



Digital Media as a Cultural Stage: From Users to Reflective Inhabitants in the Context of Contemporary Indonesia

Rustini Floranita^{1*}, Diana Maharani², Thomas Tokan Pureklolon³

Corresponding author email : 01689250018@student.uph.edu

Article History

Manuscript submitted:
05 Mei 2026
Manuscript revised:
28 Mei 2026
Accepted for publication:
20 Juni 2026

Keywords

Digital Culture; Digital Public Sphere; Reflective Inhabitant; Critical Digital Literacy; Indonesia.

Abstract

This study reexamines the position of digital media within the horizon of contemporary Indonesian culture. Digital media can no longer be adequately understood as a mere technical instrument for information exchange; rather, it must be recognised as a cultural stage upon which human beings dwell, negotiate meaning, construct identity, and contest power. Departing from Tokan Pureklolon's (2025) framework on media and the digital public sphere, and through a critical dialogue with the works of Castells (2010), Foucault (1980), van Dijk (2013), and Pariser (2011), this research employs a qualitative literature review combined with a case study approach on contemporary Indonesian digital phenomena, including the #ReformasiDikorupsi (2019) and #GejayanMemanggil (2019) movements, the polarisation pattern across the 2014–2024 presidential election cycles, the controversial provisions of the ITE Law, and the transnational activism of Indonesia's K-Pop fandom communities. The findings suggest that cultural transformation within Indonesia's digital space cannot be reduced to a technological shift; it is, rather, an ontological shift from the position of user to that of inhabitant - a dweller who resides in and is morally engaged with the digital socio-cultural ecosystem. The novelty of this study lies in the formulation of the Triadic Reflective Framework of Digital Culture (TRF-DC), which synthesises the three pillars of digital culture - meaning production, identity formation, and power relations - with an ethical-reflective layer as the ontological precondition of digital citizenship. The study further proposes the concept of the Reflective Inhabitant as a normative model for the Indonesian digital citizen, integrating technical skill, critical literacy, and ethical consciousness within a single, culturally grounded framework.

Copyright © 2025, The Author(s).

This is an open access article under the BY-NC-ND license



Contents

Abstract	134
Introduction	135
Methods.....	136
Results and Discussions.....	136

¹ Pelita Harapan University, Surabaya, Indonesia

² Pelita Harapan University, Surabaya, Indonesia

³ Pelita Harapan University, Surabaya, Indonesia

Conclusion.....	143
Reference	144

III Introduction

The history of human civilization, as far as it can be traced, is the history of the search for space. Humans are not merely creatures that live in time; they are also beings that occupy, nurture, and build culture from the space they inhabit. From the mouths of ancient caves in the Solo River valley to traditional halls in remote parts of the Archipelago, from the script space in Balinese lontar manuscripts to the image space on the walls of the Yogyakarta kraton, humans have always narrated themselves through the space they occupy. At the end of the twentieth century, that long history entered an unexpected chapter: humans now also occupy a space not touched by feet or hands, yet always present in the palm a space commonly called cyberspace, digital space, or, as Castells (2010) formulates it, a social network that transcends traditional geographical boundaries. The problem that then arises is not merely a technical one.

The issues that arise concern the very nature of humans as cultural beings. In the digital space, humans do not merely send messages to one another; they negotiate meaning, stake out identities, and compete for power. Every post is an act of self-expression; every hashtag is an ideological struggle; every algorithm is an architecture of power operating silently behind the screens of our devices. In this sense, as Tokan Pureklolon (2025) emphasizes, digital media is fundamentally more than a communication technology; it is a cultural space where meaning, identity, and power relations are produced, negotiated, and contested every second by billions of people.

