



## The Determinant Factors of Television's Audience in Choosing TV Channel in the Disruptive Era

Rendra Widyatama<sup>a</sup>, Suranto Aw<sup>b</sup>, Maizatul Haizan Mahbob<sup>c</sup>

<sup>d</sup>Department of Communication Sciences, Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

<sup>b</sup>Department of Communication Sciences,, Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Indonesia

<sup>c</sup>Center for Media and Communication Studies, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia

e-mail: <sup>a</sup>\*[rendrawidyatama@gmail.com](mailto:rendrawidyatama@gmail.com), <sup>b</sup>[suranto@uny.ac.id](mailto:suranto@uny.ac.id), <sup>c</sup>[maiz@ukm.edu.my](mailto:maiz@ukm.edu.my)

\*Correspondence

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article history:

Received 24 September 2021

Revised 30 October 2021

Accepted 25 November 2021

Available online 29 December 2021

#### Keywords: [ Key word heading]

Determinant factors

TV Audience

Choosing TV Channels

Disruptive Era

### ABSTRACT

This qualitative research article aims to explain the determinant factors that influence viewers to choose TV's channels in the disruptive era. In the period triggered by the increase of the internet and digital technology, many innovations emerged, potentially disturbing and destroying the old system. Loyalty in the broadcasting industry of the disruptive age is temporary and can change quickly. Viewers effortlessly change their TV channels according to their interests and desires. Therefore, TV managers have to pay attention to various factors on TV's audience to choose TV channels. These determinant factors occupy a prominent position among TV station managers in Indonesia and around the globe as an essential contrive to grab the attention of TV viewers. Primary data was dig using the focus group discussion (FGD) before the Covid-19 pandemic occurred. The authors conducted five FGDs involving 9-12 participants in each FGD. This research found that there are 23 determinant factors influencing audience in choosing TV channels in the disruptive era. The 23 factors are divided into four categories namely, TV program content, audience's purposes, corporate action, and community influence. The conclusion is, from four determinants factors, the range of TV content comprises the most varied category. In contrast, community influence factor occupies the last position with one variation.

### INTRODUCTION

Currently, the Indonesian television industry is increasing. Since the reform era, there have been no less than 1.232 TV broadcasting companies (Widyatama, 2018a) competing for 270.20 million potential viewers.

Inevitably, competition between TV stations is getting tougher. Moreover, at this time, digital media as a channel of choice for information and entertainment also tends to skyrocket, in line with the improvement in internet infrastructure and lower price of smart phones and



more affordable for the public (Wilding, Fray, Molitorisz, & Mckewon, 2018). The Association of Indonesian Internet Service Providers (APJII) stated that in 1998, Indonesian internet users were only around 500.000 people but increased rapidly to 171.17 million in 2018 (APJII, 2018, 2020). This number has increased by 25.53% in 2020 since the Covid-19 outbreak became a pandemic. While the Covid-19 pandemic is still happening, internet users are believed to be increasing, where work from home, online meetings and online shopping are becoming a trend (Cadogan, Kuivalainen, & Sundqvist, 2009)

Moreover, the number of social media users are also increase. In 2019, active social media users in Indonesia increased by 8.1%, of which the total social media users covered 59% of the Indonesian population, 99% of which were accessed via android (Hootsuite, 2020).

Through digital channels, viewers are easily finding alternative information and entertainment as they wish. People can also be able to easily create content, channel their thoughts, interests, and feelings to the public. The public can also take the advantage of digital media for personal gain, whether for popularity, influence, or financial gain. Through the monetization system and calculation, the public are able to earn money from various social media platforms, Facebook, Youtube, Instagram, Twitter, etc. This is in line with some researchers that have revealed that currently, many people have managed to earn up to billions of rupiah per year from social media (Lestari, Nurmantu, & Vikaliana, 2019; Roria & Sari, 2020; Wijaya & Mahatma, 2017).

The increasing number of communication media makes it easier for people to access information and entertainment. The expanding number of television stations also makes it easier for people to switch TV stations. In the disruptive era, viewers often do zapping, which is changing television channels according to their wishes (Torres, 2016). Media competition directs a new trend for media managers to adapt to the times (Khadziq, 2016), considering that there were no longer audience loyalty to TV stations.

Since audience loyalty is more about attitude than behavior. So that attitudes cannot predict behavior even though the two are very closely related (Guyer & Fabrigar, 2015). However, the theory of planned behavior by (Ajzen, 2001), intention and behavior are predicted by attitude, subjective norms and perceived behavioral control.

Attitude is someone's beliefs about specific behavior (Rehman, Bhatti, Mohamed, & Ayoup, 2019). Behavior is influenced by many factors, such as beliefs, emotions, and situational aspects (Ajzen, 2001), in addition to knowledge and experience factors (Rehman et al., 2019). Hereinafter, Oliver (1999) divides commitment into four categories: cognitive loyalty, affective commitment, conation loyalty, and action loyalty.

However, in the television broadcasting industry in a disruptive era, loyalty can change quickly. The disruptive era is an era where innovations destroy existing markets (Yu & Hang, 2010). In broadcasting, disruption is related to innovations in various media platforms due to the emergence of the internet, so these innovations affect conventional television broadcasting.



The audience's attitude might to a particular television station, but their behavior differs because they choose to watch other television channels. Viewers will easily change channels according to their interests and desires (Torres, 2016). Audiences' loyalty to TV channels is temporary and changes quickly (Bakshi, Khan, & Mishra, 2014). Watching a particular TV station does not mean committing to the television station in the long term. Television viewers are active (Katz, Blumer, & Gurevitch, 1973). The shift in attention of audience to these channels is interesting and raises a fundamental question: What factors that influence the viewers of choosing a TV channel in the disruptive era?

## METHODOLOGY

Research has been conducted before the pandemic, using a qualitative approach. The unit of research analysis is the individual. Research data collection uses FGD, which is a method widely used by researchers to uncover social issues (Nyumba, Wilson, Derrick, & Mukherjee, 2018). In this method, the authors invite several individuals to discuss specific topics to obtain information about participants' experiences, beliefs, perceptions, and attitudes (Denscombe, 2010; Hayward, Simpson, & Wood, 2004). In this case, FGD was used to explore the factors influencing viewers to choose TV channels. The FGD implementation uses the stages from Breen (2006), including an introduction from the researcher, overview of the topic, and statement of basic rules for focus groups, assurance of confidentiality, questions, and background information gathering.

