

# NYIMAK

## Journal of Communication

Nyimak: Journal of Communication | Vol. 7 | No. 2 | Pages 131 - 320 | September 2023 | ISSN 2580-3808



Published By:  
Department of Communication Science  
Faculty of Social and Political Science  
Universitas Muhammadiyah Tangerang

**Journal Address**

Program Studi Ilmu Komunikasi Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik

UNIVERSITAS MUHAMMADIYAH TANGERANG

Jl. Perintis Kemerdekaan I No. 33 Kota Tangerang, Banten 15118

Website : <http://jurnal.umt.ac.id/index.php/nyimak>

Email : [journalnyimak@fisipumt.ac.id](mailto:journalnyimak@fisipumt.ac.id)

# NYIMAK

## Journal of Communication

### DAFTAR ISI (TABLE OF CONTENT)

The Government Communication Strategy through Social Media to Increase Public Awareness — <b>Jamalullail, Fidan Safira, Hamdi</b> —	131 – 146
Interpreting Meaning in Social Criticism through Murals in Indonesia — <b>Rizaldi Parani, Samuel Aditya Darmawan, Herman Purba</b> —	147 – 165
Public Controversy in Viewing Covid-19 Information on Instagram — <b>Oktaviana Purnamasari, Puri Kusuma Dwi Putri, Riza Darmaputra, Norhayati Rafida Abdul Rahim</b> —	167 – 187
Constructing Engagement Method of Attracting Viewers' Attention to Digital Advertisement — <b>Agung Budi Kurniawan, Sri Wulandari</b> —	189 – 220
Communication Strategy Through Traditional and Weaving Villages to Increase Cultural Promotion in East Sumba — <b>Laely Indah Lestari, Evi Novianti, Yustikasari</b> —	221 – 237
Social Media Instagram as a Tool to Build a Reputation for Disaster Care (Study on The PT Pertamina Disaster Management CSR Program) — <b>Riski Apriliani, Adhianty Nurjanah</b> —	239 – 256
Determinant Factors on Audience to Watch TV Station in Indonesia — <b>Rendra Widyatama, Habil Polereczki Zsolt</b> —	257 – 273

Semiotic Analysis of the Commodification of Islamic Teachings in  
Sharia Bank Advertisements in Indonesia 275 – 296  
—**Lazuardi El Ghiffary, Gusti Oka Widana**—

Are Audience Preferences for Electronic Cinema Affected by  
Preferences in Indonesian Movie Choices? 297 – 320  
—**Endik Hidayat, Daniel Susilo, Mujiono**—

## Determinant Factors on Audience to Watch TV Station in Indonesia

Rendra Widyatama<sup>1</sup>, Habil Polereczki Zsolt<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup> Debrecen University, Debrecen, Hungary

Email: <sup>1</sup>rendrawidyatama@fsbk.uad.ac.id, <sup>2</sup>polereczki.zsolt@econ.unideb.hu

### ABSTRACT

*The competition in the Indonesian TV broadcasting industry is very intense. To win the race, they must capture the audience's attention. Unfortunately, not all TV stations can gather information about this due to a lack of human and financial resources. References related to this topic are also scarce. This article examines the factors influencing viewers' choices of TV stations through a mixed-method approach. In qualitative research through Focus Group Discussions, the researchers concluded that there are 23 factors affecting viewers in choosing TV stations. The findings from the quantitative study were tested through a questionnaire instrument involving 1,102 respondents. Based on statistical tests using regression analysis, the researchers obtained an R Square (R<sup>2</sup>) value of 0.644, which is statistically significant. Partially, through ANOVA testing, the researchers found that 12 independent variables had t-values greater than the t-table value (1.960) with a significance level of <0.05. These 12 variables, from the most significant to the least significant, are X13, X5, X4, X7, X17, X9, X3, X10, X2, X1, X6, and X19. However, when considering the effective contribution percentage, this study produces a different ranking, leading to different recommendations. Therefore, the use of research findings requires careful analysis. Meanwhile, in the same ANOVA test, the researchers concluded that the other 11 variables, namely X8, X11, X12, X14, X15, X16, X18, X20, X21, X22, and X23, had t-values above 0.05, meaning they are not significant. This research significantly contributes to TV station managers in formulating strategies to attract as many viewers as possible.*

**Keywords:** *Television broadcast, competition, confirmatory factors analyses, television organising, television engagement*