Indonesia occupies a unique position in the global digital cultural landscape. With over 270 million people and 191 million active social media users by 2024 (We Are Social, 2024), Indonesia is not only the largest digital market in Southeast Asia but also the region's most dynamic digital cultural laboratory. Indonesia has the fourth-largest TikTok user base in the world, the largest Change.org user base in Asia, and the fastest-growing e-commerce market in ASEAN (Pamungkas et al., 2024). However, behind these impressive figures lie a series of problems that warrant careful, thoughtful unraveling: political polarization that has not abated over three presidential election cycles, a flood of disinformation that has eroded public trust, the criminalization of expression through the flexible articles of the Electronic Information and Transactions Law (UU ITE), and the expansion of filter bubbles that leave citizens living in different realities despite sharing the same homeland (Pariser, 2011; SAFEnet, 2023).

The problem becomes even more acute when it is recognized that academic discourse on digital media in Indonesia is still often trapped in two equally inadequate poles. On the one hand, there is a techno-determinist approach that worships technology as a machine of liberation; on the other, there is a techno-pessimist approach that suspects technology as the source of all disasters. Both poles fail to capture the essence of digital space as a living cultural space, which cannot be assessed solely from a technological perspective but must also be assessed from a human perspective, considering how humans inhabit, maintain, and shape that space as part of their civilization.

This study aims to address this conceptual gap by posing three research questions. First, how should digital media be reconceptualized to avoid technological reductionism or naive moralism? Second, how do the three pillars of digital culture meaning production, identity formation, and power relations—operate in practice within contemporary Indonesian digital space? Third, what conceptual

framework is appropriate for developing a model of Indonesian digital citizens who are not only technically proficient but also ethically mature and reflective?

The purpose of this study, therefore, is to reposition digital media as a cultural platform, unravel the dynamics of the three pillars of digital culture in the Indonesian context, and propose a new conceptual framework, which the author calls the Reflective Triadic Framework for Digital Culture (KTR-KD), with the concept of Reflective Inhabitants as the normative model for Indonesian digital citizens. The novelty of this study lies in its attempt to synthesize the critical-humanistic tradition of Tokan Pureklolon with classical theories of digital cultural studies and then apply them concretely to the Indonesian experience. As will be shown in the discussion, Indonesia's digital space cannot be fully understood by a framework borrowed purely from the West; it demands a framework rooted in local values and experiences yet capable of engaging in dialogue with global discourses on an equal and authoritative level.

Methods

This study employs a qualitative approach, combining a critical literature review with multiple case study analyses. This method was chosen because the phenomenon of digital culture in Indonesia is complex, multi-layered, and highly dynamic, making a purely quantitative, statistical approach inadequate. As Creswell and Poth (2018) emphasize, a qualitative approach excels at exploring the meanings inherent in social phenomena within their context. The primary data sources for this study are recent academic literature (2010–2025) on digital culture, digital public spaces, and socio-cultural transformations resulting from digitalization, in both global and Indonesian contexts. Secondary data sources include institutional reports (Kominfo, SAFEnet, Komnas HAM, We Are Social, UNICEF), indexed journal articles, and classic reference books in cultural studies, media sociology, and political communication. The case studies analyzed were purposively selected based on the following criteria: (a) cases with documented national impact; (b) cases representing at least one of the three pillars of digital culture; (c) cases relevant to the 2009–2024 timeframe to capture transformation dynamics. The five main cases analyzed are: (1) the #ReformasiDikorupsi movement of 2019; (2) the #GejayanMemanggil movement of 2019; (3) patterns of digital polarization across the three presidential election cycles from 2014 to 2024; (4) the application of the ITE Law's vague articles in the cases of Prita Mulyasari, Ahmad Dhani, and Bintang Emon; and (5) the transnational activism of the BTS Army Indonesia community. The analysis was conducted using thematic analysis techniques à la Braun and Clarke (2006), which enable the systematic and auditable identification of patterns of meaning across the data.

Results and Discussions

1. Deconstruction Paradigm: From Machine Communication Becoming a Cultural Space

Ways of thinking that remain dominant in many circles, including some academic circles, continue to position digital media as merely a machine for transmitting messages. The Internet is understood as cables, optics, giant servers, cold algorithms, and structured applications, all reduced to lines of code. Thus, the problem of digital media is reduced to a technical problem: master the technology, and the problem is solved. This view, borrowing Heidegger's term (1954/1977), is the view that sees technology merely as a means to an end - a tool for goals - and thus fails to grasp the broader dimensions of technology as a method for opening the world.

