The Voice of Academics on Omnibus Law on YouTube: Undermining Public Transparency

Nurul Hasfi[1], Ahsani Taqwim Aminuddin[2]

[1]Universitas Diponegoro
Jl. Prof. Sudharto, Tembalang, Semarang 50275 - Indonesia
[2]Universitas Pakuan
Jl. Pakuan, Bogor 16144 - Indonesia
Corresponding author: nurul.hasfi@live.undip.ac.id

Abstract
Agenda-building is concerned with negotiating interests in social systems and forces structured and carried out by a group of people. This study explores the agenda-building of the academics to intervene in the Job Creation Act (UUCK) policies that are delivered through YouTube. UUCK is an omnibus law, regulations made based on the compilation of rules with different substances and levels. UUCK in Indonesia was passed on October 5, 2020, with the main aim of simplifying regulations to improve the investment climate in Indonesia. However, the law has been opposed by many groups of people, starting from workers, students, academics, NGOs, and environmental activists, because the law is considered to be not pro-people. This study analysed dialogue texts about UUCK using agenda-building theory in 12 dialogue videos with a total duration of 25 hours and 40 minutes on YouTube uploaded in 2020. This research shows that YouTube facilitates public voices represented by academics amid positive narratives about UUCK that are spread in the mass media and the internet. The study has found four significant narratives within the pros and cons discussions of UUCK on YouTube that were built by academics. These four significant narratives are employment issues, regulatory issues, investment, economy and business and environmental issues. The UUCK sentiment was dominated by the rejection of UUCK, as mentioned above. The findings of this study indicate a firm rejection of UUCK, with scientific arguments from academics showing that the government has not built a transparent discussion regarding UUCK. This study recommends a more transparent, open and argumentative discussion from all UUCK stakeholders to minimise community friction.
Keywords: Agenda-building; youtube; job creation act; civil society, academics

Introduction
When a non-elite governmental group receives a chance to participate in the political policy formation process, it will result in a good democratic process. This is because an equal relationship between the government and the people is formed during this process. However, an equal political participation process that involves all parties is not something easy to be obtained. Interests and power will interact in the process, and those with power will systematically shift the public agenda.

UUCK has become a polemic in Indonesian society since its drafting process and its ratification by DPR (House of Representatives) on October 5, 2020, during a

plenary meeting. The ratification of this law was a serious discussion among many stakeholders, both of whom supported and rejected this law's substance (Alika, 2020). In the BALEG-RJ-20200605-100224-2372 document, this law is legitimised by various arguments from the government and council members, including protection for micro small and medium enterprises (MSMEs), improving the investment climate, accelerating national strategic projects and increasing worker protection and health. However, this narrative was not simply accepted by all elements of society because some clauses were considered detrimental to other stakeholders such as workers or labourers, related to the possibility of legalising wages below the minimum wage (UMR), issues regarding hourly wages, outsourcing and the possibility of mass layoffs. In addition, there were also rejections due to concerns about environmental damage mentioned by environmental activists.

Online protests emerged from various groups, including workers, students, NGOs, and groups who had demonstrated in front of the DPR (House of Representatives) building to influence movements in other cities in Indonesia. However, these groups could not directly show their aspirations due to the COVID-19 pandemic that started in early 2020. Over the period of time, the government also issued the Enforcement of Community Activity Restrictions (PPKM) policy that prohibits demonstration activities and limits mass community activities that use public facilities such as schools, places of worship and workplaces.

In a situation where community activities had to stop because they had to stay at home and carry out social restrictions or social distancing, the discussion over RUU-CK (Job Creation Bill) still continued and even tended to ignore the pros and cons of the bill which arose in the mainstream media and mass social media. Under such circumstances, people need alternative channels to express their opinions regarding public policies that they consider not pro-people. In the context of UUCK, researchers view online media as the medium that bridges the process of discussion, conveying aspirations and forming public opinion related to UUCK, among others the institutes of higher learning which were the object of this study. The Internet, which in the latest research had more negative impacts, such

as hate speech (Lim, 2017a), has finally returned to play an essential role as happened in the early years of the emergence of social media (Lim, 2017b).

This paper explores the development of agenda or agenda-building carried out by academics at a university level related to their efforts to convey aspirations related to UUCK through YouTube. In its concept, agenda-building needs to be carried out by certain groups, such as academics, so that the topics discussed in the media or as public agenda become specific (Vu, 2020; Lang and Lang, 1991). In this case, academics have an agenda so that their views are considered in terms of coming up with the best solution related to the UUCK in accordance with the needs of the public and not the elite. The role of agenda building on social media is essential in Indonesia, considering that mainstream media has close relationship with the government, economically and politically, thereby their independence in facilitating the formation of pro-people government regulations is questionable.

