



The Framing of Identity Politics in Kompas TV's Dua Arah Program: An Entmanian Analysis



Nadya Amalia Nasution¹ , Ida Bagus Irfan Romadhoni²

*Korespondensi :

Email :
nadyaamalia@radenintan.ac.id

Afiliasi Penulis :

¹UIN Raden Intan Lampung,
Lampung, Indonesia

Riwayat Artikel :

Penyerahan : 18 Januari 2026
Revisi : 21 Mei 2026
Diterima : 25 Mei 2026
Diterbitkan : 2 Juni 2026

Kata Kunci :

Analisis Framing; Politik identitas; Robert Entman; Media televisi; Komunikasi politik

Keyword :

Framing analysis; Identity politics; Robert Entman; Television media; Political communication

Abstrak

Artikel ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis pembingkaihan wacana politik identitas dalam media televisi di Indonesia, dengan fokus pada program Dua Arah di Kompas TV. Menggunakan pendekatan konstruktivis melalui model pembingkaihan Robert N. Entman, studi ini meneliti empat elemen: mendefinisikan masalah, mendiagnosis penyebab, membuat penilaian moral, dan memberikan rekomendasi penanganan. Penelitian ini menganalisis episode "Politik Identitas, Jadi Jalan Pintas?" pada tahun 2023 dan menampilkan lima pembicara dari beragam latar belakang, termasuk akademisi, politisi, dan pengamat. Temuan menunjukkan pola pembingkaihan yang konsisten di seluruh segmen program yang mengonstruksi politik identitas sebagai ancaman serius bagi demokrasi Indonesia. Analisis pembingkaihan mengidentifikasi bagaimana program tersebut mendefinisikan politik identitas sebagai pengganggu diskusi politik substantif, mendiagnosis demi keuntungan elektoral, menyampaikan kecaman moral yang kuat terhadap praktik tersebut karena bertentangan dengan nilai-nilai Pancasila, serta merekomendasikan solusi melalui pendidikan pemilih dan regulasi kampanye. Analisis frekuensi kata menunjukkan bahwa "politik identitas" muncul 61 kali dan "agama" 39 kali, yang mengindikasikan fokus pada dimensi keagamaan. Studi ini menyimpulkan bahwa media televisi membingkai politik identitas dengan menyajikan sudut pandang spesifik yang menekankan bahaya mobilisasi politik berbasis identitas, sekaligus mengadvokasi seleksi kepemimpinan berbasis kompetensi, sehingga berkontribusi pada pemahaman tentang bagaimana media membangun wacana politik dalam demokrasi pluralistik di Indonesia.

This study examines how identity-politics discourse is framed in Indonesian television, with a specific focus on Kompas TV's Dua Arah discussion program. Employing a constructionist paradigm and Robert N. Entman's four-element framing model—define problems, diagnose causes, make moral judgments, and suggest remedies—this research analyzes the episode "Politik Identitas, Jadi Jalan Pintas?" (Identity Politics, A Shortcut?) broadcast in 2023. The episode featured five speakers representing academic, political practitioner, and observer perspectives. Analysis reveals that the program frames identity politics as a threat to democratic quality, attributes its persistence to elite opportunism and structural regulatory deficiencies, condemns its practice on Pancasilaist moral grounds, and recommends voter education alongside stronger campaign enforcement. Word frequency analysis identified "identity politics" (61 occurrences) and "religion" (39 occurrences) as dominant terms, indicating that the religious dimension constitutes the primary axis of concern in identity politics in this context. Crucially, these findings reflect the framing adopted by this specific program and should not be generalized to Indonesian television as a whole. This study contributes to political communication scholarship by demonstrating the applicability of Entman's model to interactive television discussion formats and by highlighting the role of media ideology in shaping identity politics narratives within Indonesia's pluralistic democracy.



INTRODUCTION

Identity politics has emerged as an increasingly significant phenomenon in Indonesian politics, particularly during electoral periods. This phenomenon refers to political approaches that emphasize group identity differences—such as religion, ethnicity, or culture—to mobilize support in political contestation. In Indonesia's pluralistic context (Afandi et al., 2025; Aspinall, 2011; Muhtadi, 2019), identity politics possesses the potential to create social polarization that threatens national cohesion and democratic quality (Hadiz, 2016; Mietzner, 2018). The intersection of religious identity with political mobilization has become particularly pronounced in recent Indonesian elections, raising concerns about the sustainability of democratic pluralism. Mass media, particularly television, play a crucial role in framing and presenting identity politics issues to the public. As argued by Nasution (2024) in research on Islamic leadership narratives on YouTube, digital and conventional media have become important platforms for framing religious and political messages. Nasution (2024) demonstrates that framing of da'wah messages in digital media employs specific rhetorical strategies to construct narratives that resonate with audiences. Similar framing principles apply in television media contexts, where media framing not only influences how audiences understand issues but can also shape public opinion and affect political behavior (Entman, 1993; Scheufele & Tewksbury, 2007).

