



**LUND**  
UNIVERSITY

# **Conceiving a Talk Show and Civic Talk through Young Women's Eyes**

Gender in an audience study on Indonesian Talk Show 'Mata Najwa'

Rania Savitri Mafiroh

Supervisor: Annette Hill

Examiner: Fredrik Miegel

MSc in Media and Communication

Lund University

2019

## Abstract

The thesis focuses on the agency of young Indonesian women audiences promoted by an Indonesia television talk show, Mata Najwa. The aim of the thesis is understanding the engagement of young Indonesian women with the programme and how they acquire knowledge from this public discussion talk show as their resource in having civic talk about political and social issues in Indonesia. It also explores the ultimate role of the female host, Najwa Shihab, as part of these young Indonesian women engagement. Through semi-structured interviews with fifteen informants in Indonesia, the thesis creates an understanding that the way young Indonesian women give meanings to the show and have civic talk in the private sphere is tightly correlated with the context of patriarchal culture in Indonesia. The study is theoretically informed by the notion of civic mix (Stephen Coleman), spectrum of engagement (Annette Hill) and civic cultures (Peter Dahlgren). It provides a gendered perspective and social and cultural contexts in understanding the cognitive and affective engagement of the audience with a talk show and the practice of civic talk.

The findings illustrate that the talk show does not only serve in informing young Indonesian women about the social and political issues, where they can get broader perspectives and judge the elites' capability and truthfulness but also as entertainment, where they can mock them. The role of the host, Najwa Shihab, as a journalist and pundit, challenges the patriarchy in Indonesia in the way of scrutinizing the elites who are dominated by male. It affects the acquisition of knowledge and the generation of pleasurable enjoyment on the show. The reflection from the informants on the study over the subordination of Indonesian women brings them to praise Najwa's existence as a liberated woman who is accepted in the public sphere. This also empowered them as citizens and led them to talk about the social and political issues raised on the show. The findings reveal the informants' withdrawal from the public sphere in having civic talk due to the political and patriarchal contexts in Indonesia in which becomes the challenges for Indonesian democracy. However, their practice of civic talk is optimized in the intimate public spheres, with trusted people and spaces, that will nurture their critical thinking and participate in a deliberation.

**Keywords:** *audience engagement, citizenship, civic cultures, civic agency, civic talk, civic mix, female audience, Indonesia, Mata Najwa, Najwa Shihab, intimate public sphere, patriarchal culture, spectrum of engagement, talk show*

## **Acknowledgements**

I would first like to express my thanks and gratitude to my thesis supervisor, Annette Hill, for her guidance and encouragement that help me to accomplish my master. I am forever grateful to have her as my supervisor.

My eternal cheerleader: Ayah, thank you for every smile and laugh you give me all this time, my sweetest Mamah, thank you for all your prayers. I wouldn't survive this master life without you. My forever inspiring but-not-really-helpful husband, Fitrah, who always supporting me: thank you for always challenging me with your criticism, it helps me to get new perspectives.

I am grateful to my kind-hearted friends: Ronja, Manon, Pan, Rio, Annisa, Devita, Inta, Ellen, Etha, Febrina who have provided me through moral and emotional support in this thesis work. And to everyone in MKV and PPI Scania who have supported me along the way.

Very special gratitude goes out to all down at Indonesia Endowment Fund for Education (LPDP) for awarding me the scholarship for my master study.

With a special mention to all my informants. It was fantastic to have the opportunity to discuss the issue related to this thesis with all of you. What a wonderful perspective you had!

## Table of Contents

<i>Abstract</i> .....	2
<i>Acknowledgements</i> .....	3
<i>Table of Contents</i> .....	4
<i>Introduction</i> .....	5
Mata Najwa .....	7
Aims and research questions .....	9
<i>Surveying Politics and the Media: The Context of Indonesia, Television and the Talk Show</i> .....	11
Democratic politics and media .....	11
Democracy, media and women in Indonesia .....	16
Television as public information.....	19
Talk Shows.....	22
<i>Qualitative Research on Mata Najwa</i> .....	26
Methodological Approach.....	26
Design, piloting, sampling and conducting of the interviews .....	28
Data treatment .....	32
Reflection .....	33
<i>Mata Najwa: Analysis of Female Audience Engagement with the Show and Civic Talk beyond it</i> .....	35
Civic mix: audience engagement as citizens .....	35
Najwa Shihab: the representation of the ideal woman vs. a representative of (female) citizens .....	41
The Role of the Civic in Intimate Public Spheres .....	48
<i>Conclusion</i> .....	54
In what ways do young Indonesian women engage with Mata Najwa, in particular with the social and political issues?.....	55
How does the female host become part of these young Indonesian women’s modes of engagement? .....	56
How is the show a resource for young Indonesian women to participate in civic talk beyond their viewing engagement in the private sphere? .....	57
Ways Forward .....	58
<i>References</i> .....	60
<i>Appendices</i> .....	69
Appendix 1: <i>Ratings report</i> .....	69
Appendix 2: <i>List of Interviewees</i> .....	70
Appendix 3: <i>Consent Form</i> .....	71
Appendix 4: <i>Interview Guide</i> .....	72
Appendix 5: <i>Sample of Interview</i> .....	73
Appendix 6: <i>Sample of Coding Process</i> .....	82
Appendix 7: <i>List of Episodes for the interviews</i> .....	83

## Introduction

*'Democracy without the participation of women is not truly democracy'.*  
(Kathryn Robinson, 2009:159)

The slogan above has been adopted by Indonesian activist women in relation to the lack of representation of women in the parliament (ibid: 160) because of the strong patriarchal ideology in Indonesia (Siregar, 2005). Indonesian feminists see the potential for Indonesian young women to participate in politics and bring the feminist agenda on the desk (Wildianti & Perdana, 2019). Young Indonesian women have shown their awareness of women's political struggle in the public sphere, as illustrated by the 2018 Women's March Jakarta (Mann, 2018).<sup>1</sup> During this event, they took the street to voice eight demands for gender equality. Among those eight claims, one requested an increase in the representation and participation of women in politics (ibid). This march illustrates both the underrepresentation of women in the public sphere, and the ability of young women to play a role in fostering democracy. It can also be seen as a form of women's agency in 'challenging the dominant definition of their citizenship as wives and mothers, which was the circumscribed definition of women's social roles that were the core of the gender regime of the New Order' (Robinson: 8).<sup>2</sup>

As this thesis revolves within the realm of media, it is necessary to look at the interconnections between the media and the agency of young women audiences. The media have a role in 'shaping the democratic character of society' (Dahlgren, 2009:2) as they help the audiences build 'cultural citizenship', where they can feel connected with communities such as the state (Hermes & Stello, 2000: 219). However, Indonesian media, including television, have also been impacted by the legacy of the patriarchal culture developed by New Order. They have indeed not adopted gender perspective (Pratiwi & Iswara, 2003), and their representation of women overemphasizes their feminine side, such as their physical appearance and emotions (Noviani, 2014). They are blamed for not paying attention to gender issue (Pratiwi & Iswara, 2003) and for considering women as second-class citizens (Astuti, 2016). Sarwono argues that this 'gender-biased tendency' could strengthen the inequality in Indonesian society (2012: 37), such

---

<sup>1</sup> Women's March Jakarta is a solidarity movement among women and minority communities to demand terms of tolerance and diversity, elimination of violence and protection for women, gender rights in every aspect, and eradication of discrimination against minorities (Women's March Jakarta Chapter).

<sup>2</sup> New Order is the authoritarian regime of Suharto (1965-1998) in Indonesia

as perpetuating the role of women in the private sphere, and the one of men in the public sphere (Astuti, 2016). It is thus agreed that Indonesian television does not promote female empowerment in the public sphere (Noviani, 2014).

Instead of looking at the subordination of women as the product of media, this thesis aims to understand young women's agency through their engagement with a talk show, as a resource to challenge the patriarchal ideology which shadows Indonesian society. Their media engagement is a form of civic practice during which they reflect as citizens, while watching the show. This civic practice goes beyond their viewership experiences through their 'civic talk', which are significant for democracy, as they generate 'personal and social meaning to the ideals of democracy' (Dahlgren, 2009: 116).

This thesis will use an Indonesian talk show, *Mata Najwa*, to look at how young female audiences experience their engagement with the show and their civic talk beyond the show. *Mata Najwa* is hosted by a female journalist and focuses on political and social issues at the national level, aired once a week in TRANS7 channel and uploaded in Najwa Shihab's YouTube channel. The show mainly invites people or elites involved in a particular issue to be scrutinized through the interview and a forum of political debate. According to the official branding from TRANS7, the primary target audience of the programme is male while women are their secondary target audience, as stated in the website of TRANS7.<sup>3</sup> Yet, according to the ratings report from TRANS7, the number of female audiences who watch the show is more than male<sup>4</sup>. It illustrates that the social and political discussion on *Mata Najwa* attracts female audiences, yet they are unrecognized due to the stereotypical perception of women in the patriarchal culture, which can be argued as similar to how Indonesian television perceives women.

However, there is a number of previous audience studies on *Mata Najwa* that lack the gender dimension and limit the focus on the 'interpretive practices (Dahlgren, 1995: 121) of the audience. With the quantitative method, they explore the audience's perception, in terms of host's credibility in affecting the audience's decision to watch the show (Sari, 2018:), the neutrality of the show (Santoso, 2016), and the role of the show to fulfil audiences' need of

---

<sup>3</sup> On the website, it is written, 'Mata Najwa has the potential to attract male audience with the wide age range (youth - elderly). Furthermore, the flexibility of themes on the show could be expanded to accommodate female audiences (Trans7)

<sup>4</sup> see appendix 1

information (Situmeang, 2016). All these studies have noted the knowledge acquisition from the show, yet they simplify it without concerning the affective element of the audience and the political and social contexts. Furthermore, these scholarly articles miss the debate over the embeddedness of television programme viewing and the ‘sociocultural interaction’ (Dahlgren, 1995: 121) that can enhance audience knowledge about the issues talked about on the show.

Thus, this thesis aims to add to Indonesian research by analysing the potential of the show to inform young female audiences as citizens and the involvement of young women in political conversation. As Lunt and Stenner (2005) suggest, talk shows can provide a significant role in encouraging the engagement of audiences, informing and promoting reflection on issues related to the public sphere. A key motivation for the thesis is the notion of the civic mix from Coleman (2011) where the media contribute to democracy not only in conveying public information to the audiences but also in making their product engaging so that the audiences ‘feel capable of contributing to the political conversation’ (2013: 29). In terms of political conversation or ‘civic talk’ (Dahlgren, 2009) that is stimulated by the media, this research touches upon the concept of ‘civic culture’ from Dahlgren (ibid) where the media have a role in which ‘the foundations for the civic agency are embedded.’ It is also related to ‘the spectrum of engagement’ (Hill, 2019) of audiences which addresses the ‘cognitive and affective work’ of their engagement with the show. However, these contexts do not pay enough attention to the context of gender. Therefore, this thesis addresses the gap within the context of young Indonesian women in understanding their engagement with a talk show and civic talk in the private sphere to look closer at their agency in which unrecognized by the media. 2019 is the year of politics in Indonesia when the general election is held, so that Indonesians are highly exposed by political issues. It provides the opportunity to explore young Indonesian women’s political perspectives.

### **Mata Najwa**

Mata Najwa first aired on Metro TV from the 25th of November 2009 to the 30th of August 2017 due to the resignation of the host, a key actor of the show. After her resignation, Mata Najwa returned to television screens on 10th of January 2018 in Trans7. As the presidential election will be held in 2019, Trans7 expects Mata Najwa to be a reference programme for the audience to observe the politicians who will participate in the election. Following Lunt and Stenner’s (2005) argument about the categorisation of talks show, Mata Najwa could be classified as a public discussion talk show.

Mata Najwa provides a talk show in the hybrid format of ‘factual television programmes’. By referring to factual genres addressed by Hill (2007), the format of Mata Najwa could be categorized as ‘news’, ‘current affairs and investigation’, or ‘popular factual’. News in Mata Najwa can be found in the form of interviewing people, either in the studio or in domestic places such as the interview with Hutomo Mandala Putra, or ‘Tommy Suharto’. This took place at Cendana (synonymous with Suharto) House in the episode about Tommy’s political party (Work Party) and corruption and human rights cases in New Order. The ‘current affairs’ format on the show is enacted through the discussion and political debate. Audiences can encounter the ‘investigation’ format in some episodes, such as when Mata Najwa joined the inspection held by the Law and Human Rights Ministry in Sukamiskin prison to inspect the graft convicts’ cells. Lastly, in the ‘popular factual’ style, the show offers inspirational talks in several episodes with politicians and celebrities, where the topics are related to society and politics. The most prominent formats on the show are news interviews and political debate. This hybridity can offer various audience engagements, both rational and affective, (ibid: 14) within the political and social issues. It encourages the engagement of audiences as citizens, as Ritonga (2017) argues that ‘Mata Najwa is accessible for everyone, unexceptional for (Indonesian) youths who assumed to be less engaged with politics’ (ibid: 25). Although this thesis acknowledges that Mata Najwa is a mixed genre format, it does not aim to focus on the specific formats because it tries to unravel young female audiences’ engagement with and beyond the show, as a part of the genre remit of public discussion talk shows.

The host, Najwa Shihab, is well known for her critical and provocative questions while interviewing the elites on the show. One example is when she interviewed Tommy Suharto, a son of the notorious authoritarian former president Suharto, in the episode of Siapa Rindu Suharto (Who Miss Suharto?), 11th July 2018. The episode talks about the unresolved case in the New Order such as corruption charges against Suharto, the violation of human rights in this era and the establishment of Partai Berkarya (Work Party), which promotes the ideas of New Order. It also touches on the murder case of the supreme court justice Syafiuddin Kartasasmita in which Tommy was accused of being a mastermind in the case. In the episode, Najwa asked Tommy ‘I want to ask about the case of murder, Mas Tommy. Is it hard to be the chairman of a political party and be associated as the ex-convicted murderer?’ This question illustrates the host’s critical questioning in bringing back the ‘dark’ history of the political party’s chairman that is participating in the general election of 2019. However, Najwa is not a mere host, she is a senior journalist who also takes part in the coverage of the issues and affects the way she

frames them (Setiowati & Nur, 2016). The existence of Najwa Shihab as the female host and journalist in the show is important for the female audience engagement with the show and the issues raised, because she is the representation of women in the public sphere who challenge the patriarchy. Therefore, her role for Indonesian women is significant in terms of empowering them as citizens.

### **Aims and research questions**

The main objective of the thesis is to critically investigate the engagement of young Indonesian women with Mata Najwa, and how they garner knowledge from this public discussion talk show as a resource in their civic talk on political and social issues in Indonesia. It also identifies if and how the host becomes the key player in this young, female Indonesian engagement with political and social issues raised on the show, as she is a female journalist who challenges the ideology of patriarchal culture. This thesis allows the voice of their critical opinion and feelings about social and political circumstances in Indonesia that foster or hinder them from civic talk in the public sphere. Moreover, it provides feminine insight into the political Indonesian talk shows primarily aimed at male audiences where women's issues aren't mainstream yet. It thus addresses the gap between the talk show and civic talk within the context of patriarchal society through audience research on female audiences.

The following research questions are determined to answer the aims of this research:

- In what ways do young Indonesian women engage with Mata Najwa, in particular with social and political issues?
- How does the female host become part of these young Indonesian women's modes of engagement?
- How is the show a resource for young Indonesian women to participate in civic talk beyond their viewing engagement in the private sphere?

Through audience research, it could be revealed that 'the audiences are aware that the programmes are constructed: they comment on biases introduced by production processes [...]' (Livingstone & Lunt, 1994: 71). The audiences' interpretation and criticism become pivotal to elucidate the role of media in provoking young Indonesian female engagement with social and political issues, their reflection on political and social condition, and civic talk. To explore this, a qualitative method that employed semi-structured interviews was conducted. It follows the

argument from Hermes (2013) in terms of qualitative audience studies, that it ‘bears witness to a spirit of solidarity and recognition of unequal gender relations [...]’ (Ibid: 61). Through conducting interviews with Indonesian women, the study gives female Indonesian audiences voice as citizens left out of the discourse of media audiences. With the use of concepts of civic mix, spectrum of engagement, and civic talk, the thesis unravels their attitude towards the male dominated politics through their engagement with Mata Najwa and civic talk. The research matters for Indonesia at this particular time, the year of politics, as it gives the opportunity to provide women with voices within the realm of media, as citizens who also are part of politics in Indonesia, and it opens new discussions on female Indonesian audiences and citizenship.

## **Surveying Politics and the Media: The Context of Indonesia, Television and the Talk Show**

This chapter will provide a literature review of the relationship between talk show, politics and audiences. It will first consider how the concept of politics is served in a ‘civic mix’ and discussed in the form of ‘civic talk’ in intimate public spheres. Second, it will give an overview of Indonesian media development, particularly television, and female audiences within the patriarchal hegemony which has been strongly influenced by the transition of Indonesia from authoritarianism (New Order) to democracy (post-New Order). Third, it will explain how television can promote and encourage political debate among audiences and in what way previous studies have considered the gender dimension of the audience. Finally, by analysing previous studies on how talk show programmes are defined and conceptualised, and their relationship with politics, the study will gain comprehensive understanding of the talk show from the literature.

### **Democratic politics and media**

Discussing politics in the context of democracy, Blumler and Coleman (2013), in their article entitled ‘Paradigms of Civic Communication’, criticise the relationship between ‘political’ and ‘democratic action’, which, it is argued, has become blurred due to people’s understanding of governance, which has turned into disbelief and disappointment and has altered participation in the political process. The dichotomy of ‘acting politically’ and ‘acting democratically’ is thus argued to be distinct in regard to the ways people participate in politics, yet both are intercorrelated (ibid). The political should be perceived as ‘a dimension inherent in human practices’ which is not situated in a particular type of institution or constitutes ‘one sphere of society’ (Mouffe, 2008: 105). The distinction and conjunction between ‘the political’ and ‘politics’ is clarified by Mouffe (1999: 754, 2008: 105) that ‘the political’ is the dimension of antagonism which exists in human relations and is manifested in many forms, while ‘politics’ attempts to organise a fixed order and ‘human coexistence in conditions that are always potentially conflictual because they are affected by the dimension of the political’. Following Mouffe (ibid), Dahlgren (2003: 155) asserts that the construction of the political and politics is through ‘word and deed’, while Blumler and Coleman (2013), Dahlgren (2009: 83) and Mouffe (2008: 105) emphasise that it cannot only be presented in a rational way. There is a need for

people to first feel engaged before they participate in politics (Dahlgren, 2006: 24). This engagement involves the rationale and affection; he states that ‘to be engaged in something signals not only cognitive attention and some normative stance, but also an affective investment’ (ibid: 25). Therefore, it is important to recognise both the political and politics and to underscore their relationship in understanding the way people engage in democratic action, which potentially fosters political action.

Alongside this approach, Coleman (2013) suggests that the media has roles of informing citizens and stimulating audiences to become engaged in the democratic process. He addresses the significance of the ‘civic mix’ within the media to serve democratic citizenship (2011, 2013). In his study of the 2010 televised UK election leader debate (Coleman, 2011), the use of the ‘civic mix’ notion defines the ‘mixture of game and substance-oriented debate’ during the UK elections (ibid). It unpacks the political debate on TV which comprises both politics ‘with all of its well-known characteristics of partisan competitiveness, strategies impression management and manipulative techniques) and democracy (‘with its normative emphasis upon the inclusion of the widest number of citizens in informed and well-reasoned deliberation and decision making’) (ibid: 31). Adapting Jamieson’s (1992) argument, Coleman implies that the notion of ‘game’ is rhetorical style, impression management, and winners and losers in the debate (2011: 20), meaning ‘candidates are seen as performers, reporters as theatrical critics, [and] the audience as spectators’ (Jamieson, 1992: 166), whereas ‘substance’ refers to policy challenges, intentions and solutions, party records, and leadership qualities (Coleman, 2011: 20-21). In this context, this game and substance mixture is needed for democratic citizenship in order to cover and make sense of policy differences, while energising agonistic democracy (ibid: 31).

To serve democratic citizenship effectively, it is suggested the media should provide a balanced production of rational political debate and entertainment in a civic mix to inform and stimulate citizens (Coleman, 2013: 6-7). This civic mix may thus acknowledge the significant mixture of cognitive and affective elements in political engagement. In the same vein, Dahlgren (2009: 83-86) argues that feeling is attached to the rational-subjective level of the individual. Thus, this study adopts Coleman’s notion of the civic mix to grasp the engagement of the audience with Mata Najwa as the programme contains both political and social discussion and entertainment, such as conflict among the guests and inspirational talk. Furthermore, the

rational and emotional elements are pivotal in examining why and how the audience engages with the talk show.

Considering the affective and cognitive elements in the media to serve democratic citizenship, this study emphasises the ways audiences engage in rational debate and entertainment in the show in which contextualised in the political and social contexts of Indonesia and by gender perspective. In *Media Experiences* (2019), Annette Hill explains the notions of the ‘spectrum of engagement’ and ‘modes of engagement’ which can help this study to analyse the engagement of audiences. By extending Corner’s (2011) work on the ‘stages of engagement’ that involves the ‘sustained cognitive’ and ‘affective work’ that highlights individuals’ ‘subjectivity’, Hill asserts that ‘the engagement is experienced in myriad ways and extends across an emotional range so that people switch between positive and negative engagement, or disengagement’ (2018: 7). This thus illustrates that the ‘spectrum of engagement’ resonates the moving state of the cognitive and affective work of audiences (Hill, 2017: 7). The ‘cognitive’ aspect refers to what is thought about the media text (ibid: 71). On the other hand, the ‘affective’ is about feeling, and by adopting the notion of ‘affective practice’ from Wetherell (2012), Hill also describes ‘affective’ as being the aspect of the affect and emotion of audiences that is embedded in their personal and social relations (ibid: 10).

