

CRITICAL PARADIGM ANALYSIS OF THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF THE DIGITAL ERA IN VINCENT MOSCO'S VIEW

Kamaruddin Hasan^{1*}, Teuku Zulkarnaen², Jafaruddin³, Safwan⁴, Zulfadli⁵

^{1*,2,3,5}Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Malikussaleh, Indonesia
(kamaruddin@unimal.ac.id)

⁴Faculty of Medical, Universitas Malikussaleh, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

Vincent Mosco is a prominent academic in the field of media and technology political economy. His work focuses on the interplay between power, media, and information technology, particularly how capitalism and globalization influence communication systems. Mosco highlights how media and technology corporations shape and control the flow of information, with significant implications for society. The political economy of media maps the economically and politically powerful entities that dominate global and national media ownership, including in Indonesia. When a few corporations control the media industry, they inevitably dominate public discourse. Mosco's theory emphasizes the study of social relations, particularly power dynamics in the production, distribution, and consumption of resources. Key concepts include commodification, structuration, and spatialization. This study employs a descriptive qualitative method with a critical paradigm. Data were gathered through discussions with experts in communication, politics, and business economics, along with literature reviews and observations of current media realities. The findings reveal that global and national media should avoid falling into oligarchy, monopoly, and hegemony. The media must uphold its role as the third pillar of democracy rather than serve as a tool for oligarchic politics. The public must recognize that media conglomeration is a political-economic issue, remain critical of media conglomerates, and demand access to accurate and reliable information. Strengthening media studies, monitoring, and regulation is essential to ensure that mass media operates democratically. These findings aim to contribute to both theoretical and practical discussions on the political economy of media in the digital age.

Keywords: Vincent Mosco, Political Economy of Media, Mass Media, Public, Critical Paradigm

1. INTRODUCTION

The reality of the political economy of the digital era nationally and globally has undergone a significant transformation in line with the development of digital technology, the internet, and media media platforms, including social media. This transformation affects economic ownership in the media industry, power dynamics, political dynamics, power control, and its impact on the production and distribution of mass media information to the public (Aryadi 2024).

The political economy of the media as an economic, political, and technological force that affects the structure and content of the media. This reality is greatly influenced by the concentration of media ownership, the development of digital technology, government intervention, and the role of social media platforms (Salvatore Simarmata 2014). The media is not only a tool for disseminating information, but also an instrument of political and economic power that is interrelated. This dynamic reflects the

complexity between market forces, capital owners, political interests, power, technological developments, including the role of social media platforms in today's digital era (Hasan, K and Satria 2009).

The concentration of media ownership, the development of digital technology, and government regulation have all contributed to the ever-changing media landscape. Meanwhile, digitalization has opened up opportunities for wider participation. Of course, challenges related to disinformation, political bias, and content commercialization remain a big concern for the future of mass media, journalism and press freedom, especially in Indonesia (Sujoko, Anang 2020). This phenomenon describes the complex interaction between economic, political, and technological forces in shaping the mass media. Naturally, the development of digital technology is changing the media landscape, which is now increasingly concentrated in ownership by a handful of large conglomerates and plays a role in influencing content and information distribution.

The results of Lim, M., 2012 research "The League of Thirteen: Media Concentration in Indonesia." *The Asian Journal of Communication*, stated that the media in Indonesia in the digital era experienced a concentration of ownership (Lim 2012). Several large business groups, such as MNC Group, Viva Group, Elang Mahkota Teknologi (EMTEK), Trans Corp, Media Group, Kompas Gramedia and others, dominate the conventional and digital media sectors. They control most of the Indonesian media market. As a result, the media tends to serve the interests of capital owners and has a bias towards certain issues that benefit them politically and economically.

This consolidation led to strong economic power in these groups, which allowed them to control public narratives, the direction of news reporting, and political economic interests (Tyas 2010). With this centralization of ownership, there is a risk that the diversity of voices and perspectives in news coverage may be limited. Media ownership is dominated by some of the major conglomerates, which control various sectors, including television, print, radio, and digital media. This conglomerate presents challenges in terms of information diversity and plurality of voices (Tyas 2010).

