

## Moral panics on lgbt issues: evidence from indonesian tv programme

Dina Listiorini<sup>\*)</sup>, Donna Asteria, Billy Sarwono  
*Universitas Indonesia*

Kampus Salemba, Salemba Raya, Jakarta, Indonesia  
Email: dinalisty@gmail.com/ Phone +6282134978973

**How to Cite This Article:** Listiorini, D., Asteria, D., Sarwono, B., (2019). Moral panics on lgbt issues: evidence from indonesian tv program. *Jurnal Studi Komunikasi*, 3(3). doi: 10.25139/jsk.3i3.1882

Received: 29-08-2019,  
Revision: 22-09-2019,  
Acceptance: 26-09-2019,  
Published online: 08-11-2019

---

**Abstract** There was a discussion activity conducted by a small club of the University of Indonesia called SGRC (Support Group and Resource Center on Sexuality Studies) at the beginning of January 2016. It did not only discuss sexuality such as sexual preferences but also conduct peer support for LGBT groups. However, it was reported illegal for many reasons. Although later the "illegal" stamp was dubbed as an "internal problem" of Universitas Indonesia, the effect was unbelievable. The activity of SGRC was reported by media as "LGBT's attack on campus", "LGBT is dangerous for campus", et cetera. Moral, Eastern hemisphere norms, and religious excuses were the main excuses by media to judge and "punish" the LGBT groups. After the SGRC incident, particularly in 2016, the media, both mainstream and online, massively promoted homophobia through hate speech. The media reported the LGBT phenomenon as not only dangerous but also as entities that must be destroyed. Although not as splashy as online news, some television stations reported the case in their ways. TvOne, compared to other Indonesian TV stations, was the most often to discuss LGBT issues from 2016-2018 through a debate programme titled Indonesia Lawyers Club (ILC). The most controversial episode was the one aired on February 16 whose topic was "*LGBT Issues is Rising, How Should We React?*" in which a participant, a psychiatrist, was accused of delivering false information. His statement was even responded by a U.S.-based international psychiatrist association which later sent him a warning letter. This paper will explore media framing on tvOne's debate programme using Robert Entman's Framing Methods. The result shows that through inviting certain debate participants who voiced certain statements, the TV programme promoted not only anti-LGBT actions but also homophobia.

**Keywords:** framing; anti-lgbt; indonesia; sexuality; television

\*) Corresponding Author

## **INTRODUCTION**

Discussion on sexuality in Indonesia is not a general topic and tends to be a taboo. It can be viewed from the ideas to held sex education subject for elementary and middle school that was rejected by then Education Minister, Mohammad Nuh. According to him, sex education is taboo and this education should be viewed only on reproduction education perspective (Hanz Jimenez Salim, 2014). These "taboo" problems are also applied in sexuality-related matters, including discussion about LGBT. For a heteronormative and patriarchal country, Indonesia has ideologised and defined that marriage should only be done by heterosexual couples (Nurmila et al., n.d.). LGBT is considered to violate the normality aspect of heterosexuals. This taboo term is also followed by embarrassment, in which when applied to the LGBT community will generate significant impacts on moral panics and violation towards them (Nurmila et al., n.d.). Monitoring conducted in Indonesia's ten cities from January to March 2016 by Arus Pelangi organisation has reported 142 cases of arrests, attacks, discrimination, persecution, and hate speech delivered towards LGBT groups, with hate speech dominates the statistic (Kristian Erdianto, 2016).

The report of Human Rights Watch has unfolded the continuous hatred towards the group of LGBT, which had been voiced since January 2016, was started by the state officials. The report argues that the state is thought as failed in enforcing the international human rights commitment, and, instead, spread the fire of hatred through sets of rules and laws and regulation bills (Human Rights Watch, 2016). In 2016, it could be said that the minority group of LGBT was thought of as a "danger" to Indonesia and unaccepted by society.

The news coverage with hatred affects society. It is illustrated in the survey of SMRC (2017) unveiling that although most of the people have known what LGBT is (58.3%), which seems that they only understand the surface of the issue. It is proven by the fact that most of the people who have been familiar with LGBT regard the community as a serious threat (40% of which thinks of LGBT as threatful enough and very threatful). Besides, they object when people identified as LGBT become their neighbour (79.1%) and they even feel more objection when the people from LGBT community become public officials such as Regent/Mayor, Governor, and President (89%). The survey of SRMC on the rejection of LGBT was indifferent from the Gallup Poll survey conducted in the US in 1987, although the result is not identical. The result found out that 42% of respondents agreed that AIDS was God's punishment to the sinners. It illustrates the ignorance concerning the disease and the victims as well as showing hatred towards them (Rothblum & Bond, 1996).