The modes of engagement are used to describe the multiple senses of the objective and subjective elements in media experiences which reflect audiences’ social life (Hill, 2019: 10). The objective modes of engagement involve ‘critical appreciation and genre knowledge, or storytelling, aesthetics, and style’, while the subjective modes of engagement relate to ‘the physicality and sensations associated with a live television experience’ (ibid). Hill further asserts that ‘engagement is a form of agency’ (ibid: 54), as it offers audiences the chance to act beyond the text. In relation to Mata Najwa, it is crucial to understand the engagement of young Indonesian female audiences, what they think and feel about the show, the host, the guests and the topics raised, which include their subjectivity in reacting and reflecting on their social life. Moreover, in understanding audience engagement, we can grasp how the audiences value the show, what knowledge they gather from it, and how a sense of trust to the show and actors in it is built. These *values, knowledge and trust* are three dimensions of civic cultures, the cultural prerequisites of ‘civic agency’, in which people can perceive themselves as participants in democracy (Dahlgren, 2009). Engagement is the step that needs to be taken into account for people to participate in the democratic process.

It is necessary that this study is informed by the circuit of civic culture to elaborate the connection between audience engagement and the way they are engaged in civic talk. Coined by Dahlgren (2009), 'civic culture' is 'a framework intended to analyse the conditions that are necessary for - either promote or hinder - civic engagement' (ibid: 103). The circuit involves six intercorrelated dimensions: knowledge, values, trust, spaces, practices and identities. The first dimension of civic culture is the *knowledge* of the social and political world that revolves in the public sphere, meaning people 'must have access to reliable reports, portrayals, analyses, discussions, and debates about current affairs' as well as the acquisition of relevant knowledge to engage civically (ibid: 108-109). How do young Indonesian female audiences obtain knowledge from Mata Najwa? This is one of the key points addressed in the analysis, as the 'modes of knowledge' of young people have evolved in terms of 'new ways of knowing and forming communicative competencies' (Dahlgren, 2003: 158). Further, knowledge is inseparable from the process of learning as it is situated within audiences' understanding of particular information (Hill, 2007: 28). The second dimension is *values*, which Dahlgren (2009: 111) categorises as being substantive ('equality, liberty, justice, solidarity, and tolerance') and procedural ('openness, reciprocity, discussion and responsibility or accountability'). As the media tend to encourage 'the commitment to democratic values' (Dahlgren, 2003: 155), this thesis explores how the show applies the virtues of democracy - the exploration of the issue - from the audience's perspective, and whether the way audiences participate in civic talk reflects the values that adhere to democracy, such as tolerance and openness.

The third dimension is *trust*, whereby 'the bearers of trust are usually seen as citizens, and the object of trust are the institutions or representatives of government' (Dahlgren, 2009: 112). In this sense, trust among citizens is highly dependent on their knowledge of the government and their representatives as presented in the media. Kohring and Matthew (2007) examine the trustworthiness of news media, comprising trust in topic selection, selectivity of facts, accurate depictions, and journalistic assessment. In this thesis, the trustworthiness of Mata Najwa, as the source of information, may affect audiences' evaluation of the political actors and institutions. However, trust does not only concern the relationship between citizens and the institutions but also the 'social trust' (Couldry, Livingstone, and Markham, 2007: 13) among citizens which fosters civic participation in political life (Dahlgren, 2009: 114). The next dimension of *spaces* is where 'citizens need an access to each other to develop their collective political efforts to act together' (ibid, 153). The spaces where democracy takes place vary, including public and

private ones (Mitchell & Staeheli, 2004:147). The association between political practices and the various spaces is examined in terms of ‘publicity and privacy’ (ibid). The study pays attention to the way audiences generate the spaces to meet others to discuss ‘policy and decision-making’ (Dahlgren 2009: 114) and to who can access them.

The fifth dimension is *practices* which need the ‘skills’ of ‘communicative competencies’ to construct ‘personal and social meaning to the ideals of democracy’, so the dimension is closely related to that of knowledge (Dahlgren, 2009: 116-117). Dahlgren (ibid: 88-90) points out that conversational talk is considered as political deliberation when it veers towards political talk. The audiences of public discussion talk shows may, therefore, engage in democratic practice, as manifested in conversations related to the show, which serves to encourage their civic identities. This in line with Coleman’s (2013) argument that people need to feel capable enough to participate in political talk; have the initiative to become engaged in the political process that affects their lives, at least by not feeling as outsiders; and recognise that their ‘subjective belief’ matters for the world (ibid: 29). The final dimension is *identities*, ‘the theme of people’s subjective view of themselves as members and participants of democracy’, which is the centrepiece of civic culture and together with the other five dimensions helps in ‘shaping the conditions of its existence’ (ibid: 118-119). Dahlgren suggests two significant schematic components to civic identity: ‘the sense of being an empowered political agent’ and ‘membership in one or more political communities’ (ibid: 120-121). This is in line with the concept of ‘agency’ addressed by Gamson (1992:7), in which people are empowered to be the ‘potential agent’ in collective action as ‘We’. With civic cultures in mind, the thesis explores young female audiences in terms of how they are empowered by the media to participate in civic talk, and how they reflect on their political subjectivities as female citizens.

With regard to civic talk, it is necessary for the thesis to approach the notion of ‘deliberative democracy’ proposed by Habermas (1996) to assert the relationship between communication and democracy. It is a normative category of the legitimate political process which occurs in the public sphere, where rational debate aims to justify political agreement (ibid: 306). In the same vein, Elster (1998) and Schudson (1997) assert that deliberation is the appropriate method to undertake collective decision making.

However, Dahlgren (2009) criticises the exclusiveness of the deliberative instrumental view and suggests looking beyond the formal context of deliberation. Following Dahlgren (ibid),

deliberative democracy can be perceived as a process of generating ‘public reasons’ and reaching ‘mutual understanding’ through everyday civic talk (Kim & Kim, 2008: 51). Dahlgren contends that the ‘messiness and unpredictability of everyday talk in order to put forward the view that the political, and thus the individual’s role as a citizen, is never a priori given, but can emerge in various ways, to which political analysis has to attend’ (2003: 160). However, everyday talk is treated as ‘civic talk’ when it turns into political discussion (ibid) when it moves to a ‘politically relevant theme’ (Dayan, 2005: 60). Considering the ‘civic talk’ that takes place in everyday communication, it is important for this study to consider the way audiences develop conversation into a rational argument about politics.

Regarding the places where people have political talks, the division between the public and private spheres becomes obscure. Drawing on the Habermasian traditional view of the public sphere, which is limited to instrumental deliberative democracy and openness (1989), informal civic talk is therefore associated with the private sphere. The private is usually referred to as a women’s sphere, while the public sphere is a space for men (Dahlgren, 1995; Dahlgren, 2009; Plummer, 2003). Women’s talk in the private sphere is considered as ‘gossip’ and it is perceived that their conversation is not rational (Wood, 2009: 16). However, apart from the gendered sphere, there are intersections between the public and private spheres where the personal is ‘connected to, structured by, or regulated through the public sphere’ (Plummer, 2003: 70). In line with Plummer (ibid), Lauren Berlant developed the notion of the ‘intimate public sphere’, where people can imagine, experience and govern their personal and collective identities in a private space (1997). Berlant asserts that the intimate public sphere in the context of the US is a place in which social belonging is produced by ‘personal acts and values, especially acts originating in or directed toward the family sphere’ (ibid: 6). In this sphere, people experience citizenship through intimacy (Berlant, 1997). Therefore, the thesis attempts to explore the intimate experiences of young female audiences which lead to civic talk.

### **Democracy, media and women in Indonesia**

To contextualise the thesis research, it is necessary to identify the bigger picture of Indonesia from previous studies, in terms of democracy, and the media and women, providing the background and addressing the gap in the study of women within the realms of democracy and the media. Television in Indonesia has been a symbolic witness of the Indonesian journey from the authoritarian regime of Suharto to a democratic nation. The national broadcaster, TVRI,

was established in Indonesia in 1962 and was the only television station in the country until 1987, when it worked as a tool of state propaganda (Kitley, 2000; Sen & Hill, 2000; Hollander et al., 2009). It was a site for the state to construct and reconstruct the imagined community of Indonesians as an ‘ideal’ nation, united under the domination of the state (Kitley, 2000). The state invented a ‘national culture’, which was presented as cultural policies, practices and values (Sen & Hill, 2000: 5). An example of cultural invention in the New Order was the definition of women as “companions to their husband, educator for their children, supplementary income-earners, housekeepers [...]” (Blackburn, 1999: 200). An imbalance in power relations therefore prevailed between Indonesian men and women, in which women were perceived as subordinate to men (Fakih, 1998).

Therefore, the responsibilities undertaken by women as ordered by the state and the promotion of femininity that asserted that politics was for men, prevented them from participating in the public sphere as citizens (Blackburn, 1999: 200). However, in the last decade of the New Order, young well-educated urban women started to establish organisations aiming for social change, and after the fall of Suharto in the Reformation era, under President Habibie they became more vocal and attempted to gain media recognition (ibid: 201). Challenging the stereotypical definition of femininity promoted by the New Order, these women raised issues such as ‘the negative representations of women in mass media, and initiated public discussion around issues of sex discrimination, and sexual harassment in the workplace’ (Robinson, 2009: 148). They demanded a democracy that offered gender equity (ibid). It is argued in this thesis that the pre-transition phase played a role in Indonesia, in which society forced the state to make democratic reforms, and conflicts among the ruling elite emerged (Kitley, 2003: 105). During this phase, five commercial television stations, owned by Suharto’s family and cronies, were established to fulfil the public’s desire for entertainment (ibid), and the increasing demand for public information (Hollander et.al., 2009: 41).

Although the state controlled the news bulletins, the emergence of commercial television stations, with their soft news and current affairs programmes, such as talk shows, business dialogues and political panel discussions, encouraged ‘the discursive participation of [...] audiences in social and political commentary and criticism’ (Kitley, 2000: 265). Kitley (2000, 2003) argues that even though commercial television stations contributed to the intensification of the public sphere within Indonesian society, their objectives were merely commercial, which generated a pseudo-public sphere of culture consumption. Following Habermas’ (1989)

discussion on commercialisation in the public sphere, Kitley confirms Habermas' (ibid, 164) statement that 'Discussion becomes formalised and [...] loses its publicist function' (Kitley, 2003: 104). In this case, in contradiction to Kitley (2003), Coleman (2013: 1) suggests identification of the potential of television that is relevant for democracy, in which 'democratic debate might be instigated, stimulated, or promoted'. As illustrated in the previous section on the civic mix of Coleman (2011), democratic citizenship relies on informed individuals who feel engaged in the political process. Therefore, the thesis explores this potential, which Kitley (2000, 2003) has also pointed out, through research on young female audiences, as the context of gender in terms of audience participation in political talk has yet to be addressed.

Even in the new post-New Order era of democracy, the representation of women in politics is low, implying that Indonesian politics is dominated by males (Siregar, 2005). Male elites of politics considerably do not pay attention to gender issues because they believe it is women's problem (ibid). (Wildianti & Perdana, 2019). In terms of the media, the political discourse in Indonesia is under the influence of the media owners who are affiliated with political parties (Tapsell, 2015). Therefore, many studies criticize Indonesian commercial televisions for preserving patriarchal culture instead of serving democracy, which promotes gender equality to all citizens. Murtiningsih and Advenita (2017) argue that women tend to be treated in 'unequal standard', due to their underrepresented voices and misrepresented portrayal. The act of feminization and sexualization of women, such as focusing on women's beauty, manner, the physical appearance, emotion, women in the domestic sphere, is perceived often and has become the reference of Indonesian commercial television programmes in representing women (Noviani, 2014; Iswara & Pratiwi, 2003). The lack of women issues in the coverage of Indonesian commercial television is also concerning because it is perceived to be supporting the disapproval of patriarchal culture as well as the encouragement of women's empowerment in the public sphere (Noviani, 2014: 61). On the other hand, the Indonesian media report the participation of women in politics when women protest on the streets to demand their rights (Venny & Rahayu ed., 2014:19). Siregar (2004) contends that it is the case of the ambivalence of Indonesian television institutions, where they open space for women to express their rights; on the other hand, these institutions reinforce the patriarchal presentation of women.

Further, in the middle of this criticism, Indonesian televisions accept women who are against the patriarchal culture through their critical thoughts in hosting political and social discussion in TV such as Najwa Shihab (Mata Najwa's host) and Ira Koesno (a former journalist, who

currently hosts *Indonesia Berbicara / Indonesia Speaking* in NET.). Their visibility contrasts the lack of attention given to gender studies in television. According to Carpentier (2011: 88), the representation in the media ‘leaves more space for diversity and cultural struggle and the role of identities and affect.’ The representation of women in Indonesian television who participate in the mediated public sphere will give the space for Indonesian female audiences to reflect on their identity as part of the state, as Joke Hermes and Stello (2000) argue in terms of cultural citizenship. Thus, this thesis argues that it is necessary to take a closer look at the representation of women in the public sphere that challenges the ideology of patriarchal culture in Indonesia through a public discussion talk show from female audiences perspective, as it provides a different perspective on how female audiences give meaning to their viewing experiences.

### **Television as public information**

Within the realm of democracy, television has long been regarded as one of the main media for audiences to obtain political information and to encourage discussion as part of their participation in democracy (Curran & Gurevitch, 2000: 129; Dahlgren, 2009: 34; Coleman, 2013). Delli & Keeter (1996) and Chaffe & Kanihan (1997: 423-424) argue that television plays a crucial role in providing political information, either before or after elections, through news and current affairs programmes. Through their roots in journalism, news and current affairs programmes serve to ‘enhance public knowledge’ (Dahlgren, 1995: 46). This is related to the notion of the ‘public knowledge project’ of Corner (1991: 268), which focuses on ‘the politics of information and the viewer as citizen’ to promote engagement in the democratic process. As a result, the audiences can develop a civic agency in which people generate knowledge together, such as through civic talk (Dahlgren, 2009). Menzes, Ponte, Britez (2017) demonstrates that news become the source of conversation for young people talking about politics with their family and friends.

News programmes are mostly productions that present ‘the main source of public information’ (Hill, 2007: 44) to connect the government and the governed (Norris, 2000: 26), enabling people to obtain political information while making judgements on how political power is exercised (Aalberg et al., 2010). The study by Mirca Madianou (2005) on television news audiences in Greece, including the Greek, Greek Cypriot, and Turkish-speaking communities, demonstrates that news can be the ‘mediator’ between ‘public institutions’ and audiences’ interests. The study

shows that audience engagement in news goes beyond its function as a source of information. Some audiences in her study are able to position themselves as the public who addressed by the news. This supports the statement by Nightingale that television provides the space where people can encounter a sense of connection to the public sphere (Nightingale, 2007: 185). However, the study by Madianou (2005) illustrates that some audiences decide to ‘switch off’ from being part of the public due to several reasons such as their lack of trust to the media and journalists. In terms of gender, women audiences switch off due to lack of time to access news and/or dissatisfaction with the coverage of ‘national issues’, which is caused by ‘negative personal experiences to the media and journalist (Madianou, 2005: 107). This shows that even though news treats its audiences as citizens, the way audiences give meaning to news is unpredictable as it involves affective and cognitive engagement (Hill, 2019) that are contextualised and dynamic. This thesis strives to understand the way audiences engage with what appears on the screen and reflect as citizens.

Despite the significance of the audience’s political identity in engaging with public information, it is also necessary for this thesis to contextualise audience engagement with its gender identity. A study by David Morley (1992) demonstrates the television programme preferences of women and men, claiming that women tend to watch ‘fictional programmes’, while men prefer watching ‘factual programmes’ (ibid: 148). However, a more recent study by Hill and Gauntlett (1999) does not find gender differences in the viewing process and audience preferences, as both men and women in their study enjoy the soap opera genre, which is stereotypically identified as feminine. A study by Ross (1995) on British women and news also found that women did watch news programmes but acknowledged that news stories did not cover women’s issues, contained irrelevant content to their everyday lives, and evaluated the news coverage. This shows that women engage with news and able to reflect on their lives that the news media have not enough fulfilling their interests in women’s issues. Following Ross’ study, which cuts across the division of gendered media, Liesbet van Zoonen (1991: 47) suggests that in terms of female audience research, ‘the focus on the reception of soaps, romances and women’s magazines seriously narrows our potential for articulating a comprehensive cultural critique, for we tend to ignore whole areas of social and cultural practice.’ Therefore, based on this approach, the thesis counts on women’s voices regarding their engagement with a public discussion talk show, to obtain in-depth comprehension of their engagement and their reflections on their identities as audiences, women and citizens within the context of patriarchal Indonesian culture.

It has been discussed above that although news offers the opportunity for the audience to obtain public information, it is the audience who give it meaning. It is acknowledged in the thesis that the construction of meaning is not merely from the information provided in Mata Najwa, as the audience might be exposed to information both from the media and their own experience. Dahlgren (2000: 323) asserts that to become knowledge, information has to be meaningful and linked to previous understanding. To support Dahlgren's statement, Chaffee and Kanihan's (1997) study on the contribution of television and newspapers to audiences' political knowledge indicates that these two media are complementary with each other. As audiences are perceived to be active in seeking information, they use several media to obtain different information. To be specific, television is used for evaluating the personalities of political actors, while newspapers are for obtaining detailed information about the policies offered by such actors (ibid). Hence, the thesis aims to unravel how audiences obtain and negotiate information from multiple sources and programmes by the way they give it meaning and make sense of issues.

The way audiences make sense of issues on television news is related to the role of the journalists and presenters who organise the programmes. They present 'the world, with particular events, feelings and experiences that are represented in the news content' (Hill, 2007: 133) to the audience. This is in accordance with the definition of news as part of citizenship made by Corner (1995: 55), that news helps its audiences to not only understand issues but also 'their capacities for judgement and action'. Therefore, as its representatives, journalists do not simply present the 'facts' based on statements from politicians, but they delve into and interpret them (Patterson, 1997: 447). This is the case when journalists do not only describe the 'facts' of issues and events, but they also interpret them so that the audience can understand. Their involvement in interpreting issues is evident in the form of news interviews, in which journalists enclose their statements within the questions to protect the neutrality of their coverage (Clayman, 1988). This could be perceived as being the result of journalists' observations and their comments on the political scene (McNair, 2011: 71). According to Nimmo and Combs (1992: 24), those who 'voice their special knowledge in public forms' are considered as 'pundits'. The term 'pundit', derived from a Sanskrit word, means 'learned person or teacher who is not only an authority but also a renowned political figure' (ibid: 6). This refers to people who do not only make authoritative judgments, but also 'mock the pretensions of those who nag politicians through public and widely circulated observations' (ibid). The opinions conveyed by pundits can therefore influence public opinion (ibid: 8). Drawing on Corner

(2011), this public opinion can be seen to be the result of the ‘soft power’ of the media because of ‘the perceptions they encourage, the information they provide and the feelings they generate’ (ibid: 14). The notion of ‘pundit’ is important here in order to grasp the contribution of the host, who has a journalistic background, in affecting the understanding of young women audiences of political and social issues.

## **Talk Shows**

This section considers previous studies that have focused on the talk show as a television genre to help comprehend the genre and its components, such as format or subgenre, topic and host. Television programme genres change over time, and there is continual search for new programmes, so the boundaries of genres become blurred and expand, leading to the overlapping of different genres and subtypes (Livingstone & Lunt, 1994: 37). Livingstone and Lunt argue that talk shows ‘resist categorisations in established genres’ (ibid). However, in order to analyse the relationship between programmes and audiences, programme categorisation based on similarities is needed (ibid). Several researchers have defined various formats of talk show genre (Dahlgren, 1995; Lunt & Stenner, 2005; Tolson, 2001). Dahlgren (1995: 62) categorises talk shows into two formats: *elite* and *vox pop*. Mata Najwa belongs to the elite talk show category, as it fits well with the television journalism he posits, and the guests are experts who are able to present ‘a reasoned analysis’ during the discussion (ibid: 63). TRANS7, from their website, categorised Maja Najwa as a talk show as well. However, Mata Najwa also invites lay people to be part of the discussions of ‘concrete political issues’ (ibid), which Dahlgren would categorise as being *vox pop*.

Contrary to Dahlgren (1995), Tolson (2001: 5) maps out the formats of the range of talk shows, from ‘issue-oriented debates, through exploration of personal experiences, to the kinds of staging and performance sometimes dismissed as ‘trash’ TV’. In line with Tolson, Lunt and Stenner (2005: 62) emphasise the distinctions between talk show formats in terms of the subject of discussion: *public discussion talk shows* focus on ‘public discussion of issues of concern’; *therapeutic talk shows* ‘take an explicitly therapeutic approach to personal problems’; and *conflict talk shows* feature ‘conflict and emotive secrets’. Instead of focusing on the talk show participants, the thesis concentrates on Lunt and Stenner’s, *public discussion talk show* format. Although Mata Najwa has hybrid formats with regard to debates, interviews and investigations,

the issues discussed on the programme are centred on social and political issues, which follows the characteristics of a *public discussion talk show*.

There is some discussion around talk shows and their role as a forum of debate in the public sphere. Public discussion talk show programmes offer a space for different actors to gather, where they can put forward ‘claims and reason’ in ‘immediate challenges and response’, so the audience will receive more obvious perspectives about public issues (Schultz & Wessler, 2007: 22). Even though this format of talk show is an arena where debates on political and social issues occur, according to Lunt and Stenner’s (2005: 78) study on *The Jerry Springer Show*, talk shows should not be treated as a public sphere, but as ‘the mediation of public expression, reflection and deliberation’. They claim that the talk show is a form of deliberation within a mediated space (ibid), and that although the discussion on talk shows usually does not aim to achieve consensus, the participants ‘express something important and characteristic about public opinion’ (ibid: 61). Following Lunt and Stenner (2005), Schultz and Wessler (2007) posit the debates on talk shows is not simply made by the interested actors, they can be ‘problematized’ and ‘discussed’ through justification of the claim and argument. Hence, a talk show can be seen to be promote public deliberation (Lunt and Stenner, 2005).

On the other hand, Liebes’ (1999) study of the Israeli talk show demonstrates that the genre often emphasises the dramatic value within it, where the ‘argument, conflict, and sense of chaos’ have become the characteristic of the television talk show (ibid: 113). The selection of participants for shows is also based on their potential to attract people (ibid: 123). The talk show is argued to be a spectacle of verbal battle and entertainment, which jeopardises their legitimation as space for rational deliberation in the public sphere (ibid). This follows the argument of Lunt and Stenner about talk shows as an ‘emotional public sphere’ which provides entertainment for audiences through the conflict arising on the programme (Lunt & Stenner, 2005). The entertainment value of the talk show is relevant to the ‘popular culture project’ introduced by Corner (1991), which concerns entertainment and emphasises ‘the social problematics of taste and of pleasure’ (1991: 268).

