



OPEN ACCESS

EDITED BY

Pieter Maesele,
University of Antwerp, Belgium

REVIEWED BY

Rudi Salam Sinaga,
Universitas Medan Area, Indonesia
Moch Fakhruji,
State Islamic University Sunan Gunung Djati,
Indonesia

*CORRESPONDENCE

Justito Adiprasetyo

✉ justito.adiprasetyo@unpad.ac.id

✉ justito.adiprasetyo@auckland.ac.nz

RECEIVED 30 March 2025

ACCEPTED 29 August 2025

PUBLISHED 17 September 2025

CITATION

Adiprasetyo J (2025) Epistemic bias and the rise of qualitative dominance in post-authoritarian Indonesian communication research.
Front. Commun. 10:1602567.
doi: 10.3389/fcomm.2025.1602567

COPYRIGHT

© 2025 Adiprasetyo. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License \(CC BY\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.

Epistemic bias and the rise of qualitative dominance in post-authoritarian Indonesian communication research

Justito Adiprasetyo ^{1,2*}

¹Department of Mass Communication, Universitas Padjadjaran, Sumedang, Indonesia, ²School of Social Sciences, The University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand

The field of communication studies has long been defined by deep epistemological divisions between quantitative and qualitative traditions. These divides are not merely intellectual disagreements; rather, they are deeply entangled with the history of knowledge imperialism, the politics of knowledge production, and contemporary efforts toward knowledge decolonization. In several contexts, efforts to decolonize knowledge have produced unintended consequences, including new forms of epistemic imbalance. This tension is particularly evident in countries like Indonesia, where the legacy of Cold War geopolitics and decades of authoritarian rule continue to shape academic practices. Following the country's political transition and the liberalization of higher education, interpretive and critical paradigms began to gain ground in communication scholarship. Central to this shift were the contributions of Dedy N. Hidayat and Deddy Mulyana. Hidayat's work on the political economy of communication challenged the technocratic and instrumentalist foundations of earlier research, while Mulyana's phenomenological approach helped institutionalize interpretive methodologies, emphasizing subjectivity and lived experience. However, this qualitative turn also led to the marginalization of quantitative approaches and generated other disciplinary consequences that remain underexplored. This study explores the long-term impact of the mainstreaming of qualitative approaches on Indonesian communication scholarship by employing a multi-perspectival approach, combining intellectual history, biographical analysis, and autoethnography. This study contributes to the sociology and history of communication studies by highlighting how political transitions, academic authority, and institutional structures shape disciplinary evolution.

KEYWORDS

communication scholarship, authoritarian, qualitative dominance, intellectual history, autoethnography, epistemic bias

Introduction

The field of communication studies globally has long been marked by deep epistemological divisions between quantitative and qualitative traditions. These divides are not merely intellectual disagreements; rather, they are deeply entangled with the history of knowledge imperialism, the politics of knowledge production, and contemporary efforts toward knowledge decolonization. In its early development, particularly in the United States during the mid-twentieth century, communication research was dominated by quantitative methodologies focused on persuasion, media effects, and behavioural modelling—fields closely linked to Cold War strategic imperatives and the myth-making of communication studies as a “new emerging scientific discipline” (Gary, 1996; Glander, 1999; Pooley, 2008;

Simpson, 2003b; Wartella, 2013; Simonson et al., 2019). This continuity remains especially visible in certain subfields in global communication studies—such as political communication and public relations—where the hegemonic authority of the functionalist paradigm, positivist epistemologies, and quantitative methods continues to dominate (Jelen-Sanchez, 2017; Phelan and Maesele, 2023). In response, critical scholars from Europe, Latin America, Africa, and Asia increasingly challenged the universalizing claims of positivism, advocating for more interpretive, culturally situated, and politically aware approaches (Asante, 2014; Fajardo, 2021; Fuchs, 2017; Gallagher, 1992; Hall, 1980; Miike, 2007).

However, the project of critique and epistemic decolonization while essential, has often produced unintended consequences. In several contexts, the critique of positivism has not led to greater methodological pluralism but instead has resulted in new forms of epistemic closure, where specific paradigms become dominant to the exclusion of others. This tension is particularly evident in countries like Indonesia, where the legacy of Cold War geopolitics and decades of authoritarian rule continue to shape academic practices (Adiprasetio, 2025c, 2025b; Dhakidae, 2003; Dhakidae and Hadiz, 2006). In the aftermath of democratization, the rejection of the positivist paradigm in communication scholarship—though necessary to challenge the technocratic and depoliticized use of quantitative methods under the New Order authoritarian regime—has, over time, given rise to a different form of orthodoxy. Qualitative methodologies, especially in interpretive and constructivist paradigms, have become institutionally and intellectually privileged, often marginalizing alternative methodological traditions and limiting the development of a more balanced and dialogic epistemic landscape.

Personal trajectory: witnessing epistemic bias from within

When I began my undergraduate studies at the Faculty of Communication Sciences, Universitas Padjadjaran, Indonesia's oldest communication faculty, in 2006, I repeatedly observed how faculty members openly expressed their scepticism toward quantitative research approaches. Many openly asserted that quantitative methods, rooted in positivism, represented a flawed and incompatible paradigm for communication studies. However, these assertions rarely materialized into meaningful academic discourse or debate.

Although the curriculum formally included a course on quantitative research methods, it was neither well-structured nor rigorously implemented. Notably, the faculty members teaching this course lacked academic publications in international communication journals or books that rigorously elaborated or employed quantitative methodologies. As I progressed in my academic training, I became increasingly aware of a hostile attitude toward quantitative approaches, which was often explicitly expressed within the department.

This scepticism persisted during my master's studies in Communication and Media Studies at the Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Gadjah Mada, in 2012. Once again, despite the presence of a quantitative research methods course in the curriculum, the prevailing academic culture within the department heavily favoured qualitative research, reinforcing the marginalization of quantitative methodologies.

The epistemological bias against quantitative approaches in Indonesian communication scholarship is not limited to a single institution but rather reflects a systemic pattern across multiple universities. This trend is empirically evident in a study I conducted on publications in 28 Indonesian academic journals specializing in communication studies between 2001 and 2020. The findings indicate that over 62 percent of communication research publications relied on qualitative methodologies, while only 19 percent employed quantitative approaches (Adiprasetio, 2022b). The majority of this small percentage of quantitative studies were descriptive, relying predominantly on simple correlational analyses rather than advanced statistical modelling or experimental designs (Adiprasetio, 2022b). This is also the case for research in other fields, such as journalism studies (Adiprasetio, 2022a, 2025b). These findings suggest that quantitative methodologies in Indonesian communication studies are not only underrepresented but also underdeveloped.

This epistemological imbalance extends beyond research methodology. This sentiment is evident in the book *Matinya Ilmu Komunikasi (The Death of Communication Studies)*, which portrays deep-seated cynicism toward positivism within Indonesian communication scholarship while favouring constructivist paradigms (Narwaya, 2006). However, the fundamental problem with this kind of critique is that positivism or quantitative methodologies themselves in Indonesia have never fully developed into a productive and globally relevant research tradition. In global academic debates, positivism has been rigorously challenged in global academic discourse by critical rationalists, post-positivists, or post-structuralists for its reductionist and epistemologically limited assumptions. But in Indonesia, such critiques tend to be adopted in broad strokes, often without deep engagement with the contemporary epistemological debates or the actual contributions of quantitative methods in contemporary social research.

Unlike in other academic contexts where quantitative approaches have contributed substantially to both empirical findings and theoretical development, in Indonesia, their application remains largely superficial. Rather than evolving into a rigorous methodological tradition, quantitative research is often reduced to technical exercises, disconnected from critical reflection or innovation. This absence of academic debate has further entrenched the methodological imbalance and hindered the growth of a more pluralistic and dynamic research culture.

Such marginalization of quantitative approaches raises pressing concerns about methodological pluralism. Globally, communication studies complement qualitative and quantitative methodologies in recognition of the field's interdisciplinary nature (Benoit and Holbert, 2008; DeCoster and Lichtenstein, 2007; Jensen, 2013). Nevertheless, in Indonesia, resistance to quantitative methods has hindered methodological innovation and limited local scholars' engagement in wider international dialogues (Adiprasetio, 2025c).

The origins of this imbalance can be traced back to the sociopolitical realignments following the late 1990s collapse of the authoritarian New Order regime, which had long shaped academic and intellectual discourses (Adiprasetio, 2023). In the reconfigured landscape of post-New Order Indonesia, two influential figures emerged: Dedy N. Hidayat from Universitas Indonesia and Dedy Mulyana from Universitas Padjadjaran. Both scholars are affiliated with universities that have become canonical centers of communication scholarship in Indonesia, alongside Universitas Gadjah Mada. Through their pedagogy, publications, and leadership roles, both scholars endorsed qualitative approaches uniquely suited to uncovering the

complex realities of media, culture, and communication in Indonesia's diverse contexts. Over time, their intellectual impact, what I call the "Deddy-Dedy Effect," heavily influenced the discipline's epistemological leanings, steering many faculty and students toward qualitative work while leaving quantitative methods on the periphery.

