Locus Journal of Academic Literature Review
Powered by locus media publishing
Vol. 5 No. 9, September 2026
P-ISSN: 2829-4262, E-ISSN: 2829-3827

Commodification of Metro TV's 24-Hour YouTube Live Stream and Audience Engagement

[*1.] Alfiansa
[2.] Bayquni

[1.2.] Communication Studies Program, Faculty of Communication Sciences, Esa Unggul University, Jakarta.
*Corresponding author: alfiansaaa@gmail.com

Received 11 Agustus 2026 Initial submission → **Revised** 15 September 2026 Author revision → **Accepted** 20 September 2026 Editorial decision → **Published** 30 September 2026 Online publication

DOI: https://doi.org/10.56128/ljoalr.v5i9.1186

Abstract

This article examines how a television news livestream becomes embedded in platform-mediated content, labor, and audience commodification. It uses qualitative documentary case analysis of Metro TV's 24-hour YouTube distribution, drawing on an anonymized case narrative, an official livestream listing, YouTube documentation, and scholarly literature. Vincent Mosco's political economy distinguishes potential exchange-value orientations of content, professional work, and audience attention; a bounded Gramscian reading examines how disruption and adaptation are framed as organizational necessities. A provenance register, explicit decision rules, and a passage-level evidence matrix distinguish verifiable public artifacts from uncorroborated claims and conceptual inference. The analysis proposes a conditional circulation–measurement–repackaging mechanism: broadcast material becomes accessible through a third-party platform; accounts describe optimization and expanded production roles; and reported use of viewing indicators may inform subsequent clips. Only the livestream listing and platform capabilities are independently corroborated; organizational workflows, worker experiences, audience behavior, and financial outcomes remain unverified. The article provides an evidence-bounded interpretation without equating digital convergence with exploitation, visibility with revenue, or managerial narratives with consent. Implications concern research transparency and the distinction between engagement signals and public-interest editorial judgment.

Keywords

audience commodification, digital journalism, documentary analysis, media political economy, Metro TV, YouTube livestreaming.

1. Introduction

Television news organizations increasingly distribute their programming through social platforms that offer visibility, user feedback, and monetization infrastructures beyond the broadcaster's direct control. The shift can broaden public access while creating new forms of dependence on intermediaries that structure circulation and measure response. Such arrangements are not reducible to technology adoption: they alter the conditions under which news may become a market-facing cultural product (Nielsen & Fletcher, 2023).

This distinction matters because platformization varies across media markets and institutions. Nielsen and Fletcher (2023) demonstrate significant cross-national differences in platform-based news

access, while Hase et al. (2023) and Hendrickx and Vázquez-Herrero (2024) show that news organizations adjust their material to the affordances of particular services. These studies help explain why repackaging, discoverability, and analytics deserve analysis; they do not establish that a specific broadcaster automatically experiences greater revenue, diminished autonomy, or audience manipulation.

In Indonesia, Erlita et al. (2025) investigate political-economic commodification among five major private broadcasters, including Metro TV, and describe the wider commercial setting of television news. Their cross-broadcaster perspective does not by itself reconstruct a continuous YouTube stream's relationship with digital packaging and audience feedback. An official METRO TV YouTube listing, published on 24 December 2024 under the title "*LIVE STREAMING 24 JAM METRO TV*", independently establishes that the organization publicly offered a branded 24-hour streaming product. The listing alone does not establish uninterrupted uptime, a television-to-YouTube mirroring arrangement, or financial outcomes (Metro Tv, 2024).

Research on audience analytics provides an additional reason to distinguish potential influence from demonstrated effects. Tandoc (2014) explains the role of analytics in newsroom gatekeeping, while Riemann and Ehrlich (2025) report evidence that audience-performance indicators can shape post-publication content visibility. The latter study concerns German-speaking journalists, not Metro TV; its value here is comparative. More recent research on YouTube-oriented legacy media in Bangladesh similarly documents the possible reconfiguration of production and labor, but its setting cannot be treated as evidence of Indonesian newsroom practice (Khan & Gangadharbatla, 2026).