Drawing on these discussions, this study acknowledges that public discussion talk shows do offer debate, which is very important for democracy, as the audience obtains different perspectives to generate their own opinion and knowledge. However, at the same time, talk shows provide entertainment for the audience, attracting public attention through the verbal

battles broadcast. Therefore, instead of examining talk shows as a forum of debate with regard to the public sphere, this thesis attempts to analyse their potential for sustaining an informed audience through public knowledge and entertainment values, and promoting public discussion. This refers back to the notion of the civic mix, which offers the ‘high mindedness of rational political debate and the enchanting appeal of participatory democracy’ (Coleman, 2013: 6-7). It is also related to the notion of ‘cultural citizenship’ developed by Joke Hermes to analyze the potential of democracy within the popular culture (2005: 5). Through the ‘practices of reading, consuming, celebrating, and criticizing offered in the realm of (popular culture),’ it allows the audience to feel connected with the community and reflect on that connection (ibid: 10). The community here is ‘ranging from ‘formally organised communities such as the nation-state to virtual communities such as feminism’ (Hermes and Stello, 2000: 219). Therefore, exploring talk shows and their values will help obtain in-depth understanding of the blurred boundaries between the ‘public knowledge project’ and ‘popular culture’ in serving citizenship, which Hill (2007: 13) addresses in terms of the popular factual genre that it is ‘connected to the transformation of the public knowledge project’.

A talk show is ‘host-centred’ for the role of the host is significant in leading the talk and influences the quality of discussion (Schultz & Wessler, 2007: 23). The host has a responsibility to ‘tone’ and direct, guide and set limitations to the talk among the guests (Timberg, 2002: 3). Even though this thesis does not evaluate the talk show, it pays attention to the role of the host in driving the discussion through his or her ‘questions and intervention’ and ability to ‘stimulate more or less substantial argumentation’ (ibid). The role of hosts here is defined as being intermediaries between the guests, and between the audience and the public issued, as they help audiences to give meaning to the political and social issues discussed. This is what the thesis is aiming to achieve: to understand what meaning the audiences construct from the show in question.

As the host of Mata Najwa is female, it is necessary to consider how a female host plays a crucial role in affecting female audience. Timberg (2002) takes the example of *The Oprah Winfrey Show* to analyse the significance of the role of Winfrey, as a female host, in representing the ‘double voiced’ identity of an African and American woman, which can then be argued to empower her audiences (ibid). Adding to Timberg’s analysis of Winfrey, Helen Wood (2009: 28) addresses the trust relationship between the host and her audiences, which fosters audience empowerment manifested in ‘dialogue, self-help and solidarity to combat

contemporary demons'. The way Winfrey positions herself in the discussion by connecting herself with the guests and the audiences 'exhibits a good deal of empathy [...] which might be regarded as both feminine and feminist in its insistence on personal intimacy' (ibid: 24). As a representative of women, who has talked about her background as the victim of child abuse, drugs and self-hate, Winfrey empowers her audiences to confess their own problems (Tolson & Brunvatne, 2001: 154). The familiarity between the host and audience becomes a resource to build intimacy between them.

The emergence of intimacy and familiar feelings between the host and talk show audiences are developed within the notion of the 'para-social' relationship coined by Horton and Wohl (1956). Audiences experience the illusion that they know and have a close relationship with the host, known as 'intimacy at a distance', through the way the host addresses them. This feeling becomes salient in the 'informal, ritualized and interactive style' of talk shows, which encourages audiences to be part of the interaction (Livingstone, 1994: 169). This makes the host seem normal, accessible and an equal (Tolson, 2001: 33). It is crucial to build the audience's trust in the host (ibid). Mata Najwa clearly cannot be compared to The Oprah Winfrey Show, whose genre is a therapeutic talk show, rather than one of public discussion (Lunt & Stenner, 2005). However, what is useful for the thesis from this discussion is to look beyond the host's role, at how the intimacy that leads to trust is built, the way she positions herself as part of the audience in the contexts of Indonesia, and the way she expresses her thoughts.

## **Qualitative Research on Mata Najwa**

This chapter will reflect on and analyse the methodology and methods applied to the study of young female talk show audiences in respect of media, cultural, social and political approaches. The chapter will first outline the methodology. It will then address the methods of data collection and analysis using a qualitative approach. At the end of the chapter, there will be a critical reflection on the research process to illuminate how the overall process of data collection was conducted and how the analysis was made.

### **Methodological Approach**

The cultural invention of gender (Kitley, 2000: 5) in Indonesia is evidence that gender is ‘a social construction and culture’ (van Zoonen, 1991: 46). As the thesis aims to understand the agency of women in a patriarchal culture, it takes as its foundation the standpoint theory of Sandra Harding (2004). In this study, female audiences are considered to be marginalised people in political and social settings. By studying women’s experiences and perspectives, Harding argues that they can be resources for understanding the social and political processes that shape their lives, as they look ‘beneath or behind the dominant sexist and androcentric ideologies’ (2004: 6). Standpoint theory therefore provide the groundwork for the thesis to critically identify how the patriarchal culture of Indonesia affects the way young female audiences interpret their engagement with a talk show and civic talk.

Rooted in social constructionism, in which the meaning-making by audiences is significantly tied to the social construction of individuals, the audience research in this study is built upon the spectacle-performance paradigm (Abercrombie & Longhurst, 1998: 37). According to Abercrombie and Longhurst, everyday life is constructed as ‘performance’ and individuals are constructed as ‘performers’ (ibid: 73). They assert that even though everyday life is dominated by the media in which constructed, audiences as ‘performers’ can give meaning to text in the media in a ‘diverse’ and ‘unpredictable’ manner (ibid: 32) as a way of self-reflection (ibid: 40). This paradigm fits this study as it allows agency for young female audiences even though they are constructed by their ‘disposal’ (given their education, class, background, etc.) (Hermes, 2014: 62).

Following this approach, Seale et al (2004: 5) suggest that there is a need for social researchers to focus on the practice of everyday life in order to identify the influence of the ‘thoughts, feelings, and identities’ which are ‘brought to bear on our understandings of who and what we are, both in relation to what we apparently are within and to what we believe we share as members of particular situations’. Thus, the social context binding audiences cannot be taken for granted, and it is necessary to examine it critically (ibid). This relates to the proposition of the spectacle-performance paradigm, in which ‘people, objects and events in the world cannot simply be taken for granted but have to be framed, gazed upon, registered...’ (Abercrombie & Longhurst, 1998: 78). In order to achieve this, the contextualisation of research is crucial, as Flyvbjerg (2001: 72) suggests that social science could develop a ‘nuanced view of reality’ through case studies, as these can provide ‘concrete, context-dependent knowledge’. Therefore, a case study on the female audiences of a talk show, *Mata Najwa*, is developed in this work, as discussed in the introduction. Since 2009, *Mata Najwa* has presented political and social discussion and has become a means for its audiences to engage in social and political issues, by highlighting the critical questions from the female host (Rahman, 2015) and the entertainment during the show (Palupi, 2018).

As this thesis examines the female audiences of a talk show, which goes against popular opinion, which deems this to be of almost exclusive interest to men (Byerly & Ross, 2006), it is important to identify the female audiences through exploration of the social and political context of women’s lived experience (ibid). It has been established that the study will explore female audiences’ experience and opinions of a talk show, as well as civic talk beyond the programme within the Indonesian context, to grasp how they negotiate their position as an audience against the reality of their lives, and the way in which they participate in civic talk as citizens in a patriarchal culture. The importance of audience research is supported by the claim by Hermes (2009: 124) that ‘media power and audience agency remains as important as ever’. Moreover, Jensen (2002: 256) argues that research considers the fact that the media as a vehicle of meaning allows people with a ‘sense of identity’ to perform their agency and orient themselves in ‘social interaction.’ He adds that the connection between meaning and action by audiences is explored through qualitative research. In addition, Brinkman and Kvale (2015:1) and Jensen (2002: 270) argue that to understand an audience’s perspective on media, in-depth interviews are the best method to search for knowledge in terms of meaning-making.

## **Design, piloting, sampling and conducting of the interviews**

The interviews were guided by the outline of the topic, with suggested questions (Kvale, 2007: 57) to help me cover the themes included in the study. As the thesis employs semi-structured interviews, the questions and flow do not strictly adhere to a particular interview guideline. I followed up informants' answers and opened up new directions to develop more profound conversations. The semi-structured interviews allowed the informants to answer the questions in their own way (Seale 2012: 205). According to Holland and Edward (2013: 3), the varied and flexible structure of semi-structured interviews enriches the insight and data produced.

Two individual pilot interviews were conducted in February 2019 with Indonesian friends in Lund, who engage with *Mata Najwa*. These interviews were held to test the interview guide. The advantage of doing pilot interviews for this study was to give clues to which of the initial research questions and methods worked or did not work. This is supported by Teijlingen & Hundley's (2001: 102) statement that the aim of a pilot study is to recognise whether a primary research project or research instruments might fail. The methods used on the pilot were semi-structured interviews and observation through the 'text in action' (Wood, 2005) method. This was developed by Helen Wood (2005) and involves watching television programmes together with informants and recording their reactions while watching. I noticed that the presence of the researcher while watching the programme generated discomfort in the informants, as they only respond at the beginning. This is in line with the challenge to methods addressed by Wood, Thumim, and Skeggs (2008: 12), as in this case the method produced both comfort and discomfort among the research participants. However, their reactions during viewing were reconfirmed during the interviews to provide more information. By considering the results of the pilot, therefore, the empirical data gathered was mainly through semi-structured interviews with the participant observation. The research design also initially considered to only examine *Mata Najwa* as a whole programme. However, the pilot interviews showed that the host, Najwa Shihab, played an important role in influencing the informants' understanding of the programme and the political topics covered. It was therefore decided to explore in-depth the role of the host in order to understand comprehensively the engagement of *Mata Najwa*'s audiences.

Snowball sampling was employed to access potential interviewees who filled the respondent requirements (Jensen, 2002: 239). The recruitment process was conducted through friends that

engage with Mata Najwa to connect me with their female friends who also watch the show. The informants were young Indonesian females in the age range of 23-28 years old<sup>5</sup>, representing the medium to highest viewing percentages of Mata Najwa audiences. I obtained the ratings report from TRANS7 after sending the proposal and request letter signed by my thesis supervisor to the Research and Development Department of TRANS7. The report was sent following agreement on confidentiality. According to the ratings report from January 2018 to February 2019, young female audience ratings are averagely higher than those of young males; the percentage of young females is around 1.2, while that of young male audiences is 0.97.<sup>6</sup> Instead of aiming to capture a broad range of phenomena, the choice of female audiences in Indonesia intends to address the gender gap in the social and political context within audience studies on talk show and civic cultures. Young female audiences were chosen as the research sample because their political interests are minimally recognised in the Indonesian media, whereas the report demonstrates the number of young Indonesian females who watch this political television programme is higher than that of males.

Fifteen informants were involved in the study, with nine individual interviews and three group (two people) interviews. All the interviews were conducted face to face and took place in a cafe (five interviews), an informant's home (one interview), informants' work place (five interviews), and an informant's school (one interview). These locations were chosen by the informants in terms of convenience. Holding interviews in the cafe and school was challenging, as other people might come, go, and talk. However, recognising the need for the researcher and interviewee to feel 'relaxed' and 'undisturbed' (Seale, 2012: 218), we sat in spots where fewer people were sitting. On the other hand, the interviews conducted at home and in the working places were more convenient because the noise levels were low. The different interview locations did not affect on the quality of the conversations.

The interviews were organised in Jakarta, Depok and Jember during my visit to Indonesia in March 2019 in order to obtain more diverse voices from the audiences in different regions. Jakarta and Depok are neighbouring cities and closer to the political events in Jakarta, the capital of Indonesia, while Jember is located on East Java. All the informants actively followed the national news and the polarisation between the two presidential candidates (one of the political events at the time of the interviews was the presidential election); despite the different

---

<sup>5</sup> see appendix 2

<sup>6</sup> see appendix 1

regions, their opinions about Mata Najwa and Indonesian politics at the national level were similar. The duration of each interview was around 1h to 1h 45m. Furthermore, all the informants came from the educated middle - upper classes. This reflects the fact that the majority of the programme's audiences are also from the middle to upper<sup>7</sup> and well-educated. They, therefore, had the capability to express their opinions and critical interpretations of Mata Najwa, and the social and political situation in Indonesia.

Being aware of the ethical issues in interview inquiry, it is acknowledged that the moral integrity of 'the researcher depends on own knowledge, experience, honesty and fairness' (Kvale, 2007: 29). Therefore, before the interviews started, consent forms<sup>8</sup> and a brief explanation of the purpose, process, and estimated duration of the interview were given to the informants, in line with good ethical practice in social research (Holland & Edward, 2013: 67) and as protection for the informants (Kvale, 2007: 27) to gain their trustworthiness. Kvale (ibid.) notes that the consent form embodies 'informed consent', which involves 'the voluntary participation of subjects'. Interviewees are also told that they are allowed to say anything they want or not to answer a question if they do not want to. Accordingly, Mata Najwa had been discussing the 2019 election since 2018. TRANS7, through its website, declared that Mata Najwa was adequate as a reference programme for audiences to follow the 2019 election. It was expected the election would be part of topic interviews as it gave the opportunity to explore the informants' opinions about Indonesian politics during the pre-election period, yet it was almost absent on the interview. On reflection, there was some sensitivity in talking about politics at that time due to the big polarisation in Indonesia of presidential election at the time.<sup>9</sup>

Before the interview started, we watched one part of the episodes<sup>10</sup> of Mata Najwa out of seven in total. Doing this helped the informants to recall their thoughts about the programme and to be a reference for them when explaining what they thought and felt about it. Although the watching process was not part of the method, I wrote down some notes on the informants' responses during the viewing. For example, I wrote 'giggling while -this guest- spoke'. Guided

---

<sup>7</sup> See appendix 1

<sup>8</sup> See appendix 3

<sup>9</sup> Indonesian presidential election in 2019 was the continuation of the previous election in 2014. The presidential candidates were the same: Joko Widodo and Prabowo Subianto. Tapsell (2019) argues that the social media generates 'artificial atmosphere of polarisation' between two candidate's supporters. The discourse on social media defines Jokowi online supporters as "tadpoles" (cebong) and Prabowo online followers as "bats" (kampret) (ibid). This online polarisation, for Tapsell, affects the sensitivity of election topic in offline reality (ibid).

<sup>10</sup> See appendix 7

by Corner's advice to 'assume less and investigate more' (2011: 87), I clarified their responses in the interview afterwards to understand the reasons behind them, which mostly concerned their previous experience with aspects such as the guest, issue or host. The episodes we watched were randomly chosen from ones screened in July, August and September 2018 and which received high ratings; they covered various topics. The programme's monthly rating reports are shown in the appendix 1.

The study conducted group and individual interviews. Group interviews were chosen to provide a space for the informants to have a dialogue and produce in-depth accounts of their individual and collective views (Seale, 2012: 210). The questions for the individual and group interviews were based on the same interview guide<sup>11</sup> to ensure the same topic outline. Although the questions were almost the same, the semi-structured interview dynamic enabled me to follow up the informants' answers, which led to different questions in each interview. Furthermore, in the group interviews, the interaction between the informants motivated each other, making the interviews more compelling and providing a more complex analysis (Seale, 2004: 209).

Bahasa Indonesia was the primary language used during the interview as it was the informants' and researcher's native language. This allowed the informants to express their opinions fluently. Even though there was no language barrier between the informants and the researcher, some seemed to face difficulties in expressing what they thought. For example, one of the informants said, "*there is a problem...something wrong has not revealed yet. There must be something*" (Cita, 23). Hence, clarification of what they said was needed. This also happened with sensitive issues, such as "*is it fine if I mention this here?*" (Lily). Although I said that it was fine, they restricted themselves to saying what they wanted to say. This issue is addressed by Jensen, who explained that "people do not always say what they think or mean what they say" (2002: 240). Therefore, I let them finish their answers without interruption and asked several questions to tease out what they meant, whilst giving responses based on my experience in an attempt to create the 'We' (as females) relationship (Seidman, 2006: 96). It is also worth noting that my background as an educated female who has lived in the same cities as the informants affected our relationship. These similar identity helped me to build 'mutual self-disclosure' with the informants which helped to 'encourage deep disclosure' between us (Rapley, 2014: 19). The 'asymmetries of power' (Holland & Edwards, 2013: 78) between researcher and informants

---

<sup>11</sup> see appendix 4

could thus be minimised. As a result, the interviews were not only a matter of ‘a conversational exchange’ (ibid: 77), but also the way the informants expressed their experiences and opinions openly.

### **Data treatment**

All the interviews were fully transcribed before the coding process began. I listened to the recordings and transcribed them personally. After that, I read the text thoroughly, highlighting the quotes I thought essential for the analysis. This helped me to build ‘intimate knowledge’ (Bazeley, 2013: 73) of my data by going back and forth within it. I then printed the transcripts for coding<sup>12</sup>. For this, I used a mix of inductive and deductive coding approaches, starting with open coding to give room for the data to ‘speak it for itself’ (Seale, 2012: 372). Furthermore, open coding was utilised to capture the general question of ‘What is going on here?’ and types of reflective question such as ‘What is this study about?’ (Saldaña 2009, p.70). Besides treating the data equally (Seale, 2012: 370), the transcripts were coded line by line to ensure that no statements were ignored.

After all transcripts were coded, I converted them in the transcripts onto a computer, structured them better, and coloured them based on each informant to find them easily when I picked out their quotes. The open codes were then put into subcategories and themes, which had evolved when designing the research. However, I spent considerable time linking the data to the knowledge and mind map that I made during the fieldwork when categorising the subcategories and themes. The codes overlapped with each other within the themes and generated multiple interpretations, such as the lack of knowledge of the guests (elites) at the same time as trust in them. Both were categorised as engagement and trust in civic cultures with one classified as trust. However, these overlapping codes evidenced that there was a connection between the codes in the empirical data, which provided a rich avenue of exploration (Bazeley, 2013: 144).

As the interviews were conducted in Bahasa Indonesia, I acknowledge that there was ‘a boundary crossing between two cultures’ (Halai, 2007: 345). I did not translate all the interviews into English to avoid the language gap which could affect the meaning of what the informants said. Bazeley argues that working in a foreign language leads to too much meaning

---

<sup>12</sup> see appendix 6 for the sample of coding

being lost and interpretations becoming burdensome and superficial (Bazeley, 2013: 77). Therefore, as she suggests, as a native speaker of Indonesian, I transcribed the interviews in Bahasa Indonesia. I used English, as the required language, to code the transcripts in order to perform the empirical data analysis, which also led to the challenge of translation. Considering the suggestion by Simon (1996: 130), the translation process took into account the cultural meaning the text carried.<sup>13</sup> Further, to ensure the reliability of the coding, my supervisor and I checked whether it was consistent and corresponded to the purpose and framework of the research. Bazeley (2013: 150-151) states that this reliability check with a second person as an 'inter-coder' aims for 'clarity and comprehensiveness' of the data findings which contributes to the validity of the interpretation of the codes.

## **Reflection**

As the researcher, I would like to discuss some conditions and considerations as a reflection on how I have progressed with the research and achieved the outputs expected. The first point to mention is that, I do not consider myself a regular viewer of Mata Najwa unless my friends suggest me to watch particular episodes. For me, Mata Najwa is a programme that I will engage with in relation to political talk, together with friends who suggest I watch it. This position helped me to be neutral during the interviews, while naturally showing my interest in the topics (Seale, 2012: 20). Some of the informants discussed their experience and referred to certain episodes that I had not watched. I asked them about the episode in particular and lead to conversation. Brinkmann and Kvale (2015: 57) and Brinkmann (2013: 25) conclude that the dialogue in interviews makes the researcher involved in the co-construction of knowledge.

The second point is that even though this study takes a critical position towards the common processes of audiences' experience, it does not mean that the knowledge produced is related to the 'truth' (Burr, 1995: 3-4). As the interpreter of meaning in the study, I also acknowledge that my interpretation is also constructed through social processes. Further, instead of seeing the study as a tool to prove something, I perceive it rather as a learning process. Flyvbjerg (2001: 73) cites Hans Eysenck's reminder that:

---

<sup>13</sup> see appendix 5 for the sample of interview translated in English

*‘Sometimes we simply have to keep our eyes open and look carefully at individual cases— not in the hope of proving anything, but rather in the hope of learning something!’*

Recognising that qualitative research cannot generalise its findings to another study context (Brinkmann, 2015: 144), I have never intended to generalise the study to a larger population of young Indonesian female audiences of Mata Najwa as the findings were based on the situations or circumstances of the case and research process. Moreover, the audience study focuses on how the specific individuals perceive meaning in the media and on understanding the meaning constructed in ‘shared cultural knowledge and bound by social structure’ (Hermes, 2013: 64).

The last point in this reflection is about feminism in the research. Some informants had experienced marginalisation when talking about politics with their male acquaintances. While some of the others had not experienced this, they could still recognise the problems that Indonesian women faced, such as women’s issues being under-represented in the media and the prevalent traditional stigma of illogical women. The interviews revealed that the informants knew about their social conditions which lead to such a situation. It confirms the ‘standpoint theory’ developed by Harding (2004), in which studying women’s lives enables us to acquire knowledge about dominant institutions’ assumptions and practices which encourage or constrain women (ibid: 117). Harding emphasises that ‘dominant groups cannot understand the nature and causes of their own social situations if they examine such topics from their own native perspective’ (ibid: 18). In this study, it has become clear that investigating the talk show and civic talk from the female audience’s perspective has revealed the grip of the patriarchal culture in Indonesia which affected the participants’ engagement with the show and politics in general.