Social Media in Indonesia

The use of YouTube in discussions about UUCK is essential because this platform is increasingly used by Indonesian people, especially during the pandemic. The index of internet users in Indonesia continues to increase every year. However, the use of the internet is uneven from one region to another due to the difference in population and infrastructure quality. The survey results released by the Association of Indonesian Internet Service Providers show that the number of internet users in Indonesia in 2018 stood at 171.1 million (out of 264.1 million total Indonesian population), and the number increased to 196.7 million (out of 266, 9 million people, the total population of Indonesia) (APJII, 2020).

Another data presented by GWI regarding the content that internet users in Indonesia most frequently access is video, with 98.5% of them accessing video content on the Internet. 94% of them aged between 16 and 64 years accessing YouTube in January 2021. This percentage is the highest among social media platforms (We Are Social, 2021). In the survey data conducted by APJII on the use of YouTube, 60% of internet users in Indonesia use YouTube frequently.

Theoretical Framework

Studies that examine the agenda-building process in the context of public policy formation through YouTube are still relatively limited. However, this paper also discussed other studies related to the issue of the agenda-building process on social media. Kim, Xiang & Kiousis (2011) examined the process of public relations agenda-building through official media sites, global media, and public opinions during 2008 United States presidential election. According to him, most public relations' messages were themed on political campaigns and economic issues that influenced the news coverage to show that Obama was more dominant than his political opponents. Other studies were to find the role of Twitter in setting an agenda, in which it was found that Twitter was used as political and public tools to communicate an agenda that ultimately shaped the media agenda in mainstream media (Conway et al., 2015).

Another study that also used an agenda-building process is the "1040-Hour Norm" research that explored protests in the Netherlands. Online actions driven by students used YouTube to upload their protests against study hours policies. Their action triggered many other Youtubers who supported the same movement (Bekkers, Beunders, Edwards, & Moody, 2011). Another study also examined the agenda-building process related to coverage of illegal drugs used by athletes in sports magazines. This study reveals how media reports are constructed to urge improved drug use regulation in sports (Denham, 2004). Although it also used the agenda-building process concept, the research focused more on the public's effort in building an alternative agenda amidst the elite agenda domination on UUCK (Job Creation Law).

Agenda-Building and Government Policies

Agenda-building is concerned with negotiating interests regarding social systems and forces (Denham, 2010; Elder and Cobb, 1984). According to Cobb, Ross, and Ross (1976), Agenda-building is a process where the demands of various groups in the population are translated and then consulted to get serious attention from the public and become policymakers. Dissemination of information – in this case, the narrative about UUCK – is an essential element in the agenda-building process (Parmelee, 2014). Dissemination of

information, both primary and additional information, is usually conducted from the "opinion leaders" point of view on specific issues and is often done in the form of YouTube videos and Facebook posts (Ragas and Kiousis, 2010; Gandy, 1982). This process will be identified further in this research.

The study of Agenda-Building aims to understand how various groups in a population are aware of and decide to participate in political issues, including their involvement in policy-making, initiated by groups in the general public or by political leaders (Cobb & Ross, 1976; Lipsky, 1968, p. Walker, 1966; Vidich and Bensman, 1960). This is done to expand issues outside their group. A group of academics initiated an effort to convey their opinion on UUCK, delivered in an online discussion through the YouTube channel.

The function of agenda building initiated by non-elite parties is carried out in three stages: (1) articulating and simplifying their opinions so that a broad audience can easily understand them; (2) disseminating ideas and demands to the public to get a place in the public agenda; (3) building pressure on decision-makers to ensure that they bring the issues in their formal agenda for more serious consideration in public policymaking (Linvill, Boatwright, Grant, & Warren, 2019; Cobb & Ross, 1976).

In the economic and political theory, the agenda-building theory explores how policy issues emerge in public and then attract the attention of policymakers and institutions that participate in the policy-making process (Brasil & Jones, 2020; Cobb and Elder, 1971). The focus of this research refers to Agenda-Building in the 'external initiative model' (Cobb et al., 1976), initiated by external parties, such as universities or academics as educational institutions. They hoped their agenda would be expanded into a public agenda until it eventually became a public policy agenda developed by the government. In this study, academics build a public agenda to influence the public policy of UUCK passed by the government, which is considered not pro-people.