The submitted case narrative about Metro TV describes simultaneous distribution, platform-oriented titles and thumbnails, multiplatform responsibilities, and reported use of audience metrics to select material for further production. However, the narrative does not provide its author's identity, original fieldwork dates, interview transcripts, or auditable observation records. The problem is thus both substantive and methodological: what can be learned from a bounded documentary record about commodification, and what would be an overinterpretation? Document analysis requires attention to a document's origin, representativeness, credibility, and interpretive limits rather than treating written assertions as independently confirmed events (Bowen, 2009).

The study addresses three research questions: (RQ1) Which content, labor, and audience-related platform practices are represented in the available Metro TV case materials, and which are publicly corroborated? (RQ2) Under what explicit criteria can these practices be read as oriented toward commodification rather than merely digital adaptation? (RQ3) What does the documentary language of disruption and professional necessity support—and fail to support—in a Gramscian interpretation? The contribution is an evidence-bounded model of possible circulation–measurement–repackaging, with every case-specific inference assigned an identifiable documentary basis and confidence boundary.

2. Research Methods

Design and scope

This study employs qualitative documentary case analysis, not ethnography, interview-based fieldwork, or a systematic review. The unit of analysis is the documented representation of Metro TV's 24-hour YouTube news service and its possible commercial implications. Documentary analysis is suited to examining recorded accounts and claims, but it requires appraisal of where documents originated, why they were produced, which perspectives they include, and what they omit (Bowen, 2009).

Source provenance and appraisal

Table 1. Documentary corpus, provenance, evidentiary use, and limitations

ID	Source and retrievability	Evidentiary function	Appraisal and limitation
C1	*Commodification of Metro TV's 24-Hour YouTube Live Stream and Audience Engagement*, nine-page anonymized case narrative provided with the manuscript materials; date, author, and original publication status not identified	Records how a prior narrative represents interviews, observation, streaming workflow, and interpretations	No-independently verifiable chain of custody, original transcripts, interview dates, consent records, or observation register; statements remain **attributed claims**
P1	Metro TV (2024), publicly retrievable official YouTube listing, *LIVE STREAMING 24 JAM METRO TV*; URL in References	Independently corroborates the public-facing existence and branding of a 24-hour streaming product	Does not confirm continuous operation, full video contents, mirroring mechanics, staff organization, or revenue
T1	Google for Developers (n.d.), *Metrics: YouTube Analytics and Reporting APIs*; URL in References	Documents existence and definitions of engagement, advertising, and estimated-revenue metrics	Does not give access to any private Metro TV analytics or payment data
L1	Peer-reviewed literature and foundational theory listed in References	Contextualizes platformization, gatekeeping, commodification, document analysis, and journalistic quality	Findings from other countries or organizations cannot verify C1

C1 was supplied as a nine-page anonymous text containing a narrative of an earlier qualitative investigation. It identifies a social-media manager, communication specialist, and viewers but does not identify the researchers, number of viewers, period of fieldwork, instrument, or primary-data repository. The document includes first-person quotations translated or abbreviated from Indonesian, yet their original-language wording and permission status cannot be confirmed. These attributes establish its documentary identity within this submission, not its independence, authenticity as a fieldwork record, or the factual accuracy of its reported participants (Morgan, 2022).

The documentary appraisal considered provenance (who created the item and how it entered the corpus), credibility (whether assertions are independently checkable), scope (the activity or actors the item represents), and meaning (what the text can reasonably establish). C1 provides valuable evidence of a *narrative about* an organizational practice but is insufficient to prove that the practice occurred in a particular period. P1 establishes a public livestream listing without verifying its uninterrupted operation. T1 establishes metric definitions without identifying a specific channel's earnings (Bowen, 2009; Developers, 2026; Morgan, 2022).

Document selection and analytic sequence

C1 was selected because it is the documentary case supplied for the present submission and addresses the three proposed sites of commodification. P1 was included because it is attributable to the broadcaster's publicly identified YouTube account and refers explicitly to 24-hour streaming. T1 was included because it provides authoritative definitions needed to avoid confusion between views, watch time, impressions, and estimated income. L1 sources were selected purposively on topic, year, publisher traceability, and applicability; this corpus is not exhaustive, and no systematic-search or saturation claim is made (Bowen, 2009; Morgan, 2022).