In Indonesian television media, political discussion programs play strategic roles in framing sensitive issues such as identity politics (Lim, 2017). Kompas TV's *Dua Arah* (Two-Way) program represents one of the political discussion programs that addresses various current issues, including identity politics. Episode berjudul "Politik Identitas, Jadi Jalan Pintas?" (Identity Politics, A Shortcut?) serves as the focus of this study because it specifically discusses the phenomenon of identity politics in Indonesian electoral contexts. The program features speakers from various backgrounds—including Hermawi Taslim (academic and political observer), Masinton Pasaribu (PDI Perjuangan politician), Titi Anggraini (Executive Director of Perludem), Dedek Prayudi (political activist), and Andi Sinulingga (political observer)—to discuss identity politics issues in depth with moderator Liviana Cherlisa, making it a relevant object for media framing analysis (Subiakto, 2015).

Research on identity politics framing in Indonesian media has been conducted by several researchers with diverse focuses. However, a critical gap remains: prior studies have either examined identity politics through social media platforms (Triantoro, 2019), analyzed online news coverage (Akihary et al., 2023), or offered macro-level sociological analyses (Jati, 2022; Romli, 2019)—none of which systematically applies Entman's complete four-element framing model to an interactive television discussion program. Interactive programs differ fundamentally from news broadcasts in that framing emerges through live multi-party deliberation, making the framing process more dynamic and contested. Furthermore, no prior study has situated Indonesian television

framing analysis within the broader context of the outlet's ideological positioning, a critical factor in constructivist media analysis (Shoemaker & Reese, 2014). This study directly addresses these gaps. This study seeks to fill that gap by systematically applying Entman's analytical framework to understand how television media constructs identity politics discourse (Gamson & Modigliani, 1989; Van Dijk, 2011). Several previous studies have examined identity politics issues and media framing in Indonesian contexts. First, Triantoro examined identity politics practices on the Anies – Sandi campaign's social media accounts during the 2017 DKI Jakarta Regional Election.

This study employed critical discourse analysis to examine how religious and ethnic symbols were strategically deployed in campaign content to construct identity –based narratives. Findings revealed that identity politics in the digital campaign predominantly manifested through Islamic religious symbolism, reflecting the growing influence of conservative and Islamist movements in Indonesian electoral politics. The study demonstrated that social media served as a key platform for amplifying identity –based appeals, contributing to heightened social polarization during the election period. However, this research was limited to social media platforms and did not examine how broadcast media—particularly television—frames and presents identity politics discourse to wider audiences. Furthermore, the study did not employ Entman's framing model, leaving unexamined how specific framing elements such as problem definition, causal diagnosis, moral judgment, and treatment recommendations operate in political media discourse (Triantoro, 2019). Second, Raharjo Jati examined the dynamics of societal polarization in Indonesia during the 2014 –2020 period, with particular attention to the role of identity –based divisions in shaping democratic quality. The study identified that polarization in Indonesia is fundamentally driven by identity—particularly religious and ethnic identity—rather than ideological differences, as political elites instrumentalize these markers to mobilize electoral support. Findings revealed that such identity –based polarization intensified during major electoral contestations, including the 2017 Jakarta gubernatorial election and the 2019 presidential election, generating significant threats to democratic consolidation. While this study provides valuable macro –level analysis of identity politics and its societal consequences, it does not examine how media—particularly television—frames and constructs identity politics discourse for public audiences (Jati, 2022)

Third, Romli investigated the relationship between political identity and the challenges it poses to democracy consolidation in Indonesia. The study argued that identity politics, when manipulated for short –term electoral gains, fundamentally undermines the procedural and substantive dimensions of democratic governance. Romli found that the persistence of identity –based political mobilization reflects structural weaknesses in Indonesia's democratic institutions, including low voter political literacy and insufficient regulatory frameworks governing campaign conduct. Although this research provides a strong theoretical foundation for understanding why identity politics poses

democratic challenges, it does not analyze the role of media framing in mediating or amplifying these challenges, nor does it address the specific communicative strategies through which identity politics is constructed and disseminated to audiences (Romli, 2019). Fourth, Akihary, Marta, and Panggabean analyzed media framing of identity politics in Indonesian online news coverage ahead of the 2024 election, focusing on how prejudice and stereotype are embedded in news narratives about identity politics. The study found that different online news platforms employed distinct framing strategies—some reinforcing polarizing social categories around identity, while others maintained relatively neutral stances by emphasizing electability over identity divisions. The research demonstrated that media framing plays a constitutive role in shaping how identity politics is perceived and normalized in public discourse.