### ABSTRAK

Persaingan siaran TV di Indonesia sangat ketat. Untuk memenangkan perlombaan, mereka harus mampu menarik perhatian penonton. Sayangnya, tidak semua stasiun TV dapat mengumpulkan informasi mengenai hal ini karena kurangnya sumber daya manusia dan keuangan. Referensi terkait topik ini juga jarang. Artikel ini mengkaji faktor yang mempengaruhi pemirsa memilih stasiun TV melalui metode campuran. Pada penelitian kualitatif melalui kelompok diskusi terarah peneliti menyimpulkan terdapat 23 faktor yang mempengaruhi pemirsa dalam memilih stasiun TV. Temuan dalam studi kuantitatif, tersebut diuji dalam penelitian kuantitatif melalui instrumen angket, melibatkan 1.102 responden. Berdasar uji statistik melalui analisis regresi, peneliti mendapatkan nilai R Square (R<sup>2</sup>) sebesar 0,644 secara signifikan. Secara parsial melalui uji ANOVA, peneliti memperoleh hasil bahwa ada 12 variabel independen yang memiliki nilai t lebih besar dari t tabel (1,960) dengan nilai signifikansi < 0,05. Secara berurutan, 12 variabel tersebut yang memiliki nilai signifikansi besar sampai nilai signifikansi kecil yaitu variabel X13, X5, X4, X7, X17, X9, X3, X10, X2, X1, X6, and X19. Namun bila menggunakan besarnya prosentase kontribusi efektif, penelitian ini menghasilkan urutan yang berbeda sehingga menghasilkan rekomendasi yang berbeda pula. Oleh karena itu, penggunaan hasil penelitian memerlukan analisis yang hati-hati. Sementara itu, dalam uji Anova yang sama, peneliti menyimpulkan bahwa 11 variabel lainnya yaitu X8, X11, X12, X14, X15, X16, X18, X20, X21, X22, and X23 memiliki nilai t di atas 0.05, yang berarti tidak signifikan. Penelitian ini memberi

---

Citation : Widyatama, R., & Zsolt, H. P. (2023). Determinant Factors on Audience to Watch TV Station in Indonesia. *Nyimak Journal of Communication*, 7(2), 257–273.



kontribusi signifikan bagi para pengelola stasiun TV dalam menyusun strategi mendapatkan penonton sebanyak-banyaknya.

**Kata Kunci:** Siaran televisi, persaingan, konfirmatori faktor analisis, pengorganisasian televisi, keterlibatan televisi

## INTRODUCTION

TV audience occupies an essential position for TV stations around the world. Many viewers will influence the chance of the TV station to get an ad. The TV ad is a crucial aspect of the survival of a TV broadcast company: the more advertisements, the more company revenue. Hence, a TV company with many advertising revenues will have profitable broadcasting. TV stations can get more promotions if they have more viewers. In the fierce competition, it is difficult for TV broadcast stations to get viewers. In accordance with the uses and gratification theory, the audience is active (Katz, Blumer, & Gurevitch, 1973). The audience is motivated to satisfy their desires and seek fulfillment (Egede & Chuks-Nwosu, 2013). Individuals utilizing the same program may have varying requirements (Kuyucu, 2015). They will do zapping using the TV remote to pursue their desire and satisfaction. Zapping is a TV audience habit of switching channels from one to another to avoid TV commercials or programs that don't appeal to the audience (Torres, 2016).

To receive the audience's attention, TV stations should know what the audience wants. Big TV stations collect information on their audience through the research and development division. Some TV stations assign a documentation division to find data on audience desires. However, many small TV stations need more human and financial resources to establish R & D divisions.

Various factors dynamically influence a TV audience; hence, viewers often change. Researchers began considering TV audience research when Katz, Blumer, & Gurevitch (1973) formulated the uses and gratification theory. People could find some international publications related to the uses and gratification theory, i.e. Alhassan & Kwakwa (2013), Balci & Ayhan (2015), Kim & Viswanathan (2015), Shade, Kornfield, & Oliver (2015), R. Malik (2016), Rui & Stefanone (2016), Bhatt & Singh (2017), etc.

Uses and gratification research is related to the cultural context. For example, Papacharissi & Mendelson's study (2007) reveals that American viewers select TV channels for genuine entertainment, relaxation, social interaction, companionship, passing time, and voyeuristic experiences. However, the same research in Ghana shows that the audience is influenced by clear reception, station heritage, news coverage, kind of program, and friends/colleague influence (Alhassan & Kwakwa, 2013).

Concerning the description above, this article reveals influencing factors on audiences choosing TV stations in Indonesia. This study provides valuable information for TV stations in Indonesia and TV broadcast companies targeting Asian spectators that are relatively similar to Indonesian cultures. This topic is becoming increasingly important because Indonesian TV broadcasting companies are fierce. In this country, there are many TV stations. In 2016, according to the Ministry of Communication and Information data, there were 1,251 TV stations, 24 public TV (all state-owned), 763 private TV, 437 cable TV, and 27 community TV. Those TV stations are spread all over Indonesia.