## **Mata Najwa: Analysis of Female Audience Engagement with the Show and Civic Talk beyond it**

Based on the findings, three themes have been revealed: first, the informants experience rational and emotional engagement with the show, with a balance between what makes them engage with the show and what they need to know. This links to Coleman's (2011) concept of the 'civic mix', in which the rational and emotional can mutually encourage and reinforce audiences to engage with public, revealing that audiences act as citizens while watching the show. As a mediator of public affairs, it illustrates the 'spectrum of engagement' (Hill, 2019) of the audiences to critically and emotionally engage with the show, both as audiences and citizens. Second, the ways the female audiences in the study identify their relationship with the host are based on their identities of women and citizens. Because of the strong personality and character of the host, audiences perceive her as a role model for woman. As a journalist, the role of the host is to be representative of the citizens in scrutinising political practice in the nation. It also implies audience trust in terms of the host's neutrality and credibility. However, due to Najwa's ability to investigate guests from elites, dominated by male, the notion of 'pundit' (Nimmo & Combs, 1992) also needs to be taken into account. The third theme demonstrates that watching Mata Najwa fosters civic talk among the audiences. Together with the analysis on civic cultures (Dahlgren, 2009), it elaborates the reason behind the choice of 'intimate public spheres' (Berlant, 1997) as spaces for women to talk about politics. These spheres are not merely about 'spaces', but also the people who are allowed to participate and the topics they can discuss.

### **Civic mix: audience engagement as citizens**

All the study informants praised the novelty of the information provided in the show, which encouraged the curiosity of the audience about the issues. Cici (28) stated that '*So I watch the show from the start to the end. I can get new information which I've never got before from other sources.*' The acquisition of information from the show is also defined as a way of obtaining a broader perspective. This is expressed by Juju, a receptionist, who had stopped using social media as the main way of seeking political information:

*I was always in a position where my main source of information was Instagram. At that time I followed Liputan 6 (news programme) account and others. Then I was thinking that making social media as the main source of information was wrong. Their captions are limited and the videos only last one minute. Sometimes my wisdom in understanding the information could be wrong. Back then, I judged something*

*bad or good easily. And my fanaticism over something was easily affected. By watching Mata Najwa, I get more and balanced information. (Juju, 23)*

Despite the social media's role in providing news, Juju disengaged with it as a news source. For her, its limited text and video duration meant that the provision of news was narrow and might lead to misunderstanding of issues, as was the case for her. Moreover, using social media as news source can prompt 'like-minded citizens' to generate 'echo chambers' or 'filter bubbles' in which opposing views are blocked (Gentzkow & Allcott, 211). Juju also acknowledged that social media played a role in her 'fanaticism' over 'something' (implying political partisanship). Hence, she engaged with Mata Najwa to obtain wider and more balanced perspectives.

Mata Najwa was perceived as an effective programme because it invited the key actors involved in issue, as illustrated by the following statement:

*I usually read about political issues...waiting for Mata Najwa and I get a new perspective. [...] Because it always invites relevant people. So I don't need to read Detik (online news) again. The people invited are the ones who correspondent to the issue. [...] the discussion on the show is also based on rationality and fact (Lily, 24)*

According to the informants, Mata Najwa works as a more comprehensive source of information than social media, based on rationality and fact. This illustrates their critical engagement with the show and indicates that they were familiar with the issues as they could compare the information from the show to other sources and reflect on them.

This situation corresponds to the argument by Dahlgren (2009: 109) that information must be made meaningful through 'integrating it in relation to one's existing frames of reference' to become knowledge. Following Dahlgren, this understanding entails previous experience of the audience with the subject or issue in order to evaluate the information provided on the show, as Lily, Cici and Juju mention. They elicit knowledge from other news sources and integrate it with their understanding of the information given on the show, so it can be a resource for them to give meaning to the show and make sense of the issues circulating in the media. Prior experience is not only mediated but can also be in the real world. Lily's judgment of the guests on the show illustrates this:

*I felt close to what the interviewee said when I was in Jakarta. At that time, a group who supported Ahok (a former governor of Jakarta) had explained their opinion, while the opposition group, one of the*

*Islamic groups, talked about defending Islam. When I was in Jakarta, this group did not act like that. They were terrible. So (when I watched the episode), I felt like “you are lying”. (Lily, 24)<sup>14</sup>*

Lily challenges the credibility of the guest's answers through her personal experience. There is negotiation between the audience's experience and what they see on the show. Incompatibility between what is experienced and what is seen in the media leads to negative engagement that includes critical judgement and emotional dis-identification (Hill, 2019: 12), as Hill asserts that personal experience in people's lives generates emotions (2007: 195). The negative engagement with the guests affected Lily's perception of them. This perception offers the foundation for 'engagement with the realities and judgment upon them' (Corner, 2011: 89) in the media. According to the statement above, judgments on truthfulness therefore contain both rational and emotional reasoning, leading to Lily's negative engagement, distrust, not only of the guest, but also of the Islamic group with which he was associated.

On the other hand, another informant interpreted the practice of judgment as entertainment:

*I watch Mata Najwa for entertainment because the interviewees' arguments are sometimes buffoonery. I don't understand why they do that. Haha...In addition, the fierce counter responses from Najwa emphasise that “these people are stupid” (Eli, 23)<sup>15</sup>*

Eli states that her enjoyment in watching the show comes from the interviewees' arguments and the host's response. The use of the term of 'buffoonery' (or 'lawak' in Bahasa Indonesia) in this context implies that some of the guests make ridiculous arguments; the amusing parts are mostly their ridiculous answers or refutations. This demonstrates that Mata Najwa emphasises rationality in the show, so the appearance of guests who give answers as described above reflects their incapability and thus becomes part of the audience's enjoyment. This emerges due to the way the host provokes the guests through her counter-responses embodied in the questions.

---

<sup>14</sup> The case of former Jakarta Governor Basuki Tjahaja Purnama (Ahok) who was sentenced two years for blasphemy for claiming that some politicians had violated a Quranic verse to block Muslim for choosing him, a non-muslim, in his re-election in the Jakarta Governor Election 2017 (Wijaya, 2017). One of the Islamic forums in Indonesia, which Lily referred to led the protest against Ahok. (BBC News, 2017)

<sup>15</sup> Eli gave an example from the episode we watched when Najwa asked an ex-corruptor, the head of Hanura party's branch, who would participate in the 2019 election if he assigned himself as the candidate of the legislator. He answered 'I chose myself (as the legislator candidate) [...] it's not for myself. First, my colleagues (politicians) won't be willing to participate if I did not participate first'. For Eli, the answer is funny because it was out of context. For the link of the video, see appendix7

*[...] she does not let the informants 'flow' to wherever they want. She does not follow the informants. She already knows what to do. Her questions are very 'closed' and specific. (Wewe, 24)*

The questions from the host are provocative. This generates intense cognitive and emotional engagement with the interviewees among the audiences. Wewe acknowledges that the host's role in formulating the interaction on the show is appealing for the audience. It creates 'emotional engagement, excitability and interest' (Lunt & Stenner, 2005: 68) in the audience, which are sources of the 'cultural public sphere' (ibid). The host builds the 'evaluative elements' from the guests' statements into a 'contentious statement' to preserve the live interaction of the show (Thornborrow, 2001: 117). The audience relishes the flow of arguments in the show and are excited to judge the guests based on the values of truthfulness, honesty and capability which the host uncovers.

The interaction on the show also produces a sense of 'liveness' of the broadcast for the audience, a feeling of co-presence with what is watched (Scannell, 1996: 84). One informant clearly remarked on this:

*I love watching a debate (conflict), both in reality and on a digital platform. Hahaha [...] that is so interesting. I stay at home every day and do everything (domestic work). So it (a debate) is my entertainment. I can mock people (while watching) [...] Then Najwa asks something that could make the guests helpless and ashamed. (Gigi 24)*

Gigi is a housewife. She spends her time mostly at home taking care of her baby. Watching Mata Najwa once a week is a source of entertainment for her, when she can scorn people on the show when conflict arises. It is part of the lively attraction, and an immediate moment on the show that is happening 'now'; as Gigi says, *'I feel like in the middle of it (the debate)'*. This live interaction between the guests and host provokes the participation of the audiences at home (Hutchby, 2001: 170). Insulting the guests in front of the screen is an embodiment of audience participation. This is related to the identity of the guests as elites and whom the host investigates, so the audiences can examine the values of the guests, as discussed above. The show might provoke the excitement of mocking the guests, yet it also can be seen as the expression of sarcasm and irony over the guests. It is expressed by Lily when she talked about a politician celebrity, who applied to be a legislator, invited on the show and could not answer 'simple' questions from Najwa. Lily (24) said, *when Indonesia will be developed country if the legislators are stupid like that*. The audiences enjoy this mockery because they have 'serious emotional engagement' (Doona, 2016) between the audiences with the guest and the issues.

However, the sense of ‘liveness’ does not only work with negative engagement, as the audiences’ emotions can switch between the positive to negative. Gigi addresses this point:

*I like the way Najwa takes control of the guests. She can make me, as one of the audience, feel part of the debate. [...] But sometimes, when the guests have not finished talking, she cuts them off. I feel like, “wait...wait...Let those people talk. Don’t cut them off” (Gigi 24)*

This shows that Gigi likes how Najwa has power over the guests on the show, but she also expresses her dissatisfaction with her being ‘rude.’ However, this negative engagement has not led her to disengage with the show yet, as it switches to the positive again, such as in her admiration for the unexpected questions Najwa asks after she has cut off the guests. Although this switching has not resulted in disengagement, it can build up expectations of the host. This is indicated by Zizi (24): ‘*I expect Najwa to explore (the guest) more*’. When this expectation fails to be fulfilled, there is a possibility that the audiences will switch their engagement to disengagement (Hill, 2019: 63).

From observing the data, cutting off the guests’ answers is Najwa’s attempt to make the discussion focused and to emphasise rational debate rather than emotional tensions on the show as this could repress the potential for conflict on the show and the enhancement of emotions (Lunt & Stenner, 2005: 65). All the informants acknowledge that conflict between guests during the debates is inevitable, and is in fact a source of entertainment. Even for the audiences who are more concerned with rational discussion, conflict on the show plays a crucial role in attracting their attention.

*It’s not possible that a program is not ‘designed’. But what she (Najwa) shows us...if there’s no gimmick, it feels like something is deficient. But it has not made the viewer weary. It is still acceptable. (Wewe, 24)*

This statement is evidence for Lunt and Stenner’s (2005: 75) argument about entertainment within the rational critical discussion on a talk show. They argue that entertainment generated from conflict has the potential to disrupt rational discussion (ibid). However, the host plays a role in managing the conflict, which accentuates the entertainment value and instead emphasises the rational value of political debate.

The excitement produced by the conflict on the show is also deemed helpful for validating the audience’s judgment about who is ‘right’ and ‘wrong’, and the guests’ personality. As Lily (24)

states: *'I enjoy it (the conflict) because it reveals who is the stupid one. They (the guests' real personalities) will be more visible. When there is a conflict, the high-tempered person is the wrong one.'* She is entertained by the conflict, and the emotional expression from the guests affects her perception of them. This supports Livingstone and Lunt's (1994: 166) claim that emotional tension plays a role in heightening 'the sense of involvement and authenticity' of what guests' say.

The emotionality on the show does not only appear as conflict but also as fun and light conversation in the format of inspirational discussion. This is addressed by one informant when discussing an episode of 'Habibie dan Suara Anak Negeri' (Habibie and The Voice of People). The episode talks about a vision of Indonesia as an independent country with democracy as its instrument. The show invited people considered to have dedicated their lives to Indonesia, one of whom was BJ Habibie, a former president.

*Sometimes I rewatch the episode of BJ Habibie. That is my mood booster when I am burning out with the job and deadline. Watching him on the show reminds me that Indonesia does have lots of potential. And it generates optimism for Indonesia's future. (Juju, 24)*

This statement includes the rational 'potentials' and the emotional 'optimism.' These two elements are the foundation of citizens' engagement (Dahlgren, 2009: 80) and are inseparable from the audiences' subjective level (Coleman, 2013). The way Juju perceives the episode is by reflecting on her pessimism with Indonesian politics, which has been abused by the power of the elites, and she gives examples of countless corruption cases in Indonesia. By watching the episode, she sees the 'potential' of Indonesia presented by the guest, which helps her to build 'optimism'. Different to the debate format that raises the cynicism of audiences with regard to Indonesian politics, in its inspirational discussion Mata Najwa offers content to foster civic engagement.

The experience of watching the show also includes the 'imagination' of 'the others' who are watching it, who are people with a concern for politics.

*The excitement of watching the show is when the topic is hot trending, or if the topic concerns elites or conspiracies, like being a spectator of a drama. This is exciting. Because we can identify the character of our officials in order not to get cheated by them. Don't you, elites, abuse your power! (Arti, 23)*

This illustrates the reflection of Arti as a citizen. Watching the show is the embodiment of her surveillance of the possibility of elites abusing their power. The use of the words ‘we can identify’ above indicates that she has joined the ‘imagined community’ (Anderson, 1991) as she has the sense of belonging, as a citizen. This is constructed by, and through, the process of viewing, as addressed by Abercrombie and Longhurst (1998: 117), who stated that ‘the sense of belonging engendered by the imagined community is also a construction of identity’.

Therefore, Mata Najwa offers two roles for its viewers, as ‘audiences’ who rationally and emotionally engage with the programme, and beyond the show as ‘public’ who reflect on public issues as citizens through their engagement. The ‘audience’ and ‘public’ overlap because the sense of being a member of the public is constructed via the text during the viewing process, or constructed from other text. This status is explained by Livingstone (2005: 57) as the fact that ‘public must always have been audiences’, which in line with the notion of the ‘citizen-viewer’ of Corner (1991). Furthermore, being a member of the public or a citizen means relying on the media to sustain one’s understanding of politics (ibid: 11). This understanding is affected by the knowledge (cognitive) and affective experience which emerge in the engagement with the media (Dahlgren, 1995: 38). The mixture of rational discussion and the emotional appeal that emerged during the political debate and interview, termed the ‘civic mix’ by Coleman (2011), plays a significant role in ‘informing and stimulating citizens’ (Coleman, 2013: 24).

In relation to Mata Najwa, Najwa Shihab plays a prominent role as the host of the show. She has to lead its flow, critically interrogate the guests to present information to the audiences, and help them to understand the issues. Discussion about the host will be made in the following section.

### **Najwa Shihab: the representation of the ideal woman vs. a representative of (female) citizens**

In Mata Najwa, Najwa Shihab hosts the show without neglecting her status as a journalist. As a ‘program manager,’ she introduces the subject of discussion with a poem, presents the guests (who are mostly from elites), and manages the discussion through ‘linguistic patterns’ such as questions and interruption (Tolson, 2001: 32). However, according to the informants, she acts differently in different show settings. One informant understands these differences as follows:

*From the content, Mata Najwa is the same. What I mean is that when she does the interviews in the show, she wants to explore the facts, but when the show is at a university (Mata Najwa on Stage), it becomes semi-formal. She definitely asks the students (as the audiences) about something. She communicates with her audiences. I, as a member of the audience (at home), am (watching it) more relaxed. I pay attention to the interviewees because it (the show) in the studio focuses on the interviewees. Otherwise, when I watch her on the roadshow, she has another way of inviting the audiences. (Cici, 28)*

Following Cici's statement, in the roadshow setting Najwa's role is in line with Tolson's (2001) idea about the responsibility of the host in building interactive communication with audiences. The host on the roadshow is deemed to be close to viewers as she can invite them to be part of the show in terms of its informality. There is also a feeling of 'intimacy' and 'familiarity' (Horton & Wohl, 1956: 216) between them, which produces a relaxing feeling for the audience at home. Horton and Wohl (ibid) describe the 'social scene' presented by the host as 'the persona,' which creates the illusion of 'intimacy' and 'familiarity' for the audiences at home as she blends with them during the roadshow. This is called a para-social relationship. The audiences associate with the host as if they are close, 'in somewhat the same way they know their chosen friends: through direct observation and interpretation of appearance, gestures and voice, conversation and conduct in a variety of situations' (ibid).

However, in the studio Najwa focuses on the guests, so this affects her relationship with the audiences. She emphasises her status as a journalist who questions interviewees, who here are the guests on the programme. The relationship between Najwa and Cici in the studio setting seems to be absent, but it is actually present. Taking into consideration Horton and Wohl's (1956) concept of persona, and engagement that involves 'cognitive and affective work' (Corner 2011: 91), the audiences develop the perception of intimacy with hosts through admiration for them.

*She is a role model. I've often thought how to be Najwa Shihab, I want to be like her. I observe her (on the show) seriously. It's not only about the way she asks, but also the questions, her gestures, eye contact. How she could be a figure like that [...] her thoughts. (Arti, 23)*

The statement by Arti captures how emotional engagement is manifested, with admiration for the host significant in perceiving host-audience relationship in the context of Mata Najwa. Schmid and Klimitt (2011) claim that social attraction, such as admiration, is the main factor in a para-social relationship between the audience and media personalities. This clarifies the correlation between 'admiration' affection and cognitive embedded in Arti critical thoughts. In other words, Arti and other informants place trust in the host as their 'role model'.

The presence of a para-social relationship between the audience and host is inseparable through reflection as females in the context of Indonesia, a patriarchal culture.

*She can accentuate herself in the middle of patriarchal culture. (Alfi, 24)*

Additionally, another informant highlights the hardship Indonesian women face:

*[...] she is a courageous enough...woman. Oh. I just realized that she is a woman. What I mean is, it cannot be denied that we live in a masculine country. A woman has to...maybe she has to be five times better than a man to be recognised in a public space. In the past, it was rare for a woman to lead an excellent talk show like this. So, even though she is associated with the name of "Shihab" and is a daughter of Quraish Shihab, she offers 'colour' and hope. She is a woman who is present in the middle of us and gives a different 'colour'. I am not a feminist, but I love the participation of women in the public sphere, so I support her. (Wewe, 24)*

The way Najwa treats her audience as citizens encouraged the study informants to reflect on the images of Indonesian women and their situation which are perceived to be subordinated by the patriarchal culture. It is evident that the informants use 'referential association' (Liebes & Katz, 1990: 58) of their identity to relate to the host. The statement by Wewe that '*I am not a feminist but...I love the participation of women in the public sphere*' indicates that even though she does not regard herself as a feminist, who engages with politics in the public sphere, she acknowledges that the subordination of Indonesian women in the public sphere exists. Therefore, the acceptance of Najwa as a female journalist challenges the patriarchy because of her capability to critically investigate interviewees. A study from Luviana and Haryanto on Indonesian female journalist (2012: 18) concluded that the capability of female journalists in Indonesia was still perceived to be no better than that of male journalists because of the domestic responsibility imposed on women. Najwa is thus deemed to be a role model for participating in the public sphere. Many of the informants were fully aware that the visibility of females in the mediated public sphere is important, and that the presence of Najwa Shihab gives 'hope' for women to challenge the patriarchy itself. Eli (23) asserts this by saying, '*she (the host) shows that women can also ask logical questions as men. She is a representation of women, who is free from the stigma that women are not rational.*' For Eli, Najwa Shihab is a representation of an ideal Indonesian woman who can escape from the sexist stigma in Indonesia that 'women are considered to accept information simply without posing any questions thereabout' (Sarwono, 2012:37).

The involvement of a female in public discussion is considered to provide a different perspective on it, as Wewe (24) mentioned the term 'colour' in her statement. It relates to Ross'

(1995) findings on women and their representation in the media, with the conclusion that female audiences expect to ‘see more women on television [...] to provide alternative perspectives and practices’ (ibid: 14). For this reason, the appearance of a female journalist on the show makes many informants feel that Najwa represents their thoughts. One informant made the following remark:

*I've always felt like the questions on my mind about the guests are also asked by Najwa. That was when the guest was the Mayor of Surabaya City. She asked her in detail, saying things like "why couldn't you do that, Miss? Is it because there is a political party or officials who oppress you?" You know, this kind of question is also our question. There must be people (elites) who force the Mayor . (Cici, 28)*

The experience of Cici having the same thoughts as the host demonstrate that she is imagining being involved in the discussion of politics on the show as a citizen. This brings us back to the discussion around the imagined community of the public or citizens and indicates that the host facilitates female audiences to understand the issues that they need to know about. Therefore, scrutinisation of the elites on the show by the female journalist encourages empowerment for the female audiences as citizens, not as ‘mothers’ or ‘wives’, the roles stereotypically associated with Indonesian women (Robinson, 2009: 9).

Dahlgren (2009:100) argues that democracy will not work if ‘virtues’ such as the willingness to maintain its fundamentals and procedures are not applied in society. One informant talks about one of the substantive values of democracy, ‘justice,’ in the show: ‘*Fortunately, there are people (Najwa and the Mata Najwa team) still concerned about how justice and law should be upheld*’ (Cici, 28). The context of this statement is the episode which investigated Sukamiskin Jail. The episode shows that the cell of a Setya Novanto (corruptor) is fake; that he bribed a jail officer to secure him a ‘deluxe’ cell. In the episode, the show invited the current Minister of Law and Human Rights to obtain clarification about the case. Najwa interviewed him about the findings of the investigation and urged him to ascertain if Setya Novanto pretended he was in the original cell. The minister promised to check not only that of Novanto, but also others. According to the Indonesian news on September 2018 (Salim, 2018), it was proven that not only Novanto had an extravagant cell, but so did 52 others. Hence, we can see that Najwa and her team played a role in uncovering the bribery case concerning lavish jail cells at Sukamiskin. This implies that she is an actor watching over the elites and the state. By perceiving her as an actor, this emphasises her identity as a professional journalist acting as a representative of the public and their interests (Jones, 2005: 43). Najwa, as a journalist, was then considered by Cici to be a part of the public or citizens who have a concern for how democracy should function.

To contextualise the analysis of how the audiences in the study perceive the role of Najwa in exploring issues through interrogating guests, I will focus on the topic of public affairs, which is then categorised as news interviews (Clayman, 1992). Discussion of her neutrality during the interviews cannot be avoided for the informants acknowledge her as a host, a journalist and the authority of the show.