METHOD

This study focused exclusively on online news media and did not examine interactive political discussion programs on television, which operate through different communicative dynamics involving live deliberation among speakers with diverse perspectives. Furthermore, the study did not apply Entman's comprehensive four—element framing model, leaving a methodological gap that the present research seeks to address (Akihary et al., 2023). This research contributes to the literature in several distinct ways. First, it systematically and comprehensively applies the framing model in analyzing all four framing elements (define problems, diagnose causes, make moral judgments, and suggest remedies) in Indonesian television programs. Second, the focus on interactive discussion programs (Dua Arah) offers different perspectives than previous research, which mostly analyzed news or one—way talk shows. Third, this study not only identifies the framing used but also analyzes the implications of this framing for democracy and pluralism discourse in Indonesia by integrating keyword frequency analysis (Bowen, 2009). Second, its focus on an interactive discussion program (Dua Arah) captures framing dynamics that differ substantively from one—way news broadcasts and social media content analyzed in prior studies. Third, this study situates framing analysis within Kompas TV's ideological positioning, addressing the relationship between media ownership, editorial orientation, and framing outcomes—an analytical dimension absent from previous Indonesian framing studies. Fourth, by integrating keyword frequency analysis, this study provides a mixed—method dimension that strengthens analytical triangulation (Matthes & Kohring, 2008). Fifth, the study maintains critical analytical distance throughout, treating the program's framing as an object of analysis rather than accepting it as a transparent account of political reality.

This study employs qualitative framing analysis as its primary method. The analytical framework draws on Robert N. Entman's (1993) framing model within a constructionist paradigm, operationalized through four functions:

defining problems, diagnosing causes, making moral judgments, and suggesting remedies (Eriyanto, 2015). The constructionist paradigm treats reality not as an objective given but as actively constituted through processes of social interaction and representation—including media production (Berger & Luckmann, 1966). Within this paradigm, media functions not as a neutral mirror of events but as an active agent that selects, emphasizes, and contextualizes information to construct particular versions of social reality (Eriyanto, 2015). The paradigm used is constructivist, which views reality as a result of social construction, including construction conducted by media (Creswell & Poth, 2016). In this context, media is not viewed as a mirror of objective reality, but rather as an active agent that constructs social reality through processes of selection, emphasis, and presentation (Shoemaker & Reese, 2016; Tuchman, 1978). Crucially, adopting a constructionist paradigm obliges the analyst to maintain critical distance from the frames under study—that is, to analyze how the program constructs its discourse rather than to reproduce or endorse that construction (Van Gorp, 2007)(Reese & Shoemaker, 2016; Tuchman, 1978). Entman's (1993) framing model identifies four key functions of framing that are central to this analysis.

First, define problems—defining what problem or issue is highlighted and how it is characterized. This element reveals which aspects of identity politics are emphasized and how they are problematized. Second, diagnose causes—identifying actors or factors that cause the problem. This element uncovers who or what is blamed for identity politics issues and how causal relationships are established. Third, make a moral judgment—providing a moral evaluation of actors and their actions. This element examines the ethical standards applied and the construction of moral assessments. Fourth, suggest remedies—proposing solutions or actions. This element analyzes the recommended interventions and their justification (De Vreese, 2005; Entman, 1993; Matthes & Kohring, 2008). The research object is Kompas TV's Dua Arah program episode titled "Politik Identitas, Jadi Jalan Pintas?" (Identity Politics, A Shortcut?) broadcast in 2023 with a 90-minute duration. This program was selected for several reasons: (1) it specifically and in-depth discusses identity politics; (2) it features speakers with diverse perspectives, including Hermawi Taslim (academic), Masinton Pasaribu (politician), Titi Anggraini (observer), Dedek Prayudi (activist), and Andi Sinulingga (political observer); (3) its duration allows for comprehensive multi-segment discussion; and (4) it is an established political discussion format on Indonesian national television broadcast by Kompas TV—a media outlet whose ideological positioning warrants explicit consideration in any framing analysis (Lim, 2017; Subiakto, 2015).

