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ABSTRACT

The study of agenda-setting since its inception in 1972 had undergone an evolutionary process that does not stop at the initial assumption, namely regarding the transfer of salience from the media agenda to the public agenda, but continues to expand to experience replication by adopting various theoretical perspectives and other established communication concepts. However, recent literature reviews on research mapping of agenda settings have been rare so far. Therefore, to fill in the gap in the literature review of the agenda-setting study, this study made an effort in revealing the development of agenda-setting research from 2014 to 2019. The research objectives were intended as a basis for deepening previous studies and providing a new landscape for future agenda-setting studies. Through meta-analysis, it seeks to obtain patterns from the overall review both from theoretical trends, study topics, methodology, media usage, and research contributions. The result showed changes in previous studies. This was shown by the strengthening of the use of the network agenda-setting theory and the intermedia agenda-setting theory. This change is due to the growing development of digital media which is slowly leaving conventional media. Therefore, future studies, with the existence of various media platforms, need to design alternative models and methodologies that can explain the power of influence of each medium in shaping the effect of the agenda-setting.
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INTRODUCTION

Mc Comb (2005) in his new finding on the US presidential election in Chapel Hill, Carolina in 1972 explained that what are important priorities for issues presented by the media are also important issues for the public. The conclusion from Mc Combs and Shaw stated that the news media provide a lot of information, and become the basis for voters to determine decisions in voting (M. E. Mc Combs, 2018). Therefore, the agenda-setting study began as a form of assessment of how public opinion is formed and the consequences of the main media coverage.

The development of research exploration on agenda setting continues to develop, not stopping at the traditional assumptions, namely explaining the transfer of salience from the media agenda to the public agenda, but continues to expand to experience replication by adopting various theoretical perspectives and other established communication concepts. Likewise, the topics raised were not only concerning general election regulation but were widespread in various public matters and other aspects of political communication. Further developments, agenda-setting research is not only attractive to US researchers but continues to expand to other continents, such as Europe, Asia, Latin America, and Australia (M. E. Mc Combs, 2018).

More than 4 decades of agenda-setting theory, many studies have been produced. Kim and Zhou (2017) found that the number of published scientific articles in this field has increased over time, with a real enhancement since 2000. Starting with the first level of agenda-setting, the second level, then the intermedia agenda-setting (for example, Zhou et al., 2016a; (Vonbun et al., 2016; Harder et al., 2017), as well as agenda building (for example, (Kim et al., 2011; Kiousis et al., 2016; Zhang et al., 2017)). The presence of communication technology with the internet creates a new communication media, such as online and social media. Thus, agenda-setting research has entered a new phase, namely research on agenda setting at the third level (for example, (Cheng, 2016; Guo & Vargo, 2015; Vargo & Guo, 2017). The study results explain that most of them provide broad evidence that supports the idea that the audience considers the issues emphasized by the news media as an important thing. ((Y. Kim et al., 2017a)).

A systematic literature review on agenda-setting research has previously been conducted. For example, Luo (2014) conducted a research mapping of agenda-setting in China in the period from 1994 to 2008. The theme explained that agenda-setting in China is connected to global scientific discourse, several studies follow the agenda-setting trend in the United States (Luo, 2014) such as research on the comparation of the agenda-setting in China and Korea. There were several differences between those studies, research of Korean studies reflect similarities with the US studies in terms of a topical focus and less interest in the social issues, whereas studies in China concentrate more on social issues and are usually a-theoretical and lack of methodological diversity. Besides that, there were also several similarities between those studies, like the research shifts of both countries to the Internet and social media ((Zhou et al., 2016)). Other studies, such as Luo (2019), examined the setting effects of public agenda media. Through a rigorous meta-analytic approach to analyze the empirical agenda-setting studies published from 1972 to 2015, and 67 studies that met the inclusion criteria for analysis resulted in a grand moderate effect size of 0.487 (Luo et al., 2019). The literature study is still local and limited to one pattern, namely the media effect.

