Jurnal
Dialektika Keadilan

Volume 2 No 1
Published on May 2026

The Indonesian Broadcasting Commission from the Perspective of Government Public Relations: A Juridical Study on Authority and Public Communication

Manasi Kanal Haq[1], Tsuraya Hasna Azizah[2], Dede Lutfia[3]
[1,2,3]Universitas Al-Azhar Indonesia

*Corresponden Autor
Email : sika.haq@gmail.com

Abstract

The Indonesian Broadcasting Commission (*Komisi Penyiaran Indonesia* / KPI) is an independent state institution vested with the authority to regulate and oversee broadcasting activities in Indonesia under Law Number 32 of 2002 on Broadcasting. In carrying out its functions, KPI does not merely act as a regulator but also serves as a representative of government public relations, bridging communication between the state, broadcasting institutions, and the public. This study aims to analyze KPI's role from a Government Public Relations perspective and to examine its legal authority in building transparent and accountable public communication. The study employs a library research method with a qualitative approach, through analysis of legislation and communication science literature. The findings indicate that, normatively, KPI possesses strong legal legitimacy in its broadcasting oversight function; however, in public communication practice, challenges remain in implementing the two-way symmetrical communication model that is considered ideal in Government Public Relations. This study concludes that optimizing KPI's role as both a regulator and a public communication institution requires the strengthening of transparency, public participation, and consistency in regulatory enforcement in order to enhance public trust and institutional legitimacy.

Keywords : *Indonesian Broadcasting Commission, Government Public Relations, Authority, Public Communication, Broadcasting Regulation*

Copyright © 2026 Jurnal Dialektika Keadilan
This is an open access article which permits unlimited use, distribution and reproduction in any medium so long as the original work is properly cited.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Indonesian Broadcasting Commission (KPI) is an independent state institution established under Law Number 32 of 2002 on Broadcasting, which holds authority to regulate and oversee the implementation of broadcasting in Indonesia. This authority encompasses the establishment of broadcasting conduct guidelines, broadcast program standards, as well as the imposition of administrative sanctions against violations of broadcast content. In practice, every policy and decision issued by the KPI is not only juridical in nature, but also has a direct impact on the public sphere.(Wahyudin, 2026).

This condition indicates that the exercise of KPI's authority cannot be separated from the aspect of public communication. As a state institution that directly interacts with the public through its policies and decisions, KPI also factually carries out a governmental communication function. Therefore, an analysis of KPI becomes relevant to be examined from the perspective of Government Public Relations, particularly in assessing how such legal authority is communicated in a transparent, participatory, and accountable manner to the public.(Artarini, 2024).

In this context, every decision made by KPI does not stop at the legal-formal aspect, but also demands a process of information delivery that is clear, argumentative, and accountable. It is precisely at this point that the dimension of governmental communication becomes relevant. As an institution within the state governance structure, KPI factually carries out a public communication function aimed at building understanding, maintaining policy legitimacy, as well as managing public perception and public participation. (Artarini, 2024).

The urgency of this approach is further reinforced when linked to governmental public relations management as regulated in the Regulation of the Minister of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform Number 30 of 2011, which emphasizes the importance of transparency, accountability, and two-way communication between government agencies and the public. Thus, the analysis of KPI should not only be viewed from the perspective of juridical authority, but also needs to be placed within the framework of Government Public Relations (GPR)(Peraturan Menteri Pendayagunaan Aparatur Negara dan Reformasi Birokrasi Nomor 30 Tahun 2011 tentang Pedoman Umum Tata Kelola Kehumasan di Lingkungan Instansi Pemerintah, 2011). Based on these considerations, the subsequent discussion will examine how the concept of Government Public Relations is used to understand the implementation of GPR authority, particularly in the management of public information, policy communication strategies, as well as efforts to build trust and legitimacy in the public broadcasting sphere.

A number of previous studies have examined the role of the Indonesian Broadcasting

Commission in the broadcasting system from various perspectives. Research on consumer protection positions KPI as an instrument for overseeing broadcast content based on Law Number 8 of 1999 on Consumer Protection and Law Number 32 of 2002 on Broadcasting, with a focus on the enforcement function against violations. Other studies regarding KPI's authority emphasize legal legitimacy in broadcasting supervision, yet have not examined how such authority is communicated to the public. (Syukri, 2024).