Television broadcasting operates as a two-sided market (Chakrabarti & Chakrabarty, 2013; Evans, Schmalensee, Noel, Chang, & Garcia-Swartz, 2011). TV channels fulfill a dual role by catering to consumers through the provision of entertainment and information while simultaneously serving advertisers, whose contributions generate revenue for the company. The acquisition of substantial revenue can enhance the company's operational efficiency. Consequently, TV channels consistently endeavor to secure a maximum number of advertisements, striving to present captivating TV programs that yield high ratings. Therefore, advertisers love to choose high-rating TV programs because the TV ad would be watching a broad audience.

Television audiences typically exhibit a preference for engaging and captivating programs, while concurrently displaying aversion towards commercial advertisements. According to viewers, advertisements interfere with the enjoyment of watching TV (Lal & Vats, 2016). Furthermore, viewers express a preference for minimizing their exposure to advertisements that are displayed frequently and repetitively (Wilbur, 2016). Danaher (1995) found that ratings tend to fall during commercial breaks.

TV stations need to create exciting and quality programs to get many viewers. TV quality is "people just seem to know it when they see it." TV quality has multi-level complexity and is subjective (Schlütz, 2016); people have their measurement. However, there has yet to be a clear consensus on the nature of TV quality (Manero, Uceda, & Serrano, 2013). In general, the quality assessment of TV quality from three perspectives: the perspective of consumers, product creators, and media managers. Each perspective has a different definition of quality.

In addition to program quality, television program scheduling assumes a fundamental role for broadcasters. Effective scheduling and continuity strategies serve as pivotal instruments for crafting and upholding channel identities, as well as fostering viewer loyalty (Bulck, Tambuyzer, & Simons, 2014). Unconventional scheduling practices can deter the audience from channel surfing, which refers to the act of switching channels when the

program lacks appeal or interest (Torres, 2016). TV stations structure their television program schedules employing various techniques, which encompass strategies like “lead-in programming” (positioning a popular program early during prime time), “hammocking” (placing a program of limited appeal between two popular programs), and “counter-programming” (offering distinct programming compared to competitors to attract audiences from diverse demographics) (Ihlebaek, Syvertsen, & Ytreberg, 2014).

According to Katz, Blumler, and Gurevitch (1973) in the uses and gratification theory, it is posited that the audience assumes an active role. The researchers found two motivations in the audience choosing the media, fulfilling the desire and satisfaction (Blumler, 1979; Brown, Lauricella, Douai, & Zaidi, 2012; Egede & Chuks-Nwosu, 2013). Individuals utilizing the same program may exhibit varying needs (Kuyucu, 2015).

While the uses and gratification theory enjoys widespread support, it also elicits pointed criticisms from other researchers. According to McQuail (2010), the uses and gratification theory encounters challenges in predicting media selection and utilization due to difficulties in measuring motivation. McQuail outlines public motivations for using media, such as seeking escape from daily routines, forming social connections, reinforcing personal values, and aiding in personal achievement. McQuail’s critique of this theory underscores the subjective nature of audience motivation in their selection of TV channels. Additionally, viewers opt for TV channels guided by hedonistic motivations (Reinecke, 2017). In pursuit of this hedonistic objective, individuals often engage in environmental adjustments to optimize their mood, seeking to maximize the media’s positive impact while minimizing any adverse sentiments associated with it. Within the framework of mood management theory, it is observed that audience members may not always consciously recognize their motivations when selecting a TV station (Bryant, Roskos-Ewoldsen, & Cantor, 2003).

Some researchers have revealed factors that influence audiences using TV media. They reveal that TV audiences have the same motives, but many researchers have different conclusions. Those researches show us that there are many motivations to watch TV. According to the researchers, two approaches influence viewers to choose TV channels, namely individual and structural (Kim & Viswanathan, 2015). The determination of individual choices encompasses various personal characteristics, such as gender, age, audience requirements, preferences, and gratifications. The structural aspect to consider the audience’s capacity to access media, programming tactics, and the viewing context. Each community may exhibit distinct motivations for selecting TV media. Researchers found several research publications on the factors influencing consumers’ choice of TV, as shown in the Table 1.



**Table 1. Research Publications on Factors Affecting Consumer's TV Choices**

Researchers/ Scholars	Research site	Research Object	Typology of Uses and Gratification
Alhassan & Kwakwa (2013).	Ghana	General public	Clear reception, station heritage, news coverage, kind of program, colleague influence
Shade, Kornfield, & Oliver (2015)	USA	Students	Need for enjoyment, entertainment, escape, enlightenment
Kim & Viswanathan (2015)	Korea	General public	Learning, social interaction, relaxation, self-driven
Balci & Ayhan (2015)	Kyrgyzstan	General public	Entertainment-relaxation, escape from social interaction, companionship, information seeking, and pastime.
Rui & Stefanone (2016)	USA	Students	Cultivates desire for fame among the viewers
R. Malik (2016)	India	Teachers	Coverage news; information obtained; accuracy; confidence news presenter; types of news covered; viewers role in society; clear reception; need for entertainment; social influence; the history of brand name; and no of ads
Bhatt & Singh (2017).	India	Women	Information, education, entertainment, and knowledge