Only a handful of literature reviews have been thoroughly discussed. For example, the thematic analysis approach (Y. Kim et al., 2017b), examined the theoretical, topical, and methodological trends of agenda-setting research over time from 1972 to 2015. Results showed that the number of agenda-setting research studies has increased over time, along with the expansion of research, media, methods, and other theoretical uses topics. Until now, the research is only up to 2015. Meanwhile, further new research on the agenda-setting trend has not been carried out. Therefore, to fill the gaps in previous research and see the agenda-setting research trends, it is important to clearly describe the development of the latest agenda-setting studies to analyze and re-evaluate these research areas. Through a meta-analysis of agenda-setting study publications, we could get the patterns from the overall review both in terms of study focus, theoretical trends, usage of other theories, methodologies, usage of media, and contribution to agenda-setting research. Meta-analysis has proven to be a useful method for assessing the current state of knowledge, identifying directions for future research, advancing theory, and guiding policy decisions (Guzzo et al., 1987). Therefore, this study aimed to provide a foundation to be able to deepen the previous studies and provide a new landscape for future agenda-setting studies.

LITERATURE REVIEW

1. *Agenda Setting Study Approach*

The development of agenda-setting theory undergoes 5 evolutionary stages, namely, basic agenda-setting effects, attribute agenda-setting, the psychology of agenda-setting effects, sources of the media agenda, and consequences of agenda-setting effects (Mc Combs, 2005). Basic agenda-setting effects introduce the first level of agenda-setting. At this level, the news media have a major influence on the focus of public attention, specific issues that are considered by members of the public to be the top priority at all times (McCombs, 2015). The transfer of salience from the news media to the public that is often documented is the first key step in shaping public opinion.

Attribute agenda setting is the second level of the agenda-setting stage. The attribute agenda study examines the salience of these two attribute dimensions. First, the substantive dimensions that describe the specific characteristics of issues on the media and public agenda. Second, the affective dimension which is described as positive, negative, or neutral. The attribute agenda emphasized by the media influences the salience of these attributes in public opinion (Cheng & Chan, 2015). Introducing the priming and framing theories, in looking at the agenda attribute, is a natural extension of the agenda-setting (Scheufele, 2000). Priming is the impact that agenda setting has on how individuals evaluate the priority and importance of issues presented by pre-existing media and shape more attention. Meanwhile, framing is the media used in determining how problems are thought through the selection and placement of issues in their agenda coverage that focuses on certain attributes (Y. Kim et al., 2016). Media can form a certain perspective, or "reverse", the events it presents. In turn, this will affect the public attitudes towards these events. There are several examples of research on this second level agenda, for example, agenda-setting and framing on the problem of policy solutions (Keskitalo et al., 2016; Martin & Grüb, 2016; Ekayani et al., 2016). The second level of agenda-setting in coverage of US pre-election newspaper (Johnson et al., 2009), and political debates in Italy(Ceron et al., 2016), as well as Twitter framing discussions about genetically modified mosquitoes, and the interactions between two media platforms (Wang & Guo, 2018).

The psychology of agenda-setting effects is understanding the power of agenda-setting effects with the concept of Need For Orientation (NFO). This concept details the psychological aspects of each individual concerning the media. McCombs and Weaver (1973) first understood NFO as the need for people to familiarize themselves with the environment through the usage of mass media(Camaj, 2014). In a comprehensive psychological analysis of agenda-setting effects, McCombs and Stroud (2014) concluded that NFO is only one part of the answer to the question of why agenda-setting effects occur. In conclusion, individuals who use media passively have lower NFO levels than individuals who use media actively. Individuals with "medium-active" NFO (high relevance and low uncertainty) used partisan media more than media with high levels of NFO (high relevance and high uncertainty) (M. Mc Combs & Stroud, 2014). Other studies exploring the role of NFO for the second level of agenda-setting showed that NFO carries out the first function, namely the importance of objects (Matthes, 2008). However, although the second-level agenda-setting effect occurred, NFO on the affective attribute issue did not influence media salience. In conclusion, NFO describes the number of information search, not the affective attribute of the information sought by individuals.