Research related to media literacy has touched on the aspect of communication, yet remains within the framework of one-way education. Meanwhile, studies on regulatory governance position KPI as part of the media control system, without linking it to the role of state public communication. Thus, previous studies have still focused on supervisory functions, consumer protection, media literacy, and regulation. No study has yet integrated a juridical analysis of KPI's authority with the perspective of Government Public Relations. Therefore, the research gap lies in the fact that KPI has not yet been examined as an actor of state public communication. The novelty of this research is to reposition KPI not only as a broadcasting regulator, but also as a Government Public Relations institution that exercises its legal authority through transparent, participatory, and accountable public communication. (Itok Dwi Kurniawan, 2023). From the explanation and gaps in previous research, the authors will outline the problem formulation, which includes the following: How is KPI's authority juridically positioned within the state's public communication system? Does the exercise of KPI's authority reflect the function of Government Public Relations? Is KPI merely a legal regulator or also an actor in state broadcasting supervision?

This research aims to analyze the juridical position of the Indonesian Broadcasting Commission's authority within the state's public communication system, as well as to examine the extent to which the exercise of such authority reflects the function of Government Public Relations. Furthermore, this research also aims to identify whether KPI serves solely as a legal regulator in broadcasting as stipulated under Law Number 32 of 2002 on Broadcasting, or has assumed a broader role as a state public communication actor that bridges the relationship between the government, broadcasting institutions, and the public. Accordingly, this research is directed toward providing a comprehensive understanding of the integration between legal authority and public communication functions in the institutional practice of KPI.

II. METHOD

This research is a qualitative study employing the library research method. The materials examined include primary legal sources in the form of legislation, particularly Law Number 32

of 2002 on Broadcasting and the Regulation of the Minister of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform Number 30 of 2011, as well as secondary sources comprising scientific journals, books, and official institutional documents of KPI relating to Government Public Relations and public communication. Data collection was carried out through documentation techniques, namely the inventory and review of relevant legal materials and communication literature. The data were analyzed using a normative juridical and descriptive-analytical approach, by describing KPI's legal authority and subsequently analyzing it within the theoretical framework of Government Public Relations and the symmetric two-way communication model.

III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Broadcasting derives from the word "siaran" which means a message or series of messages in the form of sound and/or images transmitted to the public through electronic devices such as radio and television. The broadcasting process encompasses activities including the production of broadcast material in the studio, preparation of broadcast content, and transmission through transmitters and antennas so that it can be received by listeners or viewers. In English, broadcasting refers to the entire process of delivering broadcast programs from the production stage until they are received by the audience. In Indonesia, the implementation of broadcasting is grounded in Pancasila and the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia as regulated under Law Number 32 of 2002 on Broadcasting, which emphasizes the principles of benefit, justice, legal certainty, diversity, ethics, freedom, and responsibility in its implementation. (Syukri, 2024).

The Indonesian Broadcasting Commission (KPI) as regulated under Law Number 32 of 2002 on Broadcasting is an independent state institution that holds authority in regulating various matters relating to the implementation of broadcasting in Indonesia. This position indicates that KPI plays an important role in maintaining the governance of the broadcasting world so that it operates in accordance with applicable regulations. Article 8 paragraph (1) of the Broadcasting Law states that KPI represents a form of public participation that functions to accommodate aspirations and represent public interests in the field of broadcasting. This indicates that KPI was established to ensure that the interests of the public remain the primary concern in the implementation of broadcasting. Furthermore, the broadcasting system in Indonesia requires fair and dignified regulation, particularly in the governance of broadcast content. Such regulation is important given the rapid development of media, which cannot be left without supervision. Moreover, broadcasting frequencies constitute a limited resource whose utilization cannot be entirely surrendered to market mechanisms, but rather needs to be

regulated so that its use can provide the greatest possible benefit to society. (KPI, 2010).