Primary data collection techniques were conducted through documentation, namely by recording and completely transcribing the program broadcast. Transcripts include all dialogues, narratives, and relevant visual elements. The transcription process was conducted verbatim to ensure no information was missed. Besides transcripts, researchers also conducted content logging by noting time codes, speakers, keywords, and discussion themes for

each segment (Krippendorff, 2018). Secondary data were also collected from academic literature, media reports, and related documents to provide a broader context for identity politics in Indonesia. The unit of analysis is the thematic discussion segment, defined as a continuous exchange (ranging from approximately 3 to 15 minutes) demarcated by a topic shift or a moderator intervention. This segment-level unit was selected because it captures the communicative context within which framing elements operate, as distinct from isolated utterance-level coding that risks.

The data analysis process was conducted systematically through several stages. First, the entire transcript was read repeatedly to obtain a holistic overview. Second, segments relevant to identity politics were identified based on keyword occurrence and thematic content. Third, word frequency analysis was conducted to identify dominant terms across the program. Fourth, each segment was coded according to Entman's four framing elements using a structured analysis matrix; for example, the utterance "politicians use religion to win elections, not to govern" was coded simultaneously under Diagnose Causes (elite exploitation of religious identity) and Make Moral Judgment (instrumentalization of religion violates democratic ethics). Fifth, framing patterns across segments were interpreted within the context of Indonesian political discourse. Sixth, findings were triangulated against secondary literature for validation. To enhance coding reliability, a second independent coder reviewed approximately 30% of the segments, yielding sufficient inter-coder agreement to support the analytical conclusions. To maintain research credibility, several validity strategies were implemented: (1) Credibility—through in-depth and repeated analysis (prolonged engagement) and peer discussions; (2) Transferability—by providing detailed descriptions (thick description) of research context and process; (3) Dependability—through systematic documentation of the research process in the form of an audit trail; and (4) Confirmability—by maintaining researcher objectivity and reflexivity in the analysis process.

RESULTS

Kompas TV's Dua Arah Program: Political Narratives in Indonesia

Dua Arah is a political discussion program broadcast on Kompas TV every Friday at 8:30 PM WIB. The program, hosted by senior journalist Liviana Cherlisa, is known for its in-depth discussion format, featuring speakers from diverse backgrounds. This research focuses on the episode "Politik Identitas, Jadi Jalan Pintas?" (Identity Politics: A Shortcut?), which was chosen because it brings together five main speakers representing academics, political practitioners, and observers to debate identity politics in Indonesian elections. The range of perspectives in this episode offers valuable insight into the phenomenon and aligns with the goals of this research. This Narration is shown in Figure 1.

Figure 1. Kompas TV's Dua Arah Program Discussion Panel



Source : YouTube.com, 2026

The figure 1 describe is divided into five main segments, totaling approximately 90 minutes. The first segment (00:04 – 05:05) serves as the opening and thematic introduction, presenting the identity politics issue in electoral contexts and emphasizing its divisive impacts. The second segment (05:31 – 16:30) discusses speakers' perspectives on identity politics, focusing on definitions, differences between identity politics and identity politicization, and implications for democracy. The third segment (22:07 – 31:29) discusses the politicization of identity and hegemony, examining how identity is used as a political tool. The fourth segment (38:17 – 49:48) raises specific cases related to Anies Baswedan and alleged use of identity politics, including references to the 2017 Jakarta Regional Election. The fifth segment (54:34 – 58:40) closes the discussion by highlighting candidates' commitments to avoiding identity politics and to monitoring their roles during elections. The moderator plays an active role in directing discussion, posing provocative questions, and facilitating debates among speakers while maintaining balanced speaking time and encouraging clarification of each speaker's position.

Framing Analysis of Identity Politics Discourse

The analysis reveals consistent framing patterns across program segments. Each segment contributes to constructing identity politics as a democratic threat requiring urgent attention. Table 2 presents a detailed framing analysis for each major theme discussed in the program.

Table 2. Framing Analysis of Opening Segment

Framing Element	Content	Brief Conclusion
Define Problems	Identity politics disrupts substantive political discussion and divides society based on primordial sentiments.	Frames identity politics as democratic disruption
Diagnose Causes	Political elites lacking strong programs exploit identity sentiments as electoral shortcuts.	Elite opportunism identified as root cause
Make Moral Judgement	Identity politics contradicts Pancasila values and national unity principles.	Strong moral condemnation based on national ideology
Treatment Recommendation	Voter education on evaluating candidates based on competence rather than identity.	Education – based solution proposed

Source: Author's Data Processing, 2026

Table 2 describes the opening segment, which establishes the foundational framing that identity politics represents a serious threat to Indonesian democracy. By framing the problem as a disruption to substantive political discourse, the program immediately positions identity politics negatively. This framing aligns with elite theory perspectives that emphasize how political leaders manipulate identity for electoral advantage. The discussion among political elites is summarized in Table 3.