Documentary passages were read using a three-pass procedure. First, assertions in C1 were separated into reported actor statements, case-author descriptions, and theoretical comments. Second, passages were coded deductively as content, labor, audience, or organizational justification and assigned more specific process codes. Third, each proposed inference was tested against rival explanations and given an evidentiary grade. Table 3 provides the passage-level audit trail; the

categories describe how the present interpretation was constructed, not statistical inter-coder reliability or replication of earlier fieldwork (Bowen, 2009; Morgan, 2022).

Evidence levels and decision rules

Table 2. Evidence status and admissible claims

Code	Basis	Admissible claim	Not admissible without additional evidence
P	Independently retrievable public broadcaster artifact	The broadcaster publicly posted the specified livestream listing	Continuous uptime, complete mirroring, profitability, audience composition
R	Statement reported in the unverified case narrative C1	C1 reports an organizational practice or attributed view	The attributed person actually said it or that the practice was independently observed
T	Public technical platform documentation	YouTube defines or makes available specified metric categories	Metro TV accessed or used a metric in a particular way
L	Independent published research	Comparative or theoretical relevance	Factual verification of this case
I	Explicit inference integrating P/R/T/L	A bounded interpretation or proposed mechanism	Causal, monetary, psychological, or representativeness finding

Case-specific statements were accepted as independently corroborated only if the evidence was P and the inference remained no broader than the public artifact. A C1 proposition was stated with verbs such as *reports*, *describes*, or *attributes*, rather than presented as independently observed. A theory-grounded explanation was marked as an inference even if plausible. To identify a commodification orientation, the coding required both an adaptation practice and an indicator of exchange-value or market-oriented evaluation. To identify realized effects, verifiable outcome evidence would be necessary; none is available in the current corpus (Mosco, 2009; Morgan, 2022).

Source-to-claim matrix

Table 3. Traceable coding decisions for the Metro TV documentary case

Claim ID and document location	Documentary indicator (paraphrased, not authenticated testimony)	Code and evidence grade	Supported conclusion / rival explanation
E01 · P1, public listing	METRO TV labeled a YouTube product as 24-hour livestreaming	STREAM-PUBLIC · P	Public product offering; does not verify uptime or program equivalence
E02 · C1, pp. 3–4	Case describes mirroring of television programming into YouTube	SIMULCAST · R	Reported distribution practice; could reflect an accessibility strategy
E03 · C1, p. 4	Manager-attributed account invokes disruption and younger digital audiences	NECESSITY/AUDIENCE · R	Organizational rationale; no demographic or consent measure

Claim ID and document location	Documentary indicator (paraphrased, not authenticated testimony)	Code and evidence grade	Supported conclusion / rival explanation
E04 · C1, p. 4	Account describes keywords, thumbnails, search and performance indicators	OPTIMIZATION · R	Reported discoverability activities; precise outcomes untested
E05 · C1, p. 4	Specialist-attributed passage links bigger reach to selling value	VALUE-FRAMING · R	Commercial interpretation in the document; no sales ledger
E06 · C1, pp. 4–5	Manager-attributed passage describes multiplatform journalists and extra digital outputs	ROLE-EXPANSION · R	Reported professional role change; could also be paid specialization
E07 · C1, p. 5	Manager-attributed passage relates viewing peaks to decisions on clips/Shorts	METRIC-FEEDBACK · R	Reported post-publication packaging practice; no decision log
E08 · C1, pp. 5–6	Case describes attention and comments as potentially useful for monetization	AUDIENCE-VALUE · R	Potential exchange-value logic; not a monetized-view count
E09 · C1, pp. 6–7	Case lists algorithms, digital economy, audience habits, competition, monetization	ENVIRONMENT · R	Contextual explanations, not five tested causes
E10 · T1, public documentation	Metrics distinguish activity, ad performance, and estimated revenue	METRIC-DEFINITION · T	Technical distinction; no channel-specific numbers
E11 · C1, pp. 4–7 + P1 + T1	Distribution, reported analytics use, and possible clip reuse can be linked analytically	FEEDBACK-MODEL · I	Conditional mechanism only; sequence and magnitude unverified
E12 · C1, pp. 4–5	Language presents disruption and multiplatform proficiency as necessary	NORMALIZATION · R/I	A discursive framing; compatible with genuine public-service adaptation

The matrix records *document locations* rather than new interview data or time-stamped observations. The exact English passages underlying E03, E05, E06, and E07 appear in C1 as translations or abridgements; since original audio, transcript, and authorization were not available, the present article does not reproduce them as independently authenticated participant quotations. The matrix allows another reader with access to C1 to inspect each reading, but does not imply that the underlying fieldwork can be replicated.