The hatred and homophobic actions towards LGBT groups in the media are practised through the choice of the key speakers, topic direction, as well as used dictions. The following table illustrates the uptight reaction and homophobic actions through mass-media by various parties, particularly the government:

Table 1. Statements on the Media about LGBT

Media	Title on 2016
Kompas.com	<i>Menhan Nilai LGBT Bagian dari "Proxy War" yang Harus Diwaspadai (23 Februari)</i>  The Ministry of Defense Thinks LGBT as Part of "Proxy War" which Must be Watched Out for (23 February)
Republika.co.id	<i>DPR: Menentang LGBT Juga Termasuk Hak Asasi</i>  DPR: Resisting LGBT is Also Part of Human Rights (18 April)
Detik.com	<i>Guru Besar IPB Dkk Minta LGBT Dipenjara 5 Tahun: KUHP Sudah Tidak Relevan (19 Juli)</i>  Professor of IPB (and his Colleagues) Requesting the LGBT people to be Jailed for 5 Years: KUHP is No Longer Relevant (19 July)
Vivanews.com	<i>LGBT Bertentangan dengan Pancasila (18 Februari)</i>  LGBT goes against Pancasila (18 February)
Okezone.com	<i>MUI Anggap LGBT Tanda Kiamat Sudah Dekat (22 Februari)</i>  MUI (Indonesian Ulama/ Muslim Priest Council) Thinks LGBT as a Sign of an Incoming Doomsday (22 February)
RRI.co.id	<i>KPI Larang Kampanye LGBT (dengan audio) (25 Februari)</i>  KPI Forbids LGBT Campaigns (with audio) (25 February)
BeritaSatu TV	<i>Stop Propaganda LGBT (18 Februari)</i>  Stop LGBT Propaganda (18 February)
Indonesia Lawyer's Club (ILC) TVOne	<i>ILC Episode "LGBT Marak, Apa Sikap Kita?" (16 Februari)</i>  ILC Episode "LGBT Issues is Rising, How Should We React?" (16 February)  <i>ILC Episode "LGBT Menyasar Anak-anak" (7 September)</i>  ILC Episode "LGBT Targetting Kids" (7 September)
Kompas TV	<i>AIMAN episode "SGRC dan Kontroversi Orientasi"(15 Februari)</i>  AIMAN episode "SGRC and the Controversy of Orientation" (15 February)

Source: Processed media data

Table 1 shows that in 2016, the media, in every line, either online or conventional, participated in spreading hate speech towards the LGBT community. The news titles imply that there were firm rejections against the community, by featuring words such as "being watched out for",

“terrorised”, “threat”, “jailed”, and “against (the ideology)”. The rejections occurred in many regions in Indonesia, which does not only pervade through the government officials but also various subordinate institutions and bodies, particularly the educational ones. Referring to the initial case which triggers the furore, namely the activity of SGRC of the University of Indonesia, the initial rejections towards the LGBT community was started by carrying out narratives such as “campus”, “education”, and “the youth”. At first, the issue was about the spreading of homosexuality on campus or “LGBT has entered the campus” (*LGBT masuk kampus*). It occurred from January to March 2016, as shown by the following table:

Table 2. LGBT Issues and Campus in January-March 2016

Media	News Title	Statement
Detik.com January 24	<i>Ketua MPR: Kelompok LGBT Harus Dilarang Masuk Kampus!</i>  MPR (People’s Consultative Assembly) Spokesperson: LGBT Group Must be Forbidden to Enter Campus!	Spokesperson of People's Consultative Assembly, Zulkifli Hasan, agrees with Minister of Research, Technology, and Higher Education M. Nasir who forbids the group of lesbians, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) to enter the campus. For him, LGBT is not adhering to the Indonesian culture.
Tempo.co January 25	<i>Menteri Nasir Ungkap Soal LGBT di Kampus, Ini Ceritanya</i>  Minister Nasir Unveiled LGBT Matters in Campus, Here is the Story	Immoral conducts on campus, he continues, are surely unacceptable because it will harm the morality and the order of the university. “What is forbidden is sexual activity on campus, including showing off intimacy”.
Republika.co February 15	<i>LGBT Ancam Negeri</i>  LGBT Threatening the Nation	The community of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) has reached campus. It would be very dangerous if it was ignored. The danger of LGBT is like a virus which can spread to other people because the environment has an important role in (propagating) sexual orientation deviation.

Source: Processed media data

The TV stations, particularly the national-scale, Jakarta-based stations, have significant influence for the audience. tvOne is one of the TV stations discussing LGBT issues. At least, the issue had been discussed in three debate programmes of Indonesia Lawyers Club (ILC) from 2016 to 2018. Kompas TV, through a talk show titled AIMAN, also aired a discussion programme about the LGBT controversy on February 15, 2016. Another television station, Berita Satu, only featured the LGBT as a part of the news on February 18, 2016 (see Table 1).