Table 3. Framing Analysis of Political Elite Discussion

Framing Element	Content	Brief Conclusion
Define Problems	Political elites systematically exploit religious and ethnic identities for electoral mobilization.	Systematic exploitation pattern identified
Diagnose Causes	Weak enforcement of campaign regulations and low voter political literacy enable identity exploitation.	Structural and educational deficiencies
Make Moral Judgement	Elite manipulation of identity is unethical and produces illegitimate leaders.	Legitimacy crisis framing
Treatment Recommendation	Strengthen campaign law enforcement with candidate disqualification sanctions.	Legal enforcement solution advocated

Source: Author's Data Processing, 2026

Table 3 explains that this segment deepens the causal analysis by identifying structural factors enabling identity politics. The framing shifts from individual elite behavior to systemic issues, suggesting that addressing identity politics requires institutional reforms rather than merely changing individual actors. This systemic framing resonates with scholarly analyses that emphasize institutional factors in the proliferation of identity politics (Hadiz, 2016). A case study of this issue can be found in Table 4.

Table 4. Framing Analysis of 2017 Jakarta Case Study

Framing Element	Content	Brief Conclusion
Define Problems	The 2017 Jakarta election demonstrates how identity politics can dominate campaigns and polarize communities.	Historical case illustrates dangers
Diagnose Causes	Religious mobilization against Ahok exemplifies how identity issues overshadow governance records.	Religious dimension emphasized
Make Moral Judgement	Using religious sentiments to defeat competent leaders violates democratic meritocracy principles.	Meritocracy violation highlighted
Treatment Recommendation	Learn from 2017 to prevent repetition through stricter monitoring and awareness campaigns.	Historical lesson approach

Source: Author's Data Processing, 2026

Table 4 describes the 2017 Jakarta case study, which provides concrete evidence supporting the program's framing of identity politics as problematic. By referencing a well-known, contentious election, the program grounds its abstract arguments in lived experience familiar to audiences. This strategy of using specific cases to illustrate broader patterns is consistent with effective framing techniques

The Framing Analysis of Identity Politics Discourse

The framing analysis reveals significant implications for understanding contemporary political communication in Indonesia. In particular, it shows how television media constructs and presents identity politics discourse. The analysis demonstrates three key patterns in how the Dua Arah program frames identity politics issues. This transformation of political discourse aligns with Nasution's (2024) observations about media platforms. These platforms construct religious and political messages through strategic framing choices. Such choices resonate with audience concerns while advancing specific ideological positions. Before analyzing specific framing patterns, it is necessary to situate Dua Arah within Kompas TV's broader ideological context. Framing choices do not emerge in a vacuum. They are shaped by factors such as an outlet's ownership structure, editorial orientation, and political positioning (Reese & Shoemaker, 2016). Kompas TV operates under the Kompas Gramedia Group, one of Indonesia's largest media conglomerates. It is historically associated with a pluralist-nationalist editorial stance. This stance has tended to support civic, Pancasilaist values over communalist or religiously exclusivist ones (Lim, 2017). This ideological positioning plausibly shapes the selection of speakers, the moderator's line of questioning, and the evaluative framework applied to identity politics throughout the episode. From a constructionist standpoint, the program's consistent negative framing of identity politics—and its alignment with Pancasila-based normative discourse—are not politically neutral acts. Instead, they are exercises of symbolic power that legitimize certain political positions

while marginalizing others (Entman, 2007; Van Gorp, 2007). This analytical context is essential for interpreting the findings that follow.

The problem definition frames demonstrate that, across all segments, the program consistently constructs identity politics as a disruptive force that diverts political discourse from substantive policy issues to primordial sentiments. It is important to note that this analysis describes how the program frames these issues; it does not constitute an endorsement of that framing. Speakers consistently portray identity politics as disrupting substantive policy discussions and diverting attention from candidates' competence and programs. This pattern reflects what (Entman, 2007) describes as selective highlighting, emphasizing certain aspects of reality while obscuring others. By consistently framing identity politics negatively, the program leaves little rhetorical space for alternative perspectives that might view identity-based mobilization as a legitimate representation of marginalized groups' interests (Kymlicka, 1995; Young, 2000). The frequency with which religious dimensions appear in discussions (39 mentions of "religion") indicates particular concern about religious identity politicization in Indonesia's Muslim-majority context. The causal analysis employed reveals a strategic integration of individual and structural explanations for identity politics. While political elites are identified as primary actors exploiting identity sentiments, the program also acknowledges systemic factors such as weak enforcement of campaign regulations and insufficient voter political education. This dual-level analysis suggests that addressing identity politics requires both holding elites accountable and reforming institutional structures. The emphasis on elite agency aligns with scholarship emphasizing Indonesian political elites' instrumental use of identity appeals (Mietzner, 2018). However, by also highlighting structural causes, the framing avoids oversimplification and suggests comprehensive solutions.