Notably, this shift in methodological preference addressed genuine limitations of New Order era quantitative research, which had often been superficial and politically constrained. However, the pendulum has now swung so far in favour of qualitative inquiry that new issues have arisen. These include insufficient engagement with theoretical depth, neglect of macro-structural or policy questions better suited to quantitative designs, and a parochial focus that impedes broader theoretical innovation (Adiprasetio, 2025c).

Theoretical implications and global relevance

The Indonesian case underscores broader theoretical concerns about the sociology of knowledge, particularly in post-authoritarian societies and the impact of Cold War conditions. It invites reflection on how academic disciplines evolve not merely through internal scientific debates but through political ruptures and intellectual leadership (Bourdieu, 2004; Kuhn, 1962).

Moreover, it raises critical questions for the global decolonization project in media and communication studies. While the critique of Eurocentric (Glück, 2018; Miike, 2007), positivist traditions is essential, it must avoid reproducing new closures that impoverish methodological pluralism.

By analysing the Indonesian experience, this article contributes to global debates on methodological politics, offering a grounded case study of how epistemological landscapes are reconstructed in the wake of political and intellectual transformation. It argues for a renewed commitment to methodological pluralism as essential for both national scholarship development and global academic dialogue.

Methodology

This research employs an integrative design that synthesizes intellectual history, biographical analysis, and autoethnography to illuminate how Indonesian communication studies has shifted from a predominantly positivist orientation to one centered on qualitative methods. By weaving together these three methodological components, the study addresses both the formal trajectories of academic discourse and the more intangible institutional practices that collectively influence how particular paradigms take hold.

The intellectual history element reconstructs the disciplinary evolution of Indonesian communication studies (See Averbek, 2008; Löblich and Scheu, 2011), identifying how methodological norms have responded to changing political climates. This line of inquiry traces the field's transformation from the New Order regime (1966–1998), where state-backed modernization agendas favoured quantitative approaches, to the post-*reformasi* era, which saw the ascendancy of interpretive and critical paradigms (Adiprasetio, 2019, 2023). By situating these shifts against broader socio-political developments, it becomes possible to see how certain epistemic traditions were endorsed, contested, or sidelined over time

(Averbek, 2005, 2008; Löblich and Averbek, 2016; Löblich and Scheu, 2011).

To further contextualize this epistemological transition, the study conducts a biographical analysis of two influential scholars, Dedy N. Hidayat and Deddy Mulyana. Their academic trajectories, research output, and pedagogical practices played a pivotal role in reinforcing qualitative methodologies as the dominant epistemological framework in Indonesian communication studies.

Through an analysis of their scholarly contributions, institutional influence, and mentorship practices, this study examines how their intellectual perspectives shaped academic norms, faculty recruitment, and research priorities. The "Deddy-Dedy Effect" describes how their leadership and academic authority solidified the hegemony of qualitative methods, displacing quantitative approaches and reorienting academic discourse toward phenomenology, ethnography, and interpretive frameworks.

The biographical approach allows for a critical interrogation of how specific intellectual traditions gained legitimacy, while others were systematically critiqued or de-emphasized (Averbek, 2008; Löblich and Scheu, 2011). By analysing their publications, this study highlights the mechanisms through which academic authority influences methodological preferences.

In tandem with these historical and biographical perspectives, the study employs autoethnography to explore how academic sentiments regarding positivism and quantitative methods. Autoethnography uses personal experience as a gateway to broader institutional and cultural questions (Chang, 2016; Ellis and Bochner, 2006). By adopting an insider standpoint, this approach opens a space to critically examine the ways institutions regulate who is seen as an "expert," how knowledge is validated, and the ideological commitments that sustain methodological boundaries (Jones, 2007).

Recent scholarship highlights the diversity of autoethnography and its potential to challenge conventional ideas of what constitutes "valid" scientific inquiry (Wall, 2016). Scholars have argued that autoethnography might appear "unscientific" or theoretically thin (Denzin, 2013), nevertheless, proponents maintain that it can disrupt established paradigms, revealing how personal identities are interwoven with the social and cultural landscape of higher education (Chang, 2016). By looking out from the inside, as opposed to looking in from the outside, autoethnography offers a vantage point on institutional life and the methodological allegiances that shape it. This stance is neither atheoretical nor merely autobiographical; rather, it recognizes that the self cannot be disentangled from the cultural milieu in which it operates (Wall, 2016). While advocates occupy different positions on the "analytical–evocative" continuum, there is consensus that autoethnographic work holds the potential for building sociological knowledge (Wall, 2016).

Combining intellectual history, biographical analysis, and autoethnography enables a layered examination of the decline of quantitative methodologies and the rise of qualitative ones, what this study calls the "Deddy-Dedy Effect." Through this integrative design, the research uncovers the macro-level political and institutional forces that delegitimized quantitative research, as well as the micro-level enactments that have entrenched interpretive traditions. Moreover, it assesses how these shifts continue to inform current practices and debates, illuminating the broader epistemic implications for methodological pluralism in Indonesian communication scholarship.

Discussion

The trajectory of Indonesian communication studies has been shaped by deep-seated epistemological and institutional shifts over the past several decades. The discipline, initially dominated by a positivist and quantitative orientation, has undergone a substantial transformation, culminating in a widespread embrace of qualitative methodologies. While this transformation has expanded the scope of inquiry and fostered a more nuanced understanding of media and communication in Indonesia, it has also introduced new methodological biases that warrant critical examination.

The growing dominance of qualitative research in Indonesian communication studies has not emerged in isolation but rather as a response to long-standing political, ideological, and institutional constraints. For much of its early history, Indonesian communication research was tethered to modernization theory and state-driven developmentalist paradigms. This positivist orientation was reinforced by geopolitical influences, particularly during the Cold War, when American behavioural traditions and administrative research frameworks were exported to Southeast Asian social sciences, including Indonesia. The authoritarian Suharto regime further entrenched this paradigm, favouring quantitative methodologies as a means of legitimizing state policies and controlling public discourse.

The collapse of the New Order in 1998 opened the intellectual space for alternative paradigms to gain legitimacy. Scholars, frustrated with the limitations of positivist frameworks in capturing Indonesia's cultural complexity, sought new approaches that would allow for deeper engagement with lived experiences, social structures, and power relations. It was in this context that two key figures, Dedy N. Hidayat and Deddy Mulyana, played a pivotal role in reshaping the methodological landscape of Indonesian communication studies. Their intellectual contributions, which emphasized qualitative inquiry, not only transformed pedagogical and research practices but also shaped the broader discourse on the validity of different research paradigms.

Historical context: from authoritarian foundations to post-*reformasi* realignments

The development of communication studies in Indonesia has been significantly shaped by global geopolitical shifts, particularly the Cold War and the authoritarian political climate of Suharto's New Order regime (Adiprasetio, 2025c). Established formally in the early 1970s, the discipline was deeply influenced by the American tradition of mass communication research (Haryanto, 2008), which prioritized positivistic paradigms and quantitative methodologies (Narwaya, 2006). This orientation was not merely a matter of academic preference but was largely driven by political and ideological factors. The United States' strategic interests in Southeast Asia and Suharto's authoritarian developmentalism agenda together contributed to the institutionalization of a research culture that favoured modernization theories (Adiprasetio, 2023; Dhakidae and Hadiz, 2006; Fansuri, 2015), prioritizing administrative research with quantitative methods while marginalizing critical and theoretical perspectives (Adiprasetio, 2023).

The Cold War significantly influenced the formation of social sciences (Fajardo, 2021; Gil-Riaño, 2021; Solovey and Cravens, 2012; Solovey and Dayé, 2021; Wang, 2015; Wirth, 2021), including communication studies, in Indonesia (Adiprasetio, 2025c). The United States played a central role in shaping the discipline, using it as an ideological tool to counteract communist influence in Southeast Asia. After the 1965–66 anti-communist purge and the rise of Suharto's New Order (Bevins, 2020; Roosa, 2006), Indonesia aligned itself with American geopolitical interests, leading to the adoption of Western, particularly American, paradigms in the social sciences (Adhikarya, 1980, 1981; Adiprasetio, 2019; Dhakidae and Hadiz, 2006). Modernization theory became the dominant framework, positioning communication as a vehicle for social change and economic development in the service of state-led modernization (Baber, 2001; Frey, 2003; Simpson, 2003a, 2008).