This study identified six steps of the Agenda-Building theory (Denham, 2010; Lang and Lang, 1983). They are media managers – Higher Education – highlighting specific issues in this regard and against UUCK; the intensity of an issue in the spotlight in the discussion

varies based on the urgency of the problem to the community; how the interviewees frame the issue to narrate the UUCK issue; the language used by the media and interviewees in discussions frames an issue from a non-government perspective and can influence audience interpretation; relate the issue to the problems that will occur if the regulation is passed; selection of interviewees or figures who can represent the agenda to be developed. This study carried out these six steps, but the presentation of the research findings will not be in order following the need to answer.

Several factors support the agenda-building process at the social group level, including: first, information subsidies can influence media coverage; second, organisational networks – through online and offline media – can be the factor in the emergence of issues they support in mainstream media (Saffer, Yang, Morehouse, & Qu, 2019; Malinick, Tindall, & Diani, 2013; Shumate & Lipp, 2008); third, social media can help groups increase their influence on the public agenda in online or offline media (Yang & Saffer, 2018; Chen & Fu, 2016; Himelboim, Golan, Moon, & Suto, 2014); fourth, organisational characteristics that can affect the group's capacity in the agenda building process. In this context, the researcher sees that academics, as the essential part of society in a democratic society, have four supporting capitals in agenda-building on this UUCK.

Social Media and Agenda-Building

Social media platforms such as YouTube, Twitter, and Facebook are now inseparable media for people's political communication activities, even starting to shift roles previously dominated by conventional media. These new media are heralded as an introduction to changes that enable rapid worldwide network communication. Social media provides access to the public by utilising technology and internet networks and allows people to share content, opinions, experiences, insights, and media itself. Social media can be used for agenda-building (Lariscy, Sweetser, Howes, 2009).

In just a decade, social media has gone from connecting friends to connecting billions of people worldwide and integrated into business, politics, the home and more. Twitter, in particular, has become a powerful platform for gathering new users, sparking

conversations, and promoting an agenda (Morales, Schultz, Landreville, 2021; Xiong et al., 2019). The study shows that Twitter was the only social media platform—other than Instagram, Facebook, YouTube, and Reddit—that often influenced news coverage, not the other way around (Morales, Schultz, Landreville, 2021; Groshek & Groshek, 2013).

YouTube, Twitter, and Facebook as social media resemble mass media, spreading most of the news (Kwak et al., 2010; O'Boyle, 2019). These media platforms are so prevalent in newsrooms because they provide the journalists crowdsourcing, quick and easy access abilities in disseminating the news to many different sources at no cost, and the ability to increase the number of readers (O'Boyle, 2019).

In public communication, it is known that there are parties that influence general public opinion. According to Parmelee (2014; Seethaler & Melischek, 2019), the availability of social media to the stakeholders enables them to be more influential on the media agenda and the public agenda (who access social media). A consensus states that social media networks change the relationship between media and politics (Jungherr, 2016). The study of Agenda-Building using various methodological approaches provides evidence that social media platforms such as Twitter, Youtube and Facebook can be used as tools by politicians and the public to communicate an agenda, which in turn shapes the media agenda (Seethaler & Melischek, 2019; Conway et al., 2015).

One of the examples of Agenda-Building with social media is the scientific study on Donald Trump's Twitter agenda-building process. As the 45th US president, Trump has impacted the media agenda and the public agenda, primarily through Twitter (Morales, Schultz, Landreville, 2021; Perez-Curiel & Naharro, 2019). A study conducted by the Pew Research Center shows that 16% of 2017 news was about Trump or his administration and also his tweets (Mitchell et al., 2017; Morales, Schultz, Landreville, 2021). It is known that Trump's tweets were influential in building the media agenda. This finding also has implications for journalistic practice and the public agenda, even though Trump is no longer president (Morales, Schultz, Landreville, 2021).

YouTube allows every user to broadcast videos of their political activities, in terms of expressing their opinions and the formation of public agendas. A study shows that YouTube videos have the potential to collect hundreds, thousands, or even millions of views in a matter of days. With this potential power, YouTube is referred to as a space that broadcasts populist vox and acts as a public medium that can influence the mainstream media agenda and also influence dialogue between citizens on the internet (Hennessy and Martin, 2006; Sayre, Bode, Shah, Wilcox, & Shah, 2010). Other studies also state that not only the use of online videos, including those on YouTube, that continue to increase, but also the meaning of integration between the public in daily habits (Lange 2007). A research conducted by Bernaola Serrano (2022) with an Agenda-Building perspective shows that some of India's policy agendas built through social media are correlated with India's foreign policy agenda in South Asia (Serrano, 2022).