**Source: Author's Editing (2019)**

## RESEARCH METHOD

The authors employ a mixed-method approach, which integrates qualitative and quantitative primary data collection techniques. The integration of these two approaches yields a comprehensive analysis that has the potential for broader generalizability, particularly suited for addressing the intricacies of complex analyses (Parylo, 2012). Mixed-method strategies are well-established within the domain of audience research in television studies and have been recognized for their capacity to foster a more expansive, robust, and in-depth comprehension of the responses under investigation (Heiselberg, 2018). It is worth noting that mixed-method research approaches, as suggested by Cameron and Molina-Azorin (2011), can yield superior results compared to research conducted through a single-method approach.

The authors employed a qualitative methodology to investigate the factors that influence the audience's selection of TV channels. Data were gathered through the utilization of Focus Group Discussions (FGD), and the collected data were subsequently analyzed utilizing NVivo 12 software. FGD represents a versatile qualitative research technique designed to gain insight into various social issues (Nyumba, Wilson, Derrick, & Mukherjee, 2018).

In this methodology, the authors assemble a group of individuals with the purpose of engaging in discussions on specific topics, aiming to extract information regarding participants' experiences, beliefs, perceptions, and attitudes (Denscombe, 2010; Hayward, Simpson, & Wood, 2004). Researchers incorporated the findings from qualitative research into a questionnaire for use in quantitative research. A total of 1,200 paper-based questionnaires were dispatched to respondents. Among these, 1,102 respondents completed the questionnaires in their entirety, while the remaining respondents did not fulfill or complete the survey. The determination of the sample size was guided by the application of the Taro Yamane formula. To assess the impact of factors influencing consumer choices of TV stations, regression and ANOVA tests were conducted with the aid of SPSS software. The presentation of research outcomes was facilitated through the inclusion of tables and visual representations.

## **DISCUSSION**

In the qualitative study, the authors employed a singular type of FGD, characterized by an interactive group discussion conducted by participants in a common location (Nyumba et al., 2018). These discussions revolved around specific subjects and followed a semi-structured format that encompassed both open-ended and closed-ended questions (Harrell & Bradley, 2009). In this format, all participants were afforded equal opportunities to articulate their viewpoints.

The authors adhered to the FGD implementation stages outlined by Breen (2006). The eligibility criteria for FGD participants included a minimum age of 15 years, an active interest in television viewing as a hobby, a minimum of 3 hours of daily television consumption, recent television viewing within the past week, and the ability to effectively articulate opinions within a group setting. In this research, each FGD convened 9-12 participants. It is noteworthy that, according to experts, the ideal number of FGD participants may vary and typically ranges from 8 to 12 individuals (Omar, 2018).

According to Dilshad and Latif (2013), the optimal number of FGD participants falls within the range of 6-12 individuals. This range is considered ideal because having fewer than 6 participants may result in insufficient information generation, while exceeding 12 participants often presents challenges in FGD management (Dilshad & Latif, 2013; Nyumba et al., 2018). The authors conducted the five times of FGDs, and each has 1.5 hours in a different schedule and place. The authors compiled the discussion transcripts in the DGD and conducted an analysis using the NVIVO 12 software.

The research study engaged a total of 51 participants in FGDs, comprising 26 men and 25 women. The age range of these participants spanned from 17 to 52 years. Regarding educational qualifications, the majority held high school degrees (22 participants), followed by bachelor's degrees (20 participants), master's degrees (5 participants), and diplomas (4 participants). The participants who did partake in the FGDs represented a diverse educational spectrum, including senior high school students, diploma students, bachelor students, and master's students.

The analysis of FGDs revealed that participants cited numerous motivations for their TV channel selections, often seeking channels that cater to their satisfaction and promptly switching to other programs if a particular one fails to meet their preferences. This observation underscores the active role played by the audience in making these choices.

Drawing from the analysis of FGDs, the authors identified 23 influential factors guiding FGD participants in their selection of TV channels. Notably, the most influential factor is the presence of entertainment programs offered by TV stations. The second most influential factor is the availability of informative programs. In the realm of communication studies, entertainment and information facets stand out as pivotal functions of TV media, alongside its educational role (Holtz-Bacha & Norris, 2001). The authors present 23 factors influencing FGD participants to choose TV channels in Table 2.