Based on the foregoing description, it can be understood that broadcasting is a strategic sector that is not only concerned with the dissemination of information to the public, but also involves public interests that must be managed responsibly. Therefore, the existence of a supervisory institution such as the Indonesian Broadcasting Commission is of paramount importance in ensuring that the implementation of broadcasting continues to operate in accordance with legal principles, ethics, and the interests of society at large. In this context, it is necessary to further examine the juridical position and boundaries of KPI's authority within the public communication system in Indonesia. Such an examination is important to understand the extent of KPI's role in regulating, supervising, and ensuring that the implementation of broadcasting operates in accordance with the applicable legal framework.

The Juridical Position of KPI's Authority in the State's Public Communication System

The Indonesian Broadcasting Commission (KPI) is an independent state institution established under Law Number 32 of 2002 on Broadcasting with the purpose of regulating and overseeing the implementation of broadcasting in Indonesia. The presence of KPI reflects public participation in the national broadcasting system, as this institution functions as a channel for public aspirations while simultaneously representing the interests of society in the field of broadcasting. Thus, KPI does not merely serve as a supervisory institution, but also as an institution that ensures broadcasting activities operate in accordance with democratic principles, public interests, and applicable legal provisions. As an independent institution, KPI holds a number of authorities in the regulation and supervision of broadcasting, including:

1. Establishing broadcast program standards;
2. Drafting regulations and establishing broadcasting conduct guidelines;
3. Supervising the implementation of regulations, broadcasting conduct guidelines, and broadcast program standards;
4. Imposing sanctions against violations of broadcasting provisions; and
5. Conducting coordination and cooperation with the government, broadcasting institutions, and the public.(Undang-Undang Nomor 32 Tahun 2002 Tentang Penyiaran, 2002).

Based on these authorities, it can be understood that KPI does not solely carry out administrative supervisory functions, but also holds the authority to assess and determine the occurrence of violations in the implementation of broadcasting(Asshiddiqie, 2010). In practice, KPI is authorized to conduct examinations of alleged violations and impose sanctions on broadcasting institutions proven to have violated applicable provisions. Although the final product does not take the form of a court ruling, such authority demonstrates a quasi-judicial

character, as KPI possesses the authority to assess broadcasting violations while simultaneously imposing administrative sanctions against parties that violate broadcasting provisions. The Indonesian Broadcasting Commission (KPI) is an independent institution that functions to regulate and oversee the implementation of broadcasting in Indonesia. KPI consists of a Central KPI with 9 members and Regional KPIs with 7 members at the provincial level. From among these members, a chairperson and deputy chairperson are elected by and from the members themselves, serving a term of 3 years and eligible for re-election for one subsequent term. Based on Article 9 of Law Number 32 of 2002 on Broadcasting, KPI has several primary functions, namely establishing broadcast program standards, drafting and establishing broadcasting conduct guidelines, supervising the implementation of broadcasting regulations, imposing sanctions for violations that occur, as well as coordinating with the government, broadcasting institutions, and the public. In carrying out its duties, KPI may also be assisted by experts and a secretariat to support the implementation of its broadcasting supervisory functions (Undang-Undang Nomor 32 Tahun 2002 Tentang Penyiaran, 2002).

In practice, the implementation of broadcasting in Indonesia still faces various issues, such as the broadcast of scenes depicting violence, gambling, and the dissemination of false information or hoaxes that potentially cause negative impacts on society. Therefore, the existence of KPI plays an important role in maintaining the quality and ethics of broadcasting so that it remains consistent with the objectives of the national broadcasting system. The provision of Article 36 paragraph (1) of Law Number 32 of 2002 on Broadcasting affirms that broadcast content must contain elements of information, education, and entertainment, as well as provide benefits for the development of the intellectual capacity, character, and morality of society, while simultaneously supporting national unity and reflecting the religious and cultural values of Indonesia in alignment with the principles contained in the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Israel. Thus, supervision of the appropriateness of broadcast content becomes an extremely important aspect in ensuring that broadcasting programs do not conflict with applicable legal provisions(Mujahid, 2025).

