between the media and the public should place the public interest as a major priority. According to McQuails, this ideal condition will be formed if the two main public interest criteria for media are met. The two criteria proposed by McQuails include issues of structure and content. There are several issues related to how the media system is structured and works in ideal conditions between the media and the public, including: freedom of publication, plurality of ownership, universality of provision, diversity of channels and forms, as well as diversity of information opinion, and cultural content (McQuails , 2010: 165).

Meanwhile, in terms of content, according to McQuails, the key elements that must be met to achieve the ideal situation in the relationship between the media and the community, include: support for maintaining public order and the security of the state, quality of cultural provision, support for democratic processes, and meetings. international human rights obligations. (McQuails, 166-167) This ideal condition will only be achieved if the two groups of criteria above are met. However, in practice,

in the performance of the media in Indonesia in particular and the world in general, it is very difficult to meet these two criteria. At most there are fundamental problems related to the political economy of the media which ultimately requires the media to display an excellent performance. However, this condition of media performance in a deeply entrenched political economy environment actually places the public in the relationship between the media and society as the excluded party. The reason is that the public is no longer the party that should be served, but instead becomes a commodity to be traded. This is what then inspired the increasingly widespread media literacy movement.

METHOD

This discourse study uses a literature review or literature study approach. The reference for the preparation and development of the idea uses a descriptive analytical research method in which the author takes and focuses attention on the problem that becomes the research question. The results of this study were then processed and analyzed to obtain conclusions. This method aims to obtain an objective explanation of a problem through a critical analysis process based on a number of existing literature both offline and online. Furthermore, the author conducted a literature study in the form of observations on several hoax news in the mainstream media. Library research itself is an activity of observing various literatures related to the subject matter raised, whether in the form of books, journals, papers or writings that are helpful so that they can be used as guidelines in the research process.

The data collection method used (a) the free-to-talk method, (b) notes, (c) interviews, (d) literature study, and (e) documentation. The data analysis method was carried out in accordance with Norman Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis model, namely (a) text analysis, (b) discursive practice, and (c) sociocultural practice. First, the text is analyzed linguistically, by looking at vocabulary, semantics, sentence structure, and cohesion and coherence between sentences. Second, the practice of discourse is carried out by analyzing the process of production, consumption, and distribution of texts. Third, sociocultural practice is analyzed using three levels, namely (a) situational, (b) institutional, and (c) social. At the analysis stage, a description, interpretation, and explanation are carried out on the discourse that is the source of the data. At the description stage, the content and analysis are described descriptively on the text. Furthermore, interpretation, which is interpreting the text associated with the practice of discourse. Third, explanation is done by correlating the production, consumption, and distribution of texts with sociocultural practices that develop in society.

DISCUSSION

Various Perspektives on Media Performance: Its Opportunities and Challenges

The presence of the media as a 'medium' of communication that is present in society is not only increasingly complex, but also increasingly challenged because of developments that arise in society. The performance of the media in meeti-n,,,g the needs of the community is a common benchmark applied in various countries, including Indonesia. Media quality is no longer a necessity, but a necessity to survive as an industry as well as a medium of communication and information for the public. Unfortunately, these two things, the media as an industry and the media as a public-owned medium cannot fully go hand in hand.

In media performance, the two often overlap or even cancel each other out. To see how the process runs in the media process, McQuails offers several parameters that can be used as benchmarks to see the tendency of media performance in media and society relations. First, freedom and independence. Mc Quails offers this formulation of freedom as a condition, not a mere job criterion. In its basic principle, freedom is a further definition to describe freedom of expression and freedom of expression. This principle should be interpreted as the absence of regulations or controls that limit or direct the media. (McQuails, 2010: 192)

Freedom of communication has at least two aspects that must be considered, namely offering a more diverse opinion and responding to the needs of a much wider community. This is where it is further shown how media culture works, independence is formed, and things such as creativity, originality, and creativity emerge. Equality in media is needed. McQuails further describes in the form

of a hierarchy and various factors that affect the performance of a media. Structural conditions that provide space for the media legally to publish information. Structural conditions are the reference because the media is free from economic pressures and political pressures. Sufficient space for the public and open access to information.