**Table 2. Influencing Factors on Consumers to Choose TV Stations**

No	Influential factor	File	Reference
1.	TV stations offer entertainment programs (X1).	51	56
2.	TV stations provide news and information programs (X2).	30	33
3.	To fill the times (X3)	24	26
4.	To stay informed (X4)	22	25
5.	TV stations feature engaging programs (X5)	21	26
6.	TV stations offer educational content (X6)	20	22
7.	For community communication resources (X7)	15	15
8.	Many cultural programs (X8)	13	16
9.	The program schedule matches my schedule (X9)	13	13
10.	To releases the stress (X10)	12	13
11.	The news is neutral (X11)	12	14
12.	To address personal challenges (X12)	12	12
13.	Promotion of programs on TV (X13)	10	11
14.	TV stations have clear signals (X14)	8	9
15.	This TV station has a particular program (X15)	8	9
16.	TV stations broadcast religious programs (X16)	8	10
17.	The presenter is interesting (X17)	7	8
18.	TV stations have extensive news coverage (X18)	6	6
19.	Satisfying program experiences (X19)	6	6
20.	Many broadcasts my regional news (X20)	6	7
21.	Frequent offline events (X21)	6	6
22.	Watch because of friends (X22)	6	7
23.	The program is similar to other TV stations (X23)	4	4

**Source: Author's Calculation (2019)**

In the quantitative study, the researcher compiled a questionnaire based on the results of the FGDs, which concluded that 23 factors influence the audience's choice of TV broadcasts. The authors examined 23 factors influencing viewers in choosing a TV station in the quantitative research. The sample was 2,102 respondents, more women than men. The authors displays the profiles of research respondents in Table 3 below:

**Table 3. Profile of Respondents**

	Male		Female	
	Freq	%	Freq	%
Respondents	910	43.30%	1.192	56.70%
<b>Ages</b>				
16-25	485	23.1%	661	31.4%
26-35	204	9.7%	281	13.4%
36-45	148	7.0%	172	8.2%
46-55	58	2.8%	61	2.9%
>56	15	0.7%	17	0.8%
<b>Profession</b>				
State employee	47	2.2%	54	2.6%
Soldier / police	17	0.8%	13	0.6%
Farmer	51	2.4%	54	2.6%
Labour	257	12.2%	333	15.8%
Student	455	21.6%	621	29.5%
Entrepreneur	66	3.1%	69	3.3%
Other	17	0.8%	48	2.3%
<b>Religions</b>				
Islam	664	31.6%	910	43.3%
Catholic	131	6.2%	164	7.8%
Cristian	88	4.2%	103	4.9%
Hindus	18	0.9%	6	0.3%
Buddhist	7	0.3%	7	0.3%
<b>Marriage Status</b>				
Marriage	432	20.6%	337	16%
Not Marriage	557	26.5%	744	35.4%
Widow	2	0.1%	16	0.8%
Widower	14	0.7%	0	0
<b>Education</b>				
Primary school	4	0.2%	3	0.1%
Junior High School	13	0.6%	4	0.2%
Senior High School	568	27%	692	32.9%
Diploma	134	6.4%	234	11.1%
Bachelor	159	7.6%	217	10.3%
Master / PhD	32	1.5%	42	2%

Source: Author's Calculation (2019)

Based on the regression analysis, the researcher obtained a result that the R-Square for all independent variables influencing TV program viewership choice is 0.644. This figure signifies that 64.4% of the influence is attributed to the 23 variables from the qualitative

research findings, while the remaining 35.6% of the influence comes from other variables. Nevertheless, out of the 64.4% effective contribution, only 50.46% is significant, while the remaining 13.94% is not significant.

As for the calculation results, the F-value in the Anova test indicates a significance value of 0.000, which is less than 0.05. These results indicate that collectively, the 23 independent variables have an influence on TV program selection. Meanwhile, the partial tests for each variable x against y yielded interesting results. According to the statistical tests, the researcher found that not all X variables have t-values less than 0.05. The complete results of the Anova statistical test are presented in Table 4 below.

**Table 4. The t-values, ANOVA Test Significance, and Effective Contribution of All Variables**

No	Variables	t-Value	Sig.	Effective Contribution
1	TV stations offer entertainment programs (X1).	2.424	.016	13.46%
2	TV stations provide news and information programs (X2).	2.453	.014	8.07%
3	To fill the times (X3)	2.491	.013	4.30%
4	To stay informed (X4)	3.385	.001	4.13%
5	TV stations feature engaging programs (X5)	7.659	.000	3.95%
6	TV stations offer educational content (X6)	2.134	.033	3.69%
7	For community communication resources (X7)	2.688	.007	3.64%
8	Many cultural programs (X8)	-.036	.971	3.50%
9	The program schedule matches my schedule (X9)	2.531	.012	3.27%
10	To releases the stress (X10)	2.449	.014	2.78%
11	The news is neutral (X11)	.256	.798	2.62%
12	To address personal challenges (X12)	-1.645	.100	2.40%
13	Promotion of programs on TV (X13)	5.253	.000	1.82%
14	TV stations have clear signals (X14)	.488	.626	1.51%
15	This TV station has a particular program (X15)	1.384	.167	1.27%
16	TV stations broadcast religious programs (X16)	.491	.624	1.02%
17	The presenter is interesting (X17)	2.689	.007	0.74%
18	TV stations have extensive news coverage (X18)	-191.573	.116	0.68%
19	Satisfying program experiences (X19)	2.100	.036	0.61%
20	Many broadcasts my regional news (X20)	.021	.983	0.59%
21	Frequent offline events (X21)	-.491	.623	0.26%
22	Watch because of friends (X22)	-1.436	.151	0.04%
23	The program is similar to other TV stations (X23)	.526	.599	0.02%
Sum				<b>64.36%</b>