The news coverage with hate speech by the Indonesian mass-media resulting in the restlessness and fear among society either heterosexuals or LGBT groups. This restlessness and fear of society is a social

phenomenon called moral panic. Essentially, the moral panic studies a social situation with a high level of pros and cons, concerning morality which generally associated with young people. The moral panic always talks about things which are thought of as "wrong" or "deviant". The moral panic theory is a multidisciplinary study emphasising on sociological concepts. The concept of moral panic is a "new" perspective in sociological theory which discusses social deviation in society. The moral panic always talks about things which considered as "wrong" or "deviant" by the society which, simply put, are dichotomised as good and bad things. It is indicated by (Critcher, 2003):

"The first moral panic must be emphasised on deviation as a condition or activity separated from the group. It must also include a threat to the moral order as a whole instead of solely local. Lastly, there is a threat to two fundamental terms within society, namely "right" and "wrong"."

The term moral panic, firstly asserted by Cohen on his book, *Folk Devils and Moral Panic* (1973), is a condition, event, people, or a group of people which is defined as threats to the values and interests of society; the phenomenon appears through certain styles and stereotypes by mass-media. Cohen's definition gives us an understanding of how Indonesian mass-media narrate LGBT as a threat to the nation of Indonesia and how they make the society believes the "threat" as truth in media coverage. Also, referring to Cohen's definition (1973), there are control agents (usually groups dealing with laws) involved in the condition, although the subject (in which case is the LGBT people or groups) is not guilty. The police and the court will still regard them guilty by referring to existing forms of behaviour and order (Cohen, 2011b). Even though there are developments of moral panics and folk devils concepts such as the considerations that those two matters are a reaction of the rebel of the working-class teenager (Feeley & Simon, 2013), such condition does not occur in Indonesia. Therefore, on a certain level, Cohen's concept is still relevant to be utilised. In this wave of moral panics, media becomes important because, according to Cohen, media is not only the source where the moral panics information is being processed and followed by media's logic but also it takes a role in defining and framing the social problem (Cohen, 2011a). Likewise, when communication technology is shifting, Cohen stated that moral panics can be quickly and easily transmitted and constructed (Cohen, 2011b). However, Cohen (2011a) also agrees that in certain levels, a moral panic is an extreme form of moral regulation that has its discursively-formed concept, as argued by Critcher (2008): first, the perceived threat to moral order is posed by an issue, second, the extent to which it is seen to be amenable to social control, and third, how far it invites ethical self-formation. Moral panics, especially those with folk devils, scored high on the first two and low on the last one.

The LGBT moral panic occurred in 2016 is not unique to Indonesia. The similar phenomenon occurred in the United States during the period of 1930-1970 when the sexual minority group of gay and lesbian had to face American laws and mass-media which practiced backlash, particularly to the gays and lesbians (Carter, 2004). For example, in 1930, *Variety* newspaper reported police's actions to "clean up" New York's streets and clubs from homosexual-related matters by saying, "If the cops have their way the effeminate class will hereafter confine its activities to the Village and Harlem" (Edsall, 2006). A well-renowned event that triggers moral panics of gays and lesbians was the Stonewall Bar Incident on June 28, 1969 (Carter, 2004):

"Stonewall, a gay bar in New York, was regarded as a relatively safe place for gays and lesbians to mingle. At that time, the homosexual relationship was illegal in the US's law. On June 28, nine police raided the bar and put the bartenders and clientele which they thought not wearing proper clothing. Stonewall was the third gay-lesbian bar raided by the police in 1969. New York itself was a very intolerant city for the existence of gays and lesbians."

The moral panic related to LGBT in the US which was started in the 1930s marked the commencement of violence towards the sexual minority group and (as with Indonesia) the moment it started becoming a political commodity (Krinsky, 2016):

"Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) histories have characterized a series of sex crime panics in the United States since the 1930s as crackdowns on queer communities and individuals. Either implicitly or often explicitly, these crackdowns have been condemned as expressions of popular punitiveness that used gay men as vehicles for drawing moral boundaries and deriving political benefit."

LGBT-related moral panics also happened in South Africa in 2006, in which there was a hate speech delivered towards gay people by South African president in his Heritage Day speech (Vincent, 2009):

"In September 2006, Jacob Zuma, speaking at Heritage Day celebrations in KwaDukuza in KwaZulu Natal province, told his audience of thousands that same sex marriages were 'a disgrace to the nation and to God'. He was speaking in the context of immanent public parliamentary hearings on the Civil Unions Bill which proposed legal sanction for gay unions. ...Zuma told the crowd that same sex marriages were a taboo that could not be tolerated in 'any normal society'."

President Zuma is not the only African president that blatantly reject gays and their rights. Ugandan President Museveni considers homosexuality as "disgusting" and signed Uganda's infamous "Kill the Gays Bill" into law in 2014. Homosexual identity in this context is being politicised in the circle of social, moral, and political power to achieve

certain goals. (Tettey, 2016).

All of the media coverage both mainstream and online has made the LGBT a folk's devil which are considered dangerous for the life of the nation and state. Subsequently, it is as if the media become the centre or truth of the knowledge about the LGBT, and then turning it into a religious-based moral panic (Cricher, 2008). The mass media build the information truth regime which supports, enforce, and spread the stigma about LGBT, which, referring to religious morality, portrays them as a dangerous entity in society.