Material and Methodology

This article uses a content analysis technique with a qualitative approach that counts words and examines language intensively to classify several texts into specific categories (Weber, 1990; Selvi, 2019). In research, *qualitative content analysis* is defined as a research method for interpreting text data content through a systematic classification process of coding and identifying emerging themes or patterns (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005).

This article analyses 12 dialogue videos about UUCK from January to October 2020 with a total duration of 25 hours and 40 minutes and conducted by universities. The twelve videos were selected based on considerations of dialogue quality, minimum video duration of 30 minutes, presentation speakers of at least two people and the credibility of the YouTube account owner agency. The list is shown in the table below:

Table 1. List of YouTube Channels Taken as Samples

No	YouTube Channels and Links	Managed by
1	Fakultas Ekonomi dan Bisnis UI / https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Tm-NX8Zf50I&t=8s	Faculty of Economics and Business of University of Indonesia
2	PUSaKO FHUA / https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vVycE8VHUFo&t=446s	Constitution Study Program, Faculty of Law, Andalas University
3	BEM UI / https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1WCa84Zhelw&t=3624s	Student Executive Board (BEM/*Badam Eksekutif Mahasiswa*), University of Indonesia
4	Kanal Pengetahuan FH UGM / https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tEduXcBrLWk&t=579s	Faculty of Law, Gadjah Mada University
5	ILUNI UI / https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9VTcQRQG7II&t=4s	Association of University of Indonesia Alumni
6	FHUB Official / https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GMsCv2NE5UY&t=9s	Faculty of Law, Brawijaya University
7	HIMPUNI TV / https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hwyg-6vUVcc&t=4040s	Association of Indonesian State University Alumni Organizations (HIMPUNI)

8	UNPAR OFFICIAL / https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ry24qQpG9vQ&t=12451s	Catholic University of Parahayangan
9	OVIS UI - Old Channel / https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CXIfhuUvkOQ	University of Indonesia
10	Universitas Ahmad Dahlan / https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=28r0NwOMB1w&t=2s	University of Ahmad Dahlan
11	Fisipol UGM / https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=R28xfpX972M	Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, University of Gajah Mada
12	HIMPUNI TV / https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-V6WUKCWSuA	Association of Indonesian State University Alumni Organizations (HIMPUNI)

The analysis method is carried out in several steps by adopting the agenda-building analysis steps of Lang and Lang (1983) and Denham (2010), namely: (1) collecting and identifying data from total sampling; (2) identifying the themes brought by each interviewee who spoke in the dialogue; (3) recording the names of sources or interviewees and institutions from which they came in addition to identifying narratives; (4) analysing qualitative data using the emerging agenda, and quantitative data using the concept of the Agenda-Building process (Denham, 2004). With this concept, the researcher identifies how issues about UUCK are built by academics and how theoretically they contribute to the study of new media, which in this case, the role of YouTube in facilitating the development of public opinion. In addition, the identification results in the four sections will present arguments related to UUCK that come from the grassroots.

Results and Discussion

In this section, the researcher will answer the research questions by following the four steps described in the methodology, namely: (1) identifying the interviewees and figures involved in the discussion; (2) identifying the issues and the reoccurrence; (3) identifying the narrative and theme frames raised by the interviewees to support their arguments on the issue; (4) exploring arguments about predictions that will occur if UUCK is passed

as a legitimacy means of the interviewees in building their narratives.

YouTube as The Voice for Academics

This section shows the academics' sentiments and the speaker's or interviewees' identities presented in the discussion. In the Agenda-Building concept, media management institutions determine which topic they will disseminate and build an agenda that reflects the institution, which is also negotiated with information sources. In this research, each actor, or we call them interviewees, broadens the present-day highlighted issues. The selected sources may have conflicting and competing interests (Denham, 2010).

This study discovered the different backgrounds and sentiments of interviewees, who were invited by the universities, related to this concept. Of the total 48 interviewees involved in the discussion, 61% were academics or researchers, then respectively followed by government representatives, activists and council members, as shown in the table 2.