The concentration of media ownership globally, described by McChesney, R. W., in his 2013 book "Digital Disconnect: How Capitalism is Turning the Internet Against Democracy", mentions that one of the main characteristics of the political economy of digital media is the concentration of media ownership. Several giant technology companies such as Google, Facebook (Meta), Amazon, Apple, and Microsoft dominate the global media and information market. They control most of the information distribution, digital advertising, and media platforms including social media (McChesney 2013). This dominance is often referred to as a platform monopoly, where most of the information, advertising, and communication traffic occurs through multiple centralized platforms that control the flow of data and content.

This transformation, the consolidation of media ownership, controls the distribution of content, technology, and internet access significantly. This power concentrated in a few global tech companies

creates an information monopoly and control over the platform, where content is filtered, sorted, and promoted based on algorithms and commercial interests (Tyas 2010). It is evident from the reality that the media industry is now controlled by a number of concentrated capital owners, leading to a media oligopoly, a monopoly of media ownership. Many media in Indonesia, for example, are only controlled by 13 large media groups. This fact globally also shows that the world's mass media industry is only controlled by 6 (six) Peru Jewish mass media (Hasan, K 2013)

The political economy of the media in the view of Vincen Moscow, in 1998, defined the political economy of the media narrowly and broadly. Narrowly speaking, it is the study of social relations, especially power relations, which together form the production, distribution and consumption of resources including communication resources or mass media (Maryani, Janitra, and Rahmawan 2019). Extensive study of the control and defense of social, economic and political life. In this case, Moscow offers at least three important concepts to apply the political economy approach to the study of media-communication, namely *commodification*, *spatialization*; and *structuration*. Moscow, provides a critical view of how power, economy, and politics affect the structure and function of mass media in the digital era (Hasan, K 2016).

For this reason, this study tries to analyze with a critical paradigm approach through a descriptive qualitative method related to the political economy of media in the digital era in the view of Vincent Mosco. This critical study seeks to explain the results of the observation of mass media trends and conduct a dialectical analysis of the ideologies and economic, social, and political conditions presented by the mass media, together with the public with the aim of strengthening their humanitarian positions, groups in the public so that they are free from various forms of domination and hegemony that tend to oppress. A critical approach must clearly educate the public to take real action without alienating them from the reality of their own world. Data sources were obtained through discussions with experts in communication, media, politics and business economics. Literature review and observation process, analysis of the latest mass media reality in general.

2. DISCUSSION

2.1 Critical Paradigm of Media Political Economy

The results and discussion of this study start from an understanding of the critical paradigm in studying the political economy of the media. That the development of critical knowledge requires an analytical method including critical research. Critical knowledge is based on the principle that all human beings, potentially, can be active agents in the development of their world. Therefore, methods that are in accordance with the principle of humanity are always based on a form of dialogue between subjects, not subjects and objects. Critical paradigma always starts from practical problems that develop in a dominated public, hegemonized by certain ideologies, especially by the mass media, and faced with social, economic, and political conditions that tend to be monopolized.

Horkheimer, Ardono, Althusser, Juergen Habermans as some of the founding figures of the critical approach including Antonio Gramsci who introduced *Hegemony* point to a concept that sees that basically the power of language is a force that can maintain the power of one group over another, the mass media is also an effective medium in maintaining that power (Jones, PIP n.d.). Another thing is Louis Althusser who offers the term "*Ideological State Apparatus*", "*Repressive State Apparatus*" where this thinking sees that the mass media to the military contribute greatly to the control of the idea of a society by the people in power (Butsi 2019).

Budi Hardiman, 2007 stated that for a critical approach, every research must acquire knowledge about *das sein* (what exists) and not *das sollen* (what should exist) (Sutrisna 2013). So that what happens is that knowledge does not lead to better changes, but only copies the social data. For Hegel (Erich Formm 1969), knowledge is not acquired in the position of objects where objects are considered to be something separate from, and in opposition to human beings who have knowledge. To know the world, humans must make the world their own (Butsi 2019; Hasan, K 2016).