The presence of the media, either the ones rejecting or supporting the LGBT, featuring selected informants, actually shows how the knowledge about LGBT—which will be eventually accessed by the society—produced by mass-media. The knowledge production, among many alternatives, is processed by performing media framing about the LGBT issue. The mass-media framing will eventually produce knowledge and certain discourses which are accessed by the audience, and, subsequently, produce certain meaning to the audience, which can appear in the form of public opinion:

“Public opinion which is thought of as attracting attention will make the media culturally dominate, reflect, and create the bigger issue. It can be seen from how the respective media journalists write ideas using the language they choose, who (they) choose as the informant to quote, and how they paraphrase (Gamson, Croteau, Hoynes, & Sasson, 1992).”

## **METHODOLOGY**

Theoretically, the concept of media framing departs from the assumption of Goffman (Gamson et al., 1992) about what is called *frame* (although Goffman does not directly state that the concept of frame is related to the media), namely the balance between structure and agency. On one hand, an event or experience that will be framed, yet on the other hand, each individual that will frame the event or experience. According to Goffman, the framing process involves social agents called organisational premise which affects the cognition which then “creates or constructs” and it does not come from the cognition itself; and, simultaneously, framing becomes the concept bridging cognition and culture. To this extent, the cultural analysis will help to explain how the political world is framed, and the events will be reported in an organised fashion (through media production process) and will not be accepted as it is.

In the sexuality area, a framing which is based on the disciplines of linguistics, sociology, and psychology, can, very generally, be understood as a way in which meaning can be imposed on a particular event, issue, or situation. For example, the debate of abortion has a different frame on either ‘pro-life’ (with specific frames around themes of morality) or ‘pro-choice’ (with specific frames around themes of rights), and these two different frames drastically alter how issues

around abortion are often framed as perceived. Therefore, framing can be conceptualised as a way to impose a particular meaning on a situation, event, or issue, and the frames used are not neutral entities but rather can be manipulated to convey the particular desired meaning, agenda, or intent of a person or institution (Jaworski, 2009). According to the fact that the majority of framing studies focus on analysing media content (Rose & Friedman, 2019), media frames consist of segments of information based on arguments, facts, cultural cues, and meanings (Scheufele, 2000).

The framing method in this study will employ Robert Entman's approach. There are four elements in shaping the framing in a communication process (Entman, 1993) namely: *communicator*, in which context is the journalists or editors who, consciously or not, generate certain framing through certain values, deciding things to be written or not to be written, selecting the statements to be broadcasted and being in a system of value or organised beliefs; *text*, in which context is the news text where certain framing can be perceived by the presence of certain dictions or phrases, the background of the interviewed informants, the presence of certain stereotypes, and the presence of sentences enforcing the facts of an issue; *audience* (receiver), the party which receive or access the issue, whether or not they are directly related to the issue; and *culture*, the social values of society which generally influence the framing on the news coverage.

Entman argues that the main dimensions of framing are *selection* and *salience*. The issue selection is related to the fact choosing and from which aspect the facts are selected or presented. The selection process causes some aspect to appear and the rest are eliminated. The second process is salience which emphasises certain accentuation which shows there is a problem, interpretation, moral evaluation, or recommendation and certain treatment over an issue (Entman, 1993). The selection and salience of a news issue, according to Entman, implies promoting up emphasised news aspects. The term salience itself means making news information noticed, meaningful, and remembered by the audience. The emphasis on certain news aspects will increase the probability that the audience will receive the information, give different meaning, and store them on their memories (Entman, 1993). The concept of selection is not enough because the news is not only select the words but also construct them. In other words, the concept of selection, construction, and salience are basic procedures in the framing of a message (Van Gorp, 2017).

There are four different steps to explain the framing process of an issue (Entman, 1993) which are defining problems, diagnosing causes, making moral judgments, and suggesting remedies. "Defining problems" explains how an issue or problem is perceived and explained through the news. In explaining the problem, the media usually see it from the common moral perspective of society. The "diagnosing causes" step is formed of seeking and analysing the cause. On the step of

"making moral judgments" or giving moral assessments, the media will offer or explain which kind of values or morality which can be used to discuss the problem. The last step, "suggest remedies", emphasises on offering the resolution to the problems and estimating the effect which might occur in society as the consequence of the news coverage.

The subjects of this study are two episodes of talk shows titled Indonesia Lawyers Club (ILC). ILC is a debate show on a private TV station, tvOne, discussing controversial issues circulating on the media and among society. The duration of this show is 3 (three) hours including the commercials. ILC is moderated by a prominent Indonesian media figure, Karni Ilyas. In discussing the LGBT issue, ILC brings together the groups which are thought of as supporting the LGBT *vis a vis* to the groups firmly opposing the LGBT. However, it also invites neutral people to balance the debate.