Starting from the assumption "who sets the media agenda, how and for what purposes it is set, and with what impact on the distribution of power and what values ​​are implanted in society" (Gandy, 1982). This assumption creates what is known as agenda building studies. This study focuses on investigating the interactions between the media and the sources (e.g., decision-makers, political actors, policymakers, media, the public) that influence the formation of the media agenda (Kiousis et al., 2016b). Therefore, agenda building can describe the role of information sources that can influence the formation of the media agenda. The concept of agenda building offers a framework for examining how to shape salience objects and attributes as well as explaining sources for media agenda setting. The objects presented in the media can influence the salience of problems in shaping public opinion. For example, in a political campaign, the political actors have networks with the media to influence the formation of the media agenda. Related research, for example, the role of the Chinese government in media coverage of Singapore and Taiwan in demonstrations in Hong Kong (Zhang et al., 2018), the US presidential election (J. Y. Kim et al., 2011; Ragas et al., 2014).

Guo and McCombs (2011) developed a theory of network agenda-setting or agenda-setting at the third level. This theory hypothesizes that the network agenda setting is “the salience of the reciprocal relationship between constructs or associative networks on a particular topic that can be transferred from the media agenda to the public agenda (Combs & Guo, 2014; Woo et al., 2020). This concept shows that the salience of network objects and media attributes affects the public network. Therefore, the agenda-setting network involves the effect of the media agenda network on the public agenda network (Guo, 2012). This new approach concludes individual cognitive representations of objects or attributes are presented as network-like structures in which different nodes are connected and are ranked based on importance linearly and logically (Cheng & Chan, 2015). This network agenda model considers the media effect from an associative perspective, whether the association that is built can be transferred between agendas ((Vargo & Guo, 2017b).

The presence of communication technology creates new communication media, namely online media and social media. In the development of the agenda-setting study, it has an impact on the intermediate agenda-setting study. This theory explains how content transfers between news media (Atwater et al., 1987; Harder et al., 2017)). There is a set of assumptions for being able to conduct intermedia studies in this digital era. First, the media agenda must be measured at the level of the problem. Second, the time lag is sufficient to understand overlaps in media content. Third, the media can be considered as a homogeneous entity (Harder et al., 2017). Online media and social media, such as Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, are establishing themselves as part of a networked and growing communication media, expanding and transforming to facilitate the access to all types of content and participants. With their unique existence, these media contribute in the changing of the ecology of the media, opening up new ways and forms of communication between citizens and their representatives (Skogerbø & Krumsvik, 2015). Several intermedia studies on general elections (e.g., Denham, 2014; Cushion et al., 2016; Jang et al., 2017).

b*. Application of Other Theory on Research Agenda Setting*

Agenda setting theory has adopted or met various other established concepts and theories. The included concepts include conferral status, stereotyping, image building, and gatekeeping. Meanwhile, theoretical complements to agenda setting include cultivation analysis and the spiral of silence, as well as framing (Mc Combs, 2005).

Likewise, when introducing the concept of social psychology, the agenda-setting theory developed a "need for orientation" (NFO). This concept describes the variation of the strength of the agenda-setting effect. The NFO is determined by the level of individual interest as well as a desire for more information about items on the media agenda. When interest and desire are high, the agenda-setting effect is strong. In contrast, when both are low, the effect of agenda-setting will be weak (Mc Combs & Stroud, 2014; Mc Combs, 2018). In NFO, the effect occurs through a psychological process, the existence of an individual's interest, and the need for this information (Matthes, 2008). In a political orientation study, for example, the public with the active involvement of the NFO is more likely to seek ideologically congruent media sources and is more likely to adopt the attribute of the media agenda (Camaj, 2014).

*C. Research Methods of Agenda Setting*

Mc Comb and Shaw (1972) at the beginning of the Chapel Hill study conducted an empirical test of the agenda-setting effect by using content analysis to investigate media agenda setting and combined it with survey techniques to investigate the media effects, namely public agenda (Y. Kim et al., 2017b). When conducting a study of agenda-setting studies between 1972-2015, 41% of agenda-setting studies used content analysis to determine the media agenda setting, and as many as 13% used survey techniques to determine the public agenda. Other techniques to find out the public agenda include interviews, experiments, focus group discussions (FGD), case studies, and others.