FGDs were conducted in 4 districts and one municipality. Each FGD

implementation lasts 90 minutes, using a single FGD type, as an interactive discussion on a topic by participants in groups in one place (Nyumba et al., 2018). Each FGD implementation involved 9-12 participants.

The authors set 7 main criteria for FGD participants. These criteria was active viewers, men and women aged between 16-55 years, domiciled in the Special Region of Yogyakarta, have a hobby of watching TV, watch TV at least 3 hours a day, and watch TV for at least the past week, and able to express their opinions fluently.

Participants discuss topics in a semi-structured format, where questions include open-ended and closed-ended questions (Harrell & Bradley, 2009). All participants have the same opportunity to express their opinion.

Furthermore the FGDs were recorded using a video recorder. The recordings were transcribed and then processed using qualitative data processing software NVivo 12. To complete the research data, the authors also used secondary data from various relevant documents.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

### FGD Participant

This research involved 51 people who met the criteria as FGD participants. They consisted of 26 men and 25 women, aged between 17-52 years. Based on the aspect of work, the highest number of FGD participants worked as employees (21 people (41.18%), followed by 11 students (21.57%), 9 civil servants (17.65%), 6 entrepreneurs (11.76%), 2 midwives (3.92%), 1 farmer (1.96%), and 1 housewife (1.96%).

In terms of education, most of participants are 22 high school graduates



(43.14%), followed by 20 undergraduates (39.22%). While the diploma and master degree respectively amounted to 4 and 5 people. In total,

participant profiles based on residence, education and gender are written in the following table:

Table 1. FGD Participants by District, Education, and Gender

District	Gender	Level of Education			
		SHS*	Diploma	Bachelor	Master
Bantul	Male	1	2	1	1
	Female	2	0	2	0
Gunungkidul	Male	2	0	0	0
	Female	3	2	4	0
Kotamadya Yogyakarta	Male	4	0	1	1
	Female	1	0	4	1
Kulon Progo	Male	5	0	3	0
	Female	1	0	1	0
Sleman	Male	2	0	2	1
	Female	1	0	2	1
Total		22	4	20	5

\*SHS: Senior High School

Source: Author's Calculation (2019).

### FGD Implementation

The FGD implementation went smoothly and lasted for 90 minutes, following the procedure of Breen (2006). Participants have a critical attitude and thinking. The critical FGD participants are in line with Parwadi's research concluded that the people of Yogyakarta have a critical attitude towards TV viewers (Parwadi, 2005).

In general, FGD participants from higher education levels dared to express their opinions than those with lower education levels. Those with a high school education are relatively less confident in conveying their different thoughts. This situation is in line with other studies who reveal that higher education generally has more critical thinking (Fahim & Masouleh, 2012; Saarmann, Freitas, Rapps, & Riegel, 1992).

### TV Stations in Yogyakarta

In general, the private television broadcasting business in Indonesia is divided into two categories: national television broadcasting companies, and local television broadcasting companies. Generally, national television broadcasting companies have significant capital and *human* resources, better and more complete broadcast technology, and have strong broadcast networks. National television tends to dominate a giant advertising cake (Rianto & Poerwaningias, 2013).

Although the area of the Special Region of Yogyakarta is not large, 19 private television stations and one government-owned public TV station broadcast freely. They competed for 3.714.922 residents spread over four districts and one municipality (BPS Provinsi DIY, 2017). The people of Yogyakarta are able watch the broadcasts of all these broadcasting stations for free. Almost all regencies



and cities in DIY (can) are able to receive broadcasts from these various stations.

Big-cap television stations broadcasting in Yogyakarta are RCTI (Rajawali Citra Televisi Indonesia), Metro TV, TV One, Trans TV, Trans 7, Indosiar, SCTV (Surya Citra Televisi), MNCTV (Media Nusantara Citra Televisi), ANTV (Andalas Televisi), Global TV, Net TV, RTV (Rajawali Televisi), Kompas TV, and i-News (Indonesia News). Of all these television

stations, ten of them are referred to as "existing private television stations" since they were established before the 2002 Broadcasting Law was implemented (Widyatama, 2018b). They are RCTI, Metro TV, TV One, Trans TV, Trans 7, Indosiar, SCTV, MNCTV, AN TV, and Global TV. These television stations are often called "Jakarta TV stations" and are all commercial television stations. All TV stations' lists in Yogyakarta presented in the table 2.

Table 2. TV Station Broadcasting Free to Air in the Yogyakarta Region

No	TV Station	Name of Company	License Status	Company Status	Subsidiary/ Principal	Company Office
1	TVRI**	Televisi Republik Indonesia	Existing public	Local	Subsidiary	Yogyakarta
2	RCTI**	RCTI Dua	Existing private	National	Subsidiary	Yogyakarta
3	Metro TV**	Media TV Yogyakarta	Existing private	National	Subsidiary	Yogyakarta
4	TV One**	Lativi Mediakarya Yogyakarta & Lampung	Existing private	National	Subsidiary	Yogyakarta
5	Trans TV**	Trans TV Yogyakarta & Bandung	Existing private	National	Subsidiary	Yogyakarta
6	Trans 7**	TRANS 7 Yogyakarta Bandung	Existing private	National	Subsidiary	Yogyakarta
7	Indosiar**	Indosiar Lintas Yogya TV	Existing private	National	Subsidiary	Yogyakarta
8	SCTV**	Surya Citra Nugraha	Existing private	National	Subsidiary	Yogyakarta
9	MNC TV**	TPI Dua	Existing private	National	Subsidiary	Yogyakarta
10	AN TV**	Cakrawala Andalas TV Yogyakarta & Ambon	Existing private	National	Subsidiary	Yogyakarta
11	Global TV**	GTV Dua	Existing private	National	Subsidiary	Yogyakarta
12	Net TV**	Mitra TV Yogyakarta	Local TV	National	Subsidiary	Yogyakarta
13	R TV/Nusa TV**	Jogja Citra Nuansa Nusantara TV	Local TV	National	Subsidiary	Yogyakarta
14	I News **	MNC TV Network	Local TV	National	Subsidiary	Yogyakarta
15	Kompas TV**	Cipta Megaswara TV	Local TV	National	Principal	Jakarta
16	Jogja TV**	Yogyakarta TV	Local TV	Local	Principal	Yogyakarta
17	Adi TV*	Arah Dunia TV	Local TV	Local	Principal	Yogyakarta
18	RB TV**	Reksa Birama TV	Local TV	Local	Principal	Yogyakarta
19	Kresna TV*	Mega Adi Citra Yogyakarta	Local TV	Local	Principal	Yogyakarta