From 2016 to 2018, ILC has aired four shows discussing the LGBT issue. Among the four shows, this study examines two shows aired in 2016, namely "*LGBT Issues is Rising, How Should We React?*" (February 16, 2016) and "*LGBT is Targetting Kids*" (September 7, 2016). The reason behind the choice of the subjects is because 2016 was the year when the media violence or media backlash toward the sexual minority groups reached the peak. Moreover, the February 16 episode of ILC is considered controversial and even protested by the American Psychiatric Association. The controversy arose because of the statement delivered by one of the speakers, dr. Fidiansjah, a psychiatrist, that considered falsifying the content of PPDGJ (*Pedoman Penggolongan Diagnostik Gangguan Jiwa/The Manual of Mental Disturbance Diagnostic Classification*).

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

As previously discussed, Entman stated that two main elements to make certain news possesses certain meanings are "selection" and "salience". On ILC shows featuring LGBT issues in 2016, the "selection" is practised by the choice of the speaker—those who support (pro), who oppose (con), and who are/is neutral. As a debate show, ILC always features two opposing parties and there is always the third party which is thought of as neutral which can bridge the two opposing groups.

The two episodes are "*LGBT Issues is Rising, How Should We React?*" (February 16, 2016) and "*LGBT is Targetting Kids*" (September 7, 2016). The first episode is about the heaps LGBT issues after the news about SGRC where the sexual minority community of LGBT faced strong and simultaneous reactions in various media. Meanwhile, the second episode responds the sexual violence towards tens of boys through (human) trafficking. Both episodes feature several speakers as can be seen in the following table:

Table 3a. The Speakers on ILC Shows in 2016

The Theme of Indonesia Lawyer's Club (ILC) on TVOne	Name and Category of Debaters		
	Care for and Support the LGBT	Reject and Against LGBT	Considered as Neutral/Moderate Position
<p><b>ILC Episode "LGBT Marak, Apa Sikap Kita?"</b></p> <p><b>"LGBT Issues is Rising, How Should We React?"</b></p> <p><b>16 February 2016</b></p>	Hartoyo, Activist of LGBT Community	Ali Mustafa Yakub, Chairman of <i>Ikatan Persaudaraan Imam Masjid</i> (Brotherhood League of Mosque's Imams)	Natalius Pigai, Komnas HAM's commissioner
	Yuli Rustinawati, Activist of LGBT Community		Sujiwo Tejo, <i>Budayawan</i> (Humanist/Cultural practitioner)
	Moamar Emka, Book Author of <i>Jakarta Undercover</i>	Erlinda, KPAI Commissioner	Marsudi Syuhud, Chairman of PBNU
	Aan Anshori, Anti-Discrimination Islamic Network ( <i>Jaringan Islam Anti Diskriminasi</i> )	Fahira Idris, member of Commission III, Indonesian People's Representative Council	
	Febriana Firdaus, Journalist of RAPPLER Indonesia	Father Benny Susetyo, Interreligion Figure	
	Ade Armando, Communication Expert	Elly Risman, Psychologist	
		Dr. Fidiansyah, Psychiatrist	
	Dr. Darmawan A. Purnama, Psychiatrist		
	Idy Muzzayad, the Vice Chairman of <i>Komisi Penyiaran Indonesia</i> (Indonesian Broadcasting Commission)		

Source: The processed data of ILC 2016

Table 3b. The Speakers on ILC Shows in 2016

The Theme of Indonesia Lawyer's Club (ILC) on TVOne	Name and Category of Debaters		
	Care for and Support the LGBT	Reject and Against LGBT	Considered as Neutral/Moderate Position
<p><b>ILC Episode "LGBT Menyasar Anak-anak"</b></p> <p><b>"LGBT is Targetting Kids"</b></p> <p><b>7 September 2016</b></p>	Hartoyo, Activist of LGBT	Brigjen Pol Agung Setya, <i>Dir. Tipideksus Bareskrim Polri.</i> (Director of Special Economic Crimes, Criminal Investigation Agency, Indonesian National Police)	Roostien Ilyas, Children Issue Observer
	Magdalena Sitorus, <i>Komnas Perempuan</i> (National Commission for Women)	Asrorun Ni'am S, Chairman of KPAI (Indonesian Commission for Children Protection)	Siti Sapurah, Activist of P2T2A Bali (Integrated Service Centre of Women Empowerment and Children Protection, Bali Region)
	Ade Armando, Social Observer	Abdul Malik Haramain, Vice Chairman of <i>Komisi VIII DPR RI</i> (Commission VIII, Indonesian People's Representative Council)	Bambang Yulianto, the Lawyer of Suspect AR, R, and AU
	Iman Tejarahmana, Acting Secretary of <i>Komisi Penanggulangan AIDS Jabar</i> (AIDS Mitigation Commission for West Java Province)	Irjen Pol Boy Rafli Amar, Chief of PR Division, Indonesian National Police	Milah, the Neighbour of Suspect AR
		Yohanna Yembise, Minister of Women Empowerment & Children Protection	Sukarto, Dormitory Guard
		Komaruddin, Chief of Neighbourhood Association no. 01/08, Harjasari, South Bogor	Hanny Warouw, Sociologist
			Edi Suharto, the Chief of Educational, Research, and Social Counseling Agency ( <i>Badan Pendidikan, Penelitian, dan Penyuluhan Sosial</i> )