At the level of media organization, freedom is usually assessed based on the degree of control that media owners exert over communicators (editors, producers, etc.), as well as the control imposed by communicators themselves over their subordinates (journalists, authors, artists, and others). others) in an organization that is often bureaucratic and hierarchical in nature. With regard to media content, it is often manifested in the form of deletion of certain news (censorship), resulting in discrepancies between the edited content and what is provided by the source. This principle at least gives hope that the media will be able to make active efforts to create and maintain an independent atmosphere and resist imposed external control or conformity with self-serving groups. The existence of freedom in media is an advantage in a media culture. With the media being free and having space to express their opinions, it is a situation that will allow a media to act as a 'watchdog'. Under these conditions, ideally the media will provide a much more objective point of view towards the government as the ruler and the owners of capital (capital).

Second, the principle of equality in media. Equality in this media means quite broadly. Therefore, in order to provide a definite understanding of this principle, it is necessary to pay attention to the correlation of this equality in what kind of communication relationship. In general terms, this equality can mean organizational where in the management of the media as an organization there is no intervention from outside parties. It can also mean, in terms of media content, there is no interference from outside parties that can affect the content of the media. With conditions like this, it can be said that all parties, under any circumstances, have no difference in the media. The principle of objectivity in the media stands out in this principle of equality. (McQuails, 2010: 195)

The principle of equality as a concept in the media appearance criteria has a correlation with at least three elements that make up the media, namely access to the media in question, the diversity that arises, and the problem of objectivity. In terms of access, equality offers a proportional condition where the media are open and allow anyone to access, in the sense that they do not intend to intervene or make the media 'side' with certain parties. Equality in the perspective of diversity offers an intention to change into something better and enrich the information circulating in society because of equal access. Meanwhile, objectivity puts the media at risk in the condition that they are impartial truths that are fair and impartial to anyone.

The third criterion that McQuails offers is, diversity and access. Diversity is a necessary condition for the audience to be able to make choices. In these circumstances, diversity is deemed necessary to provide a reference. Conditions like this become something important in democratic life. The reason is that the views that emerge will be compared with each other and open the competition map in a proportional condition. Thus, the implication that may arise is the achievement of social changes that will make the dissemination of information in society more entrenched (McQuails, 2010: 196 – 197)

At the level of society in general, this diversity is usually measured by looking at the number of independent media in the community. The more independent media that can be seen and counted, the better diversity will be in our society. Furthermore, this diversity will minimize media monopoly, which is opposed in principle by the diversity principle described by McQuails. In macro conditions, diversity should not only be seen from the number of independent and not independent media. This diversity can also be seen through all types of existing media (print media such as newspapers and magazines, radio, television, internet), the targeted media sector, as well as the segmentation of the media.

Meanwhile, at the micro level, this media diversity can be seen from the character of each media such as looking at media content, how many titles appear with what type of writing is typical. The more titles that appear and the more types of writing, the better the media will be. However, the most widely used measure and powerful enough to provide an overview of media trends is editorial policy.

In some media, this editorial policy is also called an editorial. This policy is the most tangible indicator that will help provide insight into the diversity that exists in the media.

It should be noted that the diversity that appears in the media has two sub-principles of diversity. The first is reflexive diversity, which implies that the diversity of media must be a proportional reflection of the diversity of society. The second is open access, meaning that all views and sectors in society are considered the same. The diversity that arises because of the media is often seen as something positive because it is a manifestation of the freedom of media that has occurred. Diversity is an illustration of the variety of information that will be accessible to the public. However, because the scope of diversity is very wide, to see which eyes we will use in looking at this diversity, religion, social situation, political flow, or other variables.

Fourth, order and solidarity. Most media have moved within the limits of what is acceptable to society and are bound by people's expectations not to do something they should not do. Something that should be done by the media referred to in this context is all kinds of actions that can cause social disorganization, or damage individuals, social groups or society itself. (McQuails, 2010: 203) The form of order and solidarity can be in the form of evidence regarding the negative impacts that can arise due to the presence of the media.

So, as part of a society, the media should avoid frictions that might trigger vertical and horizontal conflicts due to the many interests that play in society. This principle is sometimes interpreted as a form of 'authoritarianism' if it is taken for granted without understanding the context. The reason is that order in society is indeed possible if there is participation from above (the government) which will condition and force the community to behave in an orderly manner. In a society that has a liberal understanding, this effort to achieve order is usually manifested in the form of a prohibition on something. As an embodiment of media solidarity, it can still be identified in several forms.