By taking into account the authority held by KPI in regulating, supervising, and imposing sanctions against broadcasting violations, it can be seen that the role of this institution is not merely normative and administrative in nature. All policies, decisions, and supervisory actions carried out by KPI fundamentally carry significant communication implications for the public, broadcasting institutions, and other stakeholders. In this context, the implementation of KPI cannot be separated from the process of information dissemination, the formation of public understanding, and efforts to build legitimacy over the broadcasting policies adopted (Pranoto,

2020). This indicates that KPI's function is not only related to the broadcasting regulatory party, but also to strategic governmental communication practices. This is because every act of supervision, imposition of sanctions, and formulation of broadcasting guidelines requires a process of transparent, educative, and accountable communication to the public. Therefore, an analysis of the implementation of KPI's authority becomes relevant when examined through the perspective of Government Public Relations (GPR), which views government communication as an important instrument in building public trust, explaining policies, and creating reciprocal relationships between state institutions and society. (Suprawoto, 2018).

From this perspective, GPR is not only understood as an informative public relations function, but also as part of strategic communication management that supports the successful implementation of public policy(Cutlip, Center, dan Broom, 2013). Thus, the study of KPI within the Government Public Relations (GPR) framework becomes important to examine the extent to which the implementation of broadcasting supervisory authority is also accompanied by public communication practices capable of enhancing public understanding, participation, and legitimacy toward broadcasting policies in Indonesia.

Government Public Relations is defined as a communication management function that focuses on the interaction between citizens and the government or regulatory institutions, aimed at conveying government policies, programs, and performance to the public in an open manner, so as to create public understanding, trust, and support for the policies being implemented. This is fundamentally different from business public relations which is more profit-oriented; GPR is oriented toward public service, the dissemination of policy information, and the formation of positive public opinion toward government programs carried out by KPI. (Ruslan, 2016).

Analysis of the Implementation of KPI's Authority from the Perspective of Government Public Relations

The question of whether the implementation of the Indonesian Broadcasting Commission's (KPI) authority reflects the function of Government Public Relations (GPR) can be answered through the synchronization between the institution's legal actions and the principles of governmental communication. In this context, GPR is not understood as a static public relations activity, but rather as a strategic communication management function aimed at building mutual understanding, support, and policy legitimacy in the eyes of the public. (Fahmi Fadhilah, Hendro Saptono, 2019). Based on the analysis of KPI's institutional practices, there are three main indicators that demonstrate that the implementation of KPI's juridical authority has substantively reflected the GPR function:

1. Information Dissemination and Policy Transparency

Referring to the Regulation of the Minister of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform Number 30 of 2011, government agencies are obligated to disseminate information regarding policies and performance in a transparent manner. KPI reflects this through the publication of every administrative sanction decision and the socialization of P3SPS policies. Legal actions in the form of written reprimands or the suspension of broadcast programs do not merely serve as sanctions for broadcasting institutions, but also function as GPR instruments to inform the public about content appropriateness standards. Thus, KPI carries out a public information function to shape collective understanding regarding the boundaries of ethics in the national broadcasting sphere.(Syukri, 2024).

2. *Two-Way Symmetrical Communication*

One of the pillars of effective GPR according to James Grunig (1984) is the existence of symmetric two-way communication between the institution and its public. KPI implements this principle through public complaint channels as mandated by the Broadcasting Law. KPI's authority in receiving, processing, and following up on public complaints represents a manifestation of the GPR function as a communication facilitator. This proves that KPI does not merely serve as a top-down regulator, but rather as an institution that is responsive to social concerns, thereby creating a dialogue between state policy and public aspirations. (Hunt, 1984).

3. Building Legitimacy and Public Accountability

From the GPR perspective, every action taken by a state institution requires legitimacy so as not to be regarded as an act of arbitrariness. KPI employs public communication strategies to explain the rationale behind every sanction or regulation issued. These efforts aim to build public trust that the authority being exercised is for the purpose of protecting the interests of the audience, such as child protection and the dignity of the nation. Without the integration of the GPR function, KPI's juridical authority would be difficult to broadly accept within a democratic public sphere. In the context of the Indonesian Broadcasting Commission, this function can be reflected in public communication activities regarding broadcasting supervision, the delivery of sanctions to broadcasting institutions, as well as public education relating to broadcast content standards.(Fahmi Fadhilah, Hendro Saptono, 2019).