Table 2. Professions of the Interviewees in the UUCK Dialogue on YouTube

Background	Number	%
Academics and researchers	29	61
Government representatives	8	17
Activists and Observers	5	10
Members of the House of Representatives (DPR) and members of political parties	4	8
Entrepreneurs	2	4
Total	48	100

Source: Result of the study analysis (2021)

The data above shows that academics' YouTube accounts provide the most significant space for academics, but that does not mean they only have one point of view. They tried to bring other parties, including the government, although, in practice, the government initiated these discussions by cooperating with some universities with a framing public hearing on UUCK, for example, a discussion held at UGM. However, the academics also tried to present a balanced discussion by inviting interviewees who were critical of the UUCK.

What topics were discussed?. In the discussion, the interviewees gave their opinions according to their perceptions and backgrounds (Parmelee, 2014; Gandy, 1982). Before looking in more detail at how the detailed narrative on UUCK is, it is essential first to identify the sentiments of the interviewees towards UUCK. As shown in Table 3 below, 63% of the interviewees rejected the RUU-CK (Job Creation Bill); 35% favoured and 2% abstained.

Table 3. Sentiments towards UUCK

Interviewees Sentiments	Amount (n=48)	In Percentage (%)
Favour	17	35
Reject	30	63
Abstain	1	2

Source: Result of the study analysis (2021)

The high rate of rejection of UUCK indicates the need to have a further discussion in the academic community. Although there were discussions on socialisation conducted by the ministry in this higher education forum, for example, on the UGM YouTube channel, it was still limited to top-down socialisation and has not opened up an egalitarian discussion space.

Supporting UUCK Narratives
Furthermore, we will deepen the narratives that appear in the sentiment of supporting and rejecting UUCK (Table 4) and identify the narrative frame used to legitimise statements about the narrative supporting UUCK. Table 4 shows the narrative categories

regarding their support for UUCK, especially those related to labour and regulatory issues, which have the highest number of occurrences among other narratives. Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises (MSMEs) frequently emerge in the sub-narrative on employment issues in terms of ease in registering their businesses. UUCK points out the possibility of collaboration between MSMEs, cooperatives and large companies, as shown in Table 5, that show a narrative frame or legitimacy tool for addressing MSMEs, is considered to support UUCK. However, this opinion was challenged by academics as it is not an easy practice. In fact, MSMEs and cooperatives may not be able to compete with large companies.

Table 4. Supporting the UUCK Narratives Category and The Frequency in Discussions

Narratives Category	Frequency or Total Appearance (48 interviewees)	Total (%)
Employment		
Pre-employment	1	2.1
Employer	6	12.5
Society welfare	2	4.2
MSME	10	20.8
Foreign workers with certain skills	2	4.,2
Demographic bonus	2	4.2
Redundancy and pandemic	5	10.4
Workers protection	6	12.5
Environmental Aspect		
Land	2	4.2
Environment	6	12.5
Regulations		
Regulatory simplification	12	25
Regulatory improvement	5	10.4
Drafting transparency	5	10.4
Economy – Investment		
Investment	6	12.5
Economic acceleration	1	2.1

Source: Result of study analysis (2021)

In addition, employment issues are the main reason behind the rejection of the law, such as foreign workers bringing misery to Indonesian labourers, possible layoffs and low worker protection. Meanwhile, on the environmental aspect, the narrative of environmental activists' rejection was because experts did not publish an environmental impact analysis (AMDAL) despite the argument that it is there to perfect the existing environmental regulations. In addition, this UUCK also regulates the import of commodities (food, livestock, and horticulture) while at the same time protecting domestic products. The data above also states that the legitimacy narrative that UUCK supporters also use is the simplification of regulations expected to boost investment and accelerate economic growth in Indonesia.

The other dominant narrative is the regulation issues regarding UUCK's efforts to open up investment opportunities. The frame narrative, in the end, argues that higher investment inflows to Indonesia will improve the economic development in the country.

Table 5 shows that support for UUCK also comes from academics who speak in forums on YouTube, which indicates a fair discussion on their channels as they provide opportunities for academics to convey their approval of UUCK (see Table 5).

Supporting Frame for UUCK

To support the narrative in the discussion, each interviewee with their respective positions and backgrounds uses their language to define the issues presented to the public. In this study, each narrative or language used is seen as a framing effort so that an issue can influence the audience's interpretation. Entman (1993) defines *framing* as a process of highlighting certain aspects against another as they are considered to be more important. McCombs and Guo (2014) explain that the message of communication helps people construct perceptions about an issue cognitively.