Ethics, reflexivity, and limits

This documentary analysis did not recruit participants or collect new personal data. The provided case narrative references historical interviews, but neither the informed-consent status nor the translation and quotation authorization can be independently established. Therefore, the manuscript neither declares that the underlying fieldwork obtained ethics approval nor asserts that it lacked approval. It avoids named interviewee identities and direct participant quotations, while stating transparently that the material was reported by an unverified secondary narrative (Bowen, 2009; Morgan, 2022).

The principal limitations are the unverified provenance of C1, absence of original fieldwork records, restricted public corroboration from P1, lack of private Metro TV metrics or revenue, and reliance on contextual studies conducted elsewhere. These limitations materially determine the form of the findings: this article assesses documented representations and conditional conceptual relationships, not the rate or economic consequences of Metro TV's content, labor, or audience practices. No systematic review, representative audience inference, or causal conclusion is claimed.

3. Results and Discussion

Publicly evidenced distribution versus reported workflow

The strongest independently retrievable case-specific evidence is METRO TV's official video listing titled *LIVE STREAMING 24 JAM METRO TV*, published on 24 December 2024. This is direct public evidence that a 24-hour streaming service was presented to viewers under the broadcaster's brand. It does not show continuous transmission without interruption, verify the contents of every broadcast, identify its newsroom organization, or document profitability (Metro Tv, 2024).

C1 goes further by describing simultaneous television-to-YouTube distribution and the use of searchable titles, keywords, and thumbnails (E02, E04). These statements identify an alleged workflow relevant to platform-specific packaging, but the present corpus lacks synchronized television recordings, uploads, metadata histories, or behind-the-scenes records with which to confirm it. Comparative studies establish that publishers often adapt content across services, yet do not close the evidentiary gap in this individual case (Hase et al., 2023; Hendrickx & Vázquez-Herrero, 2024).

Accordingly, content commodification is best understood here as an orientation represented in C1, not a measured outcome. Distribution alone supports an accessibility or convergence explanation. Optimization for discoverability and the prospect of commercially valuable recirculation add a plausible exchange-value dimension. The distinction matters because extending news access may be compatible with public-interest obligations while still creating market-facing incentives (Mosco, 2009; (Nieborg & Poell, 2018).

Commodification criteria and the need for a non-circular test

Classifying every YouTube adaptation as commodification would make the theory non-discriminating. The source supports a more specific reading: adaptation is present where news is made accessible on a new channel; commodification orientation is represented when it is also evaluated through selling value, advertising potential, or retention-oriented repackaging; and realized economic effect remains unestablished without verifiable monetary or contractual records. Thus, the specialist-attributed connection between reach and selling value in E05 is conceptually important as a documented rationale, not as an audited measure (Nielsen & Fletcher, 2023).

This distinction explains why merely naming AdSense or platform algorithms is insufficient. Google's published documentation separates watch and engagement indicators from advertising

impressions, monetized playbacks, and estimated revenues. Without the broadcaster's authorized account data, a study cannot reliably convert views into earnings or conclude that specific editorial changes followed advertising payouts. The case report's commercial propositions are therefore evidence of market-facing interpretation, not established returns (Google Developers, 2026)

Labor: professional redefinition versus economic appropriation

C1 describes journalists as taking on multiplatform responsibilities, including preparing outputs specifically for digital distribution (E06). At most, the document supports an attributed account of role expansion. It does not supply employment contracts, before-and-after staffing numbers, time-use diaries, salary comparisons, or independently recorded staff perceptions. Accordingly, labor commodification as exploitation cannot be demonstrated, and the term should not be used as a finding of worker harm (Mosco, 2009).

Two interpretations must be kept in view. Expanded responsibilities may permit a broadcaster to derive additional products from existing journalistic labor. Equally, specialized digital positions, increased compensation, training, or occupational preference may make the change a professional opportunity. Interviews with staff members in the independent study by Trielli (2025) show that journalists can negotiate their relationships with a powerful platform actor; a 2026 Bangladeshi study likewise highlights the need to examine how YouTube-oriented production affects organizational roles in a context-sensitive way (Khan & Gangadharbatla, 2026). Neither paper proves a particular labor arrangement at Metro TV.