During Suharto's New Order, communication research was instrumentalized to serve the state's developmentalist ideology. The Indonesian government tightly controlled academic discourse and research, ensuring that studies aligned with state narratives of economic progress and political stability (Adiprasetio, 2025b, 2025c). The dominant paradigm at that time in communication studies was that of "development communication," which framed communication and media as a mechanism and tool for disseminating government policies and fostering public compliance (See Susanto, 1977, 1982a, 1982b). This orientation also gave rise to uniquely Indonesian media concepts such as "developmental journalism," which was deeply intertwined with authoritarian governance and legitimized through the ideological framework of the *Pancasila Press* (Adiprasetio, 2025a).

Quantitative research became the preferred methodology because it provided policymakers with seemingly objective data justifications for government programs. However, the quantitative studies produced during this era were largely descriptive and lacked theoretical depth (Ikatan Sarjana Komunikasi Indonesia, 1987). Knowledge of a theory was often derived from textbook summaries or secondary sources without understanding the concepts and limitations of the theory, as well as the context in which and how these theories were formulated (Dahlan, 1987). Scholars also focused on measuring media effects, audience reception, and public opinion, often using simplistic correlations for the sake of the state's development programs that did not engage with deeper structural or sociopolitical questions. This emphasis on positivist methodologies reinforced a technocratic approach by the authoritarian regime to academia and research, where knowledge production was valued primarily for its practical utility rather than its critical insight.

By the early 1990s, a convergence of factors, growing societal dissent, exposure to anthropological, sociological, and cultural studies theories, and mounting critiques of state-led research priorities, catalysed a reappraisal of communication scholarship's positivist leanings. However, significant political change was necessary to weaken the New Order's firm grip on academic freedoms. With the regime's collapse in the late 1990s, the resulting *reformasi* era facilitated a radical intellectual realignment, making space for qualitative methodologies with interpretive and critical paradigms long sidelined by the state's developmentalist orthodoxy.

In this more open climate, Dedy N. Hidayat of Universitas Indonesia and Deddy Mulyana of Universitas Padjadjaran emerged as central figures who endorsed *qualitative inquiry*. Their combined leadership, scholarship, and pedagogical strategies advocated a mode

of communication research that prized cultural specificity and individual subjectivities. These scholars cast interpretive paradigms as better aligned with Indonesia's social complexity, arguing that earlier quantitative works had been too shallow or politically constrained.

The “Deddy-Dedy effect”

The qualitative shift in Indonesian communication studies, spearheaded by Dedy N. Hidayat and Deddy Mulyana, rapidly permeated academic institutions, shaping curricula, graduate theses, and departmental policies across the country. As qualitative methodologies gained traction, workshops, textbooks, and conferences dedicated to interpretive, critical, and phenomenological approaches proliferated. This transformation trained a generation of scholars who viewed the positivist paradigm and quantitative methodologies as inadequate for capturing the complexities of identity formation, media cultures, and community-based communication practices.

However, as this qualitative emphasis solidified, it eventually hardened into an intellectual orthodoxy that effectively replaced the previous positivist regime. While undeniably beneficial in expanding research focus, amplifying vernacular voices, interrogating power structures, and spurring cultural research innovation, the “Deddy-Dedy Effect” also marginalized quantitative research. Over time, only a small number of scholars remained committed to developing rigorous statistical or experimental designs, leading to a growing methodological imbalance in Indonesian communication studies.

This paradigmatic shift, though necessary, introduced new epistemic limitations that echoed the very rigidity it sought to dismantle. As the field moved toward an interpretive-dominant framework, it increasingly neglected the potential contributions of quantitative research, inadvertently reinforcing the same exclusionary tendencies that had characterized the positivist era. To understand this transformation fully, an examination of the contributions of Dedy N. Hidayat and Deddy Mulyana is essential.

Dedy N. Hidayat: political economy perspectives and the mainstreaming of qualitative studies

Dedy N. Hidayat played a pivotal role in reshaping Indonesian communication studies by advocating for a political economy approach, an act that directly contributed to the mainstreaming of critical perspectives and qualitative research methodologies in the field. His intellectual trajectory unfolded within a broader historical context in which positivist paradigms had dominated Indonesian communication research since the 1970s, largely as a legacy of the Suharto regime's developmentalist ideology (Adiprasetio, 2025c).

Hidayat's academic journey, shaped by his postgraduate education in the United States, profoundly influenced his critical stance toward the discipline's methodological constraints. After earning his M. S. in journalism from Ohio University in 1984 and later completing a Ph. D. in Mass Communication at the University of Wisconsin in 1994, he returned to Indonesia with a renewed vision for the field (Aga, 2016).

His dissertation, *Newspaper Agenda Consensus as a Function of Press Freedom in Four Asian Developing Countries*, examined how press freedom influenced news agenda setting in different political

contexts (Hidayat, 1994). This early work laid the foundation for his future critiques of Indonesian media, which he saw as overly centralized and influenced by corporate and state interests. He was particularly drawn to critical communication theories that interrogated the nexus between media, power, and political economy (Gazali et al., 2009; Hanitzsch and Hidayat, 2012; Hollander et al., 2008).

Upon his return, Hidayat assumed key academic positions at Universitas Indonesia, including serving as Secretary and later Chair of the Graduate Program in Communication (2002–2010). These roles granted him significant institutional influence, which he leveraged to challenge the longstanding dominance of quantitative methodologies in communication research (Aga, 2016). Hidayat recognized the dominance of classical paradigms in Indonesian communication research compared to critical and constructivist paradigms (Hidayat, 2002), categories adopted from Guba and Lincoln (1994).

This dominance, as observed by Hidayat (1999), is reflected in several methodological, substantive, and research objectives, including:

1. The majority, if not all, of communication research adheres to classical paradigm criteria emphasizing objectivity, reliability, internal validity, and external validity. This applies not only to studies employing traditional quantitative methods such as surveys, experiments, and quantitative content analysis but also to qualitative studies, such as case studies, that use observation and in-depth interviews as data collection techniques.
2. Researchers adopting a critical theoretical framework often attempt to position themselves as value-free scholars or conceal their moral and ideological commitments, rather than explicitly acknowledging their stance.
3. Applied research, particularly in the field of advertising—which grew significantly throughout the 1990s—predominantly (approximately 70%) focused on examining the “effectiveness” of advertisements in influencing potential consumers. This includes a considerable number of studies on the effectiveness of cigarette advertising. Only a small fraction of these studies demonstrated concern for consumer protection issues, the negative effects of advertising, or broader socio-ethical considerations.

According to Hidayat (1999), several factors contributed to this paradigm dominance, including:

1. The content of research methodology courses primarily focuses on the classical paradigm, with insufficient emphasis on alternative methodological paradigms.
2. A majority of faculty members, particularly thesis supervisors and examiners, are familiar only with classical research methodologies. Consequently, they evaluate research quality exclusively based on classical paradigm criteria, treating them as the sole standard of academic rigor.
3. Researchers themselves perceive mastery of classical paradigm-based research skills as highly marketable in the media and information industries. The demand for research from these industries also tends to prioritize studies adhering to classical methodological criteria.

Hidayat endorsed methodological pluralism, arguing that communication research should not be constrained by rigid positivist criteria but should instead embrace interpretive and critical approaches. His writings, including *Metodologi Penelitian dalam Sebuah “Multi-Paradigm Science”* (Research Methodology in a “Multi-Paradigm Science”) (Hidayat, 2002) and *Paradigma dan Perkembangan Penelitian Komunikasi* (Paradigms and Developments in Communication Research), (Hidayat, 1999) became foundational texts in Indonesian communication scholarship in the early 2000s. These works introduced qualitative methodologies, positioning them as legitimate and essential tools for capturing the complexities of Indonesian media and society.

Hidayat's advocacy for qualitative methods went hand in hand with his commitment to integrating political economy perspectives into Indonesian communication research. This was exemplified in his collaborative work with Effendy Ghazaly and Victor Menayang, culminating in their seminal study *Political Communication in Indonesia: Media Performance in Three Eras* (Gazali et al., 2009). This study mapped out the shifting role of political communication and media across different political regimes, demonstrating how state policies and economic imperatives had shaped media ownership structures and constrained press freedom. Unlike the dominant paradigm in Indonesian media research, which often focuses on media effects or institutional structures in isolation, Hidayat emphasized broader socio-economic forces that shaped media dynamics (Gazali et al., 2003, 2009).

Beyond theoretical advocacy, Hidayat's leadership at Universitas Indonesia was instrumental in institutionalizing qualitative research methodologies within Indonesia's academic landscape. As Chair of the Graduate Program in Communication (2002–2010), he spearheaded curricular reforms that incorporated interpretive and critical paradigms, diversifying the methodological scope of communication studies. He encouraged students to move beyond the conventional reliance on quantitative data and to engage with media texts, audience interpretations, and structural analyses through qualitative lenses. This shift challenged the entrenched perception that qualitative methods were inherently “subjective” or lacking in rigor—a bias that had long permeated Indonesian communication academia (Aga, 2016).