This study departs from different premises. The Internet is not just a machine; it is an ecosystem embedded in a socio-cultural context, with values, meanings, identities, and power. It is constantly negotiated by billions of people every second (Castells, 2010; Manovich, 2001). Consequently, the role of being inside a room that is also necessary to understand, repeated, is important. We are not just instrumental users of tools; we are permanent residents who shape and are shaped by a space with digital neighbors, digital memories, and even digital wounds. The shift is from a user category to an inhabitant category. No, it is not just a terminological shift; it is an ontological shift with very serious ethical consequences. A user is only responsible for using the tool. At the same time, a resident is responsible for the space it occupies, above a neighbor, above comfort together, for the future room that is a community.

2. Indonesian Context: Digital Transformation Timeline- Culture

To understand the panorama of Indonesian digital culture, it is necessary to take a concise journey through the last three decades. Since connecting to the first internet network (JARING) in 1994, Indonesia has passed at least six decisive milestone transformations, as summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Timeline of Digital Transformation -Indonesian Culture (1994–2025)

Year	Milestone Transformation
1994	Connected the first internet network (NETWORK), marking the beginning of the digital era in Indonesia.
2008	Social media (Facebook, YouTube) are becoming popular, and digital culture is entering mainstream public culture.
2010	Local digital applications (Go-Jek) and e-commerce are expanding, and the digital creative economy is starting to develop.
2020	The COVID-19 pandemic has forced education, the economy, and culture to switch to an online mode on a massive scale.
2022	Digital regulation is undergoing revision, and the development of national digital literacy is being encouraged in a structured manner.
2025	Digitalization culture continues with the rise of AI, VR, and the metaverse, creating new challenges for local identity.

Source: processed from Pamungkas et al. (2024) and Febriana (2023).

The timeline above shows that digital transformation in Indonesia is not just about adopting technology; it is an ongoing cultural transformation, alongside national socio-political dynamics. The TikTok explosion in Indonesia, for example, cannot be separated from the conditions the pandemic forced, which led to new forms of cultural expression. Traditional dance, regional cuisine, and local languages now reach a global audience through the platform (Febriana, 2023; Faqih et al., 2025). The government is also actively encouraging creative MSMEs to go online, so that batik, handicrafts, and music can penetrate the global market through e-commerce channels (Pamungkas et al., 2024). In

understanding this, Indonesia's digital space is not merely a passive space shaped by global trends; it is also a place where local culture actively narrates itself to the world.

3. Three Pillars of Digital Culture in the Indonesian Context

a. First Pillar: Production Meaning and Crisis Narrative Authority

Toffler (1980), in his work *The Third Wave*, predicted that an information civilization would give rise to a new figure he called a prosumer, one who produces while consuming. What once looked like a futuristic forecast has now become a daily fact in Indonesia. Of the 191 million active Indonesian social media users, around 60 percent are not only watching but also actively producing content (We Are Social, 2024). Every citizen, with a gadget in hand, can become a broadcaster, photographer, citizen critic, journalist, or even a street philosopher. Bruns (2008) describes this phenomenon as produsage, the blurring and merging of boundaries between production and use.

The most profound consequences of this phenomenon are a crisis of the authority narrative. It raises fundamental questions that Indonesian society faces today. This is not a question about who is in power, but rather about who is entitled to narrate the truth. During the New Order era, the authorities' narrative was almost entirely controlled by the state through TVRI and major newspapers. In the early reform era, the authority shifted to the private-sector mass media. Today, the authorities' narrative is spread out, or more accurately, scattered, across millions of personal accounts, thousands of content creators, and hundreds of influencers with reach beyond prime-time national television. TikTok Indonesia's For You Page (FYP) can now create viral dances, political memes, and even a new language for Generation Z that transcends social class boundaries. This is the post-truth panorama in its typical Indonesian form: not just a war of facts versus hoaxes, but a war over authority, over who is entitled to speak in the name of truth.

b. Second Pillar: Formation Identity and the Burden of Digital Existence

We are what we share, as Sherry Turkle (2011) puts it. Formulation that, if we think about it thoroughly, contains two equal sides, sharp. On the one hand, he points to the strength of the new man, forming himself alone, in a way, conscious in the face of the world; on the other hand, he also reveals a new dependence: we, now, feel real only as far as we are seen. Goffman (1959) had previously argued that, in essence, life is a social theater; in the digital age, the stage has moved to screens, and every man is, at a time, both an actor and a viewer for himself alone.