**Source: Author's Calculation (2019)**

The above Table 4 shows that there are 12 variables with t-values less than 0.05, namely variables X1, X2, X3, X4, X5, X6, X7, X9, X10, X13, X17, and X19. This means that these 12 variables have been proven to influence viewers in selecting TV programs, while the other 11 variables do not have significant influence, as their t-values are greater than 0.05. The 11 variables that do not have significant impact are X8, X11, X12, X14, X15, X16, X18, X20, X21, X22, and X23.

Further examination of the significance values influencing TV station selection reveals interesting data. Out of the 12 independent variables, the researchers found that the most significant to the least significant variables are X13, X5, X4, X7, X17, X9, X3, X10, X2, X1, X6, and X19. When the effective contributions of all these variables are summed, it results in an effective contribution of 50.46%. The total effective contribution of 50.46%, signifies that the significant variables influencing viewers in choosing TV stations come from the 12 variables. However, it is worth noting that the remaining 11 variables also significantly influence viewers in choosing TV stations. These eleven variables have an effective contribution of 13.94%, which is insignificant. The eleven variables are X8, X11, X12, X14, X15, X16, X18, X20, X21, X22, and X23., as presented in Table 5 below.

**Table 5. Insignificant Variables for Viewer TV Station Selection**

No	Variables	t-Value	Sig.	Effective Contribution
1	Many broadcasts my regional news (X20)	.021	.983	0.59%
2	Many cultural programs (X8)	-.036	.971	3.50%
3	The news is neutral (X11)	.256	.798	2.62%
4	TV stations have clear signals (X14)	.488	.626	1.51%
5	TV stations broadcast religious programs (X16)	.491	.624	1.02%
6	Frequent offline events (X21)	-.491	.623	0.26%
7	The program is similar to other TV stations (X23)	.526	.599	0.02%
8	This TV station has a particular program (X15)	1.384	.167	1.27%
9	Watch because of friends (X22)	-1.436	.151	0.04%
10	TV stations have extensive news coverage (X18)	-191.573	.116	0.68%
11	To address personal challenges (X12)	-1.645	.100	2.40%
Sum				<b>13.94%</b>

**Source: Author's Calculation (2019)**

The SPSS data analysis shows that the variables listed in Table 5 are not significantly influential in affecting viewers' choices of TV stations. The data in Table 5 is quite concerning because these variables are important and are often discussed among television observers in Indonesia. The broadcasting system, which requires networking to promote diversity of content and ownership, does not seem to impact the choices of TV stations. Variables such as X20 and X8, which are relevant to government policies aimed at fostering diversity of content and ownership, are not significant factors in influencing viewers' choices of TV stations. The variety of programs on many TV stations does not influence viewers' selection. Furthermore, neutrality does not significantly affect viewers' choosing a TV program. Whether a TV station is neutral or not does not influence viewers to choose or reject the station. Similarly, variables like religiosity, similarity to other TV stations, extent of coverage, and the presence of off-air activities all do not significantly influence viewers' choices of TV stations.

Based on statistical tests, the researcher found that the variable with the most significant impact on viewers in choosing a TV station does not necessarily have the most effective contribution. The relationship between the significance value and the magnitude of effective contribution does not always align. For example, in the case of variable X13, which is the most significant variable influencing viewers in choosing TV stations, it only has an effective contribution of 1.82%. The variable with the most significant effective contribution is variable X1, with a figure of 13.46%. Other variables have smaller influential contribution contributions. In this study, the variable with the most negligible effective contribution is variable X19 (The program was satisfying), with a figure of 0.61%.

Analyzing variables influencing viewers in choosing TV stations requires careful consideration. The choice of analytical perspective can lead to different analytical consequences. If the perspective is based on the significance value, then the order of variables, from most significantly influential to least, is as follows: X13, X5, X4, X7, X17, X9, X3, X10, X2, X1, X6, and X19. However, the analysis is based on effective contribution. In that case, the order of variables contributing most significantly to least in influencing viewers' choices of TV stations are variables X1, X2, X3, X4, X5, X6, X7, X9, X10, X13, X17, and X19.

