

ENHANCING CREDIBILITY AND FAIRNESS: A QUALITATIVE STUDY OF TRANSPARENT JUDGING IN THE FESTIVAL FILM INDONESIA

Ngurah Rangga Wiwesa
Universitas Indonesia, rangga.wisesa@ui.ac.id

Wan Hartini Wan Zainodin Dr
Universiti Teknologi MARA, wanhartini@uitm.edu.my

Dzaa Imma Abdul Latiff
Universiti Teknologi MARA, dzaa17@uitm.edu.my

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarhub.ui.ac.id/jsht>



Part of the [Film and Media Studies Commons](#), [Other Social and Behavioral Sciences Commons](#), and the [Social Media Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Wiwesa, Ngurah Rangga; Wan Zainodin, Wan Hartini Dr; and Latiff, Dzaa Imma Abdul (2024) "ENHANCING CREDIBILITY AND FAIRNESS: A QUALITATIVE STUDY OF TRANSPARENT JUDGING IN THE FESTIVAL FILM INDONESIA," *Jurnal Sosial Humaniora Terapan*: Vol. 6: Iss. 2, Article 6.

DOI: Doi: 10.7454/jsht.v6i2.1123

Available at: <https://scholarhub.ui.ac.id/jsht/vol6/iss2/6>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Vocational Education Program at UI Scholars Hub. It has been accepted for inclusion in Jurnal Sosial Humaniora Terapan by an authorized editor of UI Scholars Hub.

ENHANCING CREDIBILITY AND FAIRNESS: A QUALITATIVE STUDY OF TRANSPARENT JUDGING IN THE FESTIVAL FILM INDONESIA

Ngurah Rangga Wisesa^{1*}, Dr. Wan Hartini Wan Zainodin², Dr. Dzaa Imma
Abdul Latiff³

¹Department of Media Production, Vocational Program, Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia

^{2,3}Universiti Teknologi MARA, Malaysia

*Correspondence: rangga.wisesa@ui.ac.id

Received: July 5, 2024 / **Approved:** July 23, 2024 / **Published:** July 25, 2024

Abstract

The implementation of a transparent judging process is vital for the credibility of the Festival Film Indonesia (FFI). Clear evaluation criteria, including aspects like theme, originality, technical execution, and cultural impact, should be publicly accessible to foster trust in the system. A diverse jury pool, comprising established filmmakers, rising talents, regional representatives, and experts in various film aspects, is essential to ensure a balanced perspective and reduce bias. Strengthening FFI's credibility also involves a robust nomination and selection process, with preliminary screenings by specialized committees to ensure high-quality contenders. Ensuring the judging process is free from undue influence through measures like blind judging and independent auditing is crucial. These steps will not only enhance the fairness and excellence of the judging process but also attract higher quality submissions and gain the respect of Indonesian filmmakers, solidifying FFI's position as the leading benchmark for cinematic achievement in Indonesia.

Keywords: *festival film Indonesia, film, judging, filmmakers, reputation.*



INTRODUCTION

A competition must prioritize fairness, and this principle is equally essential for film festivals. The integrity of a festival like Festival Film Indonesia (FFI) is reflected in its judging system. The FFI employs a voting system by its members, which is considered one of the fairest methods to determine winners. This objective judging process involves multiple parties, including experts and competent individuals in the film industry, to ensure the credibility of the nominees and winners.

However, perspectives on the fairness of the FFI judging process vary. Interviews reveal that while many believe the process is fair and commend the high competence and experience of the judges, others highlight potential conflicts of interest. Some judges involved in the judging process also participate in the creation of nominated films, which raises concerns about the objectivity and impartiality of the judgments.

By implementing a transparent, fair, and communicative judging system, the film festival committee can build trust and credibility with filmmakers and stakeholders. This will enhance the festival's reputation and attract higher quality submissions in the future.

The selection of juries, which includes established filmmakers, actors, critics, and other industry professionals, is crucial. These judges bring a wealth of experience, assessing films based on current trends, technical aspects, and storytelling techniques. Their awards set benchmarks for quality and innovation, influencing future filmmakers.

To maintain the quality and fairness of judgments, it's imperative that judges stay updated with the latest developments in the film industry, technology, and intellectual property rights (IPR). Ensuring that judges possess a thorough understanding of the evolving landscape of cinema helps prevent past controversies from recurring. Additionally, assessing the ongoing relevance of FFI members, especially those involved since before 2000, is necessary to ensure their judgments reflect current industry values.