No	TV Station	Name of Company	License Status	Company Status	Subsidiary/ Principal	Company Office
20	Bali TV**	Bali Radhana TV	Local TV	Local	Principal	Bali

Note: \*\* Member of network TV channel \*Independent TV station  
 Source: KPID DIY (2018)

Hereinafter the majority of TV stations in DIY are affiliated with TV stations from Jakarta. Officially, the television broadcasting company is a local broadcasting company, but most of its broadcasts are relayed from the central station in Jakarta. Such broadcasting practices tend to be a ploy to comply with the Broadcasting Act. Based on the broadcasting regulation stipulated that broadcasting companies might not broadcast national wide unless they network with local TV stations.

Generally, the big TV stations from Jakarta create a local broadcasting company with a name similar to the parent company in Jakarta to continue broadcasting from Jakarta. For example, PT Rajawali Citra Televisi Indonesia in Jakarta, operating RCTI, established a local broadcasting company in Yogyakarta called RCTI Dua.

Evidently, from all of the 14 broadcasting stations from Jakarta, only Kompas TV has collaborated with another local station, namely RB TV (Reksa Birama Televisi). Another television station that is networked with

local television stations in Yogyakarta is Bali TV. However, the network broadcasts of these two television stations are limited to news broadcasts. This Bali-based broadcasting station cooperates with Jogja TV. The only television stations in Yogyakarta that do not have networked broadcasts are Adi TV and Kresna TV. These two television stations are independent as local television stations.

In addition, to private television stations, the people of Yogyakarta can also catch public TV broadcasts, namely TVRI. The government is the principal owner of this television station, which is part of the national public television station network TVRI Jakarta. The Indonesian government has 29 public TV stations spread across the regions and one central public TV station.

In Yogyakarta, there are also community television broadcasting stations, namely MMTV TV, Suka TV, and Akindo TV. They broadcast in a limited area. In summary, the different profiles of national private TV, local private TV, public TV, and community TV presented in the following table.

Table 3. Profile of National Private TV, Local Private TV, Local Public TV, and Community TV in the Yogyakarta Region

No	Aspects	National Private TV	Local Private TV	Local Public TV	Community TV
1	Orientations	Commercial	Commercial	Social	Social
2	Networking	All have national networking	Some have national networking	All have national affiliation	No networking



No	Aspects	National Private TV	Local Private TV	Local Public TV	Community TV
3	Variety of content	Variety	Less variety	Less variety	Limited variety
4	Source of funding	TV Ads	TV Ads	State	Community Funding
5	TV revenue	Much	Less	-	-
6	Financial capability	Strong	Mostly weak	Moderate	Poor
7	Number of labours	Much	Less	Much	Tiny
8	Broadcasting coverage	National	Mostly local	Local	Limited
9	Transmitting power	High	Mostly medium	Medium	Limited
10	TV Share	Medium to high	Low to medium	Low to medium	Limited

Source: Author's Calculation (2019)

### Determinant Factors

FGD data analysis shows that many determinant factors influence viewers in choosing TV channels in the disruptive era. They will select TV channels that satisfy them and switch to other TV that do not attract attention and do not satisfy them. This fact shows that the audience is active as the uses and gratification theory of Katz, Blumler and Gurevitch that the audience will use the media to fulfil their needs (Katz, Blumler, & Gurevitch, 1973). If a television show does not meet the audience's needs, the audience will move their television channel to another channel that better meets their needs.

Based on data analysis, researchers found 23 determinant factors that influence viewers in choosing television channels in the disruptive era. These determinant factors are pretty varied, but FGD participants place each aspect differently in the weight of influence.

Specifically, from the research data analysis, the 23 determining factors are formed into four categories: related to the content, audience's purposes,

corporate actions, and the influence of friends. The content factor includes everything that is strongly related to the content of television broadcasts. This aspect consists of 13 things (Table 4) and the most numerous factors compared to other categories.

In the second category, the audience's purposes include everything related to the activities and needs of the audience themselves, both the requirements for themselves and the conditions related to their existence in their social environment. In this study, aspects related to the audience's purposes consist of 6 factors (Table 4).

Meanwhile, the corporate action factor is all things related to company activities (Venkatesan & N, 2018). This factor only covers three aspects. (Table 4).

Apart from the three factors above, there are factors of influence from other people. This factor is the least in number because it only covers one aspect: the influence of friends. All these influencing factors are seen in table 4.



Evidently, broadcast content is the most varied of four aspects of the determinants that affect the audience in choosing television channels. This fact proves that broadcast content has more influence on the audience's decision to select television channels.

*Factor of TV content*

In the broadcast content category, the entertainment factor was the first factor mentioned by FGD participants as a determinant in choosing television channels. In selecting a television channel, the audience considers whether or not there is an entertainment program in the television station that can provide a feeling of comfort to the audience.

Many researchers have revealed that entertainment is one of the first aspects for people to choose television channels. This can be seen in Triwardani (2011), Abdullah & Puspitasari (2018), Zahara & Irwansyah (2020). The findings are also support by Landabidea Urresti &

Loos (2015), Cha (2016), Flayelle, Maurage, & Billieux (2017), Havrylets, Rizun, Khylyko, & Tukaiev, (2018), Boursier et al., (2021).

According to FGD participants, entertaining programs have a broad meaning. Entertainment does not have to be humorous programs and music, but all programs that arouse pleasure and give psychological satisfaction to the audience. Variety programs that entertain, for instance, unique news and information, culinary, tourist and traveling places, sports information, and so forth. This broad definition of entertainment is in line with McKee et al. (2014), who stated that the scope of entertainment would depend on who defines it. In essence, entertainment is defined as something enjoyable or pleasurable that holds their attention for the time the entertaining object or occasion is perceived (Stebbins, 2007; Vorderer, 2001).