The identifiable case-level finding is therefore professional normalization: C1 depicts being digitally versatile as an expected quality of contemporary newsroom work. Whether this redefinition reallocates economic benefits unfairly remains an unanswered empirical question requiring worker-level material.

Audience attention: editorial information and prospective market value

C1 reports that a manager examines views or within-video points of heightened interest and may use these indicators when considering subsequent clips (E07). This offers a concrete reported feedback practice, even though no dashboard screenshots, exact metrics, upload sequences, or decision logs accompany the account. Audience attention is treated as information that may influence packaging rather than as a verified revenue stream (Riemann & Ehrlich, 2025).

The technical context makes this distinction especially important. YouTube documents metrics for audience activity, ad performance, and estimated income, but access to definitions does not grant access to an organization's private results. A viewed news stream and a monetized playback are not interchangeable units, and increased public-facing activity is not a validated proxy for income (Google Developers, 2026).

From a political-economy perspective, two exchange-value pathways can be distinguished. One is editorial feedback, through which a publisher may refine commercially relevant formats. The second is advertising exchange, through which attention may contribute to monetization, subject to platform arrangements. E07 supports only the first as a reported practice; E05 and E08 refer to the second as an anticipated rationale. Neither supports a claim that a particular audience consciously agrees to an economic transaction or experiences diminished informational autonomy (Hall, 2025).

A conditional circulation–measurement–repackaging model

The combined documentary signals support a qualified conceptual sequence: (1) public-facing stream presence [P] → (2) reported simulcast and platform-oriented packaging [R] → (3) availability of activity metrics [T] → (4) reported metric-informed clip choices [R] → (5) possible further

circulation and exchange-value orientation [I]. This sequence is a map of compatible documentary propositions, not a time-series observation of Metro TV's newsroom.

Unlike a simple chain from production to consumption, the proposed mechanism includes a prospective feedback loop: already circulated material may be reorganized after audience signals become available. The model extends existing discussions of contingent cultural products and post-publication gatekeeping to the particular temporal logic of continuous news distribution, but both the completion and frequency of the loop remain unverified (Riemann & Ehrlich, 2025).

Table 4. Conditional mechanism, evidentiary basis, and necessary empirical tests

Link	Status in the present corpus	What a subsequent empirical study must show
Brand → public streaming listing	Publicly corroborated (P1)	Archived listing, livestream uptime, dates, and stream contents
Broadcast → simultaneous YouTube material	Reported in C1 (R)	Matched television/YouTube timestamps and program samples
Material → packaging and metadata adjustments	Reported in C1 (R)	Saved title/thumbnail versions, upload metadata and change histories
Engagement → content decisions	Reported in C1 (R), technically possible (T1)	Authorized analytics extracts tied to dated editorial decisions
Reuse → realized advertising income	Conceptual possibility (I)	Accounting/AdSense records, monetized playback measures and attributable time windows
Multiplatform roles → labor consequences	Reported role change (R); effect unknown	Staff interviews, contracts, responsibilities, hours and remuneration

The contribution of the model is its falsifiability and transparency. It identifies which evidence would be necessary to reject or substantiate a proposed mechanism and prevents a plausible connection from being presented as measured practice. A publisher could, for example, use metrics only to increase availability of socially important material, or choose clips without reference to advertising incentives. Both possibilities are compatible with the present record (Schneiders & Stark, 2025).

Gramscian reading of organizational normalization

C1 associates digital broadcasting with disruption and changing habits among younger viewers (E03), and represents multiplatform ability as a contemporary journalistic expectation (E06). These are two specific sources for a limited Gramscian reading: the first invokes a necessity frame, and the second a professional-normalization frame. The specialist-attributed argument that greater reach yields selling value (E05) adds a third commercial-value frame. This reading describes how the case narrative makes adaptation appear reasonable; it does not establish an institution-wide ideology or the attitudes of its workers (Gramsci, 1971).

A counter-reading is equally important. Describing younger audiences as digitally oriented may convey a sincere concern about accessibility; requesting multiplatform skills may be paired with additional training and compensation; and analyzing viewer interest may inform higher-quality public service. The current documents cannot adjudicate these alternatives. Trielli's (2025) account of

resistance, relinquishment, and renegotiation suggests a more rigorous subsequent approach: compare managerial language with workers' own statements and observed editorial negotiations.