Salim, Agus in 2006, in the *theory and paradigm of Social Research*, that the critical approach in general always looks in a broad context, not only at one level but also explores other levels that play a role in an event (Salim, Agus 2006). In the study of mass media, this approach does not only look at how the work process of journalists go to the field and make news to be published. But also look at how the social, political, cultural and economic context or atmosphere when the news is made. It even explored who was the source. The newsroom of a media is also in the spotlight, who owns it, what ideology the mass media adheres to, and it could even be how the employee salary rerecitation system in the media is.

In general, two perspectives of media political economy can be described, the first is a liberal perspective centered on the issue of the market exchange process where individuals as consumers have the freedom to choose competing commodities based on the benefits and satisfaction they offer (Hasan, K and Satria 2009). The greater the market power plays its role, the greater the freedom of consumers to make their choices. The mechanism of the market is governed by what Adam Smith calls the "hidden hand" *of the invisible hand theory* (Widaningsih 2013). Mass media in this liberal view is really seen as a cultural product that must be given free and wide opportunities for anyone to own and to compete freely in the market.

This liberal view is a school of thought that emphasizes the role of the mass media in promoting *freedom of speech*. This thinking has several criteria. The first criterion is that the public is understood as competing groups. This means that there is no ruling group or dominant group. The second criterion is that the media is seen as an organizational system that has limits, gaining autonomy from the state, political parties and pressure groups. The third criterion is that media control is owned by an autonomous managerial elite, so that it can create flexibility for media professionals. The fourth

criterion is that the relationship between media institutions and the audience is symmetrical (Wuryanta 2018).

The second perspective, critical political economy, follows Marx to pay attention to the organization of property and production in cultural or other industries, rather than to the process of exchange as liberalism does. This perspective does not ignore the choices made by producers and consumers of the cultural industry, but what producers and consumers do is seen in a broader structure (Wuryanta 2018).

The critical political economy perspective differs from the mainstream in economics in terms of holism, the balance between capitalist effort and public intervention; and its relevance to issues of morality such as justice, equality, and public *goods* (Kamaruddin Hasan and Satria 2009; Rachmawati, Vina, and Diwan 2015). The holistic nature of this perspective in the context of critical political economy analysis is one of several considerations made in the context of a critical political economy perspective. Holistic here means showing the interrelationship between economic organization and political, social, and cultural life (Kamaruddin Hasan and Satria 2009; Wuryanta 2018).

Critical political economy pays attention to the expansion of the "dominance" of media companies, both through increasing the quantity and quality of cultural production that is directly protected by capital owners. Of course, the extensification of media dominance is controlled through the dominance of media content production that is in line with the preferences of capital owners. The process of commodification of the mass media shows the dominance of the role of market forces. The commodification process actually shows the narrowing of the freedom space for media consumers to choose and filter information (Kamaruddin Hasan and Satria 2009; Wuryanta 2018; Zulfiningrum 2014).

This perspective fully analyzes public intervention as a process of legitimacy through public disagreement over the forms that must be taken because of the efforts of the capitalists to narrow the space of public discourse and representation. In this context, it can also be called the existence of distortions and imbalances between society, the market and the existing system.

The criteria from this perspective include, first, that the capitalist public becomes the dominant group or class. Second, the media is seen as an ideological part in which classes in the public fight, even in the context of the domination of certain classes. Third, media professionals enjoy the illusion of autonomy socialized into dominant cultural norms. Seeing economic problems is in relation to political, social, and cultural life. Liberalism emphasizes individual sovereignty and freedom in capitalism, so the critical paradigm emphasizes social *relations* and power (Eka Wenata Wuryanta 2018; Kamaruddin Hasan and Satria 2009; Wuryanta 2018)

2.2 Expert in the Political Economy of Digital Era Media

Media political economy in the digital era is a field of study that combines economic, political, and media analysis to understand how these forces interact in the context of mass media in the digital

era. In addition to *Vincent Mosco*, several experts in the political economy of media in the digital era, including; *Dallas Smythe* (1907–1992), pioneer in the theory of media political economy. One of his most famous concepts is *audience commodity*, that in mass media, the audience is the main commodity sold to advertisers. This thinking is the basis for the analysis of the political economy of digital media, where consumer attention on digital platforms is sold to advertisers. *Herbert Schiller* (1919–2000), contributed to the understanding of how the media is controlled by the interests of corporations and the state. Highlights the concept of *cultural imperialism*, in which the global media controlled by large corporations, especially in the United States, propagates dominant values and ideologies that serve capitalist interests.