Hidayat's emphasis on qualitative methodologies was not merely a reaction against the positivist tradition but a recognition that social phenomena could not always be captured through numerical abstraction. His argument aligned with the broader epistemological debates within the social sciences, where scholars such as Guba and Lincoln advocated for the legitimacy of interpretive and constructivist paradigms (Guba and Lincoln, 1994). By mainstreaming qualitative approaches, Hidayat expanded the scope of inquiry in Indonesian communication studies, allowing for more nuanced analyses of media, culture, and power.

Deddy Mulyana: phenomenology and cross-cultural communication

If Hidayat's contributions were rooted in political economy and critical structural analysis, Deddy Mulyana charted a different path by introducing phenomenology and symbolic interactionism as research methodologies in Indonesian communication studies. His emphasis on lived experience, intersubjectivity, and meaning-making fundamentally reoriented how scholars approached media, culture, and identity formation.

Mulyana's academic roots trace back to his undergraduate studies in communication at Universitas Padjadjaran, Bandung, Indonesia, where he was introduced to various communication models predominantly shaped by Western positivist thought. Early in his career, Indonesian communication research often centered on survey-based methods and media-effects studies (Rakhmat, 1989). However, it was his subsequent engagement with interpretive and hermeneutic frameworks, particularly during his doctoral training, that laid the foundation for a paradigmatic shift in his scholarly outlook.

His doctoral thesis in Sociology at Monash University, *Twenty-five Indonesians in Melbourne: a study of the social construction and transformation of ethnic identity* (Mulyana, 1995) proved particularly influential. In this study, Mulyana embraced phenomenological inquiry to explore how Indonesian migrants in Melbourne negotiated their ethnic identities. Drawing on Alfred Schutz's interpretation of intersubjectivity (Schutz, 1970, 1972), Mulyana provided an in-depth investigation of how individuals experience, interpret, and sustain their sense of self in a new cultural context. This phenomenological orientation ran parallel to his preexisting interest in symbolic interactionism, thereby underscoring his dedication to understanding human communication as a lived, intersubjective process rather than a mere set of measurable variables (Goffman, 1959, 2008).

Mulyana's endorsement of phenomenology is evident in both his empirical research and theoretical expositions. Phenomenology, in its broadest sense, seeks to apprehend phenomena as they appear in the consciousness of social actors, emphasizing subjective meanings and lived experience (Mulyana, 2010, 2012, 2017; Mulyana and Rakhmat, 1990). While symbolic interactionism had guided much of his early empirical work, Mulyana gradually integrated phenomenological concepts to highlight the “intentionality” of experience—namely, how individuals continually interpret their own and others' actions within a shared lifeworld (Mulyana, 2010, 2012, 2017; Mulyana and Rakhmat, 1990).

His phenomenologically oriented studies underscore the depth of context, culture, and personal narrative in shaping communicative processes (Mulyana, 2003, 2010, 2016; Mulyana and Rakhmat, 1990; Sobur and Mulyana, 2020). For example, he highlights how migrants or minority communities interpret social cues, construct collective symbols of identity, and navigate power structures in everyday life. This perspective resonates with Geertz (1977) concept of “thick description,” as Mulyana extends the mandate of qualitative inquiry to include not only participants' overt statements but also the tacit assumptions and cultural codes that inform them (Mulyana, 2003).

Beyond his empirical examples, Mulyana's impact on Indonesian communication studies is most evident in his prolific writing on qualitative methods. In a landscape where classical, variable-driven research dominated, he systematically introduced phenomenological and interpretive paradigms through teaching materials and his books (Mulyana, 2004, 2008, 2010, 2012, 2013, 2017; Mulyana and Rakhmat, 1990; Sobur and Mulyana, 2020).

One of Mulyana's hallmark contributions is his insistence on reflexivity as a cornerstone of phenomenological inquiry. Inspired by both Alfred Schutz (1970, 1972) and qualitative traditions, he contends that researchers must remain aware of their own cultural and theoretical backgrounds while interpreting social phenomena. This reflexivity challenges the notion that researchers stand outside or

above the reality they study. Instead, Mulyana's phenomenological stance foregrounds the researcher-participant relationship as a site of mutual influence and co-creation of meaning (Mulyana, 2010, 2017; Sobur and Mulyana, 2020).

Beyond phenomenology, Mulyana has been instrumental in developing cross-cultural communication studies in Indonesia, a field that had previously been underdeveloped (Mulyana, 2010; Mulyana and Rakhmat, 1990). His work has played a key role in bridging intercultural communication theories with Indonesian realities, particularly in understanding the interplay between ethnicity, migration, and cultural adaptation.

Mulyana's studies have examined how cultural misunderstandings arise in intercultural interactions, emphasizing the role of language, social norms, and historical legacies in shaping these exchanges (Mulyana, 2016). In this regard, he has built upon Edward T. Hall's concepts of high-context and low-context cultures, exploring how Indonesian communication styles (Hall, 1976), characterized by indirectness and collectivism, contrast with Western communication norms that tend to be more explicit and individualistic.

One of his significant contributions to intercultural communication pedagogy has been the integration of qualitative methodologies into intercultural research training in Indonesian universities. Previously, intercultural studies in Indonesia were largely dominated by social psychological approaches, often using survey-based methods to measure variables like cultural distance, adaptation, and ethnocentrism (Rakhmat, 1989, 1996). Mulyana challenged this paradigm by emphasizing the role of lived experience in shaping intercultural competence, arguing that quantitative metrics alone cannot capture the complexity of cultural identity and interaction (Mulyana, 2003, 2017).

Mulyana's authority in Indonesian communication research is further reinforced by his decades-long teaching career at Universitas Padjadjaran. Through his lectures and supervision, generations of undergraduate and postgraduate students have been introduced to phenomenological concepts such as the lived body, lifeworld, and intersubjectivity.

The ambivalence of the “Deddy–Dedy effect” on Indonesian communication research

My journey in Indonesian communication studies since 2006 has allowed me to witness firsthand the far-reaching impact of Dedy N. Hidayat and Deddy Mulyana on the field. Their intellectual contributions transformed the methodological landscape, shifting the discipline away from its longstanding positivist foundation toward a more qualitative and interpretive paradigm. Their influence extended beyond academic debates, shaping curricula, research priorities, and institutional policies. However, my lived experience within Indonesian academia has revealed that while their interventions legitimized qualitative research, they also produced unintended epistemic consequences. The institutionalization of qualitative inquiry, rigid categorization of paradigms, and marginalization of quantitative methodologies have led to methodological misinterpretations and oversimplifications—developments that deserve critical reflection.

Institutionalization of qualitative research

Hidayat's contributions to Indonesian communication studies are most prominently reflected in his systematic categorization of research traditions. His widely cited work on paradigmatic distinctions, drawing upon Guba and Lincoln's typology: classical, constructivist, and critical, has become a foundational reference for Indonesian scholars and educators in classifying communication research (Guba and Lincoln, 1994). The comparative table adopted by Hidayat from Guba and Lincoln, for instance, was frequently encountered in quantitative research methodology lectures during my undergraduate studies at Universitas Padjadjaran (2006–2011) and later in my master's program in communication at Universitas Gadjah Mada (2012–2015). Furthermore, his framework has been extensively referenced in Indonesian-language academic books on communication research methodology, such as those authored by Kriyantono (2014, 2019, 2022), which is among the most highly cited works in the field and the academic journals.

Hidayat's classification of classical, constructivist, and critical traditions was a groundbreaking intervention in an Indonesian academic landscape where positivism (as a classical paradigm) had long been the dominant epistemological orientation. However, the institutionalization of this categorization also led to unintended consequences. Over time, many Indonesian scholars began to treat these research traditions as rigid, mutually exclusive domains rather than as fluid and overlapping epistemological perspectives. This rigid compartmentalization proved particularly problematic for hybrid approaches such as semiotics and structuralism, which inherently operate at the intersection of multiple paradigms. Consequently, both faculty and students often attempted to fit methodologies into predefined categories, even when the theoretical justifications for such classifications were tenuous.

This issue is particularly evident in the treatment of semiotics and discourse analysis. Instead of being recognized for their capacity to traverse theoretical frameworks, these approaches have frequently been artificially confined to a single category (See Adiprasetio, 2025a, 2025b). Such epistemological rigidity has not only constrained their analytical potential but also limited the methodological pluralism that qualitative research inherently requires.

The root of this issue lies in Hidayat's identification of problems in Indonesian communication research, particularly in how quality criteria are assessed across different paradigms (Hidayat, 1999, 2002). With an anecdotal case, Hidayat noted that qualitative research within the constructivist paradigm is often judged by quantitative criteria from the classical paradigm, such as objectivity and measurability (Hidayat, 2002). He attributed this to Indonesian researchers' lack of understanding of paradigm distinctions (Hidayat, 2002). However, while this diagnosis is partly correct, Hidayat does not fully account for the historical and structural factors that have shaped Indonesian academia.