The references used are of course normative and prosocial. That is, the norms that apply in society are the main considerations for running the media wheel. For example, the editorial board's positive support for opposing groups to achieve the word peace, appeals for common interests and peace, strengthening identity through national interests and spirit, and support for local community values.

Fifth, objectivity and quality of information. Objectivity is generally related to news and information. (McQuails, 2010: 199) According to J. Westersthal, the main component of news objectivity can be described as factuality associated with the form of presentation of reports about events or statements that can be verified at the source and presented without comment. Factuality is determined by truth, which can be in the form of a complete accuracy report that is supported by independent judgment, and there is no intention to mislead or suppress. Relevance relates to the selection process carried out according to the principle of clear use for the benefit of the public and society. Impartiality, associated with the neutral attitude of journalists (reporters), an attitude that distances any personal and subjective judgments in order to achieve the desired goals.

The sixth principle offered by McQuails to see the appearance of a media is objectivity (McQuails, 2010: 200). It means that the media content is expected to have the quality of truth and authenticity, depth, does not attempt to manipulate and leads to a critical attitude. The objectivity that applies in a media is more focused on the quality of information (news in the media) than on external media policies. Although the aspect of content is the focus, the principle of objectivity has a significant impact on media management. Objectivity is a central value to be a professional discipline that applies to journalists or journalists in carrying out their work.

In the world of journalists, objectivity is often associated with the concept of cover both sides, where in a report, journalists should not only favor or review one party. Therefore, objectivity has a very close correlation with independence. Objectivity becomes a sign that the media concerned has no connection with certain parties or is ridden by parties who have interests. Thus, objectivity is important to maintain the credibility of a media. Furthermore, the importance of objectivity can be seen from the concept offered by Westershal through the chart below, where it is simply stated that there is a

relationship between the components that build objectivity and objectivity is a building that has further implications in the delivery of information (McQuails, 2010: 202).

Furthermore, objectivity is more of a goal to be addressed than just a noble ideal. However, this goal still fails to materialize, because to get a solid media with objectivity is still a long and unfinished journey. The battle between information and sources, which is the factor causing this objectivity, has not yet fully occurred. The seventh or final assessment criterion offered by McQuails is related to cultural quality. The assessment that uses this cultural principle is not aimed at media content that has informative value, but rather to media content that is fiction, entertainment, or advertising. Cultural values are easier to see and apply to these things than to news values. (McQuails, 2010:205)

This cultural value can be seen through the depiction and profiteering of culture from the original into the media. That is, the criteria used can be applied in the form of how socio-cultural reflection in society enters the media. The purpose of adapting the original values of this culture is that culture is not solely used by communicators (people who use culture in the media) to support their own interests and forget the noble values that should be preserved in society.

The assessment of how the quality of these cultural values is used does not necessarily appear in real situations when it is included in the media. One way to measure it is to look at the original state when the culture was still in the community environment and when the culture was already included in the media. The extent to which changes and adaptations made by the media are from their original scope with those that have been included in the media.

One of the concerns regarding the quality of this culture is the emergence of sensationalism. Dominic noted, it is not uncommon for the media to change the content of messages from what is happening in the field, related to this culture, into the media so that there are quite significant changes. This means that the original and the adapted are different. This is sensationalism. In fact, the media further puts what is in society as a commodity rather than as nurturing and empowering its people. Media Accountability Through this media benchmark, we move further to look at media accountability.

Media performance certainly shows media accountability, and this media accountability will be the starting point where the media actually takes sides, the community or the industry. Feintuck (1999: 120) sees this accountability as two important points. First, accountability is a requirement to give a value to actions taken by a person or institution that have implications for the public or have links to public power. Second, this accountability relates to a matter of sanctions obtained by the violator when he is faced with something in power.

Questioning on Media Accountability

Meanwhile, the formulation offered by McQuails regarding media accountability relates to processes that occur voluntarily or forced by the media to answer both directly and indirectly about the quality and consequences of the dissemination of information carried out for the benefit of the community. This activity is based on certain references to the general public's assessment. Thus, in an ideal media position, media accountability is seen by how far the media is able to meet the needs of its people based on the system prevailing in society. In the case of Indonesia as an adherent of a democratic climate, accountability is seen by how the media fulfills the diversity of content and diversity of ownership which places the public as a priority over other issues.