Robert W. McChesney, with his works "Rich Media, Poor Democracy" (1999) and "Digital Disconnect: How Capitalism is Turning the Internet Against Democracy" (2013). One of the key figures in the political economy of media, especially in the digital era. Highlighting how increasingly concentrated media ownership in the hands of a few large corporations threatens democracy. According to him, the media should function as a public space where democratic discussion takes place, but the concentration of media ownership hinders that function. In the digital age, focusing on how big tech companies like Google, Facebook, and Amazon play a dominant role in the dissemination of information (McChesney 2013).

And Schiller, son of Herbert Schiller, in his work "Digital Capitalism: Networking the Global Market System" (1999), expanded the concept of media political economy into the internet age. He examines how technological transformation, especially the internet, relates to global capitalism. In his work, *Digital Capitalism*, Schiller explains how tech giants such as Google and Facebook are playing a role in shaping the digital economy and consolidating economic and political power. *Christian Fuchs*, his works "Digital Labour and Karl Marx" (2014) and "Social Media: A Critical Introduction" (2013). One of the important figures in the study of political economy of contemporary digital media. Fuchs combines Marxian's critical theory in the analysis of social media and the digital economy. In his book *Digital Labour and Karl Marx*, he explains how social media platforms such as Facebook and Google exploit the digital workforce, where users generate value through their online activities without getting a direct reward.

Manuel Castells is known for the concept of *Network Society* or network society. Examine how information technology, especially the internet, has changed the global economic, social, and political structure. In his books *The Rise of the Network Society* (1996), and "Communication Power" (2009), Castells highlights how global networks facilitate economic and political power, including control over digital media.

Noam Chomsky, although better known as a linguist and political activist, has made important contributions to the analysis of the political economy of the media. Together with Edward S. Herman, his work "Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media" (1988), developed a

propaganda model, which explains how the mass media functions in a capitalist system to support the economic and political interests of the elite. In the digital age, his thinking provides important insights into how these forces are still operating through digital platforms.

Nick Srnicek, focuses on the digital platform economy in the context of contemporary capitalism. He analyzed how big tech platforms like Amazon, Google, and Facebook generate value from user data and develop new business models that rely on global digital networks. He also introduced the concept of "platform capitalism in 2016," which shows how digital companies gain dominance through platform monopolies.

Robert McChesney, another figure who highlighted the great influence of corporations on media in the digital age. He examined how media consolidation and privatization of public media have an impact on democracy, emphasizing that corporate control over digital media limits pluralism and media independence. His book *Digital Disconnect* reviews how the internet, which was initially seen as a democratic tool, has turned into a means for large corporate profits.

Nicholas Garnham emphasized the importance of looking at the media in a broader political and economic context, linking communication systems to the dynamics of capitalism. He argues that digital media and information technology should be analyzed as part of a larger capitalist production process, focusing on how digital media serves the logic of global capitalism. *Shoshana Zuboff* is famous for her theory of *Surveillance Capitalism*, where large tech companies collect user data and use it for commercial purposes. In his book *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism*, he explains how platforms like Google and Facebook use user data to predict and direct consumer behavior for profit.

Saskia Sassen, with her concept of *Global Cities*, explains how global cities function as the center of the digital economy and global capitalism. Sassen also examines the impact of digitalization on the political economy and global inequality, as well as how technology strengthens the power of global corporations and major states. These experts have been instrumental in developing an understanding of the political economy of media in the digital age, with each offering a critical perspective on how economic, political, and technological forces interact with each other in digital media.