The poor state of scholarly engagement in Indonesia, particularly the failure to distinguish between research paradigms, is not merely a matter of misunderstanding but is deeply rooted in the technocratic legacy of the New Order regime and Cold War-era intellectual constraints. As Alwi Dahlan, Indonesia's first Ph. D and one of the early professors in communication studies, noted in the 1980s, Indonesian scholars have historically shown little inclination to engage deeply with theoretical frameworks (Dahlan, 1987). Instead of critically examining theoretical foundations, scholars often rely on

textbook summaries or secondary sources, leading to a superficial understanding that overlooks the complexities, limitations, and historical contexts in which these theories were developed (Adiprasetio et al., 2021; Adiprasetio and Wibowo, 2020). This condition led to a shift in research orientation from quantitative to qualitative methods, but rather than deepening scholarship, it resulted in a mere transfer from one superficiality to another.

Meanwhile, Deddy Mulyana played a pivotal role in mainstreaming phenomenology within Indonesian communication studies. Through his sustained advocacy for interpretive paradigms, particularly symbolic interactionism as a theoretical framework and phenomenology as a methodology, Mulyana facilitated a paradigmatic shift from an emphasis on variables and quantifiable effects to a focus on subjective experience and meaning-making processes. His influence is particularly evident in the growing preference among Indonesian communication researchers for phenomenological inquiry over other qualitative or interpretive traditions. This shift reflects a broader reorientation of the field, where communication research increasingly prioritizes lived experiences and social meanings over purely empirical generalizations.

Nevertheless, Indonesian communication scholars remain largely disengaged from broader global academic conversations, both in the Global North and across the Global South (Adiprasetio, 2025b, 2025c). This insularity perpetuates the discipline's methodological and theoretical shortcomings. Consequently, although qualitative research has gained prominence, superficiality continues to overshadow deeper, more critical analyses, illustrating how structural legacies and limited international engagement hamper the field's evolution.

The over-phenomenologization of communication and qualitative inquiry

My experiences as both a student (2006–2011) and a lecturer (2015–2024) at Universitas Padjadjaran have allowed me to observe firsthand how phenomenology has become one of the dominant methodologies and research approaches in Indonesian communication scholarship. This methodological preference is largely attributed to the extensive work of Deddy Mulyana, whose scholarship introduced and institutionalized phenomenology as the primary framework for qualitative inquiry (Mulyana, 2003). His most widely cited introductory book on communication studies in the Indonesian language, which asserts that perception is the essence of communication, has further reinforced subjectivity as the central tenet of Indonesian communication discourse, often sidelining structural or non-humanist perspectives (Mulyana, 2010, 2012, 2017).

Mulyana (2003, 2012, 2016) works and Sobur and Mulyana (2020) have solidified the prominence of subjectivity, intersubjectivity, and lived experience in communication research. His adaptation of Schutzian phenomenology has further entrenched the emphasis on *Verstehen* (understanding) over causal explanation, making phenomenology virtually synonymous with qualitative research in many academic circles. This dominance is exemplified by the work of Engkus Kuswarno, a junior colleague of Mulyana, whose phenomenological research books and research articles remain the most frequently cited in Indonesian communication studies, further legitimizing this approach (Kuswarno, 2007, 2009a, 2009b).

While this methodological shift has enriched qualitative research by emphasizing human experience and meaning-making, it has also

introduced an epistemic bias that conflates qualitative inquiry with phenomenology. Based on my experience teaching research methodology, many students and scholars, strongly influenced by Mulyana's framework, default to phenomenological approaches without critically engaging with alternative qualitative traditions. This over-phenomenologization has not only marginalized other critical-interpretive methodologies, such as critical discourse analysis (CDA) and structuralist-semiotic analysis, which provide alternative ways of understanding meaning-making beyond individual subjectivity, but has also led to the inaccurate application of discourse and semiotic analysis.

For instance, Schutzian and Husserlian phenomenology concepts of subjectivity are frequently invoked across all qualitative research without regard for the distinct methodological foundations of different approaches. This narrowing of methodological perspectives becomes particularly problematic when engaging with theorists such as Roland Barthes and Michel Foucault, whose intellectual traditions fundamentally challenge the assumptions of phenomenology. Barthes' concept of the *death of the author* (Barthes, 2016) and Foucault's critique of authorship as an ideological construct reject the idea of a stable (Foucault, 2003), intentional subject—an idea central to Husserlian phenomenology (Schutz, 1970). In the Foucauldian tradition of discourse analysis, for instance, the subject is not seen as an autonomous meaning-maker but rather as a product of discourse, shaped by historical contingencies and power relations (Kendall and Wickham, 1999; Mills, 2004). However, in Indonesian communication research, this perspective remains largely underdeveloped as scholars continue to privilege the subject-centered paradigm of phenomenology over structuralist and discursive approaches.

The superficial adoption of theories and frameworks

Dedy N. Hidayat and Deddy Mulyana have played a crucial role in legitimizing qualitative research in Indonesian communication studies, yet their influence has also led to unintended consequences. The widespread adoption of qualitative methods has not always been accompanied by a deep engagement with their theoretical foundations. Many scholars and students treat qualitative research primarily as a set of techniques rather than as distinct epistemological commitments, resulting in a superficial application of these methodologies (Adiprasetio, 2025b, 2025c).

The institutional shift toward qualitative research has not necessarily fostered greater methodological pluralism. Instead, certain qualitative traditions—particularly phenomenology—have dominated the field, while other interpretive and critical approaches remain underdeveloped. This selective appropriation has created an epistemic imbalance, where critical discourse analysis, political economy perspectives, and structuralist-semiotic frameworks are often neglected or misapplied. Discourse analysis, for instance, is widely practiced in Indonesia but is frequently stripped of its critical and structural dimensions, as scholars tend to adopt individual-centered rather than systemic perspectives. Similarly, semiotic research often prioritizes the researcher's interpretation over a systematic engagement with semiosis as a dynamic and contextual process.

A key example of this narrowing of (critical) discourse analysis is the popularization of Eriyanto's book *Analisis Wacana: Pengantar*

Analisis Teks Media (Discourse Analysis: An Introduction to Media Text Analysis), which has become the most popular Indonesian-language book on discourse analysis (Eriyanto, 2001). Dedy N. Hidayat himself wrote the foreword to this book, lending it further legitimacy. However, the book has faced strong criticism from scholars like Holy Dhona (2016), who argue that it suffers from a narrow scope, conceptual simplifications, and misinterpretations of critical discourse analysis.

Although Eriyanto (2001) introduces the basic principles of critical discourse analysis (CDA), his application of these frameworks remains superficial. One telling example can be found in Chapter VI of his book, where he discusses representation and what he calls “misrepresentation.” Eriyanto writes:

“In representation, misrepresentation is highly possible: inaccurate portrayals or distortions. A person, a group, an opinion, or an idea may not be depicted as it truly is, but rather is presented negatively. Every day, we hear, read, or see how this misrepresentation occurs. For example, a worker demanding a wage increase may be portrayed as a public nuisance or a threat to business interests [...]” (Eriyanto, 2001, p. 120–121)

This framing reflects a fundamental misunderstanding of representation. As Hall (1997) and others in cultural studies have emphasized, representation is not a reflection of a pre-existing reality, but rather a discursive practice through which meaning is constructed. Eriyanto’s assertion that misrepresentation can occur—as if there is a correct or authentic way to represent reality—suggests that he subscribes to a reflective or intentional model of representation. These are precisely the approaches Hall (1997) and any other discourse and semiotic theories critique with the constructionist approach (or critical approach), which stresses that meaning is not found in things themselves but is produced through cultural codes, language, and power relations.

From this perspective, Eriyanto’s claim that misrepresentation is simply a matter of inaccurate portrayal misses the point that all representation is inherently selective, partial, and ideologically loaded. His position thus reveals an unresolved tension between adopting a critical stance and remaining within a commonsensical understanding of representation as a mirror of reality.

Meanwhile, Dhona (2016) offers a critical assessment of Eriyanto’s conceptual missteps, particularly regarding his appropriation of Stuart Hall’s notion of ideology. According to Dhona, Eriyanto assumes that all media texts automatically serve ideological functions, thereby conflating textual meaning with ideological effect. In doing so, he overlooks the material, institutional, and economic structures that shape discursive production—an oversight that flattens the richness of critical discourse models and the broader political economy of communication (Dhona, 2016).

Perhaps most significantly, Dhona (2016) also points out Eriyanto’s misreading of Michel Foucault’s concept of discourse. While Eriyanto claims to incorporate Foucault’s perspective on discourse, his approach remains largely text-centric, failing to grasp that discourse, in Foucault’s framework, is not confined to language or media texts. Rather, it encompasses the institutional arrangements, knowledge regimes, and power relations that govern what can be said, who can speak, and what counts as truth in a given historical moment—with media texts constituting only one part of this larger formation. By

ignoring these dimensions, Eriyanto reduces discourse analysis to surface-level textual critique, undermining its critical and genealogical potential.