The variable that exerts the most significant and practical influence on viewers when selecting a TV station is variable X1, with an effective contribution value of 13.46%. This data demonstrates that the primary reason viewers choose a TV station is because the station provides entertainment to the viewers. The results of this study align with various research studies worldwide that mention entertainment as the most common motivation for TV viewers (Balcý & Ayhan, 2015; Bhatt & Singh, 2017; Malik, 2016; Shade et al., 2015).



However, statistical tests also show that this variable ranks third in significance value, with a significance value of only 0.16 and a t-value of 2.424.

Based on the above description, the researcher has found exciting data regarding the analysis from different perspectives. Variable X19 consistently ranks bottom in both perspectives. It means that variable X19 has the most minor influence regarding significance value and practical contribution. Variable X19 has a significance value of 0.036 and a practical contribution value of 0.61%. The t-value for this variable is 2.100.

## **CONCLUSION**

Viewers actively engage in the process of selecting TV stations, driven by subjective considerations aimed at fulfilling their desires and achieving satisfaction. Qualitative investigations have elucidated a total of 23 factors that exert influence over viewers' choices of TV programs. In the realm of quantitative research, regression analysis has unveiled that these identified factors collectively account for a significant proportion of 64.4% in explaining the variance, leaving 35.6% unaccounted for, implying the existence of additional contributing variables. The substantial figure of 35.6% underscores the need for further exploration to discern the potential factors that may be responsible for this unexplained variation.

A more detailed analysis indicates that out of the 64.4% effective contribution obtained, not all have significant effects. From the quantitative research, 11 variables do not significantly influence viewers' choice of TV stations. These 11 variables have a practical contribution value of 13.94%.

In the Anova test, the F-value for all variables surpasses the critical F-table value (1.539) with a significance level of 0.000, less than 0.05. Therefore, collectively, the variables (factors influencing viewers' TV program choices) impact the viewers' choice of TV stations. However, in the t-test, conducted partially in quantitative research, it is revealed that each variable has different t-values, indicating varying degrees of influence. Twelve variables have an influence, while the rest do not.

This research holds significant importance in television broadcasting, specifically in providing insights into the factors influencing viewers' choices of TV stations, a topic that has yet to be explored. When publications on factors influencing viewers' TV station choices are available, they often take a partial approach.

As revealed in this research, the twelve variables influencing viewers' choices of TV stations are crucial for the attention of TV station managers to attract viewers. Interestingly, out of the 12 influential variables, news and information, entertainment, and education remain significant influencing variables. It aligns with media experts who emphasize the functions of entertaining, conveying information, and educating viewers. Therefore, TV station managers must continue focusing on these three fundamental aspects of their programming content. They should always select updated news and information for their broadcasts, considering that viewers choose TV stations based on the desire to get all the information vital to them. The aspect of aligning with the audience's daily routines is essential for TV station managers. Broadcasts that align with viewers' routines will garner more attention, especially since viewers choose TV stations to fill their leisure time, including relieving stress.

Statistical tests conducted in quantitative research further indicate that viewer satisfaction plays a pivotal role in the selection of TV programs. The findings of this study carry substantial implications for TV station managers, emphasizing the importance of producing top-tier TV content. By consistently delivering high-quality broadcasts, TV stations enhance the likelihood of viewer satisfaction, thereby fostering a continued preference for the station. Over time, this pattern can lead to the development of a loyal viewer base.

Another important conclusion from this research is that analyzing factors influencing viewers in choosing TV stations requires careful consideration. Analysis based on significance values does not always align with analysis based on the extent of effective contribution to the variables under study. These two perspectives can yield different results, which can impact recommendations. Therefore, TV station managers must be diligent in interpreting research results to avoid making mistakes in formulating policies to attract the public to watch their television broadcasts.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

The authors express their gratitude to the participants of the FGDs and the respondents who willingly contributed to this research. Additionally, our sincere appreciation goes to the esteemed reviewers whose meticulous feedback and constructive suggestions have significantly strengthened the clarity and robustness of this article.

## REFERENCES

- 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.
- Balcý, P., & Ayhan, B. (2015). Patterns of television viewing behavior in Kyrgyzstan: A Perspective of uses and gratifications. *Journal of Social Sciences of the Turkish World*, 75, 275–312.
- Bhatt, A., & Singh, G. (2017). A study of television viewing habits among rural women of Tehri Garhwal District. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 22(7), 44–56. <https://doi.org/10.9790/0837-2207024456>
- Blumler, J. G. (1979). *Communication Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/009365027900600102>
- Breen, R. L. (2006). A practical guide to focus-group research. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 30(3), 463–475. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03098260600927575>
- Brown, D., Lauricella, S., Douai, A., & Zaidi, A. (2012). Consuming television crime drama: A uses and gratifications approach. *American Communication Journal*, 14(1), 47–60.
- Bryant, J., Roskos-Ewoldsen, D., & Cantor, J. (2003). *Communication and Emotion: Essay in Honor of Dolf Zillman*. New York: Routledge.
- 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)
- Cameron, R., & Molina-azorin, J. F. (2011). The acceptance of mixed methods in business and management research. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 19(3), 256–271. <https://doi.org/10.1108/19348831111149204>
- Chakrabarti, M., & Chakrabarty, R. (2013). Two-Sided Market Competition in Television Industry – The Way Forward In. *The International Journal's Research Journal of Economics & Business Studies*, 2(11), 28–37.
- Danaher, P. (1995). What happens to television ratings during commercial breaks? *Journal of Advertising Research*, 35(1), 37–47.
- Denscombe, M. (2010). *The Good Research Guide* (4th.). Berkshire: Mc Graw-Hill.
- Dilshad, R. M., & Latif, M. I. (2013). Focus group interview as a qualitative research method: An analysis. *Parkitstan Journal of Social Sciences*, 33(1), 191–198.
- Egede, E. A., & Chuks-Nwosu, E. (2013). Uses and gratification theory and the optimization of the media in the privatization of state owned enterprises in Nigeria. *Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development*, 4(16), 202–213.