Managing conflicts of interest is essential, with actors ideally serving as judges during inactive periods or after their active peak. A cross-generational jury provides diverse perspectives, ensuring representation from each generation. Ultimately, maintaining relevance within the industry and staying informed about current practices are crucial criteria for selecting FFI judges. This approach will enhance the festival's image and reputation, solidifying FFI's position as a leading benchmark for cinematic achievement in Indonesia.

Fairness and Transparency in FFI Judging

The judging process in film festivals, such as the Festival Film Indonesia (FFI), has been a subject of scrutiny and debate. Fairness and transparency are crucial principles in maintaining the credibility and integrity of such events. According to various sources, involving multiple stakeholders from the film industry in the judging process can enhance its fairness. These stakeholders bring diverse perspectives and parameters shaped by their experiences as film practitioners, contributing to a more comprehensive and balanced evaluation. A significant aspect of the FFI judging process is the involvement of competent and experienced judges. These judges are well-respected professionals with extensive expertise in the film industry, which lends credibility to their assessments. However, there are concerns that ordinary people, who are not part of the judging system, might perceive



the process as subjective, often favoring popular artists over the technical and narrative quality of the films.

Transparency in the judging process is essential for fostering trust and fairness. Clear guidelines on how films are reviewed and scored should be publicly accessible. A judging panel comprising experienced and respected film professionals from diverse backgrounds and expertise ensures a well-rounded evaluation. This approach is supported by strategic reputation management theories, which emphasize consistent behavior to build trust and a positive reputation. Kerstin Liehr-Gobbers and Christopher Storck define reputation as the collective perception of an institution by its stakeholders, resulting from an exchange of experiences over time.

Renewing the judging system periodically is recommended to uphold equality and competitiveness while minimizing subjective biases and political influences. The credibility of judges depends not only on meeting eligibility requirements but also on maintaining objectivity despite personal connections or biases. Involving a diverse range of parties can mitigate risks of favoritism or corruption, fostering a more objective assessment process.

The interviews with FFI stakeholders reveal that a diverse and varied committee reflects FFI's commitment to fairness and impartiality. By advocating for a balanced representation of professionals from different backgrounds, including filmmakers, academics, and cultural experts, FFI demonstrates its dedication to upholding high standards of professionalism and expertise. This inclusivity bolsters FFI's reputation as a credible platform for recognizing excellence in Indonesian cinema.

The importance of cross-generational perspectives in the judging process is also highlighted. Involving judges from different age groups ensures that the evaluation reflects diverse viewpoints and paradigms, capturing the nuances of different eras and cultural shifts within Indonesian cinema. Balancing the experience of older judges with the fresh perspectives of younger judges helps FFI stay attuned to contemporary trends and developments in the film industry.

Ensuring representation and inclusivity in the selection process of judges is critical. By including a wider range of voices from various sectors of the industry, such as filmmakers, actors, producers, technicians, and other professionals, FFI can ensure that the judging panel accurately reflects the diverse viewpoints and expertise within the Indonesian film community. This representative and inclusive approach enhances the impartiality and transparency of the evaluation process, reinforcing FFI's image as an institution that values inclusivity and fairness.

Overall, the literature suggests that a transparent, fair, and inclusive judging process, involving diverse and competent judges, is crucial for maintaining the credibility and reputation of film festivals like FFI. This approach not only celebrates the achievements of Indonesian filmmakers but also contributes to the growth and recognition of local cinema on both national and international levels.

METHODOLOGY

Although there are still a few on the subject of film festivals, past studies on building image and reputation have tended to use qualitative approaches. Qualitative research that focuses on discovery, insight, and knowledge from the viewpoints of

individuals being investigated has the greatest potential to improve people's lives (Merriam, 2009). The qualitative, interpretive, or naturalistic research paradigm clarifies the most relevant procedures and procedures for data collection and analysis.

Because qualitative research focuses on the sense in a specific environment, it necessitates the use of data collection instruments that are critical to underpinning the knowledge while collecting and evaluating data. Humans are most suited for qualitative research since interviewing, watching, and analyzing are crucial activities. Even though many assumptions and characteristics are universal to all qualitative research, there are differences in the disciplinary background that a qualitative study might draw from, how a qualitative study might be structured, and what the study's aim might be. As a result, a qualitative ethnographic study focusing on culture can be distinguished from a narrative life history research or a designed study.