New communication media, such as online media and social media have an impact on the personality of the media and social networks in society. The implication is to determine the effect of agenda-setting using different methods. Guo & Vargo (2015) used a network agenda setting (NAS) model and theory of issue ownership to analyze large data sets on Twitter during the 2012 US presidential election. The results showed that the news media can determine public identification of political candidates with not only individual issues but also the whole (Guo & Vargo, 2015b). Other studies using the network agenda-setting model (NAS), for example, the discussion of President Barack Obama with 50 US Governors in 2015 using the twitter (Yang et al., 2016)

*d. Study Topics and Media Channels of Agenda Setting Research*

Mc Combs (2005) explained that in recent years, researchers have innovatively applied the core ideas of agenda-setting theory to a variety of new topics involving a variety of topics such as corporate reputation, professional sports, classroom teaching, and religious beliefs. In the corporate arena, for example, studies on corporate social responsibility (CSR) affect the news media incorporate crises (Park et al., 2019; Badham, 2019)). In sports, discuss the horse racing scandals (Denham, 2014). Likewise, in education that tests the anti-Moral movement and National Education in Hong Kong (Cheng & Chan, 2015).

Although their popularity is starting to decline, newspapers, television, and radio are still used by researchers to test the media agenda setting. Kim, et al (2017) stated that as many as 43% newspapers, 24% television, and 3% radio. Also, the usage of 40% of new media based on communication technology, such as online media and social media, continues to increase. Based on the development of media agenda setting, a new media landscape is always emerging, for example, the use of press releases, news videotapes, books, actor policies. For example, research on the influence of books on cultural policy (Fuhlhage et al., 2017). The role of the English language newspaper in influencing voters during the campaign(Kee et al., 2017).

McCombs (2004) discussed the three stages of the evolution of agenda-setting theory and noted it as "Gray's Anatomy" of agenda-setting theory in various international settings. The first stage represents the growth of agenda-setting theory that develops in five different phases of the formation process of communication and public opinion, starting from the first level of agenda-setting effects to the attributes of agenda-setting effects, individual differences in agenda-setting effects, media agenda sources, and the consequences of the effects. The second stage deals with expanding agenda setting in other domains including politics, business, cultural norms, and sport. The third stage deals with the elaboration of the main theoretical concepts of agenda-setting theory, such as salience, attributes, need for orientation and framing.

While conducting a meta-analysis of agenda-setting studies, the three evolutionary stages of the agenda-setting study became the guidelines in this study. This refers to the view of Mc Comb (2005), there are many agendas in contemporary society. And as long as the individuals perceive this agenda as something related to their lives, we will find a broad agenda-setting effect. (McCombs, 2005) Likewise, Rogers and Dearing (1988) pointed out, agenda-setting studies have a strong empirical nature, but now meta thorough analysis is required (M. Rogers & Dearing, 1988).

Through the study, it is hoped that it can reveal several trends in the agenda-setting study as a whole, for study focus, theoretical trends, methodology, and research contributions in the past and provide insights for future research. Therefore, the research questions are asked as follows:

RQ1: What are the theoretical trends in the agenda-setting study?

RQ2: What kind of research topics were published in communication journals between 2014-2019?

RQ3: Does the agenda-setting study use other theories in understanding communication phenomena?

RQ4: What kind of methods are often used in agenda-setting studies? Is there anything new in using the method?

RQ5: What kind of communication media are often used in agenda-setting studies?

RQ6: What is the impact of agenda-setting research as measured by citations? How does agenda-setting research contribute to communications research in general?

METHODOLOGY

Meta-analysis is a method for examining the results of agenda-setting research publications. Meta-analysis is a method for identifying, analyzing, and reporting patterns (themes) in data so that they can reflect a reality that can open or reveal the surface of 'reality' (Guzzo et al., 1987). To obtain research publication data, the agenda-setting focused on the database that came from Scopus because Scopus is a database that contains abstracts and citation of peer-reviewed journal articles, and literature from various publisher sources that apply strict publication standards. Every journal and website that is listed in Scopus has passed a review test by "content selection" and "advisory board" which comes from researchers and librarians from various disciplines.

In the search for the Scopus database, the keyword of "agenda-setting" was typed from 2014 to 2019. Meanwhile, the articles that became the unit of analysis were the results of research. Journal articles that are the result of editorial notes, reviews, books are not part of this research. This limitation was done for the reason that publications that are based on research will be able to describe patterns following the research objectives. From the result of searching on agenda-setting research from 2014 to 2019 found around 132 journal articles were collected as research samples, and came from 74 publishers.