Table 4. Determinant Factors on TV Audience in the Disruptive Era

No	Categories	Aspects	File	Reference
1	TV Content	1. TV stations have entertainment programs	51	56
		2. TV stations broadcast news & information programs	30	33
		3. TV stations have interesting programs	21	26
		4. TV stations have educational contents	20	22
		5. The stations have many cultural programs	13	16
		6. The news content is neutral	12	14
		7. TV stations broadcast religious programs	8	10
		8. This TV station has a particular program	8	9
		9. The presenter is interesting	7	8
		10. TV stations have extensive news coverage	6	6
		11. The program was satisfying	6	6
		12. The station broadcasts regional news	6	7
		13. The program is similar to other TV stations	4	4
2	Audience's Purposes	1. To fill the times	24	26
		2. So as not to miss information	22	25
		3. To get materials that are useful for communicating with the community	15	15
		4. The program schedule matches my schedule	13	13
		5. To releases the stress	12	13
		6. To overcome the problem, I faced	12	12





3	Corporate's Action	4. The program was promoted on TV	10	11
		5. TV stations have clear/clear signals	8	9
		6. The station often holds events off-air	6	6
4	Community Influence	2. Watch because of friends	6	7

Source: Author's Calculation (2019)

After the entertainment aspect, in the category of broadcast content, the following determinant factors influencing viewers to choose television channels in the disruptive era are news and information aspects. FGD participants interpret news and information broadly. The scope of the report can be in various fields and information, as something that concerns everyday life. They interpret information as something that gives new knowledge to the audience.

In communication science, entertainment and information factors are an essential function of television media and education (Blumler & Nossiter, 1991; Holtz-Bacha & Norris, 2001; Maulana & Fatmawati, 2018). But interestingly, the FGD participants in this study placed the educational aspect in fourth place, even though they often discussed the need for television stations to have educational value in their television programs.

The next factor after news and entertainment is the aspect of interesting television programs. The FGD participants gave an understanding that such an interesting program was measured from a public perspective. Interesting television programs make viewers willing to choose the channel to watch.

Viewers also place cultural programs as programs that arouse interest in watching. Based on data analysis, FGD participants described cultural programs

as television shows about various cultural-related matters, such as traditional arts, community customs and habits, traditional music, and the like. For viewers, television broadcasts about these matters are one aspect that can attract interest in watching. This finding is in line with the results of other studies, which state that audiences will significantly pay attention to local culture and information (Pagani, Goldsmith, & Perracchio, 2015). The involvement of local culture in TV broadcasts also has a positive relationship with audience preferences (Cohen, 2002; Kharroub & Weaver, 2019) and increases audience loyalty (Chang, 2015; Huang, 2009).

In news neutrality, it is also an important factor used by viewers to choose television channels. Based on research data, FGD participants love impartial news. In the disruptive era, the audience has independence in their attitude and opinion. In this era, people want honesty, transparency, and the authenticity of the information in addition to the increasing desire for personalization (Singh & Thirumoorthi, 2019). The existence of cynicism towards certain TV stations as the government's mouthpiece while other TV stations as opposition channels confirm this finding. Viewers prefer neutral TV stations in reporting so that viewers will choose them as television stations worth watching. News neutrality will increase viewers' trust in TV stations (Watanabe, 2017).



The next influential factor among viewers in choosing a TV station is religion. The FGD participants placed this factor in 7th place out of 13 other significant aspects in the broadcast content category. In this study, FGD participants interpreted religious programs as television programs that broadcast religious lectures, compared to television programs coloured excessively by specific spiritual values.

Religious broadcast programs on television tend to be dynamic. The audience for spiritual events in Ramadan has increased relatively, but in other months, the rating for religious programs has decreased (Madhav, 2011). Religious program ratings never beat soap operas (Adam, 2018). In Pakistan, which has intense religiosity, TV viewers occasionally watch religious TV (Biberman, Gul, & Ocakli, 2016). Even in Iran, religious programs on TV do not satisfy the audience (Yeganeh & Azizi, 2008).

The particular program is the factor that determines the audience to choose the next television broadcast in the eighth order. The FGD participants described the specific program as a special report that raised a current viral theme in the community.

The following important factor that influences the audience to choose television channels in the category of television broadcast content is the appearance of presenters, actors, actresses who appear on the small screen. FGD participants put this aspect as one of the factors that determine whether they watch television or not. Research in India states that the presenter is one factor that influences a person's preference for choosing a TV station (Malik, 2016). Similar conclusions also occurred in

research in Nairobi (Kirigo, 2010; Munyoki & Kirigo, 2011).

The next influential aspect for viewers to choose television channels is the coverage of television broadcast news. Research findings, show that this factor ranks tenth in the category of television broadcast content. FGD participants described news coverage as the breadth of the news topic and the breadth of the area of news sources. The more news topics make the audience more interested in watching. In addition, the more comprehensive the coverage of news in TV shows, the more attractive the audience is. This phenomenon is in line with research in Ghana that viewers prefer to choose television stations that broadcast a lot of information from many regions (Alhassan & Kwakwa, 2013).

The next factor is audience satisfaction with television programs. Viewers who are satisfied with television programs will encourage them to choose television stations. Research findings show that this factor is ranked 11th. Regarding audience satisfaction, several studies state that satisfaction with TV stations will significantly increase the number of viewers (Choi & Bum, 2019; Natalia & Handrimurtjahjo, 2016).

Regional news broadcasting from the region where the audience comes from is the next important factor in choosing television stations. The audience's attitude towards this factor aligns with research from others that local news influences the desire to watch television (Pagani et al., 2015; Rubin, Perse, & Powell, 1985).

The last aspect of the factor that influences the audience to choose a television station is imitating broadcast programs from other television stations. The FGD participants said that this aspect involved the audience in choosing a



television station. Other studies suggest that imitation can influence the audience's selection of television broadcasts (Hong & Chang, 2019).

#### *Factor of Audience's Purposes*

This factor focuses on meeting the interests of the audience. The determinant factor in the category of goals owned by the audience includes six aspects, far less than the content factor of television broadcasts. The six aspects are; 1. They were filling spare time, 2. So as not to miss information, 3. They were obtaining materials that can be used in discussions with the broader community. 4. Television shows according to the audience's schedule of activities, 5. They were releasing stress, and 6. They were overcoming problems faced by the audience.