The moral framework demonstrates strong normative commitments to Pancasila ideology and national unity as standards for evaluating political behavior. Speakers consistently invoke *Bhinneka Tunggal Ika* (Unity in Diversity) as an ideal that identity politics threatens. This nationalist framing positions identity politics not merely as poor strategy but as ideological betrayal. From an analytical standpoint, this moralized framing warrants critical scrutiny: while it carries rhetorical force in Indonesian contexts where Pancasila functions as state ideology and national consensus framework, it simultaneously naturalizes a particular liberal-nationalist conception of democracy that excludes identity-based political claims. The program's moral condemnation of identity politics as producing "illegitimate leaders" reflects underlying assumptions about democratic meritocracy as requiring identity-blind evaluation—assumptions that scholars such as Kymlicka (1995) and Young (2000) would contest as insufficiently attentive to structural inequalities that identity-based representation may seek to redress.

The treatment recommendations illustrate pragmatic approaches combining education, regulation, and civic responsibility. Rather than advocating

suppression of identity expression, the program emphasizes voter education to recognize and resist identity –based appeals. This educational emphasis reflects faith in informed citizenship as the foundation of democracy (Habermas, 1991). However, the program also advocates stricter legal enforcement, suggesting that education alone is insufficient. The combination of educational and regulatory approaches indicates recognition that addressing identity politics requires multilevel interventions. These recommendations align with scholarly analyses emphasizing both cultural change and institutional reform as necessary for managing identity politics in diverse societies. Table 5 shows the number of times each keyword appears in this broadcast.

Table 5. Keyword Frequency Analysis

No	Keyword	Frequency
1	Identity Politics	61 times
2	Religion	39 times
3	Society	28 times
4	Election	21 times
5	Anies Baswedan	19 times
6	Bhinneka Tunggal Ika	17 times
7	2017 Jakarta Election	15 times
8	Democracy	13 times

Source: Author's Data Processing, 2026

Table 5 draws the keyword frequency data, demonstrating sustained focus on identity politics throughout the program, with the term appearing 61 times across 90 minutes. The high frequency of religious references (39 mentions) confirms that religious identity constitutes the primary dimension of identity politics in Indonesian contexts. References to specific cases (e.g., Anies Baswedan in the 2017 Jakarta election) provide concrete examples that ground abstract discussions. And in Table 6, the author will provide an overview of the framing patterns across all segments of this broadcast.

Table 6. Summary of Framing Patterns Across All Segments

Segment	Define Problems	Diagnose Causes	Moral Judgement	Treatment Recommendation
Opening (00:04 – 05:05)	Identity politics disrupts democratic discourse	Elite opportunism	Violates Pancasila	Voter education
Definition (05:31 – 16:30)	Systematic identity exploitation	Weak regulations	Creates illegitimate leaders	Strengthen enforcement
Hegemony (22:07 – 31:29)	Identity politicization dominates	Religious mobilization	Threatens pluralism	Public awareness
Case Study (38:17 – 49:48)	2017 as cautionary example	Religion overshadows competence	Meritocracy violation	Learn from history
Closing (54:34 – 58:40)	Ongoing identity risks	Insufficient elite commitment	Endangers democracy	Strengthen monitoring

Source: Author's Data Processing, 2026

Table 6 synthesizes the framing patterns across all program segments, revealing a notable degree of consistency in how identity politics is constructed throughout the 90-minute discussion. Each segment reinforces a broadly negative framing of identity politics while adding segment-specific nuances. This consistency may reflect editorial orientation, shared ideological assumptions among speakers, or the moderator's framing of questions—though determining the precise causal mechanism would require production-process research beyond the scope of this study. What can be stated analytically is that the program's framing reflects Kompas TV's broader pluralist-nationalist editorial positioning, producing a discourse that may limit space for alternative perspectives on identity-based political representation.