The consequences of this digital dramaturgy in Indonesia can be seen in the phenomenon the author calls influencer syndrome: fear of missing out (FOMO), the display of a stylish life, and a deep crisis of authenticity among younger generations. A UNICEF survey (2021) shows that 45 percent of Indonesian teenagers experience anxiety as a consequence of social media pressure always to seem perfect. Digital identity, instead of liberating, often creates a real psychological burden. However, the formation of digital identity does not always entail loss; it also opens new possibilities for collective identity that transcend geographical boundaries. Indonesian K-Pop fan communities, for example, show that digital solidarity can become real political strength. BTS Army Indonesia, with its close-knit digital community network, has participated in thwarting ticket registration campaigns in the United States and, more generally, has been active in criticizing local government policies deemed unfair (Boyd,

2014). A collective identity that seems to be based only on musical taste turns out to be capable of becoming substantial political capital.

c. Third Pillar: Power Relations and Four Key Actors

Foucault (1980) has reminded us that power is no longer owned only by the state; it flows through every social relation. In the digital era, power flows through every algorithm and every platform policy. In the Indonesian context, the author identifies four actors in a tug-of-war over digital power, as summarized in Table 2.

Table 2. Four Key Actors in Indonesia's Digital Power Relations

Actor	Source of Power	Indicator Empirical
Corporation Technology	Mastery algorithms, data, and global platform architecture (Meta, Google, TikTok).	Data 270 million Indonesian users are below mastery of foreign entities.
Countries and Regulations	Authority law through the ITE Law and national digital governance policies.	More than 300 cases under the ITE Law during the 2016-2023 period, with 90% of defendants being inhabitants of civil law.
Influencers and Buzzers	Symbolic capital in the form of followers, virality, and the ability to form public opinion.	Range Indonesia's top ten influencers transcend national prime-time TV.
Grassroots Public	Solidarity among inhabitants was organized digitally through hashtags and petition platforms.	Change.org Indonesia's petition has collected more than 10 million signatures, with dozens of policies successfully changed.

Source: processed from Foucault (1980), Flew (2021), and SAFEnet (2023).

Table 2 above shows that power relations in the Indonesian digital space are highly asymmetrical. Global technology corporations dominate data and algorithmic architecture; the state holds legal authority that is frequently enforced disproportionately; influencers and buzzers can form opinions that go beyond mainstream media; and the temporary public, although potentially large, often has to face off against huge capital and state power. However, Indonesian digital activism also shows that when the public unites, narratives can be reversed, as clearly seen in the two cases discussed next.

d. Digital Activism: When Hashtags Become Weapons

In September 2019, a movement not started by the political party, not led by big figures, and not funded by large capital shook the national political stage. The movement was called #CorruptedReformation. Students from various cities used Twitter and Instagram to coordinate massive demonstrations rejecting the revision of the Constitution Commission, which is considered to weaken institutions. The hashtag became a national trending topic for 24 consecutive hours, prompting

a direct response from the House of Representatives and the President. Thousands of students took to the streets in more than 20 cities; some DPR sessions were postponed due to the large public pressure (Lim, 2013; Nugroho et al., 2012).