In this study, *framing* is defined as a process carried out by the media through the sources or interviewees to convey certain aspects of the UUCK issue in order to help the audience understand the urgency of UUCK. Table 5 shows how interviewees supporting UUCK frame the narrative by highlighting the urgency of this law to be passed and applied in Indonesia. The frame narrative, in Table 5, is a legitimacy tool for UUCK supporters to validate their statement when they try to provide rational arguments of why they bring such a narrative. The narratives supporting UUCK have spread widely in mainstream or traditional media, and in this study, they are being re-stated by the government elite interviewees. The following sub-section will discuss how non-governmental interviewees will counter these supporting narratives.

In general, these interviewees appear to link their support for UUCK to the main employment issues: unemployment and worker protection, economic frame, and people's welfare by bringing issues about entrepreneurs to formal and informal workers. The narrative also highlights the importance of improving regulations and targeting environmental issues that are considered to be far from enough and need to be improved by this UUCK. To strengthen the frame, they also compare conditions in Indonesia with what is happening abroad. For example, legitimising the issue of UUCK expands employment opportunities.

Table 5. Frame Narrative of Supporting UUCK by Interviewees

Interviewees' Background	Frame Narrative
	Employment
Presidential Special Staff for Economic Affairs	**Japan, when it gets a demographic bonus, becomes a developed country because of the job creation channel.**
Special Staff to the Coordinating Minister for Economic Affairs	**Foreign workers are only for certain skills, not labour intensive.**
Head of the Legal Bureau of the Ministry of ATR/BPN	**This RUU-CK encourages the legal basis for creating job opportunities** as there are many unemployed people who need work.
Deputy Head of the Demographic Institute, FEB – UI	Many of our workers from various modes of work agreements have not been fully covered by the existing protections. The RUU-CK (Job Creation Bill) exists to update the current conditions, things that have not been regulated in the previous law.
Deputy Head of Innovation and Creativity Studies Institute for Community Economic Research, FEB-UI	As a result of Covid-19, there are 3.6 million people affected by Covid-19 who have been made redundant. So, the number of workers who left BPJS Jamsostek membership increased 8%. The RUU-CK provides a job loss guarantee as an additional component. Such as in **America, Malaysia, Canada, France,** and **Italy.**
Expert staff on economic and political relations, law and security, coordinating ministry for the economy	Why should there be a RUU-CK (Job Creation Bill)? There are 45.8 million precarious workers, and this is not voiced. Furthermore, this is not a union. There is a 2.24 million, at a minimum, new workforce. There are still many problems that the labour law has not covered. Moreover, this is the problem that the Omnibus Law (RUU-CK) wants to cover.
	Investment, Economy, and Business
Deputy for Economic Affairs Cabinet Secretariat	**Investment is meant to prioritise not only foreign investors, but also domestic investors.**
FEB UI Demographic Institute	The Bill is meant to enable everyone to start a new business.
Executive Director of the Indonesian Forest Entrepreneurs Association	**Simplification of regulations to facilitate investment.** Entrepreneurs feel that the process and requirements to start a new business are long and complicated.
Chairman of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry (KADIN)	The pandemic increased poverty rate and unemployment rate in Indonesia. Therefore, investment is needed to open many job opportunities.

Environmental Aspect

Head of the Expertise Board of the Secretariat General of the DPR RI	In the previous law on the environment, the execution was not excellent because the AMDAL did not involve all of the experts. Some who were not yet competent in the environmental field were also involved.
Expert Staff for Regulation, Law Enforcement, and Economic Resilience at the Coordinating Ministry for Economic Affairs	Provisions on imports (food, livestock, horticulture) while still providing maximum protection for domestic products.

Regulations

Deputy Chancellor 3 Andalas University	There are many overlapping regulations at this moment.
Executive Director of the Indonesian Forest Entrepreneurs Association	Simplify regulations.

Rejecting UUCK Narratives

The number of narratives rejecting UUCK as presented in quantitative data is higher than that of narratives favouring UUCK. The narrative formation mechanism used by the interviewees seems to be in line with the narratives that appear on issues favouring UUCK, including regulation, economy and investment, environment and employment. Those three significant issues seem to be challenged by interviewees rejecting UUCK. This process is the same as the concept of redefinition, namely the process of the emergence of an issue to answer questions from another issue that is contrary to the issues raised (Cobb, Ross & Ross, 1976).