Analysis of the first determinant factor ranks first in the category of audience's purposes. FGD participants said that generally, they would fill it by watching TV when they have free time. This fact is in line with the researchers's findings who state that watching television is used to fill the spare time or pass the time when the audience does not have any activities (Castro, Rigby, Cabral, & Nisi, 2021; Ort, Wirz, & Fahr, 2021; Starosta, Izydorczyk, & Dobrowolska, 2020).

The second determinant factor in the audience's purposes is related to the motivation to watch to not miss the information. FGD participants said that missing information cause unease and disconnected feeling from the environment (Cha, 2016). Even though the internet has made it easier for people to find information, viewers still place television as one of the media sources of information (Shaikh, 2017).

The motivation to watch television to not miss the information mentioned is often related to the audience's presence as social beings. The audience wants to be accepted by society and able to communicate freely. One of them is having a variety of topics to start conversation. This aspect is one of the factors that influence the audience to choose television shows.

The suitability of the audience's schedule of activities and television programs is also an essential factor influencing watching television. The FGD participants stated that the audience had certain routine activities every day. On the other hand, television stations also have programmed schedules. Schedule compatibility between viewers and television stations is an essential factor for viewers in influencing the selection of TV stations. This conclusion is in line with other studies, for example, from Cohen (2002), Havens (2007) dan Bulck, Tambuyzer, & Simons (2014).

The next determinant factor that influences viewers of choosing television channels is the motive for releasing stress. This motive is in line with several studies such as Gurlen & Sukhmani (2011), Havrylets et al., (2018), dan Starosta et al. (2020). All researchers said that the motive for releasing stress was closely related to choosing television channels.

The sixth aspect of the audience's purpose is the audience's desire to overcome through watching television. The FGD participants said that the desire to overcome problems influenced the choosing television stations. They use information taken from television shows to solve the issues that they face. They do zap or channel-surf (switching television channels) using their remote control, according to their experience. Viewers



will positively respond when they find television channels that broadcast helpful information for themselves (Dachyar & Banjarnahor, 2017).

#### *Factor of Corporate's Action*

The third category related to the influencing factors of the audience in choosing a television station is corporate action. The FGD participants defined corporate action as the actions of television broadcasting companies to improve the company's image through various promotional and marketing actions. In this study, aspects of corporate action include promoting broadcast programs, maintaining television signals and organizing off-air activities. Promotion significantly affects preferences (Daniel, 2020) and behavior in choosing products/services (Mughal, Mehmood, & Ahmad, 2014).

Television signal as the primary delivery medium transmits the contents of television broadcasts. Broadcasts are clearly seen on TV's audience sets if the TV signal is in good quality. Digital television signals are brighter than analogue TV signals so that digital television has better picture and clearer sound. The clarity of the image and sound can influence the audience from choosing television channels.

The third determinant factor in the corporate action category is the off-air activities of television broadcasting companies. Off-air activities are activities of television broadcasting companies outside the building. Off-air is one of the marketing activities to improve its brand image in the community. Some companies combine this activity with public relations activities and as part of Company Social Responsibility (CSR) activities, although some others are under marketing activities. The form of this

activity is comprehensive, depending on the creativity and needs of the company. Examples of off-air activities include health service activities, sports activities, and so on.

According to FGD participants, off-air activities can influence viewers in choosing television channels. The impression of a good image resulting from the action of off-air activities will give a positive impression to the audience. It has an impact on the selection of the television station as the channel chosen by the audience. Like this, consumer behaviour follows the findings of researchers where a brand image has a significant impact on brand purchase (Raza, Frooghi, Rani, & Qureshi, 2018; Sallam, 2016; Zhang, 2015).

#### *Factor of Community Influence*

In this study, the influence of friends in choosing television channels only includes one aspect, namely the impact of friends. The FGD participants said that humans are social creatures. They are influenced by and influencing the environment and also the people around them. Generally, the audience behaves according to the environment as they want to stay connected and become part of their community. Researchers say that the influence of the surrounding community is very significant on a person's attitudes and behaviour (Loureiro, Costa, & Panchapakesan, 2017). Another study states that society influences 24.34% of a person's decision in purchasing behaviour (Sahelices-Pinto, Lanero-Carrizo, & Vázquez-Burguete, 2020).

The magnitude of the influence of friends on television viewers to watch specific television channels can be through words of mouth (WOM). Many



researchers conclude that WOM significantly affects attitudes and behaviour (East, Hammond, & Wright, 2007; Martensen & Mouritsen, 2016; Naz, 2014). In particular, WOM negatively affects people's behaviour not to choose specific products (East, Romaniuk, Chawdhary, & Uncles, 2017).

## CONCLUSION

In the disruptive era, the determinant factors that influence the audience in choosing television broadcasts cover extensive aspects. According to the data analysis of this research, the determinant factors comprised of 23 elements and grouped into four categories. The four categories are television content, audience's purposes, company's action, and community influence. The factor of television content is the most varied among the four categories, followed by the audience's goals, company's activity, and the influence of friends. In the category of television content, there are 13 sub-factors that influence audience in choosing television broadcasts. The factor of audience's purpose includes six aspects, factor of company's action consists of 3 aspects and the factor of community influence consist only has one aspect.

From these variations of influencing factors, the researcher concludes that viewers pay more attention on television content in the television broadcasting industry, more than factors related to the audience's own needs. Therefore, the element of television content needs most significant attention from television stations. However, other aspects must still receive attention because other factors have the same impact, influencing the audience in choosing television broadcasts.

In the era of disruption, the results of this study could help TV managers win the competition to grab the attention of TV's audiences. The category of TV content, which occupies the first position as an influential aspect, shows that this category has more variety of reasons for viewers to choose TV channels. Therefore, TV managers should pay more attention to broadcast content. However, the highest amount of variation in an influence category is not significantly more important than the one with the slightest variation. All determinant categories of influence have equal positions. TV managers have to improve all aspects that influence TV audiences in choosing TV channels because they are all essential.