Source: The processed data of ILC 2016

Besides selection and salience, Entman's framing methods are examined using these four analytical steps, namely *defining problem*, *diagnosing causes*, *making moral judgment*, and *suggesting remedies*, as illustrated in this following table:

Table 4: The Framing of 2016 ILC Talkshow Program

Analytical Methods	Two Episodes of 2016 ILC Talkshow	
	Episode 1 16 February 2016	Episode 2 7 September 2016
Defining Problem (DP)	<p>LGBT is a deviation and the majority people must reject the existence of LGBT</p> <p>The movement of promotion or propaganda that LGBT is dangerous</p> <p>There are many discriminative actions towards the sexual minority group of LGBT and the state never did anything</p>	<p>The evidence that LGBT is dangerous is the disclosure of boy prostitution network for gays whose modus was HIV/AIDS counseling. The victims of the prostitution network were more than 100 kids.</p>
Diagnose Cause (DC)	<p>The media is thought of as responsible for the spread of hate speech towards LGBT</p> <p>LGBT in Indonesia is a very massive movement, organised, and supported by large sum of money</p> <p>The appearance of LGBT in the media such as TV and giving them the stage is considered as an LGBT promotion</p>	<p>LGBT targetting children, endangering the youth</p> <p>The LGBT movement is thought of as massive and structural</p> <p>The existing laws are not enough to criminalised LGBT groups</p>
Managing Moral Judgement (MMJ)	<p>Convincing that LGBT is a contagious disease and must be rejected to save the nation</p> <p>There is no law, societal, or religious norm which approves LGBT</p>	
Suggest Remedies (SR)	<p>LGBT can be cured, the role of family is very important in educating the children</p> <p>Urging people to reject LGBT</p> <p>The revision of KUHP (Indonesian Penal Code) must include LGBT and adultery</p>	

Source: Processed data of ILC 2016 episodes

## Analysis

The concept of selection is very palpable on the list of speakers for both episodes. The number of people supporting or emphasising the LGBT issue is less than the speakers who resist it. The supporting group is more likely from the civil society, whereas the contradicting party is more likely to be presented by the state and government officials, religious figures, or people with law authority. In other words, through this show, ILC wants the audience to know that the existence of the

LGBT is rejected by the state. By presenting more LGBT-opposing speakers than the supporting ones, the talk show also emphasises the impartiality of both society and the state towards the group. Besides, as can be seen in Table 3, the concept of salience is quite observable in the choice of the invited speakers.

Besides selection and salience, the four aspects of the framing process of an issue (Entman, 1993) is dissected as follows: First, *defining problems*. In defining the problems, the media usually see them from the viewpoint of the common moral values of society. On the researched particular programme, the perspective of the talks related to LGBT tends to frame that this sexual minority group is immoral and deviating from religious teachings; that they dared to show off and believed to do high-scale promotion supported with an extraordinarily large sum of money. The "*define problems*" aspect of the first episode discussed more the LGBT problems which were considered as distressing.

Secondly, "*diagnose cause*" or looking for and analysing the causes. The cause of the LGBT furore is different on both episodes. Nevertheless, the second episode seems to answer the "worries" of the group opposing LGBT. By referring to the table 4, it is because the children that become the target of LGBT. ILC targets the LGBT cases by framing the issue associated with the case of boy prostitution whose the leader identified as gay, as well as the JR AILA lawsuit which was rejected by the Constitutional Court. On the latter case, the Constitutional Court's decision was thought of as allowing or taking sides on the LGBT. The speakers believed that the LGBT was more than individuals, but a massive movement. The rejection of the lawsuit was not following the discourse which they tried to produce, namely by rendering the LGBT as the abnormal entity which needs to be criminalised. However, the group whose emphasises LGBT groups in the first episode stated the raise of LGBT issues was entwined with the role of the media which spread hate speech. It was unveiled by Febriana Firdaus who was then one of the journalists of Rappler.com. Ironically, many of the hate speeches, as written on the findings of Human Rights Watch in 2016, were originated from the government which supposed to protect the group.

Thirdly, "*making a moral judgment*". In this aspect, the media will offer or explain which values or morality used to discuss the problem. There was no significant difference between the first and second episode—both episodes produced more or less the same framing—except for the fact that the resenting group was given much more portion in the second episode. Also, the second episode involved parties considered as having the power to determine the "fate" of the LGBT community, namely the statesmen/women, lawmen/women, and people representing religions. By giving a large portion to speakers with religious and law background, the ILC show tried to bring the LGBT issues to the domain of morality, in which case the LGBT was thought of as something dangerous.