*Coding scheme*

The unit of analysis in this research was an academic journal which is the result of research based on the agenda-setting theory. Journal title, year, and publisher are recorded and coded. This categorization is important to know, when the journal was published and who was the publisher. The period as a unit of analysis in this study is between 2014 and 2019.

Before explaining the coding scheme, it is necessary to know the average number per year of agenda-setting research publications. Figure 1 shows the number of issues per year.

Figure 1: Publishing agenda setting studies per year

Figure 2 shows the name of the publisher who has published the agenda-setting study article. There are 72 publishers, the most published are Journalism Studies with 5.30% articles, and others, such as the Asian Journal of Communication, International Journal of Communication, The International Journal of Press with 4.55% each.



Figure 2: Publisher of Study Agenda Setting

Regarding the coding scheme, it includes the following variables:

1. *Research theory trend:*

Referring to Mc Comb's categorization of agenda-setting theory trends, such as agenda-setting basic effects, agenda-setting attributes, the psychology of agenda-setting effects, media agenda sources, and consequences of agenda-setting effects (Mc Combs, 2005). In the agenda-setting research theory trend, the categorization in this study was defined as 9 categories of research trends, (1) first level of agenda-setting, (2) second level or attribute of agenda-setting, (3) agenda building, (4) third level or network agenda-setting. , (5 need for orientation, (6)) intermedia agenda-setting (7) agenda policy (8) agenda history (9) other research. If the article contains more than one trend, it would be identified and included in the other trends and coded.

1. *Research topic:*

Identification of the dominant subject to the main topic discussed in the article was conducted to find out the research topic. Ten main topics were included in this category. (1) Social problems (eg, social welfare, population, crime, and education), (2) Politics (eg elections, candidates, political corruption and democracy), (3) Economy (eg jobs, marketing, and finance), (4) Environment and health (for example, disasters, medical problems, and health-related problems such as medicine), 5. Sport, (6) War (for example terrorism and military), (7) International issues (for example foreign policy, and international cooperation and international organizations), (8) Corporate (for example CSR, production, and advertising (9) Various issues (for example a combination of three or more research topics), (10) History, (for example memory culture, and memory groups), (11) Public Policy, (12) Others. If there was an article containing more than one research topic, only the dominant topic was coded.

1. Other theories

Another theory that was used to explain, support, and expand the agenda-setting research was examined in this study. Usually, the theory was used to explain phenomena in testing hypotheses or research questions. The theory was coded if it can explain the reasons for the theory being used in the agenda-setting study. Referring to previous research categorization and it has been modified with a new agenda-setting study, these theories included, 19 theories, (1) Framing, (2) Priming, (3) Need for Orientation, (4) Cultivation (5) Uses and Gratification, (6) Information seeking, (7) Spiral Silence, (8) Network theory, (9) Information processing, (10) Social responsibility model, (11) Extended parallel process model, (12) Stakeholder theory, ( 13) Issue ownership theory, (14) Multiple Streams Approach, (15) World system theory, (16) community structure theory, (17) A Dynamic theory, (18) Interpersonal paradigm, (19) Preeminent theory, (20) Others.

1. *Research method*

Categorization in the usage of research method was divided into 11 categories, namely: (1) Content analysis, (2) Survey, (3) Experiment, (4) Case study, (5) Interview, (6) Secondary data analysis, (7) Critique/review, (8) Network analysis (9) Focus Group Discussion (10) Historical analysis (11) Ethnography, (12) other. The existence of new methods that are not included in the 11 categories will be included in other’s category, as a research finding.

1. *Media or channel*

Media or channels as a central element of agenda-setting research can be categorized as 10 media or channels. (1) Newspapers, (including print media such as magazines, tabloids), (2) Television (for example Cable TV, Local TV), (3) Radio, (4) Telephone, (5) Online news media, ( 6) Social media (for example Facebook, WhatsApp, youtube, Instagram), (7) books, (8) press releases (9) others (for example speeches, databases, videotape news, and statutory texts), if The article contains more than one media, all media used in this study were coded.

1. *Citation and contribution*

The measurement of citations was conducted by looking at the number of references to Google Scholar. Each article was grouped according to the number of frequencies referred to. Meanwhile, research contributions were divided into 4 categories, namely categories that contribute to the expansion of the communication phenomenon, the concept of agenda-setting, theory, and methodology.