## Credit authorship contribution statement

Rendra Widyatama: Writing-Conceptual Draft, Methodology, Data curation, Suranto Awb: Writing, Data curation, Draft Compilation, Investigation, Methodology, Maizatul Haizan Mahbobc: Data curation, Supervision, Reviewing and Editing.

## Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare that they have no financial interests or personal relationships that could affect the quality of this study

## Acknowledgements

The authors would like thanks to: all FGD participants who involved in the research. Many thank you also addressed to the reviewers and editor of the Profetik Jurnal Komunikasi.



## REFERENCES

14.060364

- Abdullah, A., & Puspitasari, L. (2018). Media Televisi Di Era Internet. *ProTVF*, 2(1), 101. <https://doi.org/10.24198/ptvf.v2i1.19880>
- Adam, A. (2018). Wajah Acara TV: Ramai-Ramai Menayangkan Konten Dakwah Islami. *Tirto*, p. 6. Retrieved from <https://tirto.id/wajah-acara-tv-ramai-ramai-menayangkan-konten-dakwah-islami-cLKs>
- Ajzen, I. (2001). Nature and operation of attitudes. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52(February 2001), 27–58. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psy.ch.52.1.27>
- Alhassan, H., & Kwakwa, P. A. (2013). Preference for television stations among inhabitants of Akropong Akuapem, Ghana. *Online Journal of Communication and Media Technologies*, 3(1), 195–204.
- APJII. (2018). *Buletin APJII*. Jakarta: Asosiasi Penyelenggara Jasa Internet Indonesia.
- APJII. (2020). *Laporan survei internet APJII 2019 – 2020 (Q2)* (Vol. 2020). Jakarta.
- Bakshi, M., Khan, B. M., & Mishra, P. (2014). The effect of content credibility on consumer-based brand equity: The case of Indian television channels. *International Journal Indian Culture and Business Management*, 8(3), 329–344. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJICBM.20>
- Biberman, Y., Gul, S., & Ocakli, F. (2016). Channeling Islam: Religious Narratives on Pakistani Television and Their Influence on Pakistani Youth. *Asian Affairs: An American Review*, 43(3), 78–97. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00927678.2016.1202712>
- Blumler, J. G., & Nossiter, T. J. (1991). *Broadcasting Finance in Transition: A Comparative Handbook* (1st ed.). London: Oxford University Press.
- Boursier, V., Musetti, A., Gioia, F., Flayelle, M., Billieux, J., & Schimmenti, A. (2021). Is Watching TV Series an Adaptive Coping Strategy During the COVID-19 Pandemic? Insights From an Italian Community Sample. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 12(April), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsy.2021.599859>
- BPS Provinsi DIY. (2017). *Provinsi Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta Dalam Angka*. Yogyakarta.
- Bulck, H. Van den, Tambuyzer, S., & Simons, N. (2014). Scheduling and continuity techniques in a changing television landscape: A case study in Flanders. *International Journal of Digital Television*, 5(1), 39–60. [https://doi.org/10.1386/jdtv.5.1.39\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1386/jdtv.5.1.39_1)
- Cadogan, J. W., Kuivalainen, O., & Sundqvist, S. (2009). Moderating Effects Under Differing Internationalization. *Journal of International Marketing*, 17(4), 71–



- 89.
- Castro, D., Rigby, J. M., Cabral, D., & Nisi, V. (2021). The binge-watcher's journey: Investigating motivations, contexts, and affective states surrounding Netflix viewing. *Convergence: The International Journal of Research into New Media Technologies*, 27(1), 3–20. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354856519890856>
- Cha, J. (2016). Television use in the 21st century: An exploration of television and social television use in a multiplatform environment. *First Monday*, 21(2), 1–25.
- Chang, D. Y. (2015). A Study of TV Drama Series, Cultural Proximity and Travel Motivation: Moderation Effect of Enduring Involvement. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 18(399–408). <https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr>
- Choi, C., & Bum, C. (2019). How Do You Watch Sports? Differences on Credibility, Viewing Satisfaction, Flow, and Re-viewing Intention between Public TV Stations and One - person Media via SNS. *Sport Mont*, 17, 61–67. <https://doi.org/10.26773/smj.190211>
- Cohen, J. (2002). Television viewing preferences: Programs, schedules, and the structure of viewing choices made by Israeli adults. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 46(2), 204–221. <https://doi.org/10.1207/s15506878jobem4602>
- Dachyar, M., & Banjarnahor, L. (2017). Factors influencing purchase intention towards consumer-to-consumer e-commerce. *Intangible Capital*, 13(5), 946–966. <https://doi.org/10.3926/ic.1119>
- Daniel, C. O. (2020). Effect of Advertisement on Consumer Brand Preference Effect of Advertisement on Consumer Brand Preference. *International Journal of Business Marketing and Management*, 4(3), 26–31.
- East, R., Hammond, K., & Wright, M. (2007). The relative incidence of positive and negative word of mouth : A multi-category study. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 24, 175–184. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijresmar.2006.12.004>
- East, R., Romaniuk, J., Chawdhary, R., & Uncles, M. (2017). The impact of word of mouth on intention to purchase currently used and other brands. *International Journal of Market Research*, 59(3), 321–334. <https://doi.org/10.2501/IJMR-2017-026>
- Fahim, M., & Masouleh, N. S. (2012). Critical Thinking in Higher Education: A Pedagogical Look. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2(7), 1370–1375. <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.2.7.1370-1375>
- Flayelle, M., Maurage, P., & Billieux, J. (2017). Toward a qualitative understanding of binge-watching behaviors: A focus group approach. *Journal of Behavioral Addictions*, 6(4), 457–471.