Along the same trail, the #GejayanMemanggil movement was born in a WhatsApp group of students in Yogyakarta and spread throughout Indonesia within hours. Organized demonstrations without any formal structure attracted more than 10,000 participants, making it the largest demonstration in Yogyakarta since the 1998 Reformation. Farther still, since 2012, Indonesia has been recorded as Asia's largest user of the Change.org petition platform, with dozens of public policies changed in response to pressure from digital petitions. What can we learn from this phenomenon? The clearest lesson is this: digital media has changed the usual inhabitant - the previous one who only became a viewer of politics - into an active political actor, transcending party boundaries, hierarchies, and geography. Digital activism does not replace street activism; it strengthens it and, more importantly, democratizes it.

e. Digital Polarization, Echo Chambers, and Dangers Hidden

However, as a room has its own side light and side dark, so is digital space. One of the most worrying forms of darkness is the increasing digital polarization, which has been growing from one presidential election cycle to the next. The Ministry of Communication and Informatics recorded 1,645 instances of hoaxes blocked during the 2019 Presidential Election (Kominfo, 2019). Researchers identified at least 300 active political buzzer accounts that polarized public opinion during the campaign period (Juditha, 2018). The 2024 presidential election will be an astonishing milestone: for the first time in Indonesian history, deepfake videos - fake videos generated with artificial intelligence - will be used in campaign politics. Candidate voices and faces will be falsified to spread narratives that the owner did not truly speak.

What is really happening? In his highly influential work, Pariser (2011) warns us about two phenomena that are mutually exclusive yet intertwined: echo chambers and filter bubbles. An echo chamber is a space where we only hear the same voices and confirm beliefs that are already there. Differences in opinion are filtered socially. A filter bubble, again, is more about algorithms actively hiding different content from view, creating an isolated personal reality without our realizing it. A 2020 study found that 62 percent of Indonesian Facebook users were exposed to only one side of the information during the Presidential Election campaign period, seeing only the supporting narrative for the choice they made (Nasrullah, 2016).

The implications for democracy are really serious. When citizens live in bubbles of diverse information, democratic dialogue becomes impossible. Polarization is no longer just a matter of choice; it becomes a difference in reality, in fact. One brother at the table can be living in two truly digital worlds, different - one believes A, the other believes not-A, without either of them ever meeting in the middle on the same facts. This is it, the inside view of the writer, the subtlest and most dangerous crisis of democracy: no crisis of institutions, but rather a crisis of the epistemic base - a crisis about what we can agree on as facts together.

f. ITE Law: When Digital Space Becomes a Legal Arena

The problem of power relations in Indonesia's digital space is becoming most visible in the implementation of the Constitution on Information and Electronic Transactions. Article 27, paragraph 3, of the ITE Law, widely known as the "rubber" chapter, defines defamation so broadly that it can be

used to silence criticism of officials, entrepreneurs, and institutions. Data from SAFEnet (2023) show that more than 300 cases under the ITE Law were reported in the period 2016–2023, and what is astonishing is that 90 percent of defendants are ordinary citizens, not public officials. The deterrent (chilling) effect against freedom of expression in Indonesia is real and can be measured empirically.

Three cases are iconic and worth remembering. First, the Prita Mulyasari case in 2009: an electronic letter containing a complaint about Omni Hospital changes became a case that triggered a solidarity movement, “Coins for Prita” - a milestone that began public awareness that the digital space is also a space of law. Second, the case of Ahmad Dhani in 2019: a musician was sentenced to prison for political criticism posted on social media. Third, the case of Bintang Emon in 2020: a comedian was criminalized for content criticizing the law that he uploaded on YouTube. These three cases, along with hundreds of other cases that did not receive media attention, show that every tweet, comment, and upload in Indonesia's digital space has the potential to become legal evidence. The revision of the ITE Law in 2024 is indeed an attempt to narrow the definition of defamation; however, digital activists believe that it is not yet sufficient to protect substantive freedom of expression in public (SAFEnet, 2023; Press Study Institute, 2022; National Commission on Human Rights, 2021).

4. Novelty: Reflective Triadic Framework Of Digital Culture And Reflective Inhabitants Concept

a. Formulating Framework Triadic Reflective Digital Culture (KTR-KD)

Departing from the description above and from Tokan Pureklolon's (2025) framework for room-demanding digital public awareness, ethics, and critical reflection, the writer proposes a new conceptual model, the Framework Triadic Reflective Digital Culture (KTR-KD). This model synthesizes three pillars of digital culture - production of meaning, formation of identity, and relationships of power - with one integrative layer that becomes the main novelty of this study, namely the reflective ethics layer. This layer is not optional; it is a prerequisite ontological condition that enables the three pillars to function in a healthy, dignified manner.