*If there is a big case, she takes the issue (on the show), and she invites the key actors in the issue and (the proportion is) balanced. So the insights are not only from one side, and she does not really invite observers (experts), mostly just the key actors. [...] She asks the interviewees persistently, particularly if the interviewees dodge the questions, that's the interesting part...If I know the interviewees, I am like, "take that!" (Zizi, 24)*

Zizi and other informants simply observe her neutrality from two points: the guests are invited onto the show and the allocation turn for the interviewees to speak. Some of the informants assumed Najwa's political stance on the Indonesian presidential elections of 2019, yet they believe she at least attempted to be objective in interrogating the interviewees. This strengthens the argument that Najwa acts on behalf of the public, which adheres to the basic principle of news interviews described by Clayman (1992: 489), that the questions posed by the interviewer (host) must be impartial. The term 'persistent' used by Zizi means two things, as she elaborated the statement further: *'in my opinion Najwa is actively involved in the debate. She never asks a question and then says 'bye.'* *She directs it. If it (the statement of the guests) does not follow the questions, she must cut it off. If she sees the statement is something that can be explored, she will ask a new question following the statement.'* This implies that Najwa will re-ask a question if the guest does not answer it, and if there is a 'space' for her to comment on the statements made by the guests, she will explore them further. Hence, the questions she asks are interpretive ones elicited by the guests' answers. She formulates her perspective through her questions. In line with Clayman's (1992: 487) argument that the point of view expressed through questions can turn 'the ownership of this viewpoint' over to the audiences, the reaction of *'take that!'* expressed by Zizi shows the turning of this viewpoint and the empowerment to say such a thing.

For the informants, the way Najwa asks the questions is a trademark of the show. She mediate the public that the audiences cannot witness directly and help them to grasp what is happening and identify the information around it. They observe Najwa scrutinising all of her guests, which is a reason why they refer to her character as being *'smart,' 'sharp,' 'critical,'* and *'firm'*, which they think fits well with the show's name "Mata Najwa" (Najwa's Eyes) However, the

questions, as part of Najwa's point of view, influence them in confirming the credibility of the show.

*The differences between Mata Najwa and other talk shows are beside the content being 'solid' [...] I think in this programme...the team has prepared the data to back them up. The research on it is 'strong', so they know what they want to ask and who the guests are. The data support them. When the interviewee is arguing about something, Najwa knows what she has to ask. In my opinion, it's because the research is 'cool' (deep). (Wewe, 24)*

Wewe believes that the capability of Najwa to counter the interviewees is supported by the research data which help her to understand the context of the issues. The interrogation on the show is not simply from her point of view, but she does it knowledgeably and authoritatively. The whole process of research and interviewing is then suggested as 'analysis' by Wewe. It is then argued that the acquisition of new information by the informants is from this 'analysis'.

The show itself is also considered to have power in revealing the hidden motives of the interviewees, who are mostly from the elites.

*When Sandiaga Uno was invited as a vice presidential candidate (of Indonesia in 2019), he revealed some issues that I've been questioning. I don't think he was aware (that he revealed something). [...] Najwa is neutral...(in the episode); I can connect his answers to why the position of Jakarta vice governor has not been filled yet. I got the 'red thread'. (Lily, 24)*

Sandiaga Uno is the vice governor of Jakarta and is still held that position when he registered as a vice-presidential candidate in 2019 election. During the pre-election, there were assumptions about why his position as vice governor had not yet been filled. The experience of Lily (24) getting the clue of Uno's case legitimates the identity of the show as a programme which questions the elites to find the 'truth.' Instead of speculating about the elites' hidden motives through her opinions, Najwa interrogates her interviewees about issues in a critical manner. This avoids the accusation of being partisan, as her identity is a journalist or a 'public spokesperson' (Clyaman, 1992: 487). Additionally, the talk show genre makes the interrogation on the show more attractive.

The informants dispute that the examination and research of a particular issue on the show by Najwa is to challenge the elites. Zizi (24) even concludes that if particular elites do not come onto the show, it means they are 'anxious' about the possibility of hidden motives being unveiled. Examining the informants' responses, Najwa's values of capability, credibility and neutrality are the foundation for the audience to build their trust to the host and affect the trust

to the elites. The values imply her ability to question the elites critically, supported by credible research, and her neutrality as a journalist, which is perceived to be objective by the informants. These values follow the procedural value of democracy pointed out by Dahlgren (2009: 111) with regard to the value of ‘accountability’.

Some informants recognise that Najwa’s questions somehow lead their opinion of the responses she receives from the guests. Her comments and observations embedded in the questions. It helps the informants to make sense of the complexity of issues as Momo (27) expressed, ‘*the interviewee didn’t really answer the question. Najwa asked him again to make sure that we understand it*’.<sup>16</sup> This makes the host as ‘pundit’ because she is a source of ‘opinion-formation and opinion-articulation’ (Nimmo and Combs, 1992: 8). Further, they (ibid: 12) posit pundits as figure who have the authority to voice their comments. In the case of Najwa, these comments are presented by the questions. A statement from Zizi (24) shows the authority of Najwa: ‘*Najwa can ask anything to anyone, even to people who have a lot of power*’, as does one from Lily (24): ‘*even high-level officials respect Najwa*’. The fact expressed by the informants that the show is able to invite the ‘key’ actors in specific issues reveals Najwa’s accessibility to elite sources. It is accepted that she can interrogate them and explore the information given by them critically and in confidence. This is the reason why informants call Najwa a ‘brave’ female journalist. Her role in exploring political issues on the show affects the way people discern politics.

*The question from Najwa is concrete...technical...so I know the plot of the issue [...] Mata Najwa strengthens what I have been believed (about the state). But when I watched one episode, it revealed that the inside of the (state) system is more corrupt than I thought. (Eli, 22)*

The public knowledge obtained from the show affects the trust Eli bestows to the government, which is a significant component in political engagement (Dahlgren, 2009: 112). However, we must acknowledge first that people’s political perspective comes from the ‘intricate spaces of their everyday lives’ (Dahlgren, 2011: 40). This means that the extent to which Mata Najwa

---

<sup>16</sup> The example from Momo was on the episode talked about the raid of books which suspect containing the ideology of communism on it by Indonesian National Armed Forces (TNI) where she invited the Brigadier General of TNI. She asked, ‘*So, it is the initiative of some Military Territorial Command. But why the raid was done at the same time?*’. Communism in Indonesia is banned. However, the issue of communism during the pre-election of 2019 in Indonesia was one of the sensitive issues that evoked. One of the presidential candidate, the incumbent Joko Widodo, was falsely claimed as a communist (Bayuni, 2019). At the same time, the ‘ghost of communism’ is used for the political purposes provoking the ‘existential threat’ of communism for Indonesia (Harsono, 2018). For the link, of the video see appendix7

affects the audience's perspective is not clear-cut; rather, Mata Najwa prompts the process of civic culture of the audiences. The show helps them to build two the cultural prerequisites for civic engagement: knowledge and trust. It has been discussed earlier that Mata Najwa provides public knowledge to the audience as a resource for them to reflect on their identity as citizens and to engage in political issues. Najwa has multiple identities: as a host, she acts to manage the flow of the discussion and keep the entertainment on the show; as a journalist, she acts to be a 'watchdog' (Norris, 2000:12) challenging the elites; and as a pundit, she has access to the elites whom she is able to criticise through investigation and plays a crucial role in producing knowledge about issues and the elites themselves. This then leads the audience to the next dimension, of 'trust' in political institutions. Knowledge and trust are closely connected to practices (Dahlgren, 2009: 117). The following section discusses how the informants in the study shift from citizen-viewers to participating in political-issues conversations as a way of understanding politics with others. The dimensions of civic culture, spaces, practices, trust, knowledge, values and identities, are elaborated in the form of female engagement with civic talk.

### **The Role of the Civic in Intimate Public Spheres**

As previously discussed, the informants act as 'citizen-viewers'; they constitute their identity as Indonesian citizens while watching the show. Some watch the show to obtain information about politics, while others intend to enjoy the entertainment while simultaneously obtaining information. The empirical data show that the differences in viewing practice affect their ways of understanding political topics. With regard to solo viewing:

*I watch the programme on YouTube. The reason why I don't speak at all during the viewing is that I am getting used to not having a friend to watch the programme with. So, I don't have anyone to talk to. [...] I always read the comments section on Twitter make sure of my thoughts. Because after I watch the show, I have my own conclusion, so I want to know that of others. (Titi, 24)*

In relation to social viewing:

*When I watch the programme on TV, I watch it mostly together with my family. I get different perspectives from others (family members). When my dad makes a comment, we continue to debate or discuss it between us. (Lily, 24)*

Both statements encapsulate how space can influence how the informants access the forms of civic engagement. In the circumstances of everyday life, they illustrate the viewing habits of

the programme, including the media used and who they watch with. Watching the show alone on YouTube, a private medium, gives no chance to experience sharing one's thoughts with others, as Lily is able to do. What Titi experiences can be understood by the fact that the programme does not invite the sociability of the audience, as the relationship between the show and the viewers is not predominantly built on a 'socio-communicative sphere' (Wood, 2009: 148). Hence, in Titi's context, the reciprocity of the audience regarding the content is rarely encountered whilst viewing.

On the other hand, the presence of others, such as family, establishes social interaction during viewing and encourages discussion about the content at the same time. In both situations, Titi and Lily witness what is happening in the public sphere through the private sphere. However, the way they understand issues is different at the time of watching the show. As discussion is absent in Titi's case, reading comments on Twitter is therefore her way to cope with her thoughts. In contrast, watching together with the family is Lily's 'communicative space' (Dahlgren, 2009: 114) for discussing issues.

For Lily, talking about public issues with family members provides broader perspectives, which are produced from the negotiation of the knowledge, as 'conversational resources' (Gamson, 1992:117) about the issues. The knowledge does not only come from Mata Najwa, but involves all kinds of information, with a process of 'integrating it in relation to one's existing frames of reference and thereby make it personally meaningful' (ibid: 109). As discussed previously, the knowledge acquisition could be from other sources of information provided by media discourse and personal experience.

*When I talk politics to my mom, it feels like her opinion is a representation of a citizen who needs to be heard. Sometimes my mom's view is funny and naive. But it is still the voice of a 'real' citizen. [...] My mom tells me about her problems. She owns a school, so what is the connection with politics? She raises the problem in the 'field.' She is not a theoretical or analytical person or whatever. [...] She talks as a citizen, about what she feels; not in the form of analysis, but as real cases that she encounters daily. Then I discuss these cases with my friends (Wewe, 24)*

In an informal conversational setting, Wewe's mom tells about her personal experiences at school. This refers to 'real cases that she encounters daily', which become the source of reflection for herself and for Wewe in perceiving issues, and relates to the concept of 'experiential knowledge' (Gamson, 1992: 122). The story is significant in the construction of shared meaning of the issues (ibid: 123). It is considered has 'a privileged place' in the political talk because there is a feeling of reluctance for others to argue about people's experience (ibid),

which is 'direct' and 'relatively unmediated' (ibid: 124). This is strengthened by use of the terms 'real citizen' and 'real case' by Wewe to describe the accountability of her mom's story. The story, as the resource, then becomes political talk with others and influences her in framing the issues.

People bring their resources from media discourse and experiential knowledge, aiming for mutual understanding and shared knowledge of issues (Dahlgren 2001: 40). This has an impact on the development of their political views, as it fosters critical, political thinking during discussions.

*Mata Najwa becomes our reference to talk about political issues. Although not all my friends watch Mata Najwa, they watch other political programmes such as Indonesia Lawyers Club. So we talk and share our perspectives. (Alfi, 24)*

Most informants make a clear line of spaces in talking about politics with others. They merely use social media to follow the news or read comments on Twitter and YouTube about the issues discussed on Mata Najwa. However, they do not share their opinions or discuss politics on social media, using it merely for entertainment. Following Dahlgren's (2009: 114) claim that 'for democracy to happen, citizens must be able to encounter and talk to each other,' the informants choose to have civic talk in 'offline' private spheres. The example from Lily (24) above shows that the home, as the private space, is the site for 'political talk' (Gamson, 1992) to take place. This is in contrary to the use of social media, as social networks are for people to connect and share (Dahlgren, 2013:37). In this context, the informants decide to refrain from talking about politics on social media due to the political and patriarchal contexts in Indonesia.

Gigi (25) mostly has political conversations with her family because she feels insecure with others' reaction to her opinions regarding the 2019 general election in Indonesia. She said that *'I talk about Mata Najwa or politics with my family and my husband. They never judge my choice. Hahaha. They would never talk about me behind my back'*. Most informants admitted that this topic was sensitive to talk to others about at that time. Therefore, they tended to avoid conflict with others who made different 'choices' than them. From a deliberative democratic point of view, the values of democracy which Dahlgren suggests (2009: 111), such as tolerance, openness and discussion, in this context might be in a problem, as they indicate a lack of recognition and respect for others' political perspectives.

The patriarchal context in Indonesia also prevents some audiences from sharing political views in social media. The negative experience of being marginalised by men when talking about politics has become a consideration for the informants not to post about politics in social media. The stereotypical gender bias in everyday life has been experienced by Arti (23), who said ‘*I get the sense from their gaze and intonation as if they are saying -women, what do you know about politics ?*’. This is evidence that although Indonesian women have long struggled to exercise power to challenge the patriarchy (Blackburn, 2004: 101), the patriarchal attitude in everyday life in society still exists. It becomes an obstacle to women’s participation in public life. It also illustrates the hegemonic perspective of the patriarchy in Indonesian society.

Additionally, there is an assumption that Indonesian social media users, as a representation of Indonesian citizens, are not open-minded enough to talking about politics and women’s issues.

*Not only things from Mata Najwa that I’ve never shared, but also all 'serious' topics, I rarely do it. Social media is just for fun. (Wewe, 24)*

Relating to Mata Najwa, which mostly discusses ‘serious’ topics, Wewe usually discusses Mata Najwa only with her particular friends whom she thinks are ‘open-minded’ and her family. In this sense, her ability to identify the obstructions to exhibiting political engagement in the public sphere reflects her identity as a female citizen. Her conclusion about the inability of her followers to enter the discussion forums on politics is based on her observation and demonstrates the dimension of women’s rationality to withdraw from social media. It also becomes obvious that all the informants are empowered to decide where and with whom to talk about politics in order to have an effective discussion.

Therefore, the informants have private conversations with trusted people such as family and friends, which take place at home, in cafes and in offices. This demonstrates that the private life of the female audiences in the study can be a way to understand their political attitudes in the public sphere; that they do not share their political thoughts on social media because of the political and patriarchal contexts of Indonesia. This takes us to the notion of ‘front stage’ and ‘backstage’ of Goffman (1959); in the ‘online’ public setting, as a front stage, the informants avoid talking about politics, yet their political opinion is expressed in an ‘offline’ private setting.

In line with the argument by Berlant (1998: 281), the closeness and familiarity within the family and friendships establish the ‘eloquence’ and ‘brevity’ of sharing thoughts. Berlant suggests the concept of ‘intimacy’ to describe the “zones of familiarity and comfort”, as well as the specific type of relationship, such as “friendship, couple, and family, animated by expressive and emancipating kinds of love” (ibid). Therefore, talking about politics for the informants is practised in an intimate way within a trusted domestic sphere, which Berlant calls the ‘intimate public sphere’ (ibid: 288). It is evident that the political engagement involved in political talk contains a mixture of the rational and affective engagement by the audiences with the topic, the people whom they talk to and the space. Hence, they can talk freely about politics in informal conversations.

Some informants asserted that they mostly talked about election topics with women. The fatigue with and lack of trust in political institutions were the main reasons for their male friends to withdraw from politics. Weariness with the state was also expressed by one informant as follows: *they (the government) are smart, so it's impossible if they don't understand the right 'concept'. But I think they decide not to pay attention (for the sake of country). It is a chronic disease which cannot be healed (Wewe, 24)*. Her disaffection with Indonesian politics generates a distance for her with the topic itself. According to her, engaging with politics was ‘useless’ as the elites use their power for their own interests, and she was pessimistic about the presidential candidates, leading her to the level of abstention. However, her engagement with political topics through Mata Najwa shows a switching between engagement and disengagement, but not with civic talk. She asserted that talking about politics with friends started from informal talk, as she mentioned that *'at first, we talk about our job, anxieties, problems... and we conclude that they are complex'*. She might disconnect from politics due to her cynicism and remain muted in the social media. The informal talk with friends allows her to express her political views, even though she is politically overwrought. This reveals that ‘informal etiquette’ in the intimate public sphere makes ‘some political intuition speakable’ (Eliasoph, 1998: 7).

Some of the informants were young women with a strong concern for women’s issue. They noticed that Indonesian women were still facing marginalisation in several aspects, including labour and human rights. In relation to Mata Najwa, with the visibility of the female host in the public sphere, who is able to scrutinise the issues of politics, they recognise a potential for the

show to raise women's issues into the public sphere, although it has not adopted a gender perspective.

*Women's issues have not been mainstream. Even now, a draft bill concerning the elimination of sexual violence has not been passed. Why is the discussion only around the elections? We should look at what the priority in the constitution is. That is more concrete, and we can solve the problem together. It's more participative. (Eli, 24)*

There is a sense of 'injustice' in the statement, and indignation at the cognitive and emotional levels toward the issues raised on Mata Najwa. It is 'a hot cognition, not merely an abstract intellectual judgment about what is equitable' (Gamson, 1992: 32). The injustice is shown by the lack of media promotion of women's issues which Eli thinks is unfair for women and causes disappointment for her. It is intimately linked to her concern that women have the right to achieve justice.

The way audiences make sense of political issues exhibits their collective identity as women, cross-cut and bound up with their identity as citizens. This intersectionality results in the solidarity of women and the idea of 'sisterhood' (Brah & Phoenix, 2004, cited in Filimonov & Svensson, 2016), as highlighted by Eli's statement that, '*we can solve the problem together.*' This 'we-ness' also indicates the agency by which the audience is aware of collective action; or, in other words, 'we can do something' (Gamson, 1992:7) to protect women. For this reason, even though the show sets the agenda for political issues, the audiences can reflect on their own subjectivity by connecting their lives and community, creating a connection between the private and public.

## Conclusion

This thesis has critically analysed the engagement of young female audiences with a talk show and then touched upon the crucial role of the host on the talk show as part of this engagement, and the civic talk that emerged beyond the viewing engagement. Both engagement and civic talk among young female audiences are tightly connected to the construction of patriarchal culture in Indonesia. It confirms the argument from Joke Hermes (1996: 100) that the way women generate meaning is relative to the specific construction in a particular context. The social and cultural context becomes central for young women to understand their viewing experience through cognitive and affective engagement within the show and its influence on the practice of civic talk. This thesis has demonstrated how audience engagement with Mata Najwa and the host has given them enjoyment of entertainment and knowledge as their reference to reflect on Indonesian politics, social conditions and participation in civic talk as citizens.

In this sense, Mata Najwa serves as more than a talk show that provides the interview with elites and a forum of political debate. Rather, through young female admiration towards the female host and her critical questions of the guests/elites, it becomes a television programme for young female audiences to observe and examine the elites that have the potential to violate the women through their power. It becomes a spectacle for entertainment the elites, which involves 'serious emotional engagement' between audiences with the guests (Doona, 2016: 181), as forms of sarcasm and irony are formed with politicians who lack knowledge and are caught revealing hidden motives. With the appearance of a female journalist on the show, the informants feels empowered as citizens, not 'mothers' or 'wives', because she is the representation of women who challenge the patriarchy in the public sphere through journalism. The show is also one of the sources for the audiences' civic talk, as it offers new perspectives through the critical questions from the host to the guests. Furthermore, it allows reflection for the informants to acknowledge that Indonesian media has not paid attention to women's issues, as the show has not mainstreamed those issue yet. Mata Najwa becomes evidence that 'public knowledge' and 'popular culture' is intercorrelated and it is an 'appropriate civic mix' (Coleman, 2010) that purposively informs the citizens without neglecting the affect of the audience engaging with it.

### **In what ways do young Indonesian women engage with Mata Najwa, in particular with the social and political issues?**

Young Indonesian female audiences in this study engage with the show as an audience and public across the cognitive and affective experience.

Through the viewing process, the informants are able to get information about the political and social issues, as well as the entertainment aspects of the political debates and interviews on the show. The informants consistently noted not only the novelty of the information on the show but also the comprehensiveness of the information that allows them to see the issues from the broader perspective.

The acquisition of knowledge from the show generates the positive engagement with content, that sustains their engagement. However, this positive engagement switches back and forth to negative engagement when it comes to the judgment of the guests (Hill, 2019). It shapes the affective atmosphere of the show and draws the affective and cognitive engagement (ibid). As the host provokes the guests through their interrogational style and the conflicts which emerge on the show, the informants are able to judge the capability and the truthfulness of the guests and encounter the enjoyment of mocking their lack of knowledge, lies, and short-temperers.

Furthermore, the judgement of the guest also transforms into negative engagement with the guest, which is parallel with the positive engagement from the enjoyment the mocking of them when the informants are reflecting as citizens. The guest are elites, which means that the revelation of their incapability and hidden motives becomes the informants' assessment of the government and its actors. Through Mata Najwa, the audience acts as the citizen, where they can surveil the politics and the political actors. In this sense, for the informants, the talk show becomes a place for acquiring knowledge, getting entertainment, and reflecting on Indonesian politics as well as observing the elite actors in this mediated space. It also illustrates that this doubling of identities of the informants is because they watch the show as the audiences and reflect as citizens to generate meaning through the show. It confirms the notion of the 'citizen-viewer' from John Corner (1991) where the audience performs as citizens at the same time. The civic mix (Coleman, 2011) on the show, embodied in rational discussion and emotional appeals, serves the viewer as citizens and spectators, because it offers entertainment that makes the audience engaged with political and social issues. It also illustrates that audience engagement works within the 'spectrum of engagement' across the cognitive and affective works (Hill, 2019) with the show, the host, the guests, and the content.

## **How does the female host become part of these young Indonesian women's modes of engagement?**

The informants acknowledge the crucial role of the host, Najwa Shihab, in their engagement with the show. The admiration for the host is expressed repetitively during the interview even though the questions are not about her. This thesis argues that the engagement with the show is particularly generated through positive engagement with the host. It indicates that the host is the soul of the show. However, she is more than just a host who leads the show. She has multiple identities: a female, a host, a journalist and a pundit who is highly valued by audiences.