- <https://doi.org/10.1556/2006.6.2017.060>
- Gurlen, E. K., & Sukhmani. (2011). Studi of TV viewership patterns among youngsters in Southern India. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 1(5), 141–160.
- Guyer, J. J., & Fabrigar, L. R. (2015). The attitude-behavior link: A review of the history Attitudes and Behavior. *International Encyclopedia of Social & Behavioral Sciences*, 2(2), 183–189. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.24007-5>
- Havens, T. (2007). The hybrid grid: Globalization , cultural power and Hungarian television schedules. *Media, Culture & Society*, 29(2), 219–239. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0163443707074254>
- Havrylets, Y., Rizun, V., Khylo, M., & Tukaiev, S. (2018). Escape and Entertainment as Key Motives for Viewing TV News in the Light of Ritualistic Use of Television. *Current Issues of Mass Communication*, 23(23), 23–34. <https://doi.org/10.17721/2312-5160.2018.23.23-34>
- Holtz-Bacha, C., & Norris, P. (2001). “To entertain, inform, and educate”: Still the role of public television. *Political Communication*, 18(2), 123–140. <https://doi.org/10.1080/105846001750322943>
- Hong, A. Y., & Chang, R. (2019). The Use Motivation of Political Satire
- Show and the Impacts of Viewing Frequency on Voters’ Political Efficacy and Political Cynicism. *Advances in Journalism and Communication*, 7, 74–93. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ajc.2019.73005>
- Hootsuite. (2020). *Digital 2020 Indonesia*.
- Huang, X. (2009). ‘ Korean Wave ’ — The Popular Culture , Comes as Both Cultural and Economic Imperialism in the East Asia. *Asian Social Science*, 5(8), 123–130.
- Katz, E., Blumer, J. G., & Gurevitch, M. (1973). Uses and gratifications research. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 37(4), 509–523.
- Katz, E., Blumler, J. G., & Gurevitch, M. (1973). Uses and gratifications research. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 37(4), 509–523.
- Khadziq, K. (2016). Media Convergence of Local Newspapers: Descriptive Study of Internet Utilization in Jogja Tribune Newspapers in Building Local Print Media Industry. (Konvergensi Media Surat Kabar Lokal: Studi Deskriptif Pemanfaatan Internet Pada Koran Tribun Jogja Dalam . *Profetik: Jurnal Komunikasi*, 9(1), 5–20.
- Kharroub, T., & Weaver, A. J. (2019). Selective Exposure and Perceived Identification With Characters in Transnational Arabic Television Independent Researcher. *International Journal of Communication*, 13, 653–673.
- Kirigo, W. R. (2010). *Factors that*





- Influence Consumer Preference of Television Stations by Public Primary School Teachers in Langata Division, Nairobi.* University of Nairobi.
- Landabidea Urresti, X., & Loos, E. (2015). Contemporary meanings and experiences of television in the digital age. *International Journal of Digital Television*, 6(1), 43–60. [https://doi.org/10.1386/jdtv.6.1.43\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1386/jdtv.6.1.43_1)
- Lestari, A. D., Nurmantu, S., & Vikaliana, R. (2019). Analisis Pelaksanaan Pengawasan Pengenaan Pajak Penghasilan Atas Penghasilan Youtubers Pada Direktorat Jenderal Pajak Tahun 2018. *Jurnal Reformasi Administrasi*, 6(2), 144–162.
- Loureiro, S. M. C., Costa, I., & Panchapakesan, P. (2017). A passion for fashion: the impact of social influence, vanity and exhibitionism on consumer behaviour. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 45(5), 468–484. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijrdm-11-2016-0202>
- Madhav, V. (2011). Indonesians Spend More on Food and Watch More TV during Ramadan. Retrieved March 9, 2018, from Nielsen Newswire website: <http://www.nielsen.com/us/en/insights/news/2011/indonesians-spend-more-on-food-and-watch-more-tv-during-ramadan.html>
- Malik, R. (2016). Factors affecting preference for television news channels among school teachers with special reference to District Sirsa, Haryana. *Imperial Journal of Interdisciplinary Research*, 2(6), 2454–1362.
- Martensen, A., & Mouritsen, J. (2016). Total Quality Management & Business Excellence Using the power of Word-Of-Mouth to leverage the effect of marketing activities on consumer responses. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, (June), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14783363.2016.1187996>
- Maulana, A., & Fatmawati, F. (2018). Analisis Produksi Program Berita Indonesia Morning Show di News and Entertainment Television. *Profetik Jurnal Komunikasi*, 11(2), 58–73.
- McKee, A., Collis, C., Nitins, T., Ryan, M., Harrington, S., Duncan, B., ... Backstrom, M. (2014). Defining entertainment: an approach. *Creative Industries Journal*, 7(2), 108–120. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17510694.2014.962932>
- Mughal, A., Mehmood, A., & Ahmad, B. (2014). The Impact of Promotional Tools on Consumer Buying Behavior : A Study from Pakistan. *Journal of Public Administration and Governance*, 4(3), 402–414.
- Munyoki, J. M., & Kirigo, W. R. (2011). Factors that influence consumer preference of TV stations by public primary school teachers in Langata Division, Nairobi. *The 7th ORSEA*



- Conference, 1–20.
- Natalia, S. V., & Handrimurtjahjo, A. D. (2016). Factors Influencing Behavioral Intentions of Television Homeshopping With Moderating Effect of Consumer Satisfaction. *International Journal of Economics and Management*, 10(S1), 65–79.
- Naz, F. (2014). Word of Mouth and Its Impact on Marketing. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 4(1), 1–4.
- Oliver, R. L. (1999). Whence consumer loyalty? *Journal of Marketing*, 63, 33–44.
- Ort, A., Wirz, D. S., & Fahr, A. (2021). Is binge-watching addictive? Effects of motives for TV series use on the relationship between excessive media consumption and problematic viewing habits. *Addictive Behaviors Reports*, 13, 100325.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.abrep.2020.100325>
- Pagani, M., Goldsmith, R., & Perracchio, A. (2015). Standardization vs. Adaptation: Consumer reaction to TV ads containing subtitled or English dubbed ads. *International Journal of Advertising*, 34(4), 702–714.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02650487.2015.1009349>
- Parwadi, R. (2005). Potret penggunaan media TV pada kalangan remaja menuju dewasa awal di Yogyakarta. *Mediator Journal*, 6(1), 83–94.
- Raza, M., Frooghi, R., Rani, D. S. H. binti, & Qureshi, M. A. (2018). Impact of Brand Equity Drivers on Purchase Intention: A Moderating Effect of Entrepreneurial Marketing. *South Asian Journal of Management Sciences*, 12(1), 69–92.  
<https://doi.org/10.21621/sajms.2018121.04>
- Rehman, S. U., Bhatti, A., Mohamed, R., & Ayoup, H. (2019). The moderating role of trust and commitment between consumer purchase intention and online shopping behavior in the context of Pakistan. *Rehman et Al. Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research*, 9(43), 1–25.
- Rianto, P., & Poerwaningtias, I. (2013). TV publik dan lokalitas budaya: Urgensinya di tengah dominasi TV swasta Jakarta. *Jurnal Komunikasi*, 7(2), 163–176.
- Roria, S., & Sari, W. K. (2020). Tax Review of Endorsement Activity By Selebgram in Indonesia. *Jurnal SIKAP*, 5(1), 122–136.
- Rubin, A. M., Perse, E. M., & Powell, R. A. (1985). Loneliness, parasocial interaction, and local television news viewing. *Human Communication Research*, 12(2), 155–180.
- Saarmann, L., Freitas, L., Rapps, J., & Riegel, B. (1992). The relationship of education to critical thinking ability and values among nurses: Socialization into professional nursing. *Journal of Professional Nursing*, 8(1), 26–34.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/8755->