The qualitative method, according to Creswell and Poth (2018), allows researchers to undertake in-depth reviews of a phenomenon. The constructive concept of qualitative inquiry is defined as a planned effort that seeks out observers all over the world and entails making the world more visible through specific interpretive, tangible acts (Ngozwana, 2018). They also state that this research approach was chosen because it is well-suited to studying individual or group phenomena involving emotions, motives, and empathy.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The findings highlight the importance of incorporating a diverse and experienced judging panel in the Festival Film Indonesia (FFI) to ensure fairness and credibility. The involvement of numerous stakeholders from the film industry in the judging process contributes to a more comprehensive evaluation, as judges bring their own expertise and experiences. This diversity helps in assessing films based on multiple parameters, ensuring that the nominees and winners are truly deserving.

Mixed Perceptions on FFI Judging Fairness and the Importance of Transparency

Interviews with various sources reveal mixed perceptions about the fairness of the FFI judging process. Many believe the process is fair due to the competence and high experience level of the judges. These judges are well-respected professionals in the film industry, capable of evaluating films based on technical aspects, storytelling techniques, and current trends. However, concerns about potential conflicts of interest have been raised, particularly when judges are involved in the production of nominated films, which could compromise objectivity and affect FFI's reputation.

Transparency in the judging process is crucial. Clear guidelines on how films are reviewed and scored should be provided to foster trust among filmmakers and stakeholders. The judging panel should consist of professionals with diverse backgrounds and expertise to ensure a well-rounded evaluation process. Periodic renewal of the judging system can help maintain equality and competitiveness while minimizing subjective biases and political influences. It is essential to manage conflicts of interest carefully, ideally involving actors as judges during their inactive periods or after their active peak.



The strategic management of reputation is vital for FFI. A positive reputation, referred to as "reputational capital," impacts various stakeholders and can lead to greater respect and higher quality submissions. This reputation is built through consistent behavior that creates trust, reflecting the collective perception of FFI among its stakeholders over time. The inclusion of cross-generational perspectives in the judging process is also emphasized. By involving judges from different age groups, FFI can capture the nuances of different eras and cultural shifts within Indonesian cinema. This ensures that the assessment outcomes are credible and relevant, reflecting diverse viewpoints and paradigms. Achieving a balance between the experience of older judges and the fresh perspectives of younger judges helps FFI stay attuned to the evolving dynamics of the film industry. This will ensure that both classic and modern elements are appreciated in the judging process and foster a more inclusive and comprehensive evaluation, celebrating the richness of Indonesian cinema while embracing its future.

In conclusion, the FFI's commitment to a transparent, fair, and inclusive judging process is crucial for maintaining its image and reputation. By incorporating diverse and competent judges, managing conflicts of interest, and balancing generational perspectives, FFI can continue to uphold high standards of professionalism and expertise. This approach will enhance FFI's credibility as a platform for recognizing excellence in Indonesian cinema and contribute to the growth and recognition of local films both nationally and internationally.

As shown in Table 1 below, categories and themes were drawn from in-depth interviews with individual informants on quality judging systems that the organizing committee can apply in building the image and reputation of the Indonesian Film Festival. The themes derived from these in-depth interviews with Indonesian film stakeholders highlight the implementation of a quality judging system by the committee in fostering the image and reputation of the Festival Film Indonesia as perceived by these stakeholders.

Table 1. Categories and Themes From In-Depth Interviews

Item	Themes Derived
(i)	Selection Procedure
(ii)	Assessment Rubric
(iii)	Competency
(iv)	Highly Committed
(v)	Objective
(vi)	Informed and knowledge
(vii)	Composition

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of our research, the interview emphasizes the significance of guaranteeing representation and diversity when selecting judges for film festivals such as Festival Film Indonesia (FFI). The proposition that greater participation of industry workers in the judgment process underscores the necessity for a fair and comprehensive approach. Furthermore, the interview highlights the significance of integrating a wide range of skills and viewpoints in the evaluation process of film festivals such as FFI. Through the use of the perspectives of fashion stylists, film critics, journalists, and filmmakers, FFI can guarantee a thorough and sophisticated assessment that highlights and appreciates the



plenty and variety of Indonesian cinema. FFI showcases its commitment to maintaining high levels of professionalism and expertise by promoting a diverse representation of professionals from various backgrounds, such as filmmakers, academics, and cultural experts. This dedication enhances FFI's reputation as a reputable platform for acknowledging outstanding achievements in Indonesian cinema.