McQuails in Mass Communication theory offers two models of media accountability that will support the appearance of the media to the public or their audience. The two models he offers are the liability model and the answerability model (McQuails, 2010: 207-210). The liability model places emphasis on things that have the potential to harm the publication media circulating both to individuals as audiences and to society. The measure that can be used to see the implications of this model is that the consequences have legal consequences both in public law and private law. The second model is the liability law, which is very different from the first model.

In this model, the emphasis is on things that are outside the judiciary, such as debates, negotiations, discussions, and other things that are bridging conflicts or various interests that may rub

off when there is a relationship between the media and the public. Verbal things are much more highlighted than material things. Whichever model will apply to this accountability, it concerns who and how the media relates. After all, the appearance of an accountable media is determined by the people who enjoy the media themselves.

Influential parties in building media accountability as partners include audiences, clients working in the media (advertisers and other sponsors), performers in the media (agency, artist, government, or related agencies), communities that may exist , media owners and stakeholders, as well as regulators and lawmakers (legislature). The differences of the parties involved in establishing proper accountability for the media, raises a frame of mind for this media accountability as an alternative to see that each of the parties involved in this process has different types.

Broadly speaking, the main differences between the parties involved are divided into four main frameworks, namely: legal and regulatory framework, market framework, social responsibility framework, and professional responsibility framework. From the perspective of the legal framework, the thing that deserves attention is media content that should be accommodative and not prone to conflict. This means that the media can run in a corridor that does not intend to violate the law and contains things that do not endanger the interests of the community. Meanwhile, in the market framework, the media is no different from other economic factors where there is a tug of war on demand and suppliers. The power of consumers is certainly at stake so that the media can still appear as an accountable economic product.

The third framework relates to social responsibility, where the media are not only obliged to report, but also protect the public from the interests of irresponsible parties. This means, the media also has a social responsibility to protect the public from media exposure. The professional point of view offered by the media professional framework, as the last framework offered by McQuails, emphasizes that the media must work professionally by paying attention to the ethics and standardization of media used in general, such as codes of ethics for reporting, advertising, and so on. However, the ideal conditions described by McQuails, where the media live in an environment that supports accountability with excellent performance and places the public as a priority, often have to deal with pressing industrial interests.

The public interest that should be prioritized is actually suppressed by various industrial desires and places the public as a commodity rather than a priority. The media, which should be friends, have become enemies because they position themselves as bridges of capital rather than bridges of information. This is the political economy of the media.

Media Political Economy

The political economy of the media is a crucial problem that is inevitable when the media enters the realm of industrialization. According to Vincent Moscow in his book Political Economy of Communication (1998), the approach in political economy is essentially based on social relations, especially those concerning power relations, both in the production, distribution and consumption of resources (resources). In the political economy of communication, these resources can be in the form of newspapers, magazines, books, cassettes, films, the internet and so on. That is, in the view of political economy the media is an industry which then places the public as part of an industrial commodity. As commodities, public interests are often neglected because they are assets that turn the wheels of the economy.

To further understand how this political economy practice of media occurs, Mosco offers three approaches, namely commodification, spatialization, and structuration. In Mosco's view, commodification is an attempt to turn anything into a commodity or merchandise as a means of making a profit. Matters related to this commodification are media content, number of audiences, and advertisements.

The second approach offered by Mosco is spatialization, which is interpreted as an effort to overcome the barriers of distance and time in social life. The important issues of spatialization relate to the role of the state, globalization, communication and concentration, as well as nationalism, socialism, and localism. The third gateway to the political economy of media that Mosco offers through

its concept is structuration. Through structuration inspired by Giddens Mosco tries to invite to see the interdependence interaction between agents and the social structure in which the agent is located. The end result is an organized set of social relations and power processes among class, gender, race, and social movement, all of which are interconnected.

With a slightly different point of view, Peter Golding and Graham Murdock offer two perspectives to view political economy, namely a critical perspective and a liberal perspective. The liberal political economy perspective describes how the market exchange process occurs, where individuals have the right and freedom to determine competing commodities based on the level of satisfaction and benefits they can achieve based on the existing supply. Therefore, the media opens up opportunities for anyone to be accessed and owned freely according to the role they play. This is what Adam Smith meant by the invisible hand. The media, when they are in the market, have a very free and wide opportunity to be owned by anyone and to compete in the market.