- 7223(92)90114-E
- Sahelices-Pinto, C., Lanero-Carrizo, A., & Vázquez-Burguete, J. L. (2020). Self-determination, clean conscience, or social pressure? Underlying motivations for organic food consumption among young millennials. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 20(2), 449–459. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cb.1875>
- Sallam, M. A. (2016). The Impact of Brand Image and Corporate Branding on Consumer's Choice: The Role of Brand Equity. *International Journal of Marketing Studies*, 8(1), 98. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijms.v8n1p98>
- Shaikh, S. J. (2017). Television versus the internet for information seeking: Lessons from global survey research. *International Journal of Communication*, 11, 4744–4756.
- Singh, A. K., & Thirumoorthi. (2019). The impact of digital disruption technologies on customer preferences: The case of retail commerce. *International Journal of Recent Technology and Engineering*, 8(3), 1255–1261. <https://doi.org/10.35940/ijrte.C4404.098319>
- Starosta, J., Izydorczyk, B., & Dobrowolska, M. (2020). Personality traits and motivation as factors associated with symptoms of problematic binge-watching. *Sustainability*, 12(14), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12145810>
- Stebbins, R. (2007). *The Sociology of Entertainment* (2nd ed.; C. D. Bryant & D. L. Peck, Eds.). Retrieved from [https://www.google.co.id/books/edition/21st\\_Century\\_Sociology\\_A\\_Reference\\_Handb/C6g5DQAAQBAJ?hl=id&gbpv=1&dq=the+sociology+of+entertainment,+Clifton+D.+Bryant+and+Dennis+L.+Peck&pg=RA1-PA179&printsec=frontcover](https://www.google.co.id/books/edition/21st_Century_Sociology_A_Reference_Handb/C6g5DQAAQBAJ?hl=id&gbpv=1&dq=the+sociology+of+entertainment,+Clifton+D.+Bryant+and+Dennis+L.+Peck&pg=RA1-PA179&printsec=frontcover)
- Torres, E. C. (2016). Broadcast television flow scheduling and the viewers' zapping: Conflicting practices. *Observatorio (OBS\*) Journal*, 10(04), 97–115.
- Triwardani, R. (2011). Televisi dalam Ruang Keluarga: Menyoal Menonton Televisi sebagai Praktik Konsumsi dalam Konfigurasi Ruang Domestik. *Jurnal ILMU KOMUNIKASI*, 8(2). <https://doi.org/10.24002/jik.v8i2.177>
- Venkatesan, T., & N, R. (2018). Analysis of Corporate Actions and Market Efficiency in India. *SJCC Management Research Review*, 8(1), 75–89. Retrieved from <http://sjccmrr.res.in/index.php/sjcc/article/view/131455>
- Vorderer, P. (2001). It's all entertainment - Sure. but what exactly is entertainment? Communication research, media psychology, and the explanation of entertainment experiences. *Poetics*, 29(4–5), 247–261. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-422X\(01\)00037-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-422X(01)00037-7)



- Watanabe, K. (2017). Measuring news bias: Russia's official news agency ITAR- TASS ' coverage of the Ukraine crisis. *European Journal of Communication*, 32(2), 224–241. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0267323117695735>
- Widyatama, R. (2018a). The Impact of Ambiguity Regulation in Indonesia's Television Industry. *Actual Problems Of Economics*, 1(199), 28–38.
- Widyatama, R. (2018b). Who Owns the Broadcasting Television Network Business in Indonesia? *Network Intelligence Studies*, VI(11), 7–16.
- Wijaya, S., & Mahatma, E. A. (2017). Analisa Upaya Peningkatan Penerimaan Perpajakan Dari Penggalan Potensi Pajak Atas Penghasilan Youtuber. *Jurnal Manajemen Keuangan Publik*, 1(2), 125–130. <https://doi.org/10.31092/jmkp.v1i2.145>
- Wilding, D., Fray, P., Molitorisz, S., & Mckewon, E. (2018). The Impact of Digital Platforms on News and Journalistic Content. In *Centre for Media Transition*. Retrieved from [https://www.accc.gov.au/system/files/ACCC commissioned report - The impact of digital platforms on news and journalistic content%20Centre for Media Transition %28%29.pdf](https://www.accc.gov.au/system/files/ACCC%20commissioned%20report%20-%20The%20impact%20of%20digital%20platforms%20on%20news%20and%20journalistic%20content%20-%20Centre%20for%20Media%20Transition%20-%202018.pdf)
- Yeganeh, M. R. J., & Azizi, J. (2008). A Survey Study of Audience Satisfaction with the Religious Programs of Radio-Television in Tehran. *Journal of Media and Religion*, 7, 70–83. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15348420701838418>
- Yu, D., & Hang, C. C. (2010). A Reflective Review of Disruptive Innovation Theory. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 12(4), 435–452. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2009.00272.x>
- Zahara, E. N., & Irwansyah, I. (2020). Binge watching: cara baru menonton televisi sebagai dampak konvergensi media. *Jurnal Sositologi*, 19(2), 237–248. <https://doi.org/10.5614/sostek.itbj.2020.19.2.8>
- Zhang, Y. (2015). The Impact of Brand Image on Consumer Behavior: A Literature Review. *Open Journal of Business and Management*, 03(01), 58–62. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ojbm.2015.31006>