The audiences in this study build a para-social relationship with her through the illusion of intimacy (Horton & Wohl, 1956) that is affected by their admiration of Najwa as a female journalist. She becomes their role model in engaging with politics in the public sphere. It illustrates that the informants reflect on the portrayal of Indonesian women that are marginalized in the public sphere (Liebes & Katz, 1990: 58). For them, Najwa Shihab is a role model who is accepted in the public sphere as someone who rationally and critically scrutinises the male dominated elites, through her role as a journalist. It is in contrast with the traditional gender stigma in Indonesia that women are emotional, in contrasts to men's rationality (Robinson, 2009: 44). It is thus argued that the representation of liberated women in the media through her capability challenges the elites in the public sphere might promote women empowerment as citizens. Even though one of the informants on the study does not regard herself as a feminist, it is assumed that feminists are the ones who join political activities in the public sphere. And while she engages with politics in the private sphere, she acknowledges the significance of women in the public sphere. As Ross and Byerly (2006: 146) asserts, there is a potential for the media to reconstruct society. In this way, the acceptance of Najwa in the public sphere might change the gender stereotypes in Indonesia, especially regarding women participating in the democratic process. Based on this, through the host, the show serves a social service in empowering women.

The informants believe that with the basis of research, Najwa is able to unmask the hidden motive of the elites who abuse their power. It illustrates that the values of democracy such as justice and accountability (Dahlgren, 2009: 111) are explored on the show. It provokes the negative engagement with the guests, and it is embodied in the judgment of the guests. It also includes the 'emotional dis-identification' (Hill, 2019) whereby the audience is invited to distrust the elites who are representative of the government. The interview on the show contains

the host's analytical and critical thoughts embodied in the questions that the informants feel, in some degrees, influencing their opinion. This links to the notion of the media pundit (Nimmo & Comb, 1992) where Najwa has the authority to comment on issues, through questions, in the public sphere. This demonstrates the power of the host in helping the audience to acquire relevant knowledge of issues through making sense of the intricacies of it. In other words, Najwa's role as the host, the journalist and the pundit, serves to, analytically investigate the issue and voice her views, in some point affecting the generation of (dis)trust of elites.

### **How is the show a resource for young Indonesian women to participate in civic talk beyond their viewing engagement in the private sphere?**

Mata Najwa invites the audiences into the interactive practices where not only challenge the guests but also have the civic talk. It encourages the audiences, through social viewing, to discuss the issue that arise on the show during the viewing process. Furthermore, their admiration for the host in exploring a particular issue and revealing the hidden motives of the elites has provoked them to discuss the issue. This takes us back to the notion of the pundit, whereby the host becomes the source of opinion-formation and opinion-articulation (Nimmo & Comb, 1992: 8). The civic talk among informants on the study starts with sharing personal stories and then transforms into talking about political and social issues. There is a sense of sociability and informality within it.

The circuit of civic cultures from Dahlgren (2009) is through several dimensions: knowledge, values, trust, practices, spaces, and identities are used to analyse civic talk in the private sphere. The informants have remarked that informal conversation has the potential for the exchange of politically relevant *knowledge*. Through civic talk with others, they bring their resources from Mata Najwa, other media discourses and personal experiences to compare and negotiate them. In this study, it has been shown that the informants create a clear division between the public sphere, social media in particular, and the private sphere as the *spaces* to participate in civic talk. This is because of the social pressure related to political and patriarchal contexts. The issues related to the 2019 Indonesian election are considered sensitive because talking about it with people who have different choices might raise judgment from others. There is also an assumption raised by an informant that Indonesian social media users, as representative of Indonesian citizens, are not open minded enough to talk about politics and women's issues, so it hinders the informant to post or talk about politics in social media. The negative experience of being marginalized in political talk also becomes a factor for the informants' discussion of

politics with untrusted people. It is the case where the *values* of democracy such as tolerance, openness, and discussion and the *trust* among citizens are under stress in the context of the public sphere.

However, as the use of social media for the informants is only for entertainment, the private sphere is thus optimised as a forum of deliberation by them. They create the public sphere with intimacy in the private and *trusted* spaces, and with *trusted* people that *practice* as citizens through ‘civic talk’ (Dahlgren, 2009). In the ‘intimate public sphere’ (Berlant, 1997), they can talk about politics conveniently in an informal way. Through this civic talk, the *identities* of being citizens can be strengthened, as Dahlgren points out, ‘identities [...] embodied in particular spaces via practices [...] that in turn serve to reinforce identities (2009: 119). Regardless of the informants' identity as citizens who observe the elites, they also desire equality for women and put that expectation in Mata Najwa to mainstream the issue of women. These connect to their agency as democratic citizens.

In the end, this intimate public sphere (Berlant, 1997) will nurture their critical thinking and desire to actively participate in various issues including politics, gender equality, corruption, and government politics. There is a juncture between the ‘personal and societal’ (Dahlgren, 2009: 89) when these female audiences are talking about the political through their engagement with a public discussion talk show.

### **Ways Forward**

For the further research, the study on the talk show through specific episodes might provide a more in-depth understanding of audience engagement with the show. This thesis may also serve as the stepping stone for female audience research in Indonesia with similar or different genres. It also might help with looking beyond the viewing engagement and the acquisition of information by focussing on the potential of television programmes as one of the democratic instruments that is accessible and engaging (Coleman, 2010). It might be enriching and fruitful for Indonesian media studies in developing and dispersing social critiques, and spreading the ideas of women (Byerly & Ross, 2006: 2).

As the thesis has shown the powerful role of the host in the audience engagement with the show, this thesis calls for future research with a host interview in order to broaden the understanding of the representation of females in the public sphere. In particular, a focus on the way she generates the questions, and how she identifies herself is very interesting from a research

perspective. It will also link to the notion of performance (Goffman, 1959) that is beneficial in grasping the cognitive and emotional work of engagement (Hill, 2019: 61).

Although this audience research is contextualised in Indonesian talk show, it permits us to see the audience from a wider perspective. This thesis has demonstrated that young female audiences connect their engagement with their reflections as women in a patriarchal culture, which is also explored through having civic talk as an extension of this engagement. Moreover, with the contextualisation of gender in this study, it broadens the understanding of the gendered perspective in relation to media engagement. Gender focused audience research could also be examined through male audiences as an enrichment of media engagement discussion.

## References

- Aalberg T, Van Aelst P and Curran J (2010) Media systems and the political information environment: A cross-national comparison. *The International Journal of Press/Politics* 15(3): 255–271.
- Abercrombie N. and Longhurst, B. (1998). *Audiences. A sociological theory of performance and imagination*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE.
- Anderson, B. (1983) *Imagined Communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Astuti, Y. D. (2016) *Media and gender: Studi Deskriptif Representasi Stereotipe Perempuan di Televisi Swasta*. Vol.09/N0.02/Oktober 2016 - Profetik Jurnal Komunikasi, pp. 25-32.
- Bazeley, P. (2013). *Qualitative Data Analysis. Practical strategies*. London: SAGE.
- Berlant L (1998) 'Intimacy: A Special Issue' in *Critical Inquiry*, 4(2), Intimacy (Winter, 1998), pp. 281-288.
- Berlant, L. (1997) *The Queen of America Goes to Washington City*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Blackburn, Susan. (1999) *Women and Citizenship in Indonesia*. Australian Journal of Political Science, Vol. 34, No.2, pp. 189-204
- Blumler, J. G. and Coleman, S. (2013) 'Paradigms of Civic Communication', *International Journal of Communication* (19328036), 7, pp. 173–187.
- Brinkmann, S. (2013) *Qualitative interviewing*. Oxford : Oxford University Press.
- Brinkmann, S. & Kvale, S. (2015) *Interviews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing, 3rd ed*. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications.
- Brites, M. J., Ponte, C. & Menezes, I. (2017) *Youth Talking about News and Civic Daily Life*. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 20 (3), pp. 398-412.
- Burr, Vivien (1995). *An Introduction to Social Constructionism*. London: Routledge.
- Carpentier, N. (2011). *Media and Participation: A Site of Ideological-democratic Struggle*. Bristol: Intellect.
- Chaffee, S. H., and F. S. Kanihan. 1997. Learning about politics from the mass media. *Political Communication* 14:421-30.
- Clayman, S. (1988). Displaying neutrality in television news interviews. *Social Problems*, 35, 474–492.

- Coleman, S. (Ed.). (2011). *Leaders in the living room: The prime ministerial debates of 2010: Evidence, evaluations and some recommendations*. Oxford, UK: Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism.
- Coleman, S. (2013) *Debate on Television: The Spectacle of Deliberation*. *Television & New Media* 14(1), pp. 1–11. DOI: 10.1177/1527476411433520.
- Corner, J. (1991), “Meaning, Genre and Context: the Problematics of Public Knowledge.” In Curran, James and Gurevitch, Michael (eds). *New Audience Studies*. Mass Media and Society, London: Edward Arnold, pp. 267-284.
- Corner, J. (1995) *Television Form and Public Address*, London: Edward Arnold.
- Corner, J. (2011). *Theorising Media*. Power, Form and Subjectivity. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Couldry, N., Livingstone, S. and Markham, T. (2007) *Media Consumption and Public Engagement: Beyond the Presumption of Attention*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Curran, J and Gurevitch, M. eds. (2000) *Mass Media and Society*, 3rd edn London: Arnold.
- Dahlgren, P. (1995) *Television and The Public Sphere: Citizenship, Democracy and The Media*. London: Sage.
- Dahlgren, Peter. (2000) ‘Media, Citizenship and Civic Culture’ in Curran, James and Gurevitch, Michael. *Mass Media and Society*, 3d. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Dahlgren, P. (2001). ” The Public Sphere and the Net: Structure, Space, and Communication”. In *Mediated Politics : Communication in the Future of Democracy* . Cambridge University Press (Communication, society and politics), pp. 33-55.
- Dahlgren, P. (2003). ‘Reconfiguring civic culture in the new media milieu’. In J. Corner & D. Pels (Eds.), *Media and the Restyling of Politics*. London: Sage, pp. 151-170.
- Dahlgren, Peter (2006) ‘Civic Participation and practices: Beyond ‘deliberative democracy’ in *Researching media, democracy, and participation : the intellectual work of the 2006*.
- Dahlgren, P . (2009) *Media and Political Engagement. Citizens, Communication and Democracy*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Dayan, Daniel (2005) “Mothers, Midwives and Abortionists: Genealogy, Obstetrics, Audiences and Publics”, in Sonia Livingstone (2005) *Audiences and publics: When cultural engagement matters for the public sphere*. UK: Intellect, pp. 43-76.
- Delli Carpini, M. X., & Keeter, S. (1996). *What Americans know about politics and why it matters*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Doona, J. (2016). *Political comedy engagement: Genre work, political identity and cultural citizenship*. (1 ed.). Lund.

- Eliasoph, N. (1998) *Avoiding politics : how Americans produce apathy in everyday life*. Cambridge University Press (Cambridge cultural social studies).
- Elster, J. (Ed.). (1998). *Deliberative democracy*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Fakih, M. (1998). *Analisis Gender dan Transformasi Sosial*. Yogyakarta : Pustaka Pelajar.
- Filiminov, Kiriiil & Svensson Jacob. (2016) (re)Articulating Feminism A Discourse Analysis of Sweden’s Feminist Initiative Election Campaign. *Nordicom Review*, 2
- Flyvbjerg, B. 2001. *Making Social Science Matter: Why Social Inquiry Fails and How it can Succeed Again*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gamson, W. A. (1992) *Talking politics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Gauntlett, David and Annette Hill (1999) *TV Living: Television Culture and Everyday Life*. London: Routledge.
- Gentzkow, Matthew & Alcott, Hunt. (2017) *Social Media and Fake News in the 2016*. *Journal of Economic Perspective* 31(2), pp. 211–236.
- Goffman, Erving. (1959) *Presentation of the Self in Everyday Life*, New York: Anchor.
- Habermas, J. (1989) *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An inquiry into a category of Bourgeois Society*. Cambridge, Mass; MIT Press
- Habermas, J. (1996) *Between facts and norms : contributions to a discourse theory of law and democracy*. Cambridge, Mass. ; London : MIT.
- Halai, N. (2007). Making use of bilingual interview data: some experiences from the field. *The Qualitative Report*, 12(3), 344–355. [online] nova.edu/ssss/ QR/QR12-3/halai.pdf. [Accessed 10 March 2019]
- Harding, S. 2004. *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political controversies*. New York: Routledge.
- Hermes, J. (1996) “Gender and/in Media Consumption”. In Ang, I. *Living Room Wars: Rethinking Media Audiences for Postmodern World*. London and New York: Routledge, pp: 92-111
- Hermes, J., & Stello, C. (2000). “Cultural citizenship and crime fiction: Politics and the interpretive community.’ in *Cultural Studies*, 3(2), pp. 215-232.
- Hermes, J. (2005) *Re-reading Popular Culture*. Blackwell: Malden.
- Hermes, J. (2009) Audience Studies 2.0. On the theory, politics and method of qualitative audience research. *Interactions: Studies in Communication and Culture*, 1(1), pp.111-127.

- Hermes, Joke. (2014) *Rediscovering Twentieth-Century Feminist Audience Research*. In *The Routledge Companion to Media and Gender*, edited by Cindy Carter, Lisa McLaughlin and Linda Steiner. New York: Routledge, pp. 61–70
- Hermes, Joke. (2013) *Rediscovering twentieth-century feminist audience research from: The Routledge Companion to Media and Gender* Routledge, pp. 61-70.
- Hill, A. (2007) *Restyling factual TV: audiences and news, documentary and reality genres*. Abingdon, [England] ; New York : Routledge.
- Hill, A. (2017) ‘Reality TV engagement: reality TV Producers and audiences for talent format Got to Dance’, in *Media Industries*, Volume 4, issue 1 May 2017: 1–17.
- Hill, A. (2019) *Media experiences : engaging with drama and reality television*. Routledge.
- Holland, Janet and Edwards, Rosalind (2013) *What is Qualitative Interviewing?*. Bloomsbury Academic. ISBN 978-1780938523.
- Hollander, E., d’Haenens, L. and Bardoel, J. (2009) ‘Television performance in Indonesia: steering between civil society, state and market’. In *Asian Journal of Communication*, 19(1), pp. 39–58.
- Horton, D. and Wohl, R. Richard (1956): 'Mass Communication and Para-social Interaction: Observations on Intimacy at a Distance', in *Psychiatry* 19, pp. 215-29.
- Hutchby, Ian. (2001) ‘Confrontation as a Spectacle: The Argumentative frame of the Ricki lake Show’. In A. Tolson (ed.) *Television Talk Shows: Discourse, Performance, Spectacle*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, pp. 155-172.
- Ida, Rachmah. (2011) ‘Reorganisation of media power in pos authoritarian Indonesia: Ownership, power and influence of local media entrepreneurs’ in Sen K. and hill, D. *Politics and the media in twenty-first century Indonesia*. Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, [England] ; New York : Routledge.
- Jamieson, K. H. (1992) *Dirty Politics: Deception, Distraction, and Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jensen, K.B. (2002). “The Qualitative Research Process”. In: Jensen, K.B., ed., *A Handbook of Media and Communication Research: Qualitative and quantitative methodologies*. London: Routledge, pp.235-253.
- Jones, J. 2005. *Entertaining politics: New political television and civic culture*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Kim, J., & Kim, E. J. (2008). Theorizing Dialogic Deliberation: Everyday Political Talk as Communicative Action and Dialogue. *Communication Theory*, 18(1), pp. 51-70. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2885.2007.00313.x
- Kitley, P. (2000) *Television, nation, and culture in Indonesia*. Athens, Ohio : Ohio University Center for International Studies.

- Kitley, P. (2003) *Television, Regulation and Civil Society in Asia*. New York ; London : RoutledgeCurzon.
- Kohring, M. and Matthes, J. (2005) 'Trust in News Media. Development and Validation of a Multidimensional Scale', in *Communication Research* 34(2), pp. 231-252. 10.1177/0093650206298071.
- Kvale, Steinar. (2007) *Doing Interviews*. Los Angeles, [Calif.] ; London : SAGE.
- Liebes, T., & Katz, E. (1990). *The export of meaning: Cross-cultural readings of Dallas*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Liebes, T. (1999). *Displacing the News: The Israeli Talkshow as Public Space*. *International Communication Gazette*, 61(2), 113–125. doi:10.1177/0016549299061002002.
- Livingstone, S. M. and Lunt, P. K. (1994) Talk on television. [Elektronisk resurs] audience participation and public debate. London ; New York : Routledge, 1994 (Communication and society).
- Livingstone, Sonia. (2005) *Audiences and publics: When cultural engagement matters for the public sphere*. UK: Intellect.
- Lunt, P. and Stenner, P. (2005) *The Jerry Springer Show as an Emotional Public Sphere* *Media Culture & Society*, 27 (1). pp.59-81. doi: 10.1177/0163443705049058.
- Luviana, and Haryanto, I. (2012) *Jejak Jurnalis Perempuan*. Jakarta Pusat: Aliansi Jurnal Indonesia
- Madianou, M. (2005). 'The elusive public of television news'. In S. Livingstone (Ed), *Audiences and Publics: When Cultural Engagement Matters for the Public Sphere*. (pp. 99-114). Bristol : Intellect Books.
- McNair, B. (2011). *An Introduction to Political Communication*. Routledge.
- Mietzner, M. (2017) *Reinventing Asian Populism: Jokowi's Rise, Democracy, and Political Contestation in Indonesia*. Hawai: East-West Center.
- Mitchell, D. and Staeheli, L. A (2004). 'Spaces of Public and Private'. In Barnett, Clive and Low, Murray. *Spaces of democracy : geographical perspectives on citizenship, participation and representation*. Sage, pp. 93-112. doi: 10.4135/9781446216309.n8.
- Mouffe, Chantal (1995) *Politics, democratic action, and solidarity*, *Inquiry: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Philosophy*, 38:1-2, 99-108.
- Murtiningsih, B.S.E. and Avenita, M. (2017) *Representation of patriarchal culture in new media: a case study on news and advertisement on tribunews.com*. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*. Rome: MCSER Publishing. ISSN 2039-2117.

- Nightingale, V. (2007) 'Lost in Space: Television's Missing Publics', in Butsch, Richard. *Media and Public Spheres*. USA: Palgrave Macmillan
- Nimmo, D.D. and J.E. Combs (1992) *The Political Pundits*. New York: Praeger.
- Norris P (2000) *A Virtuous Circle: Political Communications in Postindustrial Societies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Noviani, R. (2014) Filmic Technology in TV News and the Construction of Monstrous Feminine. In *Politics, Gender & Sustainability in the 2014 Election*. Indonesian Feminist Journal. 52-67
- Palupi, Ningrum (2018). *Tindak Ironi sebagai Kritik Sosial - Politik dalam Mata Najwa*. Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta.
- Pratiwi, T. Y. and Iswara, D. (2003) 'Perspektif program perempuan pada program televisi: Sudah adakah?' in *Perempuan dan Media*. Yayasan Jurnal Perempuan. Jakarta: SMKG Desa Putra
- Patterson, Thomas E. (1997) *The News Media: An Effective Political Actor?*, *Political Communication*, 14:4, 445-455
- Plummer, K. (2003) *Intimate Citizenship*. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press.
- Rahman, I. Q. (2015) *Persepsi Mahasiswa Universitas Telkom pada Acara Talkshow di Televisi: Studi Kasus tentang Persepsi Anggota Pers Ikom yang Menjadi Pemirsa Acara Talkshow "Mata Najwa" Episode "Gengsi Berebut Kursi" di Metro TV*. e-Proceeding of Management 2 (1), pp. 864-880. ISSN : 2355-9357.
- Ritonga, Syaira A. (2017) *Analisis Tokoh (Najwa Shihab) Berdasarkan Teori Komunikasi Antarpribadi*. *Simbolika*, Vo. 3 No. 2. pp. 71-77
- Robinson, Kathryn. (2009) *Gender, Islam and Democracy in Indonesia*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Ross, K. (1995) *Women and the News Agenda: Mediated Reality and Jane Public*. Discussion paper MC9.
- Ross, K. and Byerly, C. M. (2006) *Women and media: a critical introduction*. UK: Blackwell Publishing.
- Saldaña, Johnny (2009) *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publication. ISBN 978-1-84787-549-8.
- Santoso, A. (2016) *Persepsi mahasiswa terhadap program talkshow Mata Najwa di Metro TV*. Undergraduate thesis. Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta.

- Sari, A. R. (2018) *Pengaruh Kredibilitas Najwa Shihab Terhadap Keputusan Menonton Acara Mata Najwa di Trans7: Studi Pada Mahasiswa FISIP Universitas Lampung Angkatan 2016*. Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik, Universitas Lampung.
- Sarwono, Billy K. (2012) *Gender Bias in a Patriarchal Society: A Media Analysis on Virginity and reproductive Health*. Wacana vol. 14 No. 1 pp. 37-60.
- Scannell, P. (1996) *Radio, Television, and Modern Life : a Phenomenological Approach*. UK: Blackwell.
- Schmid, H., & Klimmt, C. (2011). *A magically nice guy: Parasocial relationships with Harry Potter across different cultures*. *The International Communication Gazette*, 73(3), pp. 252-269.
- Schudson, M. (1997). Why Conversation is not the Soul of Democracy. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 14, pp. 297-309.
- Schultz, T. and Wessler. H. (2007) Can the Mass Media Deliberate?: Insights from Print Media and Political Talk Shows. in Richard Butsch ed. (2007) *Media and Public Spheres*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. pp. 15-27.
- Seale, Clive (eds.) (2004). *Qualitative research practice*. London: SAGE.
- Seale, Clive (2012) *Researching Society and Culture*, 3rd edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publication. ISBN 978-1-8492-0799-7.
- Seidman, I. (2006). *Interviewing As Qualitative Research: A Guide for Researchers in Education and the Social Sciences*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Setiowati, E. & Nur I. R.. (2016). *Framing Analysis on The news of Violations on Ethical Code by Parliament Chairman (Case on TV Talk show "Metro TV - Mata Najwa" and "TV One – Indonesian Lawyer Club")*. *Journal of Education and Social Sciences*, Vol. 4, (June) ISSN 2289-9855. pp. 213-218.
- Sen, K. and Hill, D. (2000) *Media, culture, and politics in Indonesia*. Melbourne ; Oxford : Oxford University Press.
- Simon, S. (1996) *Gender in Translation: Cultural Identity and the Politics of Transmission*. London: Routledge.
- Siregar, W. Z. Br. (2005) Parliamentary Representation of Women in Indonesia: the Struggle for a Quota, *Asian Journal of Women's Studies*, 11:3, 36-72, DOI: 10.1080/12259276.2005.11665993
- Situmeang, I.V. (2016) *Pengaruh program acara mata najwa terhadap pemenuhan kebutuhan informasi*. *Jurnal Komunikologi* Vol. 13, no. 1, 31-39
- Skeggs, B., Thumim, N. and Wood, H. (2008) ““Oh goodness, I am watching reality TV””: How methods make class in audience research’, *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 11(1), pp. 5–24. doi: [10.1177/1367549407084961](https://doi.org/10.1177/1367549407084961).