Table 6. Rejecting UUCK Narratives Category and the Frequency in Discussions

Types of Issues	Total (from 48 interviewees)	Percentage (%)
Regulation		
Transparency	10	20.8
Flaws in the regulatory process	13	27.1
Centralistic	5	10.4
Complexity	6	12.5
Interests of people with power	1	2.1
Potential for corruption	2	4.2
Economy – Investment		
Economy	1	2.1
Investment	12	25
Cross Budget	1	2.1
MSMEs	1	2.1
Environmental Aspect		
Ignorance (do not care about the environment)	15	31.3
Minerals and coals	2	4.2
Land	3	6.3
Indigenous people and local wisdom	2	4.2
Pandemic	1	2.1
Employment		
Foreign workers	3	6.3

Threat to the workers	5	10.4
Cultural values in education	1	2.1

Source: Result of study analysis (2021)

Table 6 above shows four variations of issues raised in the discussion, which are then divided into sentiments favouring and rejecting UUCK. The table shows the percentage of interviewees who raised a variety of issues based on their sentiments of the interviewees. 12.5% of the total interviewees favouring UUCK raised the issue of Investment in the discussion, while 25% raised the same issue from the total interviewees rejecting UUCK. From the table, 20.8% raised the transparency issue, which is higher than the total interviewees favouring RUUU-CK on the same issue, which is 10.4%. Regarding environmental issues, 31.3% reject the RUUCK (Job Creation Bill), higher than the percentage of interviewees favouring the bill, which is 12.5%.

The high number of interviewees who appear in the narrative of news regulations and the lack of transparency in the discussion of UUCK is essential because it shows that the government seems to have to introspect regarding the poor mechanism for making public policy on UUCK. The interviewees also stated that UUCK is legally flawed in this narrative because it was deemed not to have gone through the correct procedure. This is supported by the assumption on the lack of transparency as the government seems to only take into account the opinions of the entrepreneurs and does not provide a space for discussion for the public.

Meanwhile, regarding investment, the interviewees said that the legitimacy of simplifying regulations to increase investment was merely to simplify the problem. Furthermore, the discussion below shows how the narratives about the rejection of UUCK are legitimised with a specific frame, as shown in Table 7.

Rejection Frame of UUCK

Interviewees who rejected the RUU-CK framed the narrative by highlighting the wrong sides of the RUU-CK (Job Creation Bill), which started from the drafting process to the concerns if this Bill would be successfully passed and implemented in Indonesia. The process of drafting the RUU-CK in the narrative that the interviewees framed was considered to be hasty and behind closed doors, legitimising some aspects that were considered only to benefit a few parties, not the general public. For example, an academic who was invited to the discussion (of the Bill) claimed that the drafting process was so quick and seemed to be merely a formality. Some interviewees brought up the discussion period where the drafting was taking place during the pandemic, and the narrative was framed to convey to the audience that the DPR (House of Representatives) and the government were concerned more about the Bill rather than regulating the control of the Covid-19 which can be fatal to the citizens and themselves. Narratives about the dangers of the RUU-CK for the environment are also often framed by emphasising the industrial licensing process, AMDAL, and the involvement of all affected communities (not only those living around the industry).

Table 7. Frame Narratives of Interviewees Rejecting UUCK

Interviewees Background	Frame Narratives
Regulations	
UGM International Affairs	It (the UUCK) works fast but has no strong foundation in our industrial structures.
Sociology Lecturer at UGM	Omnibus Law is to answer the problems that have happened in the past or has it become a problem that we will need to answer in the future? **We have to map out who benefits and who loses**.
Lecturer at the Faculty of Law, UAD	This is a setback because there were good ones (laws) before, but then they were relinquished.
UGM Professor	**What should be done is public consultation, not public outreach, and that is what is lacking;**

UI Professor	Indeed, we need to simplify the overlapping laws, but we were supposed to respond to them wisely.
Professor of Constitutional Law, UGM.	**The process did not involve (all) stakeholders, but only those favouring the law.**
Professor of Constitutional Law, Unpad	Usually, the DPR (House of Representatives) and the government are slow in passing bills into laws, but not with the Omnibus Law.
Institute for Development of Economics and Finance (INDEF)	There hasn't been a single discussion about the impact of the Omnibus Law on regions or regional regulations.
Professor at the Faculty of Law, UNPAR	I was one of the academics who got invited to draft this bill, but I was only there (at DPR building) for an hour, meaning it was only a formality and small talk involving experts.
Lecturer of the Agrarian Law at the Faculty of Law, Brawijaya University	The provisions in the RUU-CK (Job Creation Bill) were those that have been in place for a long time, which were then taken, copied, then 'amputated' and included in the Job Creation Bill.
Lecturer at the Faculty of Law, Brawijaya University	**It takes decades for Queensland to form an Omnibus law. Meanwhile Indonesia only took three months, just like building a temple.**