A similar pattern can be observed in Eriyanto’s other book, *Analisis Framing: Konstruksi, Ideologi dan Politik Media* (Framing Analysis: Construction, Ideology, and Media Politics) (Eriyanto, 2011), though to a lesser extent. With a foreword by Dedy Mulyana, this book also promotes a narrow and rigid approach to framing analysis, further reinforcing a fragmented application of qualitative methods in Indonesian communication research. Together, these introductory texts have contributed to a compartmentalized and formulaic use of discourse and framing analysis. Instead of encouraging critical integration across theoretical perspectives, they have fostered a tendency to fixate on particular scholars and their frameworks.

As a result, many Indonesian researchers treat discourse and framing analysis as static methodological templates, leading to a proliferation of studies labelled as Norman Fairclough’s Critical Discourse Analysis, Teun A. van Dijk’s Discourse Analysis, Sara Mill’s Discourse Analysis, Robert Entman’s Framing Analysis, or Zhongdang Pan and Gerald M. Kosicki’s Framing Analysis. These rigid categorizations hinder deeper theoretical engagement, as researchers often rely exclusively on Eriyanto’s summaries rather than consulting the original works of Fairclough, van Dijk, or Hall, or engaging with more recent global developments in discourse and framing methodology.

This trend toward rigid and decontextualized use of theoretical frameworks resonates across other subfields of Indonesian communication studies. When I conducted an intensive study of two decades of Indonesian communication scholarship, I identified a similar pattern in semiotic research (Adiprasetio, 2025b, 2025c). Numerous studies simply adopt a template-based approach, applying titles such as “Semiotic Analysis of (Roland) Barthes,” “Semiotic Analysis of (Charles) Peirce,” or even “Semiotic Analysis of (John) Fiske,” without making any effort to expand, contextualize, or critically develop the semiotic framework in question.

This methodological narrowing significantly reduces the analytical depth of qualitative research in Indonesia. By prioritizing methods over epistemology, many studies fail to critically interrogate power structures, ideological formations, and discursive practices embedded in communication phenomena. Consequently, Indonesian communication research risks becoming method-driven rather than problem-driven, where scholars select methods based on familiarity rather than theoretical relevance. This trend poses a significant challenge to the development of critical and theoretically informed communication research in Indonesia. Moving forward, a broader engagement with epistemology, interdisciplinary perspectives, and original theoretical sources will be essential in overcoming these methodological limitations.

The negative sentiment toward quantitative research

As qualitative research gained institutional legitimacy, this unintended consequence became particularly evident in classroom settings, where quantitative methods were often dismissed as outdated, simplistic, or ideologically problematic. While the critiques of positivism advanced by Hidayat and Mulyana played a crucial role in challenging the dominance of statistical and survey-based studies,

their influence also contributed to an intellectual climate that discouraged engagement with quantitative approaches.

This bias has been further reinforced by scholars who, in reacting against positivism, have helped create a disciplinary environment in which quantitative research is often dismissed as reductionist and incapable of addressing social complexity. In many classrooms, positivism is portrayed in a pejorative light, often without adequate argumentation or engagement with its epistemological foundations. Although I myself take a critical stance toward positivism, I sometimes find the assertiveness of these claims disconcerting, as they not only reinforce distance from quantitative approaches but also cultivate a strong sense of negative sentiment toward them. Statistical methods, in particular, are frequently characterized as rigid, mechanical, and intellectually inferior to qualitative inquiry. Lecturers frequently position qualitative research as the only method capable of capturing communication phenomena, leading to a widespread perception that quantitative approaches are either irrelevant or incompatible with the study of communication.

This epistemic bias has had tangible consequences for methodological training. Over the years, courses in quantitative research methods in Indonesian universities have often been underdeveloped compared to those of their qualitative counterparts. Many lecturers teaching these courses lack substantial publication records in statistical or survey-based research, further reinforcing the perception that quantitative methods are secondary or even obsolete. This institutional neglect has contributed to a limited pool of communication scholars with proficiency in advanced statistical analysis, survey design, or experimental research.

Beyond the classroom, this anti-quantitative sentiment has shaped research output. Many Indonesian communication scholars gravitate toward qualitative methods not necessarily out of epistemological conviction but because institutional structures implicitly discourage quantitative inquiry. Thesis supervision often privilege qualitative research, creating a cycle in which new scholars receive limited training in quantitative methodologies and thus avoid them in their research. This self-reinforcing dynamic has also led to an epistemic insularity that isolates Indonesian communication scholarship from broader interdisciplinary discussions that rely on both qualitative and quantitative insights.

Conclusion

This study has critically examined the shifting epistemological landscape of Indonesian communication scholarship, particularly the marginalization of quantitative research in favor of qualitative approaches. Through an integrative methodological approach, combining intellectual history, biographical analysis, and autoethnography, the research has traced how key intellectual figures, Dedy N. Hidayat and Deddy Mulyana, played pivotal roles in reshaping the field. While their contributions successfully challenged the rigid positivist paradigm of the New Order era and expanded the methodological repertoire of communication studies, they also produced unintended epistemic consequences. The institutionalization of qualitative research, the over-phenomenologization of inquiry, the superficial adoption of theories and frameworks, and the very negative sentiment toward quantitative approaches have all contributed to a narrowing of methodological pluralism in Indonesian communication studies.

The transition from a positivist-dominated landscape to one that privileges qualitative methodologies was necessary in dismantling the instrumentalist and state-driven nature of early Indonesian communication research. However, this shift has led to a new imbalance. The “Deddy-Dedy Effect” reinforced the legitimacy of qualitative approaches, but in doing so, it also sidelined other epistemologies, particularly quantitative and mixed-methods research. The broad adoption of qualitative research has, at times, been superficial, with many scholars employing interpretive approaches without engaging deeply with their epistemological foundations.

This methodological narrowing has significant consequences for Indonesian communication studies. The reluctance to engage with quantitative methods limits participation in global academic conversations and weakens methodological rigor. By prioritizing narrative-driven inquiry over systematic analysis, the field risks isolation and loses opportunities to produce measurable accounts of communicative processes and to compare key dimensions of communication across contexts.

This study recognizes its own limitations. It does not extend the discussion to the broader political economy of higher education, particularly the chronic effects of neoliberalism on academic life in Indonesia (Rakhmani, 2021; Rakhmani and Sakhiyya, 2024). The marketization of higher education has intensified pressures to publish, often at the expense of depth, critical reflection, and scholarly integrity. The tendency to privilege quantity over quality, visible in the proliferation of low-impact publications and managerial performance metrics, has further discouraged rigorous and theoretically informed scholarship (Adiprasetio, 2025b, 2025c). Future research should interrogate the entanglements between neoliberal university governance, publication regimes, and the epistemic direction of communication studies in Indonesia (See Adiprasetio, 2025c; Kozok and Siaputra, 2023; Rochmyaningsih, 2012; Zein, 2025).

By situating this epistemological history within a broader critique of institutional and systemic forces, Indonesian academia can better understand not only the intellectual trajectory of Indonesian communication scholarship but also the socio-political constraints that shape its possibilities. A renewed commitment to epistemic pluralism, grounded in critical engagement and methodological rigor, will be essential for the discipline to grow meaningfully in both local and global contexts.

Data availability statement

The original contributions presented in the study are included in the article/supplementary material, further inquiries can be directed to the corresponding author.

Author contributions

JA: Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing.

Funding

The author(s) declare that financial support was received for the research and/or publication of this article. This research was supported

by the Indonesia Endowment Fund for Education (Lembaga Pengelola Dana Pendidikan – LPDP) through the author's doctoral scholarship.

Conflict of interest

The author declares that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Generative AI statement

The author declares that no Gen AI was used in the creation of this manuscript.