3.3 Vincent Mosco; Middle Economy Digital Age

The political economy of media in the digital era from the perspective of Vincent Mosco seeks to place the public critically on the existence and content of mass media. Vincent Mosco is a leading academic in the field of communication studies, especially the study of political economy, media and technology. Born in 1948, he is widely known for his contributions to understanding the relationship between power, media, and information technology. One of its main focuses is on the influence of capitalism and globalization on communication systems, including how media and technology companies shape and control information flows.

Vincent Mosco, a leading theorist in the field of political economy of communication, developed the concept of the political economy of media in the context of the digital age as part of the study of the

critical political economy of media and technology. Exploring how economic, political, and social forces affect media and communication in the digital age. His thinking is very influential in understanding how information technology and digital media interact with global economic and political forces. Examine how information and communication technology is used to control the production, distribution, and consumption of information. In the digital age, he highlighted how digital technology myths, such as the free internet, often mask the fact that this technology is controlled by large corporations.

Moscow, sees the political economy of digital media as part of global capitalism, where digital technology becomes a means for market expansion and global economic power. He argued that the development of digital media cannot be separated from the interests of capitalists, who control and utilize technology for economic gain. Social media platforms, big tech companies such as Google, Facebook, Amazon, and others are considered part of the capitalist power structure that controls the flow of information and global communication.

Nugroho, Y., Putri, D. A., & Laksmi, S. (2012). "Mapping the landscape of the media industry in contemporary Indonesia." *Center for Innovation Policy and Governance*, digitalization and disruption of traditional media that the development of digital technology, especially the internet, has brought major changes to the media landscape in Indonesia. Print and television media have been disrupted due to the emergence of social media platforms. This also affects traditional media business models that rely on advertising. Many media companies are turning to digital platforms to maintain their relevance amid changing media consumption patterns. This development also provides wider access to the production and distribution of content by the general public. However, increasing digital participation also brings new challenges such as hoaxes, disinformation, and politically charged content that is often used for the benefit of certain groups. Mass media in Indonesia is often used as a political tool by its owners who have certain political affiliations or interests. Some media owners are also involved in politics or have close relationships with political figures, so the media becomes an instrument to promote certain political agendas or discredit political opponents. This makes the media not always neutral and independent.

Moscow, limits the definition of political economy narrowly and broadly. A narrow definition means the study of social relations, especially power relations, which together form the production, distribution and consumption of resources, including communication resources. In a broad sense, the study of the control and defense of social life, political economy. Moscow offers at least three important concepts to apply the political economy approach to media-communication studies, namely: *commodification*; *spatialization*; and *structuration*.

Commodification

Moscow introduced the concept of commodification, in which he explained how information, communication, and even everyday life in the digital era are transformed into commodities. User data

and personal information are used as an economic source for technology companies through the sale of highly targeted data or advertisements. This commodification is changing social and cultural relations, where human interaction through digital media is monetized and controlled by large corporations.

Commodification of information and communication, as one of the key concepts in the political economy of media. In the context of digital media, information and communication have become commodities that can be produced, distributed, and traded like any other good. Digital technology accelerates this process by transforming data and information into valuable economic assets. Social media platforms, streaming services, and search engines collect user data that is then sold or used for commercial purposes.

Commodification is related to the process of transforming goods and services from their use value to commodities that are oriented to their exchange rate in the market. This transformation process, in the mass media, always involves the media crew, the media audience, the market, and the state if each of them has an interest. There are basically 3 (three) types of commodification in communication itself, namely; Intrinsic commodification or *intrinsic commodification*, extrinsic commodification or *extrinsic commodification*, and cybernetic commodification.

Intrinsic commodification or content commodification is the process of changing messages from a set of data into a system of meaning in the form of a marketable product, such as a product package marketed by the media by loading the writing of another article writer and advertising in a package that can be sold. While *extrinsic commodification* or public commodification is the process of modifying the role of readers by media companies and advertisers from the initial function as consumers in the media to non-media public consumers, where media companies produce the public and then hand it over to advertisers. *Cybernetic commodification* is basically related to the process of overcoming control and space.