1. *Inter-coder reliability*

Efforts to strengthen the consistency of measurement in coding involved 2 coders from postgraduate students of communication science who were trained in coding sessions. After that, all coders used the same codebook to check agreements among coders. For the inter-code reliability test, the two coders randomly selected 30 journal articles or 27.7%. Intercoder reliability was tested using Koefiseien Cohen's kappa, which resulted in reliability of 0.6666 for research trends, 0.7555 for research topics, 0.7058 for research methods, 0.7647 for media or channels. The overall inter-coded reliability score for all variables was 0.745.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The research trend for agenda-setting from 2014 to 2019, as shown in Table 1, showed a dominant trend in the third level or network agenda setting the trend of 30.30%, followed by 27.27% in the first level of agenda-setting, and third, in the intermedia agenda-setting trend amounted to 19.70%. Compared to the previous study, the first level of agenda-setting was in the first order of 47.3%, the policy agenda was 13.1%, the second level of agenda-setting was 12.9%, and the third level of agenda-setting was 0.8% (Kim et al., 2017). This means that in the period 2014 to 2019 there was a change from researchers to the orientation on the network or third level of agenda-setting. This was because the presence of communication technology, such as online media and social media, formed an interactive and social networking media and public landscape. Therefore, the traditional agenda-setting study was slowly being abandoned. The concept of "association" in the third level of agenda-setting opened the intermedia networks in the media and public agenda, so it is not surprising that the theory trend used in intermedia research ranked second, at 19.70%.



Table 1: Theoretical trends of agenda setting

Topic or focus of study that was often studied in agenda-setting studies. Researchers are still interested in politics to test the agenda-setting hypothesis, followed by environmental and health topics as well as social problems. In particular, political topics are an interesting custom to study. This is related to strengthening democratic values. The study of general elections, presidential debates, or political scandals is a frequently studied theme. Another interesting topic, an increasement in environmental and health studies by 14.91%, followed by social studies by 11.36%. The flexibility of the agenda-setting theory that can be used in observing various communication phenomena opened up opportunities for new topics that have never been studied.

Table 2: Topical domains of agenda setting research in 2014-2019



The use of other theories in agenda-setting studies. The result showed that framing is a theory that is often adopted in agenda-setting research, as shown in Table 3, at 19.05%. The interesting thing in this study was that there is an increment in the usage of network theory by 14.29%. The emergence of internet media, such as online media, has an impact on traditional media, such as newspapers and television. The media was considered to be no longer able to control the news agenda and was more likely to follow the online partisan media (Vargo & Guo, 2017a).

Meanwhile, other theories, which were popular previously, such as priming, need orientation, uses and gratification ranged from 2.38% to 4.76%. Another interesting finding was the use of a theory that has never been used before. There were several new theories used in agenda-setting research, such as information processing, the social responsibility model, extended parallel process model, stakeholder theory, and others. This can be seen in Table 3.

Table 3: Another theory in agenda setting research in 2014-2019



The methodology that was often used in agenda-setting research. Table 4 showed content analysis and surveys still dominated by 41.09% and 33.09%, and the third was the usage of network analysis at 9.82%. Several other methods stand out, such as interviews and time series. The combination of using this method was common in agenda-setting research. However, some researchers combine 3 methods like the use of time series, content analysis, and surveys in one study.

Likewise, the application of new methods that did not exist before, such as time lag design, historical analysis, semantic network analysis, and vector autoregression (VAR). The use of the new method described the research of agenda-setting is open to the replication of the method.

Table 4: Methodology research agenda setting in 2014-2019



The use of media during the study period, newspapers were still widely used in the research of agenda-setting, amounting to 25.76%, as seen in Table 5. Interestingly, there was an increment in the use of social media by 13.64% and online media by 12.12%. In the future, it is estimated that the use of social media and online media will increase leaving traditional media, such as newspapers and television.

The findings in the use of media were the existence of new media used, such as making policies, amendments, books, content databases, stakeholder thinking, and news videotapes. Even though the new media was still relatively small at 0.76%, at least in the agenda-setting study it showed the use of any method, the most important thing is that the media affects the public. Another finding was the combined use of media. This is following the research objective to measure the comparison of media effects. The combination of newspaper, television, radio, social media and online media was 6.82%, mix social media and online media was 9.09%, mix social media and newspaper was 9.85%. The combination of the use of the media enriched the variety of research on agenda settings.