Why does reflective ethics become crucial? Without ethical awareness, production meaning will decline, leading to industry disinformation; without critical reflection, identity formation will be trapped in fake dramaturgy, giving rise to a mental health crisis, as shown by UNICEF data (2021). Without ethical-reflective awareness, relational power in the digital space will be dominated by an algorithmic logic that is not humane. Thus, KTR-KD is not only descriptive (describing what is) but also normative (showing what it should be). The composition of KTR-KD is summarized in Table 3 below.

Table 3. Composition Framework Triadic Reflective Digital Culture (KTR-KD)

Pillar	Empirical Domain	Risk without Ethical-Reflective Layer	Achievements with Ethical- Reflective Layer
Production Meaning	content, narrative politics, trends, culture, expression, online art.	Disinformation industry, hoaxes, and the manipulation of opinion through buzzers and deepfakes.	Pluralism, a healthy narrative; responsible creativity answers.

Pillar	Empirical Domain	Risk without Ethical-Reflective Layer	Achievements with Ethical- Reflective Layer
Formation Identity	profiles, performativity, self, virtual community, fandom.	FOMO, crisis authenticity, social media anxiety, and dramaturgy are false.	Authentic identity, grounded digital solidarity, and maintained mental health.
Power Relations	algorithms, state regulations, influencer capital, and the roots of movements.	Criminalization, expression, dominance of global corporations, and polarization are structured.	Democratic digital public space, accountability algorithm, protection of expression.

Source: formulation writer based on synthesis Tokan Pureklolon (2025), Foucault (1980), Hall (1997), Goffman (1959), and van Dijk (2013).

b. Concept Inhabitants Reflective as a Model of Indonesian Digital Citizens

As a derivative of KTR-KD, the author also proposes the concept of the Inhabitant Reflective (Reflective Inhabitant). This concept contains a shift in ontology from the three commonly used categories of digital citizens, namely: first, the user category (users) who relate instrumentally to the platform; second, the netizen category (active network citizens) who participate but are not yet reflective; and third, the digital citizen category, which is often still trapped in a technical competence dimension. Inhabitant Reflective, as a more comprehensive concept, comprises three intertwined dimensions.

First Dimensions are technical competencies: the ability to operate devices, create accounts, manage privacy, edit content, and secure personal data. These dimensions are necessary but not sufficient. Second Dimensions are critical competencies: the ability to understand how algorithms work, verify facts, read for media bias, recognize digital disinformation and propaganda, and, on purpose, step out of the echo chamber and surrounding filter bubble. Third Dimensions, which is the main novelty of this draft, is ethical-reflective awareness: digital empathy, responsibility in responding to shared content, reflection on the social impact of every digital action, as well as a commitment to building a healthy digital public as part of devotion to civilization.

The Indonesia Digital Literacy Index 2023 shows an achievement of 3.54 on a 5.0 scale, up from 3.49 in 2022, but the pillar of digital ethics has become the lowest among all measured dimensions (Kominfo, 2023). This data, in a way, directly supports the urgency of the draft proposal Inhabitants Reflective. Indonesia does not lack technically capable citizens; Indonesia also does not lack digitally active citizens. What Indonesia lacks is serious citizens who settle in the digital space as reflective inhabitants - who feel responsible for the room that takes care of them as a House together, and who refuse to just become instrumental users.

c. Implications of KTR-KD for Policy: National Digital Literacy

Implementing KTR-KD and related concepts has several practical implications for national digital literacy policy. First, the digital literacy curriculum in schools and universities needs to be restructured so that it does not focus predominantly on the technical dimension but is balanced with attention to

critical literacy and ethical awareness. Second, the National Digital Literacy Movement (GNLD), which since 2021 has reached more than 12 million people in need, should be evaluated using the KTR-KD framework so as not to stop at quantitative coverage but also to include in-depth qualitative assessment. Third, platform regulation, including a future revision of the ITE Law, is necessary to maintain a balance among the fourth actor, digital power, and the state, so the state does not become a silencing protector, corporations do not become controlling owners, and the public still has an open space to express itself in a dignified way.