Fourthly, “*suggest remedies*” or offering the resolution to the problems and estimating the effect which might occur to society as the consequence of the news. In this respect, the framing between the first and second episode was more or less the same. Both of which discussed that the “sexual deviation” of LGBT is curable, one of which way was strengthening the role of parents in children. ILC even invited an influencing speaker like Mahfud MD who convinced the audience that the decision of Constitutional Court was not exactly right.

The framing analysis of the two ILC episodes shows that television becomes a medium to discuss various matters including sexuality debates between sacred and profane spaces, as asserted by Arthurs (2004) that in television, sexual morality in public and private spaces such as adultery, childhood sexual abuse, sadomasochism, homosexual rights, sexual abuse, and prostitution are discussed. The debate of ILC implies that the heteronormative values rule the discursive area about LGBT in Indonesia. The shift or transformation in society in Indonesia concerning the sexual minority group of LGBT is inseparable to the wave of political campaigns on identity-rights recognition, which is called by Jane Arthurs (2004) as “new social movement” among the feminist, gay, and lesbian which spread throughout the globe, care for “sexual citizenship” including issues such as homosexual-right recognition, legal abortion, and contraceptive pills, which suggested by Altman (2001) as the global sex. The transformation is entwined to the political agenda and the emergence of various laws and regulation concerning the matter (Arthurs, 2004); (Altman, 2001).

Several global conditions affecting the occurrence of LGBT moral panic is connected to the role of mass media. More and more countries allowing the sexual minority groups to get the same rights as the heterosexuals such as marriage. Several countries such as Portugal (2004), Argentina and Iceland (2010), Denmark (2012), Uruguay, Brazil, and New Zealand (2013), Scotland (2014), Ireland (2015), and the United States (2015) has legalised the same-sex marriage (Supreme Court of the United States legalised same-sex marriage for all U.S. states on June 25, 2015). The social media Twitter made it viral using hashtag #LoveWIns (Avianne Tan, 2015). It seems that the acceptance of the U.S. in homosexual marriage becomes one of the reasons of the high level of homophobia among Indonesian society because one of the reasons behind the rejection towards the sexual minority group is the same-sex marriage concept. Many responses to the issue are framed on religious moral perspectives, particularly from the viewpoint of heavenly religions such as Islam, Catholic, and Protestant.

The problems arising was not only the pros and cons concerning the LGBT but also the unleashing of hatred and discrimination as well as the growing stigma followed by arbitrary persecutions. TV stations discussing LGBT problems as a part of sexuality framed the issue following the general perspective of the heteronormative Indonesian society. The media still regards LGBT issues as sexual taboo which is

inappropriate, deviant, contagious, and against the religious norms as well as dangerous for the youth. The taboo refers to the concept of sexuality which is thought of as merely "having sex" by the media; while sexuality is more complex than mere having sex. It is about the social rules, economic structures, political battles, and religious ideologies that surround physical expressions of intimacy and the relationships within which such intimacy takes place (Cornwall, Corrêa, & Jolly, 2008).

The framing in the two ILC episodes in 2016 has confirmed the fact that mass media plays a pivotal role in driving the homophobic stigma among society. In the most part of the first observed episode, "*LGBT Issues is Rising, How Should We React?*", it was obvious that there were attempts to drive the audience assumption that the LGBT individuals are deviant and unaccepted and, thus, the society should reject them. It does not stop there; the discussion also tries to drive the speakers and audience to think that the LGBT community must be criminalised through a set of laws and regulations. This type of backlash has made the LGBT community, using Cohen's term (Cohen, 2011a), a "folk's devil".

A more positive image of LGBT could be constructed by Indonesian TV stations. However, the significant religious influence among society, particularly pressure from groups or individual on behalf of Islam, has made it hard for the media to do so. As a result, the information spread, passing through the media control over the information about LGBT, are more inclined to take a side on the homophobic majority group (Rust, 1996):

"Unfortunately, efforts to include positive LesBiGay images in the media are often frustrated by the counterefforts of people who believe, usually on the basis of religious teachings, that sexuality should only be expressed within the context of heterosexual marriage and who wish to impose this belief on others via the control of information."

The argument of Rust (1996) reinforces the interpretation of what has happened on two episodes of ILC in 2016, in which the labelling and the stigmatisation that the LGBTs are dangerous, deviant, and sick are addressed to them by referring solely to their non-heterosexual same-sex sexual orientation. The discussions were more focused on the problems of sexual relationship/having sex, indicating as if they were afraid that same-sex marriage was going to be legalised. It occurs because the conception of gender and sexuality are mostly heteronormative (Cornwall et al., 2008) which has become the ideology of most of the people. The propaganda of the use of heteronormative values in viewing the LGBT issue is performed massively in schools, family, and the media. To an extreme extent, it will indirectly foster homophobia among society.