DISCUSSION

Framing analysis of the Dua Arah episode "Politik Identitas, Jadi Jalan Pintas?" demonstrates how this specific Kompas TV program constructs identity politics discourse through consistent framing patterns across its five segments. The analysis through Entman's four elements reveals that the program systematically constructs identity politics as a threat to Indonesian democratic quality—a finding that reflects how this particular program frames the issue rather than a judgment about identity politics per se. The program consistently defines identity politics as disrupting substantive political discussions, diagnoses political elites as primary actors exploiting identity sentiments for electoral gains, makes strong moral condemnations based on Pancasila values and national unity principles, and recommends comprehensive solutions combining voter education with strengthened campaign regulations. Word frequency analysis confirms sustained focus on identity politics (61 mentions) with particular emphasis on religious dimensions (39 mentions of religion), indicating the centrality of religious identity in Indonesian identity politics discourse.

This study contributes to the understanding of political communication in Indonesia in several ways. For media scholars, the findings demonstrate that framing choices in political discussion programs reflect both editorial orientation and the broader political context. The analysis also highlights a methodological risk for constructivist researchers: conflating the program's normative framing of identity politics with analytical conclusions, rather than treating it as an object of analysis. The consistent negative framing of identity politics, although grounded in Pancasilaist discourse, effectively limits discussion of identity-based representation as a potentially legitimate democratic strategy in diverse societies (Kymlicka, 1995; Young, 2000). For media practitioners, the study illustrates how speaker selection, question framing, and editorial orientation collectively shape the ideological boundaries of political discussion programs. For political actors, the findings indicate that media framing may constrain the discursive space for evaluating identity-based campaign strategies. These contributions are bounded by the study's limitations and should not be generalized to all Indonesian television media. Several limitations of this study should be acknowledged. First, the analysis is restricted to a single episode of a single program, which may not

reflect broader patterns in Indonesian television political discourse. Programs with different formats, hosts, and political orientations may frame identity politics differently. Second, the research focuses exclusively on content analysis and does not examine audience reception or interpretation; thus, how viewers understand and respond to these framing strategies remains unexplored. Third, the study does not include comparative analysis across different media platforms, such as print, online, or social media, which may frame identity politics differently. Fourth, the research does not investigate the production process behind framing choices, leaving unexamined the reasons producers, hosts, and speakers frame identity politics in this particular way. Fifth, the analysis is limited to explicit verbal content and does not include a detailed examination of visual framing, non-verbal communication, or production techniques that may reinforce or contradict the verbal content.

Future research in Indonesian political communication could pursue several promising directions. First, comparative studies across multiple television programs with varying political orientations would clarify whether the identity politics framing patterns identified in this study are widespread or program-specific. Such comparisons could also reveal how media ownership structures and political affiliations influence framing choices. Second, audience reception studies examining how different demographic groups interpret and respond to identity politics framing would provide important insights into framing effects, including whether viewers accept, resist, or reinterpret dominant frames. Third, longitudinal studies tracking identity politics framing across multiple electoral cycles would reveal temporal patterns and changes in media discourse strategies. Fourth, a comparative analysis across different media platforms would clarify how identity politics is framed in television, print, online news, and social media. Fifth, ethnographic research into television production processes would reveal how framing decisions are made, what considerations guide speaker selection, and how economic and political pressures influence content. Pursuing these directions would deepen understanding of political communication's role in shaping Indonesian democratic discourse, particularly regarding sensitive issues such as identity politics in pluralistic societies.

CONCLUSION

This study found that the Kompas TV program *Dua Arah*, in its episode titled "Identity Politics: A Shortcut?", consistently frames identity politics as a threat to the current democratic climate in Indonesia. Using Entman's framing theory, the program seeks to explain that identity politics constitutes a structured, systematic effort by political elites to exploit identity sentiments for electoral gain. Based on word-frequency analysis, it is also evident that the dominance of religious issues in the discourse on identity politics is consistently and systematically exploited by politicians to enhance their electoral influence. This study demonstrates how television media shapes public opinion on identity politics through framing analysis. These findings indicate that the selection of

sources, questioning patterns, and editorial focus shape discourse on identity politics within Indonesia's democratic practices. Thus, this study contributes to enriching the study of political communication within the practice of mainstream media in Indonesia. Nevertheless, this study also has several limitations, including a narrow scope that examines only one episode of a single television program; consequently, these findings cannot yet be generalized to all media in Indonesia. Furthermore, this study is limited to Robert Entman's framing analysis; it does not fully explain the concept of identity politics or how the media shapes this concept from various perspectives. This study provides empirical evidence on how identity politics is constructed and debated within television media. Furthermore, this study can enrich research by researchers, academics, and political practitioners on how the media plays a significant role in constructing ideas and concepts, thereby influencing public opinion on political, media, and democratic issues in Indonesia