Conclusion

This study has shown that digital media is not merely a technology for communication but rather a space where culture, meaning, identity, and relationships are produced, negotiated, and fought over every second. In the contemporary Indonesian context, with a population of 270 million and distinctive socio-political dynamics, digital space has become a stage for real culture, live—with all its beauty and all its problems. Three pillars of digital culture (production meaning, identity formation, and relationships of power) work in concrete, mutually related ways in Indonesia's digital experience. The first pillar focuses on the prosumer revolution and the crisis of the authority narrative; the second is embodied in influencer syndrome and fandom solidarity that transcend geography; the third is manifested in the tug-of-war between global technology corporations, state regulation, influencer-buzzer capital, and grassroots movements. Digital activism, such as #ReformasiDikorupsi and #GejayanMemanggil, demonstrates the potential of an emancipatory digital space, while polarization, Presidential election-related issues, flood hoaxes, deepfakes, and ITE Law cases show the need for vigilance.

Novelty studies. This lies in the formulation of the Triadic Reflective Digital Culture (KTR-KD) framework, which adds a layer of reflective ethics as a prerequisite ontological for the three pillars of digital culture, as well as a draft proposal for Inhabitants Reflective as a normative model for Indonesia's digital citizens. Concept. This unites three dimensions (technical competence, critical literacy, and ethical awareness) in a single framework for a single person, rooted in critical-humanistic Tokan Pureklolon thinking and sustained dialogue in a way equivalent to discourse in global digital culture. This study, of course, has limitations. Its conceptual nature demands further empirical research to test KTR-KD in specific contexts: education, journalism, politics, or religious research. Further research can develop measurement instruments for inhabitants' reflective practices that can be used empirically to map the measurable conditions of Indonesian digital citizenship. However, what this study seeks to confirm, as a closing word and an echo of the Tokan Pureklolon framework, is this: technology is the stage; however, we are the director and the actor of its culture. Digital space will not become civilized by itself; it will become civilized only if inhabited by serious, reflective people who not only speak in a technical way but also mature in an ethical way and are clear in a critical way. And the task that, in the end, is the task we share together as a cultured nation.

Acknowledgments

The author expresses praise and gratitude to God Almighty for His grace and blessings, which enabled the successful completion of this article/journal. The author also expresses gratitude to all parties who provided support, assistance, and contributions to the preparation of this research. Special thanks are extended to the supervisor, who provided guidance, input, and motivation throughout the research and writing process. Furthermore, the author expresses gratitude to the institution,

respondents, and family and friends, who provided moral and material support, enabling the successful completion of this research. The author acknowledges that this journal still has limitations. Therefore, the author welcomes constructive criticism and suggestions for the improvement of future research.