The Need of Media Literacy Toward a Critical Role of News Media

On a critical approach, Golding and Murdock stated that the media should not only be seen in the structure of liberalism alone. This is the key where Golding and Murdock put the media in a critical perspective, that the media are not only institutions that carry out production, distribution, and consumption. But also doing these three things in a social, economic, and political environment whose structures influence each other. For the political economy of the media, the relation between the media and the public clearly places the public as a commodity. Public is the advertising parameter. Public is the rating parameter.

The media views the public as one way to turn the wheels of the media economy as a resource that must reap profits. In this condition, the media often overrides the public's need for information that should be presented by the media. This information is not a commodification of messages that have been treated by the media as is the case in today's media.

For this reason, the public as media accessors are required to be smart and sensitive to whatever happens in the media. The public is also required to be smart and critical in responding to the media. The public today, should be seen as an active public, who always has a critical attitude towards various things that happen in the media. Public and Media Literacy In the years since the emergence of communication science as a study, communication scientists have been immersed in the belief that the public is a passive party when dealing with the media.

This linear relationship between the media and the public has become a plural belief and places the public as if they are powerless with the media presented in front of them. Inappropriate television shows, the quality of information in newspapers and online media that do not cover both sides, the endless chomp of the internet, seems to be part of an ordinary daily life. The public will only react when a dysfunction or malfunction occurs. For example, when there is a case of an elementary school child who died as a result of participating in a wrestling match like a smack down show or when a number of students were kidnapped by a friend they had just met through social networks. The public reacts when the action has taken place.

The ideal situation described by McQuails by placing the media as part of an environment that guarantees the public's need to access information seems to be a utopian state because of the media's gripping political economy. Media accountability by upholding the public as a party whose interests should be prioritized is a hope that is so far achieved when the power of capital silences the public. In a number of circumstances the public's voice hit a thick and high wall because their counter was ignored by the media. Even regulations that should serve as fences have no spurs when dealing directly with the political economy of the media.

The public's need for proper information and accommodative media is what fuels the media literacy movement in Indonesia. The public is already fed up with media activities which increasingly do not take their interests into account. Instead of accommodating, the media actually places the public as merchandise for the sake of pursuing material things. This is the reason, media literacy is no longer a mere solution in the relationship between the media and the public, but is a must so that the linear relationship between the media and the public does not always place the public as a passive party.

The media literacy movement is expected to be part of public learning that involves the public not only as spectators and connoisseurs, but also as media filters and critics. The authoritarian attitude of the media with its political economy that pretends to know the public's needs without asking the public what their needs are. In the media literacy movement, the public is encouraged to actively carry out literacy activities with media presentations. For example, when the public finds inappropriate television shows, the public can report it to the authorized media regulator such as the Indonesian Broadcasting Commission.

The public, which in this case is the public, no longer needs to feel free to criticize, because their freedom of voice is guaranteed by the constitution. It's just that the note for this media literacy movement is that public awareness of media literacy is not yet fully rooted in the community. In a number of movements campaigned by Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and educational institutions that initiated media literacy, the media literacy movement is still only focused on the upper middle class. Meanwhile, the lower middle class are the ones who are most vulnerable to this media issue.

Today, television is no longer an expensive item that only exists in the living room of the family. But it is directly connected to the rooms personally. Today too, the internet network is no longer only in big computers. he world in your hand, quoting one of the jargon of technology products. Internet through gadgets is available in our hands and wherever we are. The price of gadgets that are getting cheaper makes the media can be enjoyed by all people, from the lower class to the upper class. Thus, this media literacy movement should be carried out as a whole.

The public sphere is wholly owned by the public.

The full public sphere should also be used for the public interest. However, in practice, the public sphere in the case in Indonesia is still controlled by certain groups. Those who hold frequency licenses are in fact engrossed in abusing the license as a medium to spread political ideology and the interests of capital alone. On the other hand, the public as the owner of the public sphere actually enjoys media euphoria and is trapped in it. This is the reason why media literacy activities should not only be carried out partially, but must be carried out as a whole.