## CONCLUSION

The LGBT moral panics framed on the two episodes of ILC shows are as follows. First, the state never tolerates the existence of LGBT and assumes that the sexual minority group is dangerous and the rejection must be enforced using proper laws and regulations. Second, the ILC episodes also indicate that the emergence and the strengthening of the LGBT issue in 2016 cannot be separated from the influence of the strengthening of right-wing Islamic politics. And third, the ILC episodes also show that the state promotes excessive fear over the LGBT community or homophobia. This research can be continued by analysing the television programmes on the following years of 2017 and 2018, considering the LGBT-related debated with different topics. The future researches can also develop a framing method that being driven towards discourses such as research conducted by Pan and Kosicki (1993).

## REFERENCES

- Altman, D. (2001). *Global Sex*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Arthurs, J. (2004). *Television and sexuality*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).
- Avianne Tan. (2015). Celebrations Break Out After Same-Sex Marriage Legalized Nationwide. Retrieved July 29, 2019, from <https://abcnews.go.com/US/celebrations-break-sex-marriage-legalized-nationwide/story?id=32051778>
- Carter, D. (2004). *Stonewall: The riots that sparked the gay revolution*. Macmillan.
- Cohen, S. (2011a). *Folk devils and moral panics*. Routledge.
- Cohen, S. (2011b). Whose side were we on? The undeclared politics of moral panic theory. *Crime, Media, Culture*, 7(3), 237–243.
- Cornwall, A., Corrêa, S., & Jolly, S. (2008). Development with a body: making the connections between sexuality, human rights and development. *Development with a Body: Sexuality, Human Rights & Development*, 1–21.
- Critcher, C. (2003). *Moral panics and the media*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).
- Critcher, C. (2008). Widening the focus: Moral panics as moral regulation. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 49(1), 17–34.
- Edsall, N. C. (2006). *Toward Stonewall: Homosexuality and society in the modern Western world*. University of Virginia Press.
- Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51–58.
- Feeley, M. M., & Simon, J. (2013). Folk devils and moral panics: An appreciation from North America. In *Crime, social control and human rights* (pp. 67–80). Willan.
- Gamson, W. A., Croteau, D., Hoynes, W., & Sasson, T. (1992). Media images and the social construction of reality. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 18(1), 373–393.

- Hanz Jimenez Salim. (2014). Mendikbud Tak Setuju Ada Pendidikan Seks Usia Dini di Sekolah. Retrieved August 1, 2019, from <https://www.liputan6.com/news/read/2045715/mendikbud-tak-setuju-ada-pendidikan-seks-usia-dini-di-sekolah>
- Human Rights Watch. (2016). *Permainan Politik Ini Menghancurkan Hidup Kami: Kelompok LGBT Indonesia dalam Ancaman*.
- Jaworski, B. K. (2009). Reproductive justice and media framing: a case-study analysis of problematic frames in the popular media. *Sex Education, 9*(1), 105–121.
- Krinsky, C. (2016). Public Punitiveness, Mediation, and Expertise in Sexual Psychopath Policies. In *The Ashgate Research Companion to Moral Panics* (pp. 111–128). Routledge.
- Kristian Erdianto. (2016). Arus Pelangi Catat 142 Serangan terhadap LGBT pada Awal Tahun Ini. Retrieved July 26, 2019, from <https://nasional.kompas.com/read/2016/08/11/20580231/arus.pelangi.catat.142.serangan.terhadap.lgbt.pada.awal.tahun.ini?page=all>
- Nurmila, N., Ilahi, N., Harsono, H. S., Julkarnaen, I., Bennett, L. R., Davies, S. G., & Hidayana, I. M. (n.d.). *Seksualitas di Indonesia: Politik Seksual, Kesehatan, Keragaman, dan Representasi*. Yayasan Pustaka Obor Indonesia.
- Pan, Z., & Kosicki, G. M. (1993). Framing analysis: An approach to news discourse. *Political Communication, 10*(1), 55–75.
- Rose, I. D., & Friedman, D. B. (2019). Framing gender identity and sexual orientation: media influence on young men who have sex with men's health. *Sex Education, 19*(5), 614–626.
- Rothblum, E. D., & Bond, L. A. (1996). *Preventing heterosexism and homophobia* (Vol. 17). Sage.
- Rust, P. C. (1996). Finding a sexual identity and community: Therapeutic implications and cultural assumptions in scientific models of coming out. *Primary Prevention of Psychopathology, 17*, 87–123.
- Scheufele, D. A. (2000). Agenda-Setting, Priming, and Framing Revisited: Another Look at Cognitive Effects of Political. *Mass Communication & Society*. <https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327825MCS0323>
- Tetty, W. J. (2016). Homosexuality, moral panic, and politicized homophobia in Ghana: Interrogating discourses of moral entrepreneurship in Ghanaian media. *Communication, Culture & Critique, 9*(1), 86–106.
- Van Gorp, B. (2017). The Constructionist Approach to Framing: Bringing Culture Back In (vol 57, pg 60, 2007). *Journal of Communication, 67*(2), 303.
- Vincent, L. (2009). Moral panic and the politics of populism. *Representation, 45*(2), 213–221.