References

- Boyd, D. (2014). *It is complicated: The social lives of networked teens*. Yale University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241–258). Greenwood.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Bruns, A. (2008). *Blogs, Wikipedia, Second Life, and beyond: From production to production*. Peter Lang.
- Castells, M. (2010). *The rise of the network society* (2nd ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE.
- Faqih, A., Pratama, R., & Sari, D. (2025). TikTok and the expression culture of Indonesian locals on the global stage. *Journal of Indonesian Communication*, 14(1), 45–62.
- Febriana, R. (2023). Digital culture and expression identity of Generation Z in Indonesia. *Journal of Communication Studies*, 7(2), 215–232.
- Flew, T. (2021). *Regulating platforms*. Polity Press.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972–1977* (C. Gordon, Ed.). Pantheon Books.
- Giannini, T., & Bowen, J. P. (2023). Museums and digital culture: From reality to digitality in the age of COVID-19. *Heritage*, 5(1), 192–214. <https://doi.org/10.3390/heritage5010011>
- Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and self-identity: Self and society in the late modern age*. Stanford University Press.
- Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Anchor Books.
- Habermas, J. (1989). *The structural transformation of the public sphere: An inquiry into a category of bourgeois society* (T. Burger, Trans.). MIT Press. (Original work published 1962)
- Hall, S. (Ed.). (1997). *Representation: Cultural representations and signifying practices*. SAGE.
- Heidegger, M. (1977). *The question concerning technology and other essays* (W. Lovitt, Trans.). Harper & Row. (Original work published 1954)
- Hobbs, R. (2010). *Digital and media literacy: A plan of action*. The Aspen Institute.
- Jenkins, H. (2006). *Convergence culture: Where old and new media collide*. NYU Press.
- Jenkins, H., Purushotma, R., Weigel, M., Clinton, K., & Robison, A. J. (2009). *Confronting the challenges of participatory culture: Media education for the 21st century*. MIT Press.
- Juditha, C. (2018). Hoax communication interactivity in social media and anticipation. *Journal Pekommas*, 3(1), 31–44. <https://doi.org/10.30818/jpkm.2018.2030104>
- Ministry of Communication and Informatics of the Republic of Indonesia. (2019). *Report the annual handling of the content hoax*. Kominfo.
- Ministry of Communication and Informatics of the Republic of Indonesia. (2023). *Index Indonesian digital literacy 2023*. Kominfo.
- National Commission on Human Rights. (2021). *Report on the situation of basic Human Rights in Indonesia's Digital Space*. National Commission on Human Rights.

-
- Institute for Press and Development Studies. (2022). Press Freedom and the ITE Law: Notes critical. LSPP.
- Lim, M. (2013). Many clicks but few sticks: Social media activism in Indonesia. *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, 43(4), 636–657. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00472336.2013.769386>
- Manovich, L. (2001). *The language of new media*. MIT Press.
- Nasrullah, R. (2016). *Social Media: Perspectives on communication, culture, and sociotechnology*. Symbiosis Rekatama Media.
- Nugroho, Y., Putri, D. A., & Laksmi, S. (2012). Mapping the landscape of the media industry in contemporary Indonesia. Center for Innovation Policy and Governance.
- Pamungkas, A., Wijaya, S., & Hartono, B. (2024). Digital creative economy and Indonesian MSMEs: Challenges and opportunities. *Journal of Economics and Public Policy*, 15(1), 88–106.
- Papacharissi, Z. (2010). *A private sphere: Democracy in a digital age*. Polity Press.
- Pariser, E. (2011). *The filter bubble: What the Internet is hiding from you*. Penguin Press.
- Potter, W. J. (2004). *Theory of media literacy: A cognitive approach*. SAGE.
- Rheingold, H. (2012). *Net smart: How to thrive online*. MIT Press.
- Roudometof, V. (2023). *Glocal cultures: Digital media and global cultural negotiations*. Routledge.
- SAFEnet. (2023). *Report on Freedom of Online Expression in Indonesia 2023—Southeast Asia Freedom of Expression Network*.
- Sunstein, C.R. (2017). *#Republic: Divided democracy in the age of social media*. Princeton University Press.
- Toffler, A. (1980). *The third wave*. William Morrow.
- Tokan Pureklolon, T. (2025). *Media and space: digital public in communication politics*. Moeka Publishing page.
- Turkle, S. (2011). *Alone together: Why we expect more from technology and less from each other*. Basic Books.
- UNESCO. (2013). *Media and information literacy: Policy and strategy guidelines*. UNESCO Publishing.
- UNICEF. (2021). *The state of the world's children 2021: On my mind - Promoting, protecting and caring for children's mental health*. United Nations Children's Fund.
- van Dijk, J. (2013). *The culture of connectivity: A critical history of social media*. Oxford University Press.
- Wardle, C., & Derakhshan, H. (2017). *Information disorder: Toward an interdisciplinary framework for research and policymaking*. Council of Europe.
- We Are Social. (2024). *Digital 2024: Indonesia*. We Are Social & Meltwater