- Tapsell, R. (2015) *Indonesia's Media Oligarchy and the Jokowi Phenomenon*. Indonesia, No. 99, 29-50.
- Teijlingen, E, & Hundley, V. 2001. *The importance of pilot studies*. Social Research Update, Vol.35(1), p. 1.
- Thornborrow, J. (2001) 'Has It Ever Happened to You? Talk Show Stories as Mediated Performance', in A. Tolson (ed.) *Television Talk Shows: Discourse, Performance, Spectacle*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, pp. 117–37.
- Timberg, B. M. (2002) *Television Talk: A History of the TV Talk Show*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Tolson, A. (2001) "Introduction: The talk show phenomenon", in Tolson, A. (eds) *Television Talk Shows: Discourse, Performance, Spectacle*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1-6.
- Tolson, A. and Brunvatne, R. (2001) 'It makes it okay to cry: Two types of therapy talk in TV talk show', in Tolson, A. (eds) *Television Talk Shows: Discourse, Performance, Spectacle*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, pp. 139-154.
- van Zoonen, L. (1991) 'Feminist Perspectives on the Media', in J. Curran and M. Gurevitch (eds) *Mass Media and Society*, London/New York: Edward Arnold.
- Venny, A. and Rahayu, R. I (2014) *Patriarchal Barriers to Women's Political Participation in South-East Asia: Lessons from the Philippines, Cambodia, Malaysia, Indonesia, and Timor-Leste on Patriarchy and the Rise of Women's Participation in State Politics*. Kemitraan Bagi Pembaruan Tata Pemerintahan. ISBN: 978-602-1616-19-2
- Wetherell, Margaret. (2012) *Affect and Emotion: A New Social Science Understanding*, London: Sage.
- Wildianti, D. and Perdana, A. (2019) *Perempuan politik setelah 20 tahun reformasi di Indonesia*. Jurnal Perempuan Indonesia vol. 24 no. 1, 23-52.
- Wood, H. (2005) 'Texting the Subject: Women, Television, and Modern Self- Reflexivity', *The Communication Review* 8(2): 115–35.
- Wood, H. (2009) *Talking with Television: Women, Talk Shows and Modern Self-Reflexivity*. University of Illinois Press, pp 256, ISBN: 978-0- 252-07602-2

### **Additional Sources**

- Bayuni, E. (2019) *Indonesian elections 2019: Are we in the shallow now?*. The Jakarta Post. [online] <https://www.thejakartapost.com/academia/2019/03/08/indonesian-elections-2019-are-we-in-the-shallow-now.html> [Accessed 17 May 2018].

- Harsono, A. (2018) *Indonesian President Evokes Communism's Ghost: Human Rights Take Back Seat to Political Pandering to Military*. Human Rights Watch [online] <https://www.hrw.org/news/2018/10/09/indonesian-president-evokes-communisms-ghost> [Accessed 17 May 2018].
- Indonesia, UNFPA. (2014). *Indonesian Youth in the 21st Century*. [online] [https://indonesia.unfpa.org/sites/default/files/pub-pdf/Indonesian\\_Youth\\_in\\_the\\_21st\\_Century\\_%28Youth\\_Mapping%29.pdf](https://indonesia.unfpa.org/sites/default/files/pub-pdf/Indonesian_Youth_in_the_21st_Century_%28Youth_Mapping%29.pdf) [Accessed 12 December 2018].
- Mann, T. (2018) *Women's March in Jakarta 2018*. [online] available at <https://indonesiaatmelbourne.unimelb.edu.au/womens-march-jakarta-2018/> [Accessed 18 May 2019].
- Salim, H. J. (2018) *Ruangan Setya Novanto di Lapas Sukamiskin*. Liputan6. [online] available at <https://www.liputan6.com/news/read/3649334/menkumham-sebut-ada-52-sel-mirip-ruangan-setya-novanto-di-lapas-sukamiskin> [Accessed 20 March 2019].
- Tapsell, R. (2019) *The polarisation paradox in Indonesia's 2019 elections*. New Mandala. [online] available at <https://www.newmandala.org/the-polarisation-paradox-in-indonesias-2019-elections/> [Accessed 16 May 2019].
- Trans7. *Mata Najwa*. [online] available at <https://www.trans7.co.id/programs/mata-najwa> [Accessed 4 January 2019].
- Women's March Jakarta Chapter. [online] available at <https://womensmarchglobal.org/chapters/jakarta/> [Accessed 18 May 2019].

## Appendices

### Appendix 1: Ratings report

*Average Ratings Report of Mata Najwa January 2018- February 2019 from TRANS7 – This had been simplified due to the confidentiality.*

Age	5-9 years	10-14 years	15-19 years	20-24 years	25-34 years	35-44 years	45-44 years	55+ years
Male	0.6	1	1.1	0.9	0.9	1.3	1.7	1.7
Female	0.8	1	1.1	1.4	1.2	1.5	1.7	1.6

Class	Upper 1	Upper 2	Middle 1	Middle 2	Lower
TVR	1.4	1.5	1.3	1.2	0.9

Young People*	Female	Male
TVR	1.2	0.97

\*Young people in Indonesia are defined as citizens aged 18 to 30 (UNFPA Indonesia, 2014: vii)

2018

Months	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	Mei	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Male	1.1	1.1	0.9	0.9	1.0	0.6	1.2	1.3	1.5	1.2	1.0	1.3
Female	1.2	1.3	1.1	1.2	1.1	0.7	1.4	1.5	1.6	1.4	1.1	1.4

2019

Months	Jan	Feb
Male	1.1	1.4
Female	1.2	1.5

**Appendix 2: List of Interviewees**

<b>Name of Interviewees</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>Age (years old)</b>	<b>Sex</b>	<b>Occupation</b>	<b>Date of Interview</b>
'Lily'	Jember	24	Female	General Manager	09-03-2019
'Momo'	Jakarta	27	Female	Consultant	06-03-2019
'Juju'	Jember	23	Female	Front Office	08-03-2019
'Zizi'	Jakarta	24	Female	Research Executive	11-03-2019
'Riri'	Jember	25	Female	Teacher	08-03-2019
'Titi'	Jakarta	24	Female	Secretary	11-03-2019
'Gigi'	Depok	24	Female	Housewife	18-03-2019
'Eli'	Depok	23	Female	Student	18-03-2019
'Cici'	Jakarta	28	Female	Private employee	15-03-2019
'Cita'	Jember	23	Female	Private employee	09-03-2019
'Arti'	Jember	23	Female	Graphic designer	09-03-2019
'Wewe'	Jakarta	24	Female	Social Researcher	17-03-2019
'Alfi'	Jakarta	24	Female	Journalist	17-03-2019
'Felli'	Jakarta	25	Female	State Employee	11-03-2019
'Ilmi'	Jakarta	26	Female	State employee	11-03-2019

**Appendix 3: Consent Form**

*Mata Najwa Talk Show - Audience Research*  
Lund University

**Researcher: Rania Savitri Mafiroh**  
**Programme: Master's in media and communications**

I am currently conducting a study centred around female audiences of Mata Najwa Talk Show. This research seeks to explore the knowledge, experience, opinions, and values of women in regards to Mata Najwa. Therefore, I would like to interview you as a part of my ongoing research. The data I collect will only be used within the confinement of my final thesis, which I expect to be finished in May 2019.

I would like to record the interview and use the dialogue to present my findings. I will record the interview only with your written consent. Please feel free to say as much or as little as you want. You can decide not to answer any question, or to stop the interview any time you want.

I ensure that your identity will remain anonymous. Please tick the two following options:

I don't want my name to be used

I'm fine with my name being used

If you agree to join this study, please sign your name below.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Full name

\_\_\_\_\_  
Age and gender

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Interviewee

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## Appendix 4: Interview Guide

1. How did you know MN?
  - Access
    - Find at? Family, friends, tv
    - Medium to watch/platform? TV/YouTube
  - Interest in, what's the reason?
    - Host
    - The topic (Political/ Social)
    - The format (political debate, news interview, roadshow, investigation)
    - The guest. Who are they?
  - The way of watching
    - The frequency of watching?
    - With whom (alone/together with) and where?
  
2. How do you engage with the show? (emotional and critical engagement – positive and negative engagement - gender)
  - How does the show help you in understanding the political and social issues?
    - Host: How does she lead the show? the questions, the proportionality
    - Guest: what is your opinion about the guests who interviewed or have debate in the show?
    - The format (political debate, news interview, investigation, etc)? How about the conflict on the show during the debate?
  - How do you perceive the role of the show throughout the 2019 Indonesian pre-election? Mapping out the political actors? Vote?
  - How about the issues of women in MN?
  
3. Political Zone (space, gender)
  - Do you follow news on Indonesian politics? How do you describe it?
    - Frequency follows news
    - The medium: online or offline news?
  - Talking politics
    - Do you talk about MN with people?
    - How do you talk about politics with others?
      - With whom? Female/male – friends/family
      - Where and when?
      - Posting or comment on online platform?
  
4. Do you want to say something more related to Mata Najwa?

## Appendix 5: Sample of Interview

### A group Interview: Wewe and Alfi

Q: Thank you for being my informants. If I may know, how did you know "Mata Najwa"?

A: I've known her since she was still on metro TV, she was one of the famous journalists, so I was interested in watching her. Before he had Mata Najwa programme, she was a reporter at the metro tv. But I never watched her on metro tv when she was a news anchor, only on YouTube. Then she had her own programme, and I ended up watching it quite regularly. So the beginning of watching Mata Najwa is because of Najwa Shihab.

W: The first time I knew Mata Najwa is... I knew her, but I did not idolize her at first. I already knew that Najwa Shihab is a cool journalist. I have read... I have already read about Najwa...like the review of her on articles. I know she got the best journalist award, at the international level, and I watched her she covers tsunami. She is the first female journalist who reported it at that time. Actually, at that time I was a person who was skeptical of programmes like that (talk shows), huh... when there were Mata Najwa on Metro, I wasn't immediately interested, even though I knew it was pretty cool. I didn't think the program would be popular and I didn't watch it because I was skeptical. In my opinion, It was just like one of the mainstream media. I was not sure that it would provide an educative-alternative programme, which provides an in-depth analysis of current issues. I didn't expect it to be like that. I think it will be like other metro tv programmes, which are not as thick as the analysis. But it turned out to be...it's really cool. I didn't watch it at first, it turned out that it was ... in the middle of a television program which, according to me, was boring, then there was this programme that became an alternative. So I tried watching it and finally keep watching even though I don't watch it routinely every weekend. I rarely watch television, but it always appears at my youtube's home page, because I often search it and a few times the episodes become trending right away. But I never schedule to watch it, when I saw the title, I was interested.

Q: you said you were not interested at first because of skepticism, then what make you keep watching it now?

W: because people keep talking about it. For example, there was something that triggered me to watch Mata Najwa, but I forget what it is about. But I think, it became the topic of talk within my family and friends. And it was quite overwhelmed. So I watched it, and it gave me an in-depth analysis and I admired it. What I love the most from Mata Najwa is, I think its research is solid. The difference from other talk shows is beside the content is 'solid,'... let's take Indonesia Lawyer Club programme as the example, it is fine enough, but it has a long duration and the research ain't deep. On the other hand, this programme...the team are ready with data. Research people in this programme is 'strong', I think. So they know what they want to ask and who are the guests. Data support them. When the guests argue, Najwa knows what she has to ask. It's because the research is cool, in my opinion.

Q: if you do not watch the show regularly, how about you, Alfi

A: same here. But I watch it more after Najwa resigned from Metro TV and established her own production house. Probably because the content was adjusted to the station (Metro TV) and it aired once a week. It is still airing once a week, but I think there is a role of youtube. Now, they upload the video on youtube, so it is easily accessed, and I watch it on youtube more now. I also watch Mata Najwa depends on the issue if the issue is trending. For example, PSSI (Football Association of Indonesia) mafia case, hashtag #2019ChangePresident, that kind of topics prompt public to talk. During the regional election of Jakarta, Mata Najwa invited Ahok and Anies Baswedan (the governor candidates), and I watched the episode. So it depends. I watch Mata Najwa look for alternative programmes, as Wewe (another informant) said. The issue raised in Mata Najwa could be provocative issue. It was provocative, yet adjusted to Metro TV, but now, it is provocative as Najwa Shihab wants, following her political stance, with her perspective as a journalist. We could guess the programme's direction when it was in Metro, it was under the political party, and we know the party's intention. So, even though Najwa Shihab is a journalist, she had to follow the order of the owner. But now, she can do anything she wants.

Q: And what do you think about the topic in Mata Najwa, Wewe?

W: I think the topic or issue raised on Mata Najwa is mostly politics. For me, Najwa is quite responsive and 'sharp'. But the topics on Mata Najwa does not fulfill my needs. She rarely brings up issues out of politics. I was happy when she lifted the soccer case, even though it's politics, and then about musicians. I think people, who are tired and skeptical about politics, miss watching that kind of topics. Today, we do not have television programmes with a social and cultural theme. At least, she makes special episodes occasionally.

Q: Ok. Back to your answer before, about clicking the episode on your youtube homepage. Could you elaborate on it?

W: First, it appears on my homepage. To be honest, when it's there, I will click it automatically. I will not click it if I am not familiar with it. I don't care. Because on youtube we can see the title and the guest's face. If I know them (the guests) and their political stance, and I don't like them, then I don't watch it. When the title and the guests are 'fresh', new faces, for example, the episode talking about a young legislator, I will click it. For sure, I definitely watch the topic closes to me like youth, outside the political topic, soccer, even though it's still politics and ASIAN GAMES. We also need to be supplied by media exposure out of political theme. The political topic on Mata Najwa is at the lowermost of my list, especially about the electoral topic, I am done with it. One of the source to follow the election issue is Mata Najwa, and it influences how I see the candidates and the political parties support them. But, I have not decided yet who I will vote. I become more skeptical and exhausted.

Q: And for Alfa, what makes you get interested in provocative and trending issues on Mata Najwa?

A: to know how the direction of the issues. For example about the regional election of Jakarta. For media mainstream, we have already recognized the direction (of the political parties which oversees the media). At that time, when Mata Najwa on Metro, Najwa attempted to be neutral. So, we know how the public view it. We, as lay people, have our own political opinions. So we don't know where to find other great perspectives. As Wewe mentioned about Indonesia Lawyers Club, we know it is politicized, we know who the political party control it. Even though Mata Najwa was on Metro, they still invite independent guests, and the information is balanced. The reason why I am interested in trending issue, I don't know...Mata Najwa always looks for a trending topic, probably to increase the ratings. And I love political issue. Mata Najwa is my primary source. Apart from I studied politics, I like politics as a citizen. From we wake up until we sleep, everything is about politics. And I just realized after studying politics. I don't find any reason why I don't follow the current affairs and politics. I started to watch Mata Najwa in high school because of Najwa Shihab. Who doesn't know her? After I studied politics, it becomes a need, recognizing why the price of rice increase? If this candidate is elected what is the influence to that?

W: I want to add something. I am different with Alfi, well...fine...if she is interested in the political issue, I respect that. And I've been there. But now, I am sceptical. I prefer to work at the micro level, grassroots. With my profession right now, I am increasingly aware that the government does not have any 'concept.' Either them or us...cannot do anything. The problem is so complex. Whoever the president is, it can't be helped. Even I am on the level of 'I will not vote'. Because I work on the realm of education, what I see are, first...maybe they (the government) are smart, it's impossible if they don't understand the right 'concept', but I think they decide to not paying attention (on the sake of country). It is a chronic disease which cannot be healed. And I don't know what kind of revolution that can rectify it. So we...

A: mental revolution

W: I don't know. I am not sure with the definition of 'mental revolution'. So I prefer, 'Ok. I am working on my sector' and start from the regional area. Working in a regional area is easier. Imagine that... the regional government is so 'difficult'. They have low capability, they don't have a great understanding of the development of their area, plus there is a systemic effort from the upper level, as the ministries. The regional government cannot do anything. So I work on the bottom level, rather than I waste my energy for something useless. But I hope there are not so many Indonesian like me. Because our country needs people, who are aware of politics, they (the government) are like this (incapable) even though people watch over them, can you imagine what if all of us do not care? Maybe because you are a journalist, you have a significant role there (to monitor government). You have direct influence on them. But for me, I am so far...so I leave it up to people like you.

A: But we (Indonesian) still need a voice from people to work on grassroots. Even though you don't care about it (politics), I think you still need political power to...for example, you need 'politics' to get permission to do something on the are and lobbying people — that's politics.

W: and I don't need to know the political condition in the national level to do that.

A: on a macro basis maybe not.

W: on a macro basis, it does not influence me. If Mata Najwa takes up regional politics issue, like how the capability of local government, that would be different, I think there is a need to discuss it. Mata Najwa often talks about regional government. However, it is more about the corruption case. I am tired of that theme. So if there is another theme outside of it (corruption), I will definitely watch it. For my work, I only need a permit from them (regional government) because they don't want to discuss anything and they know nothing. So, for now, politics on a national level is not essential for me.

A: the dilemma for that kind of programme (talk shows) is raising themes that attract people.

W: unpopular topic

A: So they don't know how to grab the rating if the topic is unpopular. Meanwhile, the television programme lives from rating and share.

W: I have hope for her (Najwa Shihab) on YouTube channel.

A: Maybe there are alternative YouTube channels (that can fulfill what you want).

Q: interestingly you enjoy watching Mata Najwa, a national scale programme. What do you get from them when you are already sceptical?

W: I love the way Najwa doing research. I appreciate people doing research. She speaks based on data. The implication is, her questions are tactical. They are not something out of nowhere. I admire her in-depth data. She also quantifies the statements (of the guests), not only about facts. That is so cool. And I am more interested in analysing the way Najwa questions the guests, like "Najwa should ask 'this' to make the show more appealing," sometimes I watch the show from that side, instead of focusing on the content. I love how Najwa ask people. Her data is deep. I also think as if I am part of the team. If I am one of them, what I should do. This because my area is about research, even though in this case is media research. I also think, "that's crazy (the question). The team must be wonderful" that they can track old documents. It needs to be appreciated. All journalism should be like that.

Q: When Wewe does not concern about the content, how about you, Alfi? What they give you, as you like provocative topic?

A: I have my own perspective, but after I watch Mata Najwa, it's not like what I think before. It turns out that my thought is shallow. We can get that the perspectives from informants who are opposed to me make sense. For example what we watched before about hashtag movement (#2019ChangePresident). The informant said it is a social movement. I believed that it is a political movement. But Mardhani Ali Sera (the informant) addressed that that movement is a form of freedom of speech. Apart from he is a politician, I agree that it is a freedom of speech. But still, my political perspective says, "no way. You are opposition, and it is political movement". So I know why incumbent problematize it. But at the same time, I realize that Indonesia is a democratic country in which freedom of speech is on it. So I get a new perspective and the way Najwa direct this issue is...

W: because she knows the context. She understands it well..

A: Yes. And that makes me "oo that's how it is." Sometimes our political perspective, our framework is wrong and it 'opens' again after watching Mata Najwa. For that case, I ignore that a democratic country accepts critics from everyone. It is because my political stance is supporting the incumbent. But I just got reminded by watching Mata Najwa that everyone can criticize the incumbent.

W: the one that I like from Mata Najwa is the proportion of the guests is balanced. For example in a debate format, there are pros and cons parties. What I mean is, we should also appreciate the for providing balance and fit proportion. Maybe they look for guest...who can debate apple to apple. Mata Najwa also teaches the audience that....I mean even though they are under control of political party before, they strived to be neutral. So they

always provide varying perspectives. They also give information...for example the case of PSSI (Football Association of Indonesia), I am, as an Indonesia citizen, agitated with the Indonesian soccer. I am peeved at having no access to Indonesian soccer information. My only access is from online news, articles. Mata Najwa facilitates the visual. Apart from reading the article is tiresome, sometimes interpreting 'written language' is different to what it means. But in visual media, there is a concept in sociology, the 'expression given off.' So we can watch the expression of people there. I know there is a problem in PSSI, but I don't get the detail. So (after watching Mata Najwa), the show strengthens my assumption. I have my assumption and got some evidence (new information) from different actors (provided by Mata Najwa). Mata Najwa also gives a space for people who have the interest to speak. Now, it depends on our, as the audiences, judgment. In my opinion, there is no right or wrong in supporting whom. The thing is that Mata Najwa gives the same proportion for pros and cons parties.

Q: in your opinion, how does Najwa lead the debate and ask questions?

W: Because I am a qualitative researcher, so I focus more on the way she gives questions and explores the information. The approach of a researcher and a journalist in doing an interview or asking people is different. But I appreciate the most from her, and her team is the research. It can't be separated from the show. I agree that Najwa is capable, but it's impossible for her to do research alone. What I get from Mata Najwa is we have to master the issue. We cannot be a journalist without understanding the issue. When we comprehend the subject well, we know what we want to ask from different angles. Najwa is sharp, even though there are some moments when she's a bit dull, "she should ask this instead of that." Apart from that, Najwa knows the context; her data is 'strong,' and that is cool. And she has extensive knowledge. She ever invited Student Executive Boards, BEM, to talk about BEM in Indonesia. She did not only have the data, but she knew the context very well. So, when people cornered the Student Executive Board of Indonesia, she knows that students' voice is unheard and they could not explain what they want to say. Najwa Shihab was able to abstract it. When the chair of Bogor Agricultural University BEM said, "now students cannot graduate seven years. In the past, students can study for seven years, and it was fine." the question is why?. Mata Najwa could explain it in the further level. She said, "there is a systemic attempt from the government, so students cannot interfere politics." They want students to be passive. They make the maximum period of studying is six years, so students do not have time to demonstrate. She was able to see that. She does not only have great questions, but she is also able to abstract the problem.