References

- Adhikarya, R. (1980). Transnational knowledge utilisation process in communication studies the north American–ASEAN connection. *Media Asia* 7, 122–136. doi: 10.1080/01296612.1980.11726003
- Adhikarya, R. (1981). Transnational Communication Knowledge Transfer and Utilization Process: The US-ASEAN Case. [Doctoral Dissertation] Stanford, CA: Stanford University.
- Adiprasetio, J. (2019). Perkembangan Ilmu Komunikasi di Indonesia: Instrumentalisasi Kuasa Hingga Mekanisme Pasar. *Jurnal Pemikir. Sociol.* 6, 124–149. doi: 10.22146/jps.v6i2.51583
- Adiprasetio, J. (2022a). Perkembangan, Dinamika, dan Tren Penelitian Jurnalisme di Indonesia Periode 2001–2020. *Calathu: Jurnal Ilmu Komunikasi* 4, 77–92. doi: 10.37715/calathu.v4i2
- Adiprasetio, J. (2022b). The development of communication research in Indonesia in 2001–2020. *Jurnal Kajian Komun.* 10, 105–120. doi: 10.24198/jkk.v10i1.35954
- Adiprasetio, J. (2023). Komunikasi dan Kuasa: Sejarah Pengkajian dan Ilmu Komunikasi dalam Diskursus Epistemik Indonesia. Yogyakarta: Cantrik Pustaka.
- Adiprasetio, J. (2025a). Genealogy of Indonesian developmental journalism: the Pancasila press during authoritarian new order (1966–1998). *Media History* 31, 327–346. doi: 10.1080/13688804.2025.2502615
- Adiprasetio, J. (2025b). Journalism studies in the shadow of authoritarianism: the genealogy of the shallowness of Indonesian journalism scholarship and research. *Journal. Hist.* 22, 1–25. doi: 10.1080/00947679.2025.2515931
- Adiprasetio, J. (2025c). The chronic impact of the cold war and authoritarian regime on communication research. *Rev. Commun.* 25, 164–179. doi: 10.1080/15358593.2025.2474643
- Adiprasetio, J., Rahmawan, D., and Wibowo, K. A. (2021). A meta-analysis of hate speech in Indonesia: the yielding of an academic discourse to the discourse of authority. *Pacific J. Rev. Te Koakoa* 27, 251–267. doi: 10.24135/pjr.v27i1and2.1167
- Adiprasetio, J., and Wibowo, A. K. (2020). Diskursus Hate Speech: Ilmu Pengetahuan yang Tunduk pada Surat Edaran Aparat. Available online at: <https://remotivi.or.id/amatan/565/diskursus-hate-speech-ilmu-pengetahuan-yang-tunduk-pada-surat-edaran-aparat> (Accessed July 15, 2025).
- Aga, M. (2016). We Are The Yellow Jacket (Studi Eksploratif Pada Pemikiran Prof. Dedy Nur Hidayat Sebagai Tokoh Ilmu Komunikasi Universitas Indonesia) [Bachelor Thesis]. Malang: Universitas Brawijaya.
- Asante, M. K. (2014). Facing south to Africa: Toward an Afrocentric critical orientation. New York, NY: Lexington Books.
- Averbeck, S. (2005). Communication theories in France 1975–2005: the epistemological discourse of the sciences de l'information et de la communication. *CD-ROM* 24:2005.
- Averbeck, S. (2008). Comparative history of communication studies: France and Germany. *Open Commun. J.* 2, 1–13. doi: 10.2174/1874916X00802010001
- Baber, Z. (2001). Modernization theory and the cold war. *J. Contemp. Asia* 31, 71–85. doi: 10.1080/00472330180000051
- Barthes, R. (2016). “The death of the author” in Readings in the theory of religion. eds. S. S. Elliot and M. Waggoner (London: Routledge), 141–145.
- Benoit, W. L., and Holbert, R. L. (2008). Empirical intersections in communication research: replication, multiple quantitative methods, and bridging the quantitative–qualitative divide. *J. Commun.* 58, 615–628. doi: 10.1111/j.1460-2466.2008.00404.x
- Bevins, V. (2020). The Jakarta method: Washington's anticommunist crusade and the mass murder program that shaped our world. London: PublicAffairs.
- Bourdieu, P. (2004). Science of science and reflexivity. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Chang, H. (2016). Autoethnography as method. New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.
- Dahlan, M. A. (1987). “Status dan Perkembangan Mutakhir Ilmu Komunikasi” in Perkembangan Ilmu Komunikasi di Indonesia dalam Kurun Waktu 1965–1985. ed. E. S. Ibrahim (Semarang: Lembaga Ilmu Pengetahuan Indonesia (LIPI) dan Ikatan Sarjana Komunikasi Indonesia (ISKI) Cabang Semarang).
- DeCoster, J., and Lichtenstein, B. (2007). Integrating quantitative and qualitative methods in communication research. *Commun. Methods Meas.* 1, 227–242. doi: 10.1080/19312450701636599
- Denzin, N. K. (2013). Interpretive autoethnography. London: SAGE Publications.
- Dhakidae, D. (2003). Cendekiawan dan Kekuasaan dalam Negara Orde Baru. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Dhakidae, D., and Hadiz, V. R. (Eds.) (2006). Ilmu Sosial dan Kekuasaan di Indonesia. Jakarta: Equinox Publishing Indonesia dan Ford Foundation.
- Dhona, H. R. (2016). Asal Jargon Ideologi. Available online at: <https://www.remotivi.or.id/headline/konsep-dan-isu/331> (Accessed March 8, 2025).
- Ellis, C. S., and Bochner, A. P. (2006). Analyzing analytic autoethnography: an autopsy. *J. Contemp. Ethnogr.* 35, 429–449. doi: 10.1177/0891241606286979
- Eriyanto (2001). Analisis Wacana: Pengantar Analisis Teks Media. Yogyakarta: LKIS.
- Eriyanto (2011). Analisis Framing: Konstruksi Ideologi dan Politik Media. Yogyakarta: LKIS.
- Fajardo, M. (2021). “Latin America's dependency theory: a counter–cold war social science?” in Cold war social science: Transnational entanglements. eds. M. Solovey and C. Dayé (Cham: Springer), 191–222.
- Fansuri, H. (2015). Sosiologi Indonesia: Diskursus Kekuasaan dan Reproduksi Pengetahuan. Jakarta: LP3ES.
- Foucault, M. (2003). “What is an author?” in Reading architectural history. ed. D. Arnold (London: Routledge), 71–81.
- Frey, M. (2003). Tools of empire: persuasion and the United States's modernizing mission in Southeast Asia. *Diplom. Hist.* 27, 543–568. doi: 10.1111/1467-7709.00367
- Fuchs, C. (2017). Raymond Williams' communicative materialism. *Eur. J. Cult. Stud.* 20, 744–762. doi: 10.1177/1367549417732998
- Gallagher, C. (1992). Raymond Williams and cultural studies. *Social Text* 30, 79–89. doi: 10.2307/466467
- Gary, B. (1996). Communication research, the Rockefeller Foundation, and mobilization for the war on words, 1938–1944. *J. Commun.* 46, 124–147. doi: 10.1111/j.1460-2466.1996.tb01493.x
- Gazali, E., D'Haenens, L., Hollander, E., Menayang, V., and Hidayat, D. N. (2003). Establishing a middle ground for public and community broadcasting in Indonesia: an action research project 28, 475–492. doi: 10.1515/comm.2003.030
- Gazali, E., Hidayat, D. N., and Menayang, V. (2009). Political communication in Indonesia: media performance in three eras. In Willnat, and Aw, A. (L. Willnat and A. Aw) (Eds.), Political communication in Asia (pp. 112–134). London: Routledge.
- Geertz, C. (1977). The interpretation of cultures. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Gil-Riaño, S. (2021). “Becoming an area expert during the cold war: Americanism and Lusotropicalismo in the transnational career of anthropologist Charles Wagley, 1939–1971” in Cold war social science: Transnational entanglements. eds. M. Solovey and C. Dayé (Cham: Springer), 127–159.

Any alternative text (alt text) provided alongside figures in this article has been generated by Frontiers with the support of artificial intelligence and reasonable efforts have been made to ensure accuracy, including review by the authors wherever possible. If you identify any issues, please contact us.