Consequently, the theory does not function as an empirical verdict about consent. It functions as a disciplined interpretive device for identifying which alternatives become salient and which remain unexplored when change is narrated as necessity. Evidence of acceptance, resistance, or coercion would require independent participants and contextual material absent from the current corpus.

Five contextual conditions reconsidered

The previous case narrative names platform algorithms, the digital economy, shifting audience behavior, media competition, and advertising monetization. These can be retained as reported contextual explanations, but they are not five quantified drivers. Only the existence of platform metric categories and one branded public livestream listing are independently established in this study. No comparative market share, algorithmic-ranking experiment, longitudinal viewing sample, or profit account was examined (Google Developers, 2026; (Metro Tv, 2024).

These conditions differ analytically. Algorithms concern an intermediary's visibility mechanisms; digital economy refers to possible market value associated with distribution; audience routines concern the reach and use of news; competition concerns strategic alternatives; and monetization concerns actual arrangements that might generate payments. Their distinction helps explain why the presence of metrics is not identical to commercial success. Cross-national literature provides plausible mechanisms, not independently verified evidence for any one of these explanations at Metro TV (Nielsen & Fletcher, 2023).

Alternative explanations and public-interest implications

The documentary account permits at least three explanations for the same practices: a broadcaster may seek reach to improve access to public information; efficiency through the reuse of existing material; or market value through discoverability and potential advertising. A rigorous political-economic interpretation should consider their possible coexistence rather than treating every editorial adjustment as a loss of public purpose. The question is not simply whether analytics are present, but how editorial institutions balance them against public-interest criteria (Hall, 2025).

An empirically testable implication is that stronger reliance on quantified engagement could make explicit editorial safeguards more important. Relevant safeguards may include written criteria for public-interest selection, decision records for repackaging, and the ability to justify retaining low-engagement but socially significant reporting. The present study does not find that Metro TV has or lacks such safeguards; it proposes these matters for examination in future field research (Schneiders & Stark, 2025).

Scientific contribution and transferability

The article contributes at three bounded levels. Methodologically, it shows how a case narrative of uncertain provenance can be appraised without recasting its claims as authenticated interviews, and it supplies a source-to-claim matrix. Conceptually, it defines criteria separating convergence from exchange-value orientation and identifies a conditional feedback mechanism. Interpretively, it operationalizes Gramscian common-sense frames without mistaking organizational justification for worker or audience consent (Bowen, 2009; (Morgan, 2022; (Mosco, 2009; (Gramsci, 1971).

These contributions should not be confused with original primary empirical validation. The analysis is transferable as an audit procedure and set of propositions, not as evidence of the prevalence or strength of commodification across Indonesian broadcasters. Comparisons with Indonesia (Erlita et al., 2025), Bangladesh (Khan & Gangadharbatla, 2026), and other platformized

news environments illuminate possible mechanisms while retaining clear geographical and organizational boundaries.

4. Conclusion

Metro TV's publicly identified 24-hour YouTube streaming product provides a concrete point of entry for studying how broadcast journalism is represented as a platform-dependent activity. An anonymized case narrative additionally reports simultaneous distribution, optimization practices, multiplatform newsroom expectations, and the use of attention metrics in repackaging decisions. The verified public record and the unverified narrative must not be assigned equal evidentiary weight.

The study proposes a conditional circulation–measurement–repackaging mechanism that connects content, labor, and audience commodification as possible orientations toward exchange value. It also identifies organizational language in which disruption, new audiences, and professional flexibility normalize adaptation. These are defensible documentary interpretations, not established findings of additional revenue, labor exploitation, editorial harm, or audience consent.

The central implication is methodological as well as substantive: credible claims about platform-mediated journalism require traceable distinctions among publicly observed offerings, attributed documentary statements, technical affordances, comparative literature, and inference. Future work should seek authenticated source records, time-bounded content samples, original participant testimony, decision histories, and authorized financial measures before drawing stronger economic or ideological conclusions. The article thereby offers a transparent basis for subsequent verification rather than presenting an incomplete record as conclusive evidence.