A: it is like opening citizens' mind

W: yeah..what's the informant meant

A: Comparing her with someone on the same level, for example, Rosiana Silalahi and Karni Ilyas, Najwa is beautiful and straight to the point. In my opinion, a journalist should be polite to ask the informants and follow them. Rosiana Silalahi is less bold than Najwa even though she is more serious than Najwa. She is also a woman. And the way she treats the informants is different. For Karni Ilyas, he is merely a moderator who rarely gives his perspective. Najwa is so 'powerful' on the show, and she owns control of it. I think the audience start watching the show not because of the content, but because of Najwa Shihab.

W: for me, it was because of the content at first, plus she is courageous enough, a woman. Oh, I just realized that she is a woman. What I mean is it cannot be denied that we live in a masculine country. A woman has to...maybe she has to five times better than a man to be recognized in a public space. In the past, it is rare a woman leads an excellent talk show like this. So, even though she is associated with the name of "Shihab" and a daughter of Quraish Shihab, she offers 'colors' and hope. There is a woman who presents in the middle of us and gives a different color. I am not a feminist, but I love the participation of women in the public space. So I support her.

A: that is her strength. She can accentuate her in the middle of patriarchal culture. Even Rosiana, who is also a woman, she cannot do things as Najwa does. She still lows (being polite) herself in front of male informants, for example when she talked with Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono (a former of Indonesia President). Regardless of courtesy in front of male informants, she can deliver her questions to get the answers she wants. It's like "although you are male and older than me." She has that power. I don't know what makes her be like that.

W: it's because she is a daughter of Quraish Shihab. With the surname "Shihab," it has a role

A: I just knew that she is a daughter of Quraish Shihab

W: But the one who hires her know

A: I mean, the audience see her as a powerful woman

W: Ok. The media give her space, and if there are no media which facilitate her, maybe it would be difficult for her. And she has her channel, I know. But I think, apart from she is smart, I admit it. She is five times smarter than male journalists. We cannot deny there is "Shihab" name on hers. It brings...

A: I don't agree with you

W: I don't want to problematize it, but I am sure, in a masculine country like Indonesia, there is a role of "Shihab" name which delivers her success.

A: the context is how powerful she is

W: I have an assumption about the name. But there is no evidence, and it would be difficult to be analyzed. Well, it's just an assumption.

A: I believe it's a 'given.' It's because of Najwa's talent.

Q: Ok, people can assume anything. Now, let's talk about talking about Mata Najwa. We've said you were interested in watching Mata Najwa because people talk about it. If I may know, do you also talk about Mata Najwa with others?

A: I talk about it with my friends

W: I never arrange who I am going to talk with, I can talk to anyone. The one that I remember is, of course, talking with my family. My family loves Quraish Shihab, and there is his beautiful and smart daughter who has a television programme. She raises deep issues, instead of issues on the surface. Our conversation is light at first. We seldom talk about Najwa Shihab, and we talk about the issue. When I was in school, my friend and I talked about how the issue was addressed. And with family, we talk about the content.

A: I watch because the content is good, the topic is trending, so I talk about it with friends. Mata Najwa becomes our reference to talk about the political issue. Although not all of my friends watch Mata Najwa, they watch other political programmes such as Indonesia Lawyers Club. So we talk and share our perspective. Because my friends are mostly female and my male friends are political apathy, I talk with female friends instead of male friends. The case of Indonesian soccer case is the exception. My male friends talk about it, probably because that is soccer.

W: we can map out the gendered theme, right?

A: The topic is appealing to them. For the political issue, male friends are like "I don't care." The comparison for male friends who concern about politics is little.

W: the reason why the female is attracted watching Mata Najwa, political talk show, maybe because of the appearance of a woman there. Before the political talk show is led by a male, but now, there is a woman who has excellent political talk show. I want to add, the difference of Najwa with other show is that she does not let the informants 'flow' to wherever they want. She does not follow the informants. She already knows what to do. Her questions are very 'closed' and specific. So the guests cannot...

A: because her question itself which make the guests' answers stick to it

W: Yeah, wait. What is your question again?

Q: talking about Mata Najwa with others

W: As I said, I talk about it with my dad and mom. My mother is exposed by political information rarely, yet she experiences it as a citizen. When I talk to my mom about politics, it feels like her opinion is a representation of a citizen who needs to be heard. Sometimes my mom's view is funny and naive. But it is the voice of a 'real' citizen. My father is tough, and what I like about him is he talks about politics at the analytical level, and he is already biased. My mom tells me about her problem. She owns a school, then what is the connection with politics? She raises the problem in the 'field.' She is not in a theoretical or analytical level or whatever. For example, she said like, "Education has no improvement" that is real. When I talk with my dad, he talks from the perspective of the macro level. When I talk with friends, even though now is rare, we do not only talk about politics. At first, we talk about our job, anxieties, problems...and we conclude that they are complex. My friend is a political consultant, I am in the education area, and another friend is working in the environment area. Talking to them is fascinating. And we know what happens in the fields because we work there. My consultant politics friend, talking about how to treat politicians. So we produce discourses. We don't talk about secondary data. This is the primary data we discuss. So what we talk about is fresh. For political discussion, we refer to Mata Najwa as our reference. Oh, I thirst of the social and cultural issue on Mata Najwa. I wish I can get that, even though it is not Mata Najwa. Well, we refer to Mata Najwa while talking about politics. One of the sources of information which easily accessed is Mata Najwa, and we don't need to read articles to get credible information. I also do not believe in ordinary news. There is something new on Mata Najwa that we can talk about.

For example, is when Mata Najwa talk about youths and politics. My friend's client was there. At first, we talk about the campaign strategy and the legislator candidates she handles, and then the one invited by Mata Najwa.

She told me about the strategy. We discuss her client performance on Mata Najwa. She manages everything, from what her client uttered during the show to her post on twitter, everything has the concept. This issue is refreshing for me, and I appreciate Mata Najwa. I am tired with political issues, the 'old' politicians... we need something new, youths, although still a minority. Youths in politics just graduated from university and provided a space to talk about their intention, that is so cool! If other programmes raise this topic, it would not be as popular as in Mata Najwa, I guess. They could not cover it 'sexily'; the angle taken would not be as good as Mata Najwa. Mata Najwa is good because of the in-depth research they do, so they can make that unpopular issue to be popular.

A: the critical player in Mata Najwa is Najwa Shihab. Najwa is brave to take the risk of raising the issue. For example, is when Mata Najwa was taking Indonesian soccer case. What I got is there is no 'ultimate' victory in Indonesian soccer, and she was taking it and aired it in several episodes. My friends and I talked about it... about how Mata Najwa reveal what has been hidden before. So we knew the truth. Others are not brave enough to talk about it in depth, although now she is standing by herself (under her company). My friends and I are like, "Najwa is crazy raising this issue to the surface." Because I believe that there are many political interests within the case, it's impossible for 'lay' people courage to investigate it in depth.

Q: About political talk with other people, what is the urgency for you to talk about politic with others?

W: In the case of talking with a friend, the first thing is I will choose an open-minded friend. I don't mind if we have a different perspective. What's important is they are open-minded. Talking with them gives me a chance to see something from a different perspective, that every people... that there is nothing like an absolute truth on something... so I don't think that I am the right one, that's why I will always talk with others that have open-mind manner and has a clear basis of argument. I also talk to others for self-actualization. When I talk to family, like I said before, my family is... because my dad has a high concern to politic, if I ask something about politic to him, I get the answer. We will have a clear discussion. And about my mom, she talks as a citizen, about what she feels. Not in the form of analysis, but a real case that she meets daily. Then I bring those cases to be abstracted with my friends.

A: I am interested in politics, and I studied it. Then I jumped myself into that world too, even though in journalism. Then I become more realized, that this topic is always interesting to be talked about. Moreover, there is always something new keep happening, like suddenly a lead of party caught doing corruption, something like that. I am interested to know new things.

Q: How about sharing about political opinion or something about Mata Najwa in social media?

W: I never do that.

A: I don't.

W: Not only something about Mata Najwa that I never shared, but also all 'serious' topics, I rarely do it. Social media is just for fun. There is a specific platform to share something like that. There is a particular group for it... About the education issue, there is a platform, and I feel enough to share the concern on it. Because in social media... in my opinion, our society is not ready to talk something academic yet. They are not ready discussing issues in-depth. Even though my account is private, I only want to discuss something with an open-minded person. She doesn't have to agree with me as it will be uninteresting if everyone has the same thought. But when I see my followers, not all of them have an open mind. So that is a picture of our society. Even though my followers don't represent all of Indonesian, but it gave enough view that we are not ready. If we want to discuss something objectively, we have to prepare with the analysis that hasn't thought by society. For example, how I see the education issue. Lay people maybe will be shocked with analysis, like a critical perspective. Perhaps it will be too vulgar to be a public consumption.

A: I never share my political stance because I don't have the right moment

Q: Back to Mata Najwa, do you agree if there is an element of drama in Mata Najwa? For example when the guests are quarreling?

A: For me, Mata Najwa is more like a confirmation. All this time we think that this is A, but soon after watching Mata Najwa, we realized that it could be B. Not really sure if it called a drama.

W: I am not sure about it

A: But in my opinion, the debate in Mata Najwa is still making sense. The discussion and debate are corresponding to the topic.

W: It has not made us weary yet.

A: It does not make us think, "What the hell is this?" like Indonesia Lawyer Club programme. I believe they are scripted. Mata Najwa is not in that situation yet for me.

W: I'm not weary with it. I don't pay attention to it. It feels like I am in the middle of it and when Najwa ask the guest, I comment "Why don't you talk about that? You should ask more about this." As I said, if I don't like the topic, I focus more on how she questions the guests. Even I pay attention to the guest, "Why did you answer like that?"

A: So far watching Mata Najwa, I still feel that this is real. Like how A triggered because of B, yes it has to be like that. There are some moments when the guests cut each other, yet Najwa always guides them. If there is a dispute, I am fine. But sometimes it's more like "What the hell? Shut up.", Not like "What the hell, such a drama."

W: It's not possible that a program is not 'designed.' But what she showed to us... if there is no gimmick, it feels like something is deficient. But yes it has not make the viewer weary. Still acceptable.

Q: Do you follow the elections topic in Mata Najwa?

A: Yes I do, the Jakarta election. Because that time I was doing a thesis about Ahok, Jakarta Election. And one of the references is Mata Najwa, even though my basis data is from printed media. But I have to know the political direction, so I was looking for another reference. I followed the topic in Mata Najwa. I've been following the presidential election, but not following that much. Because I also read from other sources, and have other references, and to watch youtube video needs an extra effort. In other media we also get politician statement, the difference in Maja Najwa is, they are more like arguing each other. Now there are talk shows with debate format. On television, almost every channel has debate programmes. Mata Najwa is not my primary source for now. But for the previous Jakarta election, Mata Najwa is my primary source. Maybe because that moment they can presenting Mr. Ahok, so I'm interested to know how is the episode. So I watched the episode. It makes me understand more. In the current Mata Najwa, the guest level is still in the level of General Secretary, Chairman of Party, for me, it's common, nothing special about it.

Q: Who do you expect to see in Mata Najwa?

A: Of course the main actors. The key players who have a significant influence on Indonesian politics that everybody knows — Megawati for example. If Jokowi presents in the program, it must be scripted. Megawati, Prabowo, they are the main actors and most wanted guests of this programme. Maybe it's hard to reach these people.

W: I watched some episode about the election in Mata Najwa, coincidentally it appears on my youtube homepage, so I watched it. Or for example, I am looking for information about the presidential election. But I'm not waiting for Mata Najwa to be my basis on making a choice. Mata Najwa is one of my sources about politics information, but not the primary source. And it happens to be the right choice. What I got is just the campaign team. They are correlated. By watching Mata Najwa, I got a picture of people behind the candidate, how their capacity. But not as the primary source. For the main source of the presidential election, I prefer a written one such as some website that does analysis, like 'Conversation' and then in-depth interview at Tirto. In a written source, I feel like the data is more valid and comprehensive. So from the article, I look for extra information such as Mata Najwa. For the standard of a TV programme, the research in Mata Najwa is very strong. But still, it is different from the research-based article. So, when I mentioned the in-depth research, for the standard of a talk show, the research in Mata Najwa is very deep. But I agree with what Alfa, it's not the main actor that presented. But still in the level of supporters, people behind the candidates. But it is helpful. And Mata Najwa has influenced me enough about how I see a political party. In the statistic field, it's enough. In statistic, there are weak, enough, and strong. Mata Najwa is enough. The strong one is reading the analysis of someone.

Q: both of you watch Mata Najwa on YouTube. Could you illustrate the experience of watching it online?

W: There is no ads distraction on YouTube. I can adjust the time to watch the show on mine, rewatch or rewind it if there is something I don't understand. And I can skip the video. Either watching on TV or Youtube, whatever it is, apart from Mata Najwa, Youtube is my new online media. It is more applicable and fits me well. I feel like YouTube is closer to me. It's because I can access everything through a phone, anywhere and anytime I want. So it is more effective. I don't need to sit, and we can pause the video for a moment. Its convenience that makes me access to video on YouTube. I skip Mata Najwa frequently. If there are informants who give data-based answers or not consistent, I will jump to the more credible one. I ever stopped the video because it was boring. It's not a problem since I watched it alone. I have control over what I watch on Youtube. Relating to talking about Mata Najwa, my friends and I never watch it together, but we discuss afterward.

A: Because on television we cannot rewatch as the programme has scheduled. If we don't understand, we need to click rewind. There are so many ads on TV, and sometimes the commercials made me forget what has been talked. In case we forget, we can rewind the video on YouTube. It's more about having control. I also ever stopped watching when the discussion was no longer interesting; for example, the informants were out of the

‘track,’ or they talked too much. Najwa usually tries to cut that kind of guests, but sometimes they keep speaking.

Q: I noticed, while watching Mata Najwa before, you were laughing. What is the reason?

A: for me because one of the informants was opposition, but now he is turning to support the incumbent.

W: I have no problem with the changes in his partisanship. I think it’s exciting people change political direction like that. It’s politics. It’s possible for a politician to change political stance in one day. It’s fine. But because I have experience with him that made me laugh. He was in Indonesia Lawyers Club programme and talked with Ahmad Dhani. His argument was irrational. I think when we have a political discussion, we suppose to not relating it with religion. The basic argument should not be Qur’an. That’s not elegant. So when I watch him, I remember about it and start laughing.

Q: how about female guests on Mata Najwa?

W: the fresh one is Dara Adinda (young female politician). Via Vallen (female dangdut singer) was also ever invited, although it discussed Asian Games. In my opinion, Mata Najwa provides a space for a woman. When Via Vallen was on Mata Najwa, it also gives a space for the music community which associated with the second class. Small things like that make me admire Mata Najwa because I have a high concern on women issue.

Q: that’s it. Do you want to say anything about Mata Najwa?

W: Mata Najwa, I am not sure if they set the agenda. For sure, I miss a talk show which talks about women, the violence against women for instance. If Mata Najwa facilitates this issue, that would be great. I know women issue is not as popular as a political issue yet. The problem in this developed country is...we are still far away to talk about children issue, disability, women. Those issues need to be mainstreamed. So what I mean is Najwa has a significant role in giving colors on public discussion. I am interested in women issue because I feel the subordination over women. I study about gender, feminism and it justifies what I think. I agree that women face the same problem. What pathetic in a developed country is...well in developing country, women are aware that they are marginalized and the fight for it, even though they have difficulties to challenge it. On the other hand, in a developed country, although they experience the marginalization, they are not able to recognize the problem. They perpetuate that. So what I mean is there is a need to mainstream this issue. There is a need to tackle this problem from different sectors. If we see from education view, only in college, with a specific major, people learn about it. While not all people have access to high level of education, women issue should be applied to primary school or middle school curriculum. Another sector is media which brings influence to society. It is television. If Mata Najwa wants to educate people about this issue, women could be awakened about the problem, that women are not fine.

A: Mata Najwa is less facilitating women issue because they ‘play’ around male politicians. They rarely invite female guests. Although their main topic is politics, the guests are males. But it could not deny the fact that our political condition is like that (female politicians are far less than male politicians). So what could they do? If they want to invite female guests, then who?

W: I think...maybe Mata Najwa should bring up the issue of the number of female legislators. Why is that? What is the problem female face to participate in formal politics? Are female legislators represent female citizens well? And for females who hold this position, are they understand Indonesian women problems well? For the male, do they also recognize women’s issue?

A: But at the same time we have to acknowledge that Mata Najwa is a program which highlights the trending issue. Maybe on her channel, she can do it. But yeah, maybe Mata Najwa cannot be a space for political women, yet.

W: Mata Najwa is not a new programme. I idolize one musician, and he said, “in the beginning, I followed the market. But now, I have loyal listeners, and I will sing what I like.” That is what I wish for Mata Najwa. They have audiences. I expect...because Najwa is brave enough, and I think she is the only one in television who can cover issues underground. I think she could do it.

A: won’t it be effective? Mata Najwa is a popular programme. Who does not get influenced by what they talk about? All people know. For people who do not concern at first... for example, I don’t like soccer at first, and I have no idea about the case. After watching Mata Najwa, I want to know more especially if the issue is women issue which discussed seriously.

W: and it is packaged by exciting style

A: Mata Najwa's style

W: in-depth data as the basic and critical

A: they are not at the level...

W: descriptive

A: they are in the investigation level. It's like "whatever happens, I have to get the answer."

## Appendix 6: Sample of Coding Process

Open Coding	Sub-Category	Category	Theme
As if Indonesia has 10 Najwa, Najwa is attractive, Najwa is a good interrogator, Najwa is a good listener, Najwa's courage is cool, Najwa is a good moderator, Najwa is a good trigger, Najwa is a smart woman, Knowing Najwa as the host is enough, loving the way Najwa leads the show, the way Najwa asks the guests is sensational, Najwa asks what people what to ask, Najwa explains things to be easily understood (and logics), Najwa is a representation of women, women's questions are represented, Najwa is a woman who cannot be oppressed, Najwa shows that women are logics, feeling represented as powerful woman, defending Najwa is something happened to her, focusing on Najwa as a professional journalist, Journalism is Najwa's passion, Najwa believes what is right for her, Najwa can ask anything, Najwa can lead the discussion to be focused, Najwa has aura, Najwa has high confident, Najwa is an independent woman	Admiration for the host – positive engagement	Host engagement	Engagement
Feeling upset towards the guests, feeling unsatisfied with the guests answer, getting tired with the guests answer, diplomatic answer is funny, the guests reveal something unconsciously, guests reveal some secrets, guests reveals their own disgrace, judging the guests, feeling growled towards the guests	Negative engagement	Guest engagement	Engagement
Enjoying the drama of politics, Enjoying the quarrel, Enjoying to watch a debate, 'Excusing' part is interesting, mocking the guests if: lying, wrong, mocking the guests together with family, MN if for entertainment, feeling happy when the guests are cornered,	Conflict enjoyment – positive engagement	Content engagement	Engagement
A debate teaches to see things from different angles, connecting the current issues with the previous one on MN, educating the self, empowering audiences political perspective, understanding the issue, talking MN is exchanging information, getting insight by discussing politics with father, MN becomes the reference for political talk among youths, knowing who does what, what is happening through following political news and MN,		knowledge	Civic Circuit

**Appendix 7: List of Episodes for the interviews**

<b>Name of Interviewees</b>	<b>Episode</b>	<b>Link</b>
'Lily'	Mendadak Caleg “Suddenly becoming Legislative Candidate”	<a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OLZWj2Zrx2w">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OLZWj2Zrx2w</a>
'Momo'	PKI dan Hantu Politik “Indonesia Communist Party and Political Ghost”	<a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MXb7dSMPGIQ&amp;t=2s">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MXb7dSMPGIQ&amp;t=2s</a>
'Juju'	Pura-Pura Penjara “Pretending Jail”	<a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Tdun0At0XFg&amp;t=261s">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Tdun0At0XFg&amp;t=261s</a>
'Zizi'	Siapa Rindu Suharto “Who Miss Suharto”	<a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lwGxNbZGcbo&amp;t=34s">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lwGxNbZGcbo&amp;t=34s</a>
'Riri'	Pura-Pura Penjara “Pretending Jail”	<a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Tdun0At0XFg&amp;t=261s">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Tdun0At0XFg&amp;t=261s</a>
'Titi'	Pura-Pura Penjara “Pretending Jail”	<a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Tdun0At0XFg&amp;t=261s">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Tdun0At0XFg&amp;t=261s</a>
'Gigi'	Siapa Pilih Koruptor “Who Choose Corruptor”	<a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dp0pqvtmEuo&amp;t=568s">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dp0pqvtmEuo&amp;t=568s</a>
'Eli'	Siapa Pilih Koruptor “Who Choose Corruptor”	<a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dp0pqvtmEuo&amp;t=568s">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dp0pqvtmEuo&amp;t=568s</a>
'Cici'	Gara-Gara Tagar #2019GantiPresident “Because of Hashtag #2019ChangePresident#	<a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ic8qIV36Pto&amp;t=783s">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ic8qIV36Pto&amp;t=783s</a>
'Cita'	Mendadak Caleg “Suddenly becoming Legislative Candidate”	<a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OLZWj2Zrx2w">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OLZWj2Zrx2w</a>
'Arti'	Mendadak Caleg “Suddenly becoming Legislative Candidate”	<a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OLZWj2Zrx2w">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OLZWj2Zrx2w</a>
'Wewe'	Gara-Gara Tagar #2019GantiPresident “Because of Hashtag #2019ChangePresident#	<a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ic8qIV36Pto&amp;t=783s">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ic8qIV36Pto&amp;t=783s</a>
'Alfi'	Gara-Gara Tagar #2019GantiPresident “Because of Hashtag #2019ChangePresident#	<a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ic8qIV36Pto&amp;t=783s">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ic8qIV36Pto&amp;t=783s</a>
'Felli'	Siapa Rindu Suharto “Who Miss Suharto”	<a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lwGxNbZGcbo&amp;t=34s">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lwGxNbZGcbo&amp;t=34s</a>
'Ilmi'	Siapa Rindu Suharto “Who Miss Suharto”	<a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lwGxNbZGcbo&amp;t=34s">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lwGxNbZGcbo&amp;t=34s</a>