The media literacy movement is not just a symbol and a campaign, but it is an opportunity and real proof that the public still has the power to participate in media militarization. This is also an opportunity for the public to achieve their rights as owners of the public sphere so that their interests are also taken into account.

Conclusion

In an ideal relationship, the relationship between the media and the public should place the public as the party served by the media. The performance of the media in fulfilling this public interest should place the public as a priority. However, the practice of the media's political economy is also not inevitable when the public is placed as a commodity rather than a priority. As a result, a lot of media content that is accessed by the public does not voice the public interest and fulfills the public's needs. The public is brutally force-fed by the media for the sake of profit. It is at this point that the public must be critical in responding to the existence of the media. They must realize that the wheels of the media also rest on their existence. The public determines the advertising portion and rating. The public also determines whether the media's performance is good or not. For this reason, media literacy is important.

Media literacy here is not just a movement that campaigns for media literacy. Media literacy is also intended to restructure the relationship between the media and the public. As an active party, the public in the media literacy movement is expected to become a watch dog and media critic who will always fight for their rights in media. This movement is also an impetus for the public that they are not just an active party and can be filled with media content without being able to do anything. This media literacy movement is actually proof of the public's power over the media.

REFERENCES

Agger, Ben. 2009. Teori Sosial Kritis. Kritik, Penerapan dan Implikasinya. Kreasi Wacana. Yogyakarta

Ariin, Anwar. 1994. Strategi komunikasi: sebuah pengantar ringkas. Armico. Bandung

Dominick, Joseph R. he Dynamics of Mass Communication. 2001. New York: MC Graw Hill

Efendi, Onong Uchjana. 2003. Ilmu Komunikasi dan Praktek. Remaja Rosda Karya Bandung

Efendi, Onong Uchjana. 2003. Ilmu Teori dan Filsafat Komunikasi. Citra Aditya Bakti. Bandung.

Efendy, Onong Uchyana. 2009. Ilmu Komunikasi: Teori dan Praktek. Bandung : Rosdakarya

Griffin. 2003. A First Look at Communication Theory. New York: Mc Graw Hill

Irving Fang and Kristina Ross. Media History Timeline by Chronology. 1996. www.mediahistory.umn. edu/time/century.htm

Kriyantono, Rahmat. 2007. Riset Praktis Komunikasi. Kencana. Jakarta

LittleJhon, Stephen W. 2002. Theories of Human Communication, Seventh Edition. Wadsworth. California

Littlejohn, Steohen W dan Foss, Karen A, 2009, Encyclopedia of Communication Theory, SAGE Publication Inc.

Littlejohn, Stephen, W. 2002. Theories of Human Communication, 6th Edition. Belmonte: Wadsworth

Louw, Eric. Media and Cultural Production. 2001. London, thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage Publication

McChesney, Robert, and Schiller. 2003. he Political Economy of International Organization. United Nations Research Institute for Social Development

McQuails, Dennis. 2010. Mass Communication Theory, 4th Edition. London, Thousand Oaks : Sage Publications

Miller, Khaterine. 2005, Communication heories, Perspectives, Pocesses, and Context, 2nd edition, Mc Graw Hill International Edition

Moleong, Lexy J. 2007. Metodelogi Penelitian Kualitatif. PT. Remaja Rosdakarya. Bandung

Mosco, Vincent. 1996. he Political Economy of Communication: Rethinking and Renewal. London, Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications Mosco, Vincent. 2008. Current Trends in The Political Economy of Communication. Global Media Journal-Canadian Edition.

Mulyana Deddy. 2003. Ilmu Komunikasi Suatu Pengantar. Remaja Rosda Karya. Bandung Griin, EM. 2006. Communication heory. McGrawHill. New York – Ameri

Newman, W. Lawrence. 2003. Social Research Methods, Qualitative and Quantitative Approach, Fifth Edition. Pearason Eduation. USA

Pace, R. Wayne dan Don F. Faules (1994) Organizational Communication. 3rd ed. Englewood Clifs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

West, Richard & Turner, Lynn H. 2007. Introducing Communication heory Analysis and Application hird Edition. McGraw-Hill. New York.

Widjaja. 2008. Komunikasi Dan Hubungan Masyarakat. Bumi Aksara. Jakarta

Winarno, Budi. Sistem Politik Indonesia Era Reformasi. 2007. Jakarta: Buku Kita