Publisher's note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

- Glander, T. (1999). *Origins of mass communications research during the American cold war: Educational effects and contemporary implications*. London: Routledge.
- Glück, A. (2018). "De-westernization and decolonization in media studies" in *Oxford encyclopedia of communication and critical studies*. ed. D. Cloud (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Goffman, E. (2008). *Behavior in public places*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.
- Guba, E. G., and Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). "Competing paradigms in qualitative research" in *Handbook of qualitative research*. ed. R. W. Riley (London: Sage Publications, Inc), 105–117.
- Hall, E. T. (1976). *Beyond culture*. London: Knopf Doubleday Publishing Group.
- Hall, S. (1980). Cultural studies: two paradigms. *Media Cult. Soc.* 2, 57–72. doi: 10.1177/016344378000200106
- Hall, S. (1997). *Representation: Cultural representations and signifying practices*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Hanitzsch, T., and Hidayat, D. N. (2012). "Journalists in Indonesia" in *The global journalist in the 21st century*. eds. D. H. Weaver and L. Willnat (London: Routledge), 36–51.
- Haryanto, I. (2008). *Propaganda, Kuasa, dan Pengetahuan: Genealogi Ilmu Komunikasi di Indonesia, (Suatu Penelusuran Awal)*.
- Hidayat, D. N. (1994). *Newspaper agenda consensus as a function of press freedom in four Asian developing countries*. Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Hidayat, D. N. (1999). Paradigma dan perkembangan penelitian komunikasi. *J. Ikatan Sarjana Komun. Indones.* 3, 24–26.
- Hidayat, D. N. (2002). Metodologi Penelitian dalam Sebuah "Multi-Paradigm Science". *Mediat. J. Komun.* 3, 197–220.
- Hollander, E., Hidayat, D. N., and D'haenens, L. (2008). Community radio in Indonesia. *Javn. - Public* 15, 59–74. doi: 10.1080/13183222.2008.11008976
- Ikatan Sarjana Komunikasi Indonesia (1987). *Perkembangan Ilmu Komunikasi di Indonesia dalam Kurun Waktu 1965–1985*. Semarang: Lembaga Ilmu Pengetahuan Indonesia (LIPI) dan Ikatan Sarjana Komunikasi Indonesia (ISKI) Cabang Semarang.
- Jelen-Sanchez, A. (2017). Engagement in public relations discipline: themes, theoretical perspectives and methodological approaches. *Public Relat. Rev.* 43, 934–944. doi: 10.1016/j.pubrev.2017.04.002
- Jensen, K. B. (2013). "The complementarity of qualitative and quantitative methodologies in media and communication research" in *A handbook of media and communication research*. ed. K. B. Jensen (London: Routledge), 266–284.
- Jones, S. H. (2007). "Autoethnography" in *The Blackwell encyclopedia of sociology*. ed. G. Ritzer (Malden, MA: Blackwell).
- Kendall, G., and Wickham, G. (1999). *Using Foucault's methods*. London: Sage.
- Kozok, U., and Siaputra, I. B. (2023). Improving integrity in research and higher education: an Indonesian perspective: [Meningkatkan Integritas Dalam Riset dan Pendidikan Tinggi: Sebuah Perspektif Indonesia]. *ANIMA Indones. Psychol. J.* 38, 15–23. doi: 10.24123/aijp.v38i1.5490
- Kriyantono, R. (2014). *Teknik Praktis Riset komunikasi*. Jakarta: Kencana.
- Kriyantono, R. (2019). *Pengantar Lengkap Ilmu Komunikasi Filsafat dan Etika Ilmunya Serta Perspektif Islam*. Jakarta: Prenada Media.
- Kriyantono, R. (2022). *Teknik Praktis Riset Komunikasi Kuantitatif dan Kualitatif: Edisi Kedua*. Jakarta: Prenada Media.
- Kuhn, T. (1962). The structure of scientific revolutions. *Int. Encycl. Unified Sci.* 2:2.
- Kuswarno, E. (2007). Tradisi fenomenologi pada penelitian komunikasi kualitatif sebuah pedoman penelitian dari pengalaman penelitian. *Sosiohumaniora* 9, 161–176. doi: 10.24198/sosiohumaniora.v9i2.5384
- Kuswarno, E. (2009a). *Fenomenologi: Fenomena Pengemis Kota Bandung*. Bandung: Widya Padjadjaran.
- Kuswarno, E. (2009b). *Metode Penelitian Komunikasi Fenomenologi*. Bandung: Widya Padjadjaran.
- Löblich, M., and Averbeck, S. (2016). "The transnational flow of ideas and histoire croisée with attention to the cases of France and Germany" in *The international history of communication study*. eds. P. Simonson and D. W. Park (New York, NY: Routledge), 25–46.
- Löblich, M., and Scheu, A. M. (2011). Writing the history of communication studies: a sociology of science approach. *Commun. Theory* 21, 1–22. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2885.2010.01373.x
- Miike, Y. (2007). An Asiatic reflection on Eurocentric bias in communication theory. *Commun. Monogr.* 74, 272–278. doi: 10.1080/03637750701390093
- Mills, S. (2004). *Discourse*. New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.
- Mulyana, D. (1995). *Twenty-five Indonesians in Melbourne: A study of the social construction and transformation of ethnic identity [Doctoral Thesis]*. Melbourne: Monash University.
- Mulyana, D. (2003). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif (Paradigma Baru Ilmu Komunikasi dan Ilmu Sosial Lainnya)*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Mulyana, D. (2004). *Komunikasi efektif: Suatu pendekatan lintasbudaya*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakaryad.
- Mulyana, D. (2008). *Komunikasi massa: Kontroversi, teori, dan aplikasi*. Bandung: Widya Padjadjaran.
- Mulyana, D. (2010). *Komunikasi Lintas Budaya: Pemikiran Perjalanan dan Khayalan*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Mulyana, D. (2012). *Cultures and communication*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Mulyana, D. (2013). *Komunikasi politik, politik komunikasi: Membedah visi dan gaya komunikasi praktisi politik*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Mulyana, D. (2016). *Health and therapeutic communication: An intercultural perspective*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Mulyana, D. (2017). *Ilmu Komunikasi Suatu Pengantar*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Mulyana, D., and Rakhmat, J. (1990). *Komunikasi Antarbudaya: Panduan Berkomunikasi dengan Orang-Orang Berbeda Budaya*. West Java: Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Narwaya, S. T. G. (2006). *Matinya Ilmu Komunikasi*. Yogyakarta: Resist Book.
- Phelan, S., and Maesele, P. (2023). Where is 'the political' in the journal political communication? On the hegemonic articulation of a disciplinary identity. *Ann. Int. Commun. Assoc.* 47, 202–221. doi: 10.1080/23808985.2023.2169951
- Pooley, J. (2008). "The new history of mass communication research" in *The history of media and communication research: Contested memories*. eds. D. Park and J. Pooley (New York, NY: Peter Lang), 43–70.
- Rakhmani, I. (2021). Reproducing academic insularity in a time of neo-liberal markets: the case of social science research in Indonesian state universities. *J. Contemp. Asia* 51, 64–86. doi: 10.1080/00472336.2019.1627389
- Rakhmani, I., and Sakhiyya, Z. (2024). Inequalities and social sciences in neoliberal Indonesia. *Int. Soc. Sci. J.* 74, 9–23. doi: 10.1111/issj.12429
- Rakhmat, J. (1989). *Metode penelitian komunikasi: Dilengkapi contoh analisis statistik*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Rakhmat, J. (1996). *Psikologi Komunikasi*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Rochmyaningsih, D. (2012). Indonesia makes research publication a graduation requirement for all students – Asian scientist magazine. Available online at: <https://www.asianscientist.com/2012/03/academia/indonesia-dikti-aptisi-publication-a-graduation-requirement-for-all-students-2012/> (accessed March 9, 2025).
- Roosa, J. (2006). *Pretext for mass murder: The September 30th movement and Suharto's coup d'état in Indonesia*. Madison: University of Wisconsin.
- Schutz, A. (1970). *Alfred Schutz on phenomenology and social relations*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Schutz, A. (1972). *The phenomenology of the social world*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Simonson, P., Morooka, J., Xiong, B., and Bedsole, N. (2019). The beginnings of mass communication: a transnational history. *J. Commun.* 69, 513–538. doi: 10.1093/joc/jqz027
- Simpson, B. R. (2003a). *Modernizing Indonesia: United States-Indonesian relations, 1961–1967*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University.
- Simpson, C. (2003b). "U.S. Mass Communication Research, Counterinsurgency, and Scientific 'Reality.'" in *Communication researchers and policy-making*. ed. S. Braman (New York, NY: The MIT Press).
- Simpson, B. R. (2008). *Economists with guns: Authoritarian development and US-Indonesian relations, 1960–1968*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Sobur, A., and Mulyana, D. (2020). *Filsafat Komunikasi: Tradisi, Teori dan Metode Penelitian Fenomenologi*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Solovey, M., and Cravens, H. (2012). *Cold war social science: Knowledge production, liberal democracy, and human nature*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Solovey, M., and Dayé, C. (2021). *Cold war social science: Transnational entanglements*. Cham: Springer Nature.
- Susanto, S. A. (1977). *Komunikasi Kontemporer*. Jakarta: Bina Cipta.
- Susanto, S. A. (1982a). *Komunikasi Massa 1*. Jakarta: Bina Cipta.
- Susanto, S. A. (1982b). *Komunikasi Massa 3*. Jakarta: Bina Cipta.
- Wall, S. S. (2016). Toward a moderate autoethnography. *Int J Qual Methods* 15:966. doi: 10.1177/1609406916674966
- Wang, J. (2015). "Colonial crossings: social science, social knowledge, and American power from the nineteenth century to the cold war" in *Cold war science and the transatlantic circulation of knowledge*. ed. J. Van Dongen (New York, NY: Brill), 184–213.
- Wartella, E. (2013). "The history reconsidered" in *American communication research*. eds. E. E. Dennis and E. Wartella (London: Routledge), 169–180.
- Wirth, C. (2021). "The anthropologist as deviant modernizer: Felipe Landa Jocano's journey through the cold war, the social sciences, decolonization, and nation building in the Philippines" in *Cold war social science: Transnational entanglements*. eds. M. Solovey and C. Dayé (Cham: Springer), 161–189.
- Zein, R. A. (2025). Dilema tukin dosen ASN: Mengapa tak kunjung dibayarkan? The Conversation. Available online at: <http://theconversation.com/dilema-tukin-dosen-asn-mengapa-tak-kunjung-dibayarkan-247837> (Accessed July 15, 2025).