Based on the author's previous findings and analysis, there are three main recommendations that Indonesian film stakeholders should collaborate on to establish a robust quality awards platform. These recommendations include increasing the number of national film competitions, enhancing and reinforcing existing competitions, and promoting paradigmatic improvements within the FFI. Competitions held outside the FFI are no longer required to adhere to conventional competition terminology, such as "jury" and "best" titles. There is no justification for employing the implicit phrases "pronounced," "elected," "observer judge," "committee of judges/electors," and so on. In any competition, the primary objective is to select the most exceptional candidate, and the individuals responsible for making this decision are referred to as jurors. The FFI of The New Order was compelled to employ the term "euphemism" as a strategic "compromise" in order to avoid being perceived as a competitor or adversary to the FFI. The annual film competitions, such as the FFI, require enhancement. In addition, this involves clearly defining the competition and festival concept, strictly enforcing all game regulations, and openly demonstrating the responsibility of upkeep and engagement to all stakeholders.

REFERENCES

- Abratt, R., & Bendixen, M. (2019). *Strategic Marketing: Concepts and Cases*. Routledge. www.routledge.com/9781138593640
- Al-Kindi, I., & Al-Khanjari, Z. (2021). NVivo to Analyze the Definition of Student EBQ Qualitatively. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3768217>
- Alam, M. K. (2020). A Systematic Qualitative Case Study: Questions, Data Collection, Nvivo Analysis and Saturation. *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal*, 16(1). <https://doi.org/10.1108/QROM-09-2019-1825>
- Ardiyanti, Handrini. (2017). Perfilman Indonesia: Perkembangan dan Kebijakan, Sebuah Telaah dari Perspektif Industri Budaya. *Jurnal DPR RI*, 22(2), 79-95.
- Bakkalbasioglu, E. (2020). How to Access Elites When Textbook Methods Fail: Challenges of Purposive Sampling and Advantages of Using Interviewees as "Fixers". *Qualitative Report*, 25(3). <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2020.3976>
- Barak, M., Watted, A., & Haick, H. (2020). Establishing The Validity And Reliability of a Modified Tool For Assessing Innovative Thinking Of Engineering Students. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 45(2). <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2019.1620680>
- Braaten, B., Kramer, A., Henderson, E., Kajfez, R., & Dringenberg, E. (2020). Accessing Complex Constructs: Refining an Interview Protocol. *Proceeding - Frontiers in Education Conference*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/FIE44824.2020.9274260>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021). To Saturate Or Not To Saturate? Questioning Data Saturation As Useful Concept For Thematic Analysis And Sample-Size Rationales. *QR in Sport, Exercise and Health*, 13(2), 201–216. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2159676X.2019.1704846>
- Buriro, A., Ednut, N., & Khatoon, Z. (2021). Philosophical Underpinning and Phenomenology Approach in Social Science Research. *Asia-Pacific Annual Research Journal of Far East & South East Asia*, 38, 237–254. <https://doi.org/10.47781/asia-pacific.vol38.iss0.2526>