The Role of the Indonesian Broadcasting Commission as a Legal Regulator and State Broadcasting Supervisory Actor

The Central Indonesian Broadcasting Commission (KPI Pusat) is an independent broadcasting institution born out of the mandate of Law Number 32 of 2002 on Broadcasting.

Article 1 paragraph 13, which consists of the Central KPI established at the central level and domiciled in the state capital and the Regional KPI (KPID) established at the provincial level and domiciled in the provincial capital, constitutes the legal foundation that legitimizes the establishment of KPI with the purpose of regulating all matters concerning broadcasting in Indonesia. The position of the Central KPI as a regulator in the field of broadcasting represents one part of the manifestation of public participation in supervising broadcasts, both as a channel for aspirations and as a representative of public interests. This is also stipulated in Article 8 paragraph 1 of the Broadcasting Law. The political legitimacy for KPI's position in subsequent state life is explicitly regulated by Article 7 paragraph 2 of the Broadcasting Law, wherein KPI's position is also established as an independent state institution that regulates matters concerning broadcasting. Therefore, in realizing broadcasting that is balanced, fair, diverse, and responsible, the role of KPI as a supervisory institution in overseeing all broadcasts on Indonesian television is necessary. Conceptually, KPI's position as a quasi-state institution, or in other terms commonly known as an auxiliary state institution, or also commonly referred to as an independent state institution(Pengawasan et al., 2018).

The regulation of broadcasting in Indonesia is under the supervision of the Indonesian Broadcasting Commission (KPI) as stipulated in the Broadcasting Law, particularly Article 7. In carrying out its functions, KPI establishes two main instruments, namely the Broadcasting Conduct Guidelines (P3) and the Broadcast Program Standards (SPS). P3 serves as a guide in the production process of broadcast programs, while SPS regulates the appropriateness standards of broadcast content that may be aired to the public. Amid the development of modern media, the quality of television broadcasts has become an important concern, given that many programs are more oriented toward achieving ratings rather than content substance. In this context, KPI as a regulator seeks to ensure that television broadcasts are not only entertaining in nature, but also contain educative and informative values for society. However, in practice, there are still broadcasting institutions that tend to disregard the established standards and provisions in pursuit of popularity and profit(Arafah et al., 2019).

This condition is reflected in the increasing number of reprimands issued by KPI against various television programs. Nevertheless, not all parties provide adequate responses to such sanctions. This issue involves three main actors, namely KPI as the supervisor, broadcasting institutions as content producers, and the public as broadcast consumers. The main challenge in the broadcasting industry lies in the effort to balance business interests with content quality that conforms to P3SPS standards. On the other hand, there is a shared awareness regarding the importance of broadcasting regulation in facing the impact of globalization, particularly in

maintaining the quality and security of information conveyed to the public. Therefore, a consistent commitment is required from broadcasting institutions to not be solely profit-oriented, but to also consider the social responsibility over the content being broadcast. (Mujahid, 2025).

IV. CONCLUSION

Based on the findings of this study, this research concludes that KPI holds a juridically strong position of authority within the state's public communication system. Based on Law Number 32 of 2002 on Broadcasting, KPI does not merely carry out technical regulatory functions, but also occupies a strategic position as a state institution that directly interacts with the public through policies, sanctions, and broadcasting guidelines. The entirety of such authority positions KPI as a state public communication actor that cannot be separated from the responsibility of conveying information in a transparent, accountable, and participatory manner. The substantive implementation of KPI's authority has also reflected the function of Government Public Relations, which is manifested in three indicators, namely the dissemination of information and policy transparency through the publication of sanctions and the socialization of P3SPS, two-way communication mechanisms through public complaint channels, as well as efforts to build legitimacy and public accountability through rational communication regarding every supervisory policy. Nevertheless, the application of the symmetric two-way communication model still faces challenges in terms of consistency and the reach of public participation. Thus, KPI does not solely serve as a legal regulator, but has assumed a broader role as a GPR institution that bridges the relationship between the government, broadcasting institutions, and the public.This research recommends that KPI strengthen structured two-way public communication mechanisms through periodic public consultation forums and the open publication of supervisory reports. To the House of Representatives and the Government, it is recommended that the revision of the Broadcasting Law incorporate explicit provisions regarding KPI's obligation toward transparent and accountable public communication. For academics, this research opens space for further empirical studies to measure the effectiveness of KPI's GPR practices as well as the quality of public participation in the national broadcasting supervisory system.