REFERENCES

- Afandi, Y., Dauly, Z., & Rais, Z. (2025). Buya, Surau, and Lapau: Mahyeldi Ansharullah's Identity Politics Propaganda in Digital Space. *Journal of Islamic Communication and Counseling*, 4(2), 126 – 138. <https://doi.org/10.18196/jicc.v4i2.104>
- Akihary, S., Marta, R. F., & Panggabean, H. (2023). Media framing of identity politics through prejudice and stereotype towards the 2024 election. *Kajian Jurnalisme*, 7(1), 14 – 26. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.24198/jkj.v7i1.46191>
- Aspinall, E. (2011). Democratization and ethnic politics in Indonesia: Nine theses. *Journal of East Asian Studies*, 11(2), 289 – 319. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1017/S1598240800007190>
- Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. Doubleday.
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27 – 40.
- De Vreese, C. H. (2005). News framing: Theory and typology. *Information Design Journal & Document Design*, 13(1), 51 – 62. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1075/idjdd.13.1.06vre>
- Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51 – 58. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1993.tb01304.x>
- Entman, R. M. (2007). Framing bias: Media in the distribution of power. *Journal of Communication*, 57(1), 163 – 173. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2006.00336.x>Digital Object Identifier (DOI)
- Eriyanto. (2015). *Analisis Isi: Pengantar Metodologi untuk Ilmu Komunikasi dan Ilmu-ilmu Sosial Lainnya*.
- Gamson, W. A., & Modigliani, A. (1989). Media discourse and public opinion on nuclear power: A constructionist approach. *American Journal of Sociology*, 95(1), 1 – 37.
- Hadiz, V. R. (2016). *Islamic Populism in Indonesia and the Middle East*.

- Cambridge University Press.
- Jati, W. R. (2022). Polarization of Indonesian society during 2014 – 2020: Causes and its impacts toward democracy. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Dan Ilmu Politik*, 26(2), 152 – 167. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.22146/jsp.66057>
- Krippendorff, K. (2018). *Content Analysis: An Introduction to Its Methodology*. Sage Publications.
- Kymlicka, W. (1995). *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*. Clarendon Press.
- Lim, M. (2017). Freedom to hate: Social media, algorithmic enclaves, and the rise of tribal nationalism in Indonesia. *Critical Asian Studies*, 49(3), 411 – 427. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/14672715.2017.1341188>
- Matthes, J., & Kohring, M. (2008). The content analysis of media frames: Toward improving reliability and validity. *Journal of Communication*, 58(2), 258 – 279. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2008.00384.x>
- Mietzner, M. (2018). Fighting illiberalism with illiberalism: Islamist populism and democratic deconsolidation in Indonesia. *Pacific Affairs*, 91(2), 261 – 282.
- Muhtadi, B. (2019). *Vote Buying in Indonesia: The Mechanics of Electoral Bribery*. Springer.
- Nasution, N. A. (2024). Islamic Leadership Narratives on YouTube: A Framing Analysis of Digital Da'wah Messages. *Ath-Thariq: Jurnal Dakwah Dan Komunikasi*, 8(2), 116 – 127. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.15294/ipsr.v4i1.17214>
- Reese, S. D., & Shoemaker, P. J. (2016). A Media Sociology for the Networked Public Sphere: The Hierarchy of Influences Model. *Mass Communication and Society*, 19(4). <https://doi.org/10.1080/15205436.2016.1174268>
- Romli, L. (2019). Political Identity and Challenges for Democracy Consolidation in Indonesia. *Politik Indonesia: Indonesian Political Science Review*, 4(1), 78 – 98. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.15294/ipsr.v4i1.17214>
- Scheufele, D. A., & Tewksbury, D. (2007). Framing, agenda setting, and priming: The evolution of three media effects models. *Journal of Communication*, 57(1), 9 – 20. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2006.00326.x>
- Shoemaker, P. J., & Reese, S. D. (2014). *Mediating the Message in the 21st Century: A Media Sociology Perspective*. Routledge.
- Subiakto, H. (2015). *Komunikasi Politik, Media, dan Demokrasi*. Prenada Media.
- Triantoro, D. A. (2019). Praktik Politik Identitas dalam Akun Media Sosial Anies – Sandi. *Jurnal Ilmu Komunikasi*, 16(1), 19 – 40. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.24002/jik.v16i1.1495>
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2011). Discourse, Knowledge, Power and Politics. In *Critical Discourse Studies in Context and Cognition* (pp. 27 – 65). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1075/dapsac.43.03van>
- Van Gorp, B. (2007). The constructionist approach to framing: Bringing culture back in. *Journal of Communication*, 57(1), 60 – 78. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2006.00326.x>
- Young, I. M. (2000). *Inclusion and Democracy*. Oxford University Press.