Mass media, including conventional media television, have intelligently transformed various trinkets of human life into part of business, so that anything can be turned into a commodity worth watching, aka commodified. It must be remembered that the main interest of the media is generally not to be oriented to the development of life values purely, but simply to articulate economic interests. It is very natural that the media then makes the values of life a mere commodity without heeding the after-effects of its biased broadcasts that violate the values themselves.

The reality of life values in any form is packaged into various media content as a commodity by the cultural industry. From the perspective of the political economy of the media, media content such as soap operas, advertisements as a form of text that is produced to gain massive profits. Any media industry elite can be constructed into a highly alluring display product that will bring profits. A development of advanced capitalism marked by the commodification of all human cultural artifacts by a handful of elite rulers of the media and cultural industries.

Critical view, that media consumers are actually being objectified by the media. The public will only be considered as a complementary object calculated based on mathematical calculations regarding the potential profit that will be obtained from an impression. The relationship between the public and the media takes place in *a restrictive manner*, because the public is actually controlled by the laws of the market. The relationship between the media and the public actually places the public as a commodity, aka goods that are traded.

The law of reification assumes that a commodity contains *fetish* or amulet value. An object has a fetish value if it is considered to have an absolute value that becomes a reference for daily life. Actually, the public has fetish value for the media industry. The media industry makes the public a commodity that sells well in the intertwining of capital accumulation interests. Taking Adorno's thinking, (Strinati, 1995) the value *of fetishes* lasts when money becomes the main benchmark in the triangle of the relationship between the media, advertisers and the public.

The dynamics of capitalism continue that the relationship between the public and the media is established within the scope of "*commodity society*". The loss of identity, alienation, and ignorance of which norms to hold to the public are so easily influenced by the media. The media becomes a means of giving identity, providing friends, displaying interpretations of events, and indirectly directing the public to decision-making. The media also satisfies the needs of humans, the public and influences the way of thinking.

A commodity society is characterized by four important axioms; first, a society in which the production of goods takes place, not primarily for the satisfaction of human desires and needs, but for the sake of profit and profit. Second, in commodity societies, there is a general tendency towards a massive and extraordinary concentration of capital which allows the cloaking of free market operations for the benefit of the monopolized mass production of standardized goods. This trend will really happen, especially for the communication industry or mass media. Third, what is more difficult for contemporary society to face is the constant increase in demands, as the tendency of the stronger group to maintain, through all available means, the conditions of power relations and wealth that exist in the face of the threats that they themselves actually propose. Fourthly, because in society the forces of production are very advanced, and at the same time, the relations of production continue to shackle the existing forces of production, this makes the commodity society full *of antagonism*. This antagonism is of course not limited to the *economic sphere* but also to the *cultural sphere*. In the context of popular culture, almost all mass media content is a phase process of cultural commodification.

The digital era of information and user commodification has also become the main commodity traded. Internet user data is treated as a commercial asset, with digital companies using algorithms to collect, analyze, and monetize that data. The attention economy is central to this business model, where users become not only consumers but also products, as their time and attention are sold to advertisers. This commodification is related to the process of transforming goods and services and their use value

into a commodity that has an exchange rate in the market. Economically, the media will gain great profits thanks to the acquisition of advertisements displayed with the programs produced and aired.

In contemporary culture, simulations are familiarly used by the mass media to achieve aesthetic and political effects so that a content that is aired receives the full attention of the public. Fictitious images or *simulacrum* often appear through justification, that a work of a TV program is presented based on a true story. This depiction under the guise of a true story is what makes it problematic, because basically media content is not an objective entity. Subjectivity is so strong in every work. This means that it does not make sense if a program work, let's call it a soap opera, just becomes a reflection of reality. It makes more sense to say that media exposure is representation. In the concept of representation, there is an understanding that the media only describes a part of reality, which is often presented incompletely and implies a certain subjectivity behind it.

At the peak for the public, a hyperreality situation develops, developing when the media is controlled by certain interests. The relationship between the media and the public is colored by the politics of signs. It means a situation where the "text" of the media becomes an arena to control the public. Baudrillard (Agger, 2005), said that this simulation model succeeded in spreading the discourse of power and control directly in the public environment. Public consciousness is controlled through the means of representation to agree that what the media presents is an objective truth and not a subjective fabrication.