Table 5: The media used in the research agenda setting in 2014-2019



The impact of the agenda-setting research can be determined by tracking the number of citations which is measured through an index taken from Google Scholar. Figure 3 showed that the frequency of citations with search results was 48.48% or less than 20 journals were cited, 22.78% were cited between 21 and 40, 20.45% were cited between 41 to 60, and 3.03% were cited between 60 to 80, and 81 to 100 of 3.79 %. In this study, journals that have been cited by more than 100 citations or a total of 1.52% were found. Those research were about setting the power of fake news (Vargo et al., 2018), and research on the relationship between newspapers, Facebook, Twitter in shaping the agenda-setting in local elections (Skogerbø & Krumsvik, 2015). This showed the interest of researchers to further deepen the network agenda-setting with social media and online media objects.

Figure 3: The average citation research agenda setting

Figure 4 explained the contribution of agenda-setting research. For the study, topic found 36.36%. For example, studies of corporate environmental reporting and news coverage of environmental issues contributed to insight into the relationship between news content and corporate reporting on environmental issues (Pollach, 2014). Likewise, studies of descriptions of moral and national education in media coverage and people's minds contributed in helping understand the public agenda and the relationship of the agenda to media coverage and government policies (Cheng & Chan, 2015).

Contribution to concept development was 34.85%. For example, research on the intermedia setting agenda in the multimedia news environment (Vonbun et al., 2016a). The result showed that the role of opinion leaders determined the set of media agenda, in addition to conventional news media during the campaign. Another study, focused on campaign news by semantically highlighting certain aspects of the candidate's image while eliciting the affective reactions to these aspects through their evaluative tone. Through this process, the characteristics of political candidates who were mediated by the news media can greatly influence the political judgment of their voters (Y. Lee & Min, 2020).

The theoretical contribution of the research from 132 articles was 9.09%. For example, research that was using ownership theory issue focused on the process of ownership of a problem influencing voting choices. As a result, a synthesis of agenda-setting and prioritizing issue ownership offered a valuable framework for documenting how the salience of issues affected the ballot choice (Kiousis et al., 2016a; Klüver & Sagarzazu, 2016; Lee & Xu, 2018)).

Contribution to the methodology was 19.70%. An example of this contribution was the research on the communication behavior of law enforcers and the communities that they serve in the reciprocal usage of social media (Williams et al., 2018). Previous research, the media used were local newspapers and television. The presence of social media expanded the communication space interactively. The results of the study showed that there were priorities that are on the agenda of the police and the public has found evidence of positive responses from the community toward several priority agendas communicated by the police.

Figure 4: The contribution of agenda-setting research

Before discussing the research results and implications, it is necessary to outline some limitations. First, the sample used in the study was limited to articles indexed by Scopus. Several agenda-setting studies are not affiliated with the Scopus index, which deserves to be taken into account and could provide descriptions and contributions to the study agenda setting in the future.

Second, this study did not include the results of collaborative researchers in conducting publications conducted in groups with several researchers and the researchers' country of origin. This referred to Mc Combs (2018), research on agenda setting has spread out of the United States to various countries. However looking at the age and quantity of research produced, the agenda-setting theory is a theory that has passed the trials. McCombs and Shaw (1993) in the course of the agenda-setting theory have enriched and integrated other theories in research and developed some sub-fields along with its historical growth. The evidence from this study further confirmed this claim.

Third, this meta-analysis research could only describe the agenda-setting research for the last 6 years, so it cannot conduct in-depth criticism or detailed analysis of the agenda-setting study. However, explaining trend patterns, study topics, methodology, and media variations and examining the impact factors and contributions of identified research could provide direction for future agenda-setting research.

Overall, the results of this meta-analysis review were different from the previous studies. In the theoretical trend, the usage of the third level or network agenda setting was getting stronger. The researcher's interest in network agenda setting was influenced by the existence of internet media which has created new media alternatives. However, that did not mean that researcher's rule was out of other theories. In recent theoretical trends, agenda-setting research was quite varied to combine the internet media with other theories, such as agenda-setting at the first and second level, agenda building, or intermedia. The findings of this study confirmed a shift in the dominance of the use of traditional agenda-setting theory or the first level was replaced by the third level theory or network agenda-setting theory. This shift represented an evolutionary change from agenda-setting research. This was in line with the statement of Mc Combs (2005) regarding the evolution of agenda-setting theory.