- Bucar, M. Pajek., et al. (2013). Is the Quality of Judging in Women Artistic Gymnastic Equivalent at Major Competitions of Different Levels? *Journal of Human Kinetics*. 10.2478/hukin-2013-0038
- Bush, T. (2016). Authenticity in Research: Reliability, Validity and Triangulation. *Educational Leadership & Management*. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781473957695.n6>
- Campbell, S., Greenwood, M., Prior, S., Shearer, T., Walkem, K., Young, S., Bywaters, D., & Walker, K. (2020). Purposive Sampling: Complex Or Simple? *Journal of Research in Nursing*, 25(8)(8), 652–661. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1744987120927206>
- Canavilhas, J. (2018). Journalism In The Twenty-First Century: To Be Or Not To Be Transmedia? *Exploring Transmedia Journalism in the Digital Age*, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-5225-3781-6.ch001>
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches (Third ed.)*. SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches (Fifth ed.)*. Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Crossman, A. (2020). *Purposive Sampling - Definition and Types*. Thoughtco.
- da Camara, N. Z. (2011). Identity, image and reputation. In *Reputation management* (pp. 47-58). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.
- FFI. (2020). *Kampanye Festival Film Indonesia 2020*. <https://festivalfilm.id/kampanye>
- Fusch, P., Fusch, G. E., & Ness, L. R. (2018). Denzin's Paradigm Shift: Revisiting Triangulation, 10 (01). *Journal Of Sustainable Social Change*. <https://doi.org/10.5590/JOSC.2018.10.1.02>
- Gibson, C. B., & Manuel, J. A. (2003). *Building Trust. Virtual Teams That Work*, 59-86.
- Gioia, D. A., Majken S., & Corley, K. G. (2000). Organizational Identity, Image, and Adaptive Instability. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(1), 63-81. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/259263>
- Walle, S. V. d. (2018). Explaining Citizen Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with Public Services. *The Palgrave Handbook of Public Administration and Management in Europe*, 228 - 237. 10.1057/978-1-137-55269-3_11
- Kivunja, C., & Kuyini, A. B. (2017). Understanding and Applying Research Paradigms in Educational Contexts. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 6, 27-41. <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v6n5p26>
- Klotz, L., Horman, M., Bi, H.H., & Bechtel, J. (2008), The Impact Of Process Mapping On Transparency. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, Vol.57 No. 8, pp. 623-636. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17410400810916053>
- Merriam, S. B. (2009) *Qualitative Research: A Guide to Design and Implementation (Second ed.)*. Jossey-Bass.
- Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2015). *Qualitative Research: A Guide to Design and Implementation (Fourth ed.)*. Jossey-Bass.
- Moon, M. D. (2019). Triangulation: A Method to Increase Validity, Reliability, and Legitimation in Clinical Research. *Journal of Emergency Nursing*, 45(1), 103–105. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jen.2018.11.004>
- Natow, R. S. (2020). The Use Of Triangulation In Qualitative Studies Employing Elite Interviews. *Qualitative Research*, 20(2), 160–173. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794119830077>
- Navarro, C., Knight, T., Sharman, S. J., & Powell, M. B. (2019). Challenges in Translating Interview Protocols For Alleged Child Victims of Sexual Abuse to Different Languages: A Case Study. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 94. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2019.104033>
- Nightingale, A. J. (2020). Triangulation. *International Encyclopedia of Human Geography*, 13, 477–480. <https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-08-102295-5.10437-8>
- Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative Research & Evaluation 4th Edition*. In Sage Publications.
- Pangesti, R. (2020). *Libatkan 66 Juri, Begini Mekanisme Penjurian FFI 2020*. suara.com. <https://www.suara.com/entertainment/>



- Premelč, J., Vučković, G., James, N., Leskošek, B. (2019). Reliability of Judging in DanceSport. *Frontiers: Original Research Articles*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01001>
- Sageder, M., Mitter, C., & Durstmüller, B. F. (2016). Review Paper: Image and Reputation of Family Firms, 335 - 377. *Springerlink*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11846-016-0216-x>.
- Sanjari, M., Bahramnezhad, F., Fomani, F. K., Shoghi, M., & Cheraghi, M. A. (2014). Ethical Challenges Of Researchers In Qualitative Studies: The Necessity To Develop A Specific Guideline. *Journal of Medical Ethics and History Of Medicine*, 7, 14.
- Steiner, L., Sundström, A. C., & Sammalisto, K. (2012). An Analytical Model for University Identity And Reputation Strategy Work. *Springer Science and Business Media*. [10.1007/s10734-012-9552-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-012-9552-1)
- Stilwell, P., & Harman, K. (2021). Phenomenological Research Needs to Be Renewed: Time to Integrate Enactivism as a Flexible Resource. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 20, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406921995299>
- Sundler, A. J., Lindberg, E., Nilsson, C., & Palmér, L. (2019). Qualitative Thematic Analysis Based On Descriptive Phenomenology. *Nursing*, 6(3), 733–739. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nop2.275>
- Taherdoost, H. (2016). Sampling Methods in Research Methodology; How to Choose a Sampling Technique for Research. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. [10.2139/ssrn.3205035](https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3205035)
- Tampke, D. R., & University of North Texas, Denton. (2013). Developing, Implementing, and Assessing an Early Alert System. *J. College Student Retention*, 14(4), 523-532. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2190/CS.14.4.e>
- Tobi, H., & Kampen, J. K. (2018). The Methodology For Interdisciplinary Research Framework. *Quality and Quantity*, 52(3), 1209–1225. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-017-0513-8>
- Walle, S. V. d. (2018). Explaining Citizen Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with Public Services. *The Palgrave Handbook of Public Administration and Management in Europe*, 228-237. [10.1057/978-1-137-55269-3_11](https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-55269-3_11)
- Wan Zainodin, W. H. (2018). *Understanding the Engagement and Consequences of User Generated Online Video and Its Virality towards Generation Y Political Understanding the Engagement and Consequences of User Generated Online Video and Generation Y Political* [Universiti Teknologi MARA, Malaysia]
- Workbook E: *Conducting In-Depth Interview* (2009). <http://www.wallacefoundation.org>