In such a situation and condition, it is difficult to expect the mass media to be part of shaping the healthy character of the nation because media institutions prefer solely to be suppliers of cultural industries. In the cultural industry, the products created are always oriented towards mass consumption. The production process always considers material or capital-interests and entertainment or pleasure. Wheeler 1997, mentioned this condition as the commercialization of "waste" which is dangerous because it has a serious impact on the quality of human life. The public experiences *a cultural brain wash* by being strangled with false needs with arid, non-educational-innovative forms of spectacle.

Spatial

Spatialization, in Moscow's view, is related to the process of overcoming or as a transformation of the boundaries of space and time in public life. That spatialization is a process of institutional extension of the media through the form of corporations and the size of media business entities. The size of a media business entity can be horizontal or vertical. Horizontal means that the forms of media business entities are forms of conglomerates and monopolies. Process Vertically is the process of integration between the parent company and its subsidiaries which is carried out in one line of business to obtain synergy, especially to obtain control in media production.

Spatialization is a process to overcome spatial and temporal barriers in social life by media companies in the form of business expansion through, the process of horizontal, vertical integration and internationalization. Horizontal integration occurs when a company that is in the same media channel

buys a majority stake in another medium, which has no direct relationship with the original business; or when a company takes over a majority of shares in a company that is not engaged in the media sector at all. In practice, this horizontal integration is the cross-ownership of several types of mass media at once such as newspapers, magazines, tabloids, radio, TV by a group of large media companies. In Indonesia, this kind of integration is carried out by Kompas Group, Tempo/Jawa Post Group, Sinar Kasih Group, Media Indonesia and Salim Group and others.

Integration internationalization or globalization is seen from an economic perspective as a conglomeration of space for capital carried out by transnational and state corporations, which transform space through the flow of resources and commodities including communication and information. In the digital era, Moscow also pays attention to the phenomenon of spatialization and temporality. Digital technology affects space and time, blurring physical and geographical boundaries. The Internet allows global communication to occur in real-time, reducing distances and accelerating the exchange of information. As part of capitalism's efforts to expand its influence without being limited by geographical or time limitations.

Structure

Structuring is related to the relationship between agency ideas, social processes and social practices in structural analysis. Structuring is an interdependent interaction between agents and the social structure that surrounds them. Structuring is the process of combining *human agency* with the process of social change into structural analysis. An important characteristic of structuring theory is essentially the power exerted on social change, describing how structures are produced and reproduced by human agents acting as mediums of structures. This structuring balances the tendency in media political economy analysis to describe structures such as business and government institutions by showing and describing the ideas of agency, fundamental social relations that refer to the role of individuals as social actors whose behavior is constructed by a matrix of social relations and positioning, including class, race and gender.

1. CONCLUSION

Conclusion from Vincent Mosco's thoughts on the political economy of media in the digital era; There are at least three important concepts in applying the media political economy approach, namely commodification, spatialization and structuring. Moscow, emphasized how technology and digital media have become a new terrain for economic and political power dynamics. From data commodification to corporate dominance, Moscow invites the public to consider the impact of these developments, labor and democracy. While the internet provides opportunities for wider participation, the public must be wary of new forms of exploitation and injustice emerging in the digital age.

That the current practice of mass media always commodifies by carrying out a series of media content production processes based on market interests. Like merchandise, media management is full

of economic values that are based on ratings, production efficiency and effectiveness, media consumption, and focusing on potential consumer targets. Media products are geared towards attracting the attention of a large audience. The media now makes itself a servant of the interests and needs of the market rather than the public interest. This assumption is not an exaggeration considering that the orientation of media products almost all tend to meet the desires of consumers and advertisers. This reality also further strengthens the public position as a product sold to advertisers and as a worker who is exploited by media industrialists.

The concept offered by Moscow is in principle relevant in examining the entire media activity and formulating a holistic model from the entire production cycle to its reception. The study of media political economy theory does not use reductionist principles and linear causal relationships, but tends to be critical in assessing knowledge that is always associated with the values of participation and equality whose emphasis is greater on the process aspect than on institutional problems.