REFERENCES

Arafah, S., Budiman, & Nurliah. (2019). Analisi Pelanggaran Pedoman Perilaku Penyiaran Dan STANDAR Program Siaran (P3SPS) Pada Adegan Ciuman Bibir Dalam Tayangan. *eJournal Ilmu Komunikasi*, *7*(1), 69–82.

Artarini, H. (2024). Strategi Komunikasi Organisasi Dalam Menunjang Pelayanan Publik Komisi Penyiaran Indonesia (Studi Kasus KPI Pusat). *Fakultas Ilmu Komunikasi*, *IV*(2), 1–18. https://jurnal.uic.ac.id/Lens/article/view/242

Asshiddiqie, J. (2010). *Perkembangan dan Konsolidasi Lembaga Negara Pasca Reformasi*. Sinar Grafika.

Fahmi Fadhilah, Hendro Saptono, dan S. (2019). Analisis Yuridis Peranan KPI Sebagai Tanggung Jawab Profesional Ditinjau dari UU No. 8/1999 dan UU No. 32/2002. *Diponegoro Law Journal*, *8*(1), 264–280.

Hunt, J. E. G. dan T. (1984). *Managing Public Relations*.

Indonesia, K. P. (2010). *Buku Tahunan Komisi Penyiaran Indonesia 2010*. Komisi Penyiaran Indonesia.

Itok Dwi Kurniawan, I. S. dan S. (2023). Tata Kelola Media Digital Di Indonesia: Tantangan Dan Peluang Dalam Revisi Undang-Undang Penyiaran. *Jurnal Hukum Lex Generalis. Vol.4. No.12(2023)*, *4*(12), 1–11.

Mujahid, M. N. (2025). Peran KPID Dalam Penerapan Hukum Perlindungan Konsumen Terhadap Pelanggaran Penyiaran Televisi. *Kampus Akademik Publishing Jurnal Ilmiah Penelitian Mahasiswa*, *2*(6), 425–433.

Pengawasan, M., Siaran, I. S. I., & Kom, M. I. (2018). Peran Komisi Penyiaran Indonesia (KPI) Pusat Dalam Melaukan Pengawasan Isi Siaran Pilkada 2018 (Studi Deskriptif Pada Bidang Pengawasan Isi Siaran KPI di Televisi). *Universitas Bhayangkara*, *2018*, 180–197.

Peraturan Menteri Pendayagunaan Aparatur Negara dan Reformasi Birokrasi Nomor 30 Tahun 2011 tentang Pedoman Umum Tata Kelola Kehumasan di Lingkungan Instansi Pemerintah, 47 (2011).

Pranoto. (2020). Peran KPI dalam Menjaga Keberagaman. *Magistra Law Review*, *1*(1), 1–16.

Ruslan, R. (2016). *Manajemen Public Relations dan Media Komunikasi: Konsepsi dan Aplikasi*. PT Raja Grafindo Persada.

Suprawoto. (2018). *Government Public Relations: Perkembangan dan Praktik di Indonesia*. Prenadamedia Group.

Syukri, M. (2024). Analisis Hukum Normatif UU No 32 Tahun 2002 Mengenai Peran KPI Sebagai Lembaga Pelayanan Publik Dalam Hal Pengawasan Penyiaran di Indonesia. *Unes Law Review*, *6*(4), 10561–10567.

Undang-Undang Nomor 32 Tahun 2002 Tentang Penyiaran, 1 (2002).

Wahyudin, M. Y. (2026). Akuntabilitas Komisi Penyiaran Indonesia Sebagai Lembaga Negara Penunjang Dalam Sistem Demokrasi Indonesia : Tinjauan Dan Tantangan. *Jurnal Media Akademik(JMA)*, *4*(2), 1–14.