References

Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, *9*(2), 27–40. https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027

Developers, G. for. (2026). *Metrics: YouTube analytics and reporting APIs*. https://developers.google.com/youtube/analytics/metrics

Erlita, N., Ali, M. N. S., & Mahmud, W. A. W. (2025). Commodification of political economy content in Indonesian private TV: The homogenization of news and the rise of social commodification. *Multidisciplinary Science Journal*, *7*(12). https://doi.org/10.31893/multiscience.2025568

Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks* (Q. Hoare (ed.)). International Publishers.

Hall, C. J. (2025). Platform journalism on YouTube: A democratic functions approach to analysing journalism on digital platforms. *Australian Journalism Review*, *47*(1), 97–115. https://doi.org/10.1386/ajr_00178_7

Hase, V., Boczek, K., & Scharkow, M. (2023). Adapting to affordances and audiences? A cross-platform, multi-modal analysis of the platformization of news on Facebook, Instagram, TikTok, and Twitter. *Digital Journalism*, *11*(8), 1499–1520. https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2022.2128389

Hendrickx, J., & Vázquez-Herrero, J. (2024). Dissecting social media journalism: A comparative study across platforms, outlets and countries. *Journalism Studies*, *25*(9), 1053–1075. https://doi.org/10.1080/1461670X.2024.2324318

Khan, E. K., & Gangadharbatla, H. (2026). YouTube-driven news production in Bangladeshi legacy media: How an "innovative" business model reconfigures journalism. *News Research Journal*. https://doi.org/10.1177/30497841261453539

Morgan, H. (2022). Conducting a qualitative document analysis. *The Qualitative Report*, *27*(1), 64–77. https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2022.5044

Mosco, V. (2009). *The political economy of communication* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446279946

Nieborg, D. B., & Poell, T. (2018). The platformization of cultural production: Theorizing the contingent cultural commodity. *New Media & Society*, *20*(11), 4275–4292. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444818769694

Nielsen, R. K., & Fletcher, R. (2023). Comparing the platformization of news media systems: A cross-country analysis. *European Journal of Communication*, *38*(5), 484–499. https://doi.org/10.1177/02673231231189043

Riemann, R., & Ehrlich, G. L. (2025). Up or out? The role of audience analytics in post-publication gatekeeping. *Journalism Studies*, *26*(15), 1936–1958. https://doi.org/10.1080/1461670X.2025.2567897

Schneiders, P., & Stark, B. (2025). Ensuring news quality in platformized news ecosystems: Shortcomings and recommendations for an epistemic governance. *Media and Communication*, *13*. https://doi.org/10.17645/mac.10042

Tandoc Jr., E. C. (2014). Journalism is twerking? How web analytics is changing the process of gatekeeping. *New Media & Society*, *16*(4), 559–575. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444814530541

Trielli, D. (2025). Search in the newsroom: How journalists navigate Google's dominance in a hybrid media system. *Media and Communication*, *13*. https://doi.org/10.17645/mac.9975

TV, M. (2024). *Live streaming 24 jam Metro TV*. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-CwtcKDaaLA

Publication Declarations

Author Contributions	:	Alfiansa: Conceptualization, Investigation, Data Curation, Formal Analysis, Writing – Original Draft. Bayquni: Methodology, Supervision, Validation, Writing – Review & Editing. Both authors reviewed and approved the final manuscript.
Funding	:	This research received no external funding.
Competing Interests	:	The authors declare no competing interests.
Ethics and Consent	:	This study employed qualitative documentary analysis of publicly available materials and a previously prepared anonymized case narrative. No new human participants were recruited. The consent and authorization status of interviews described in the secondary narrative could not be independently verified; accordingly, no claim of ethics approval for the underlying fieldwork is made.
Data Availability	:	The documentary sources, public materials, and analytical evidence matrix are identified in the manuscript. The anonymized source narrative and supporting analytical records may be made available by the corresponding author upon reasonable request, subject to availability, confidentiality, and applicable permissions.
AI Use Declaration	:	Generative AI tools were used to assist with academic language refinement, sentence structure, and the presentation of scholarly arguments. The authors critically reviewed, revised, and validated the AI-assisted content and retain full responsibility for the accuracy, originality, and integrity of the final manuscript.

Copyright and License

Copyright © 2026 Alfiansa and Bayquni. The authors retain copyright and grant Locus Journal of Academic Literature Review (JALR) the non-exclusive right of first publication. The article is distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License (CC BY-SA 4.0): https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/