REFERENCES

- Aryadi, Armin. 2024. *Ekonomi Digital Dan Transformasi Bisnis Di Indonesia*. TOHAR MEDIA.
- Butsi, Febry Ichwan. 2019. "Memahami Pendekatan Positivis, Konstruktivis Dan Kritis Dalam Metode Penelitian Komunikasi." *Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Komunikasi Communique 2.1* 2(1): 48–55.
- Eka Wenata Wuryanta. 2018. "Teori Kritis Dan Varian Paradigmatis Dalam Ilmu Komunikasi." <https://osf.io/quxtn/>.
- Hasan, K. 2016. "Komunikasi Sebagai Proses Politik Dan Ekonomi." : 1–8.
- Hasan, Kamaruddin. 2013. "Ekonomi Politik Media Dan Konvergensi Media." *Proceeding Seminar Nasional Ekonomi* (November): 1–23.
- Hasan, Kamaruddin, and Deddy Satria. 2009. "Kapitalisme, Organisasi Media Dan Jurnalis: Perspektif Ekonomi Politik Media." *Dinamika Fisip Unbara Palembang* 2(3): 1–18.
- Jones , PIP, et al. *Pengantar Teori-Teori Sosial*.
- Lim, Merlyna. 2012. "The League of Thirteen: Media Concentration in Indonesia." *Research Report*: 1–20.
http://www.public.asu.edu/~mlim4/files/Lim_IndoMediaOwnership_2012.pdf.%0Ahttp://www.public.asu.edu/~mlim4/files/Lim_IndoMediaOwnership_2012.pdf.
- Maryani, Eni, Preciosa Alnashava Janitra, and Detta Rahmawan. 2019. *MACOM III Universitas Padjajaran 2019: Communication & Information Beyond Boundaries Bias Gender Dalam Artikel Di Media Lokal*.
- McChesney, Robert W. 2013. *Digital Disconnect: How Capitalism Is Turning the Internet against Democracy*. New Press.
- Rachmawati, Windyaningrum, D Saroyant Vina, and Setiawan Diwan. 2015. "Media Massa Sebagai Lembaga Ekonomi Yang Berkedaulatan Rakyat." *In Search (Informatic, Science, Entrepreneur*,

- Applied Art, Research, Humanism*), *Universitas Informatika dan Bisnis Indonesia* 12(04): 35–47.
<http://repository.unibi.ac.id/id/eprint/268>.
- Salim, Agus, and Ali Forman. 2006. *Pengantar Dan Berfikir Kualitatif Dalam Agus Salim: Teori Dan Paradigma Penelitian Sosial*. Yogyakarta.: Tiara Wacana.
- Salvatore Simarmata. 2014. “Media Baru, Ruang Publik Baru, Dan Transformasi Komunikasi Politik Di Indonesia Core.” : 18–36. <http://www.library.ohiou.edu/indopubs/search/se>.
- Sujoko, Anang, and Muhtar Haboddi. 2020. *Media Dan Dinamika Demokrasi*. Prenada Media.
- Sutrisna, EM. 2013. “Penyakit Degeneratif.” *jurnal kesehatan* (maret): 8.
- Tyas, Sagita Ning. 2010. “Konglomerasi Industri Media Penyiaran Di Indonesia Analisis Ekonomi Politik Pada Group Media Nusantra Citra.” : 1–102.
- Widaningsih, T Titi. 2013. “Ideologi Gender Majalah Remaja : Analisis Wacana Kritis (Gender Ideology Teen Magazines : Critical Discourse Analysis).” *Disertasi Universita*(Juli).
- Wuryanta, A G Eka Wenats. 2018. “Pendidikan Dan Arena Perebutan Dalam Media.” <https://doi.org/10.31227/osf.io/8nxq5>.
- Zulfiningrum, Rahmawati. 2014. “Spasialisasi dan Praktik Konglomerasi Media Kelompok Kompas Gramedia.” *Jurnal ASPIKOM* 2(3): 140.