- Evans, D. S., Schmalensee, R., Noel, M. D., Chang, H. H., & Garcia-Swartz, D. D. (2011). Platform Economics: Essays on Multi-Sided Businesses. In D. S. Evans (Ed.), *Competition Policy International* (1st ed.). London: Competition Policy International.
- Harrell, M. C., & Bradley, M. A. (2009). Data Collection Methods Semi-Structured Interviews and Focus Groups. In *Research Methodology* (1st ed.). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fonc.2015.00228>
- Hayward, C., Simpson, L., & Wood, L. (2004). Still left out in the cold: Problematizing participatory research and development. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 44(1), 95–108. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9523.2004.00264.x>
- Heiselberg, L. (2018). Expanding the toolbox: Researching reception of TV programs with a combination of EDA measurements and self-reports in applied audience research. *Journal of Audience & Reception Studies*, 15(2), 18–36.
- 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>
- Ihlebaek, K. A., Syvertsen, T., & Ytreberg, E. (2014). Keeping them and moving them: TV scheduling in the phase of channel and platform proliferation. *Television and New Media*, 15(5), 470–486. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1527476413479676>
- Katz, E., Blumer, J. G., & Gurevitch, M. (1973). Uses and gratifications research. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 37(4), 509–523.
- Kim, S. J., & Viswanathan, V. (2015). The role of individual and structural factors in explaining television channel choice and duration. *International Journal of Communication*, 9(1), 3502–3522.
- Kuyucu, B. M. (2015). TV broadcasting in Turkey: The Turkish television audience in the frame of uses and gratification approach. *Athens Journal of Mass Media and Communications*, 1(4), 289–312.
- Lal, R., & Vats, A. (2016). Advertising effectiveness on television and attitude of youth. *Ahead International Journal of Recent Research and Review*, 1(3), 60–65.
- 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.
- Manero, C. B., Uceda, E. G., & Serrano, V. O. (2013). Understanding the consumption of television programming: Development and validation of a structural model for quality,

- satisfaction and audience behaviour. *International Journal of Marketing Studies*, 5(1), 142–156. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijms.v5n1p142>
- McQuail, D. (2010). *McQuail's Mass Communication Theory* (6th ed.). Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Nyumba, T. O., Wilson, K., Derrick, C. J., & Mukherjee, N. (2018). The use of focus group discussion methodology: Insights from two decades of application in conservation. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 9(1), 20–32. <https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.12860>
- Omar, D. (2018). Focus group discussion in built environment qualitative research practice. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, 117(1), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/117/1/012050>
- Papacharissi, Z., & Mendelson, A. L. (2007). An exploratory study of reality appeal: Uses and gratifications of reality TV shows. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 51(2), 355–370.
- Reinecke, L. (2017). *The International Encyclopedia of Media Effects* (P. Rössler, ed.). <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118783764.wbieme0085>
- Rui, J. R., & Stefanone, M. A. (2016). The desire for fame: An extension of uses and gratifications theory. *Communication Studies*, 67(4), 399–418. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10510974.2016.1156006>
- Schlütz, D. M. (2016). Contemporary quality TV: The entertainment experience of complex serial narratives. *Annals of the International Communication Association*, 40(1), 95–124. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23808985.2015.11735257>
- Shade, D. D., Kornfield, S., & Oliver, M. B. (2015). The uses and gratifications of media migration: Investigating the activities motivations, and predictors of migration behaviors originating in entertainment television. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 59(2), 318–341. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08838151.2015.1029121>
- Torres, E. C. (2016). Broadcast television flow scheduling and the viewers' zapping: Conflicting practices. *Observatorio (OBS\*) Journal*, 10(04), 97–115.
- Wilbur, K. C. (2016). Advertising content and television advertising avoidance. *Journal of Media Economics*, 29(2), 51–72. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08997764.2016.1170022>