Political themes were still dominant. However, the findings of this study, other themes were an important part to be studied, such as health, public policy, sports, and history. This finding was also consistent with the prediction of McCombs (2005), that the themes or subfields of study in agenda-setting research will extend to various fields outside of public opinion.

Content analysis was an option in determining important priority issues in agenda-setting, and surveys to measure the public agenda. The domination of content analysis was related to the usage of newspaper media. But what is interesting in this review was the widespread research that focuses on the usage of online media and social media. Or intermedia which combined the mainstream media online and social media. The implication was in using the method by using the network agenda setting (NAS). This model emphasized that the news media did not only tell what to think and how to think about it but also set a network agenda to determine how the public relates to the different messages of the shift (Guo & Vargo, 2015a). The usage of NAS in this review, although not yet dominant, was slowly being used in agenda-setting studies. Due to the advancement of the internet, which was able to present the new media alternatives, in the future, the NAS model will be important as a method. Therefore, for the benefit of future agenda-setting studies, it is important to consider applying the NAS model to other media and communication concepts such as schemes, framing, and agenda building. Researchers can also use the ownership issue network framework to predict public opinion in other communication contexts.

The new theory being used as a breakthrough in enriching agenda-setting research. In this research, many new theories were used, for example, the extended parallel process model, stakeholder theory, issue ownership theory, and community structure theory. Other theories noted by Mc Combs (2005) as part of evolutionary theory, such as framing, need for orientation, were still an important part of agenda-setting research. What is interesting was the use of network theory, this was related to the emergence of internet media that sees the effects of media from an associative perspective, namely, considering whether the association that was built can be transferred between agendas (Vargo & Guo, 2017b).

The result showed the evolution of theoretical trends, study focus, methodology, media, and the application of other theories in the agenda-setting study. Although the method was still dominant in the use of content analysis and surveys. For the sake of future studies, it is necessary to pay attention to the time lag in order to know the effectiveness of the media effects. The idea of ​​"time" has acquired a different connotation. With news websites, liveblogs, and social media, news publication is highly dependent on a fixed schedule (Karlsson & Strömbäck, 2010). News also does not need to be communicated as a "finished" product (Vonbun et al., 2016b). In practice, journalists could present snippets of news when the incident occurs through social media channels, such as Twitter, then to follow up so that the report is more in-depth with full articles that can be done on their media website. The usage of content analysis on the effects of the media agenda will be more challenging if we pay attention to the comparison of social media with online media or mainstream media, such as newspapers or television.

Likewise, in the intermedia agenda setting, in future studies, it is important to design the alternative models and methodologies that do not consider setting the intermedia agenda to be a strictly linear process. Therefore, a method is needed to determine which news analysis platform appeared first so that it can track and follow events in detail. Such an in-depth method would open far more accurate insights into how and when media outlets influence one another. This is in accordance with the new direction of agenda-setting research, Mc Combs (2014) explained the theoretical trends in the study of agenda-setting in the future. The trend is, firstly, the centrifugal trend expanded to a domain beyond the original focus on public affairs. Second, centripetal research trends explained the core concepts of agenda-setting theory (M. Combs, 2014).

CONCLUSION

In the last 6 years, agenda-setting research has undergone an evolutionary shift in terms of theory use, study topics, adoption of other theories, methods, and the usage of media. It should be underlined that a prominent shift was the use of the third level of agenda-setting theory. Although it was not yet dominant, its usage in research continues to increase. This is related to the development of new media technologies, such as online and social media as well as the stratified public in social networks. Likewise, the usage of other theories will provide new directions for future agenda-setting research.

Results of this study can contribute to researchers to plan a research framework based on the agenda-setting theory in looking at various communication problems. Especially with the era of "industrial revolution 4.0", the complexity of society and the diverse media landscape, a comprehensive agenda-setting approach in analyzing both the media and the public is expected to unravel various communication problems, particularly the influence of the media and its effects on the public.
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