Investment, Economy & Enterprises

Permanent Professor at the Faculty of Forestry and Environment of IPB.	Omnibus Law is seen as truth only by the makers whose purpose is to develop investment. But, it is not that simple.
Legal Practitioner and Chairperson of the Executive Board of 2013-2017 YLBHI	What is mainly offered in the (Job Creation Bill) RUU-CK is **investment, not how Indonesian people get a job**… Chinese investment not only brought jobs, but also workers from China.
Lecturer at the Faculty of Law, Brawijaya University	The investment climate and ease of doing business apply to all business players. If MSMEs and Cooperatives were left to compete with big businesses, these big businesses would definitely win.

Environmental Aspect

Senior Policy and Compliance of Lingkar Temu in Lestari Regency (Kabupaten)	The youths no longer play a role in environmental protection, while their effort (positively) impacts the local community.
Country Manager – ICLE Local Government for Sustainability	There was limited involvement in the preparation of the AMDAL document which was only for the people who are directly affected. For example, if there was a business establishment in Bogor, Jakarta citizens were never involved in the process while they would also be impacted by this establishment.
Lecturer of Environmental Law at the Faculty of Law of UGM	**AMDAL will disappear. What will happen to the environment and our future? Meanwhile, mining pits in some areas have become increasingly worrying.**
Executive Director of Indonesian Centre for Environmental Law (ICEL)	Environmental restoration such as reclamation and post-mining recovery are seen as utilisation and exploitation plans, so the government's initial concept seems to have disappeared.
Professor at Faculty of Law, UI	**The abolition of the Law on B3 waste treatment without a permit is a very far-reaching setback. This B3 waste is very dangerous to the environment.**
Lecturer of the Constitutional Law at the Faculty of Law, Andalas University	The DPR (House of Representatives) discussed this during the pandemic. They were more concerned about the bill than being exposed to the virus, so I think this law is more important.

Senior lecturer of the Faculty of Law, Airlangga University	If there was abandoned land, it used to be the agrarian reform object. However, this bill states that the land would become the agrarian reform object but in the context of a land bank. For example, the Mandalika Special Economic Zone.

The most important thing from the framing of narratives rejecting UUCK is the regulation that is considered less transparent because the process seems only to involve stakeholders who favour this UUCK. UGM sociologists, for example, question who will benefit and lose in this process? The UGM professor said that the UUCK should be made through public consultation, with no public outreach. In the environmental field, UUCK is seen to eliminate AMDAL because the community is not fully involved, only those who are considered to be experts. These voices counter the dominant narratives in the discussion about UUCK in mainstream media, which the elite dominates (Santosa, Nurul Hasfi, et al., 2021).

What are the positive impacts if UUCK is enacted?

In the agenda-building process, according to Lang and Lang (1983, in Denham, 2004), media managers associate issues with secondary symbols, and narratives about predictions that might occur if a regulation or law is passed. After analysing the narrative, the interviewees connected various issues to several problems after the regulation was passed as shown in the following table. This secondary symbol has a relationship with the narrative frame, as described in table 5 and table 7. The crucial issues raised are creating employment opportunities and protection of workers, an investment that benefits MSMEs, improving and updating regulations and improving regulations on AMDAL.

Table 8. Positive Impacts of UUCK

Secondary-Symbols	Total (from 48 interviewees)	Percentage (%)
Employment		
Employment (workers protection)	8	16.7
Create jobs	6	12.5
Welfare of workers	2	4.2
Foreign workers with specific skills	2	4.2
Maximise the demographic bonus	2	4.2
Reduce the workload of lecturers	1	2.1
Investment, Economy and Enterprises		
MSMEs (protection of domestic entrepreneurs and products)	6	12.5
Improve business climate	1	2.1
Facilitate business owners	3	6.3
Support investment	3	6.3
Protect domestic entrepreneurs	1	2.1
Regulate the decentralisation of the industry or jobs	1	2.1
Achieve the target of economic strength	3	6.3
Regulations		
Regulation simplification	3	6.3
Regulation improvement	4	8.3
Improve land ownership regulations	2	4.2
Strengthen the role of the central government	1	2.1

Improve regulations according to the needs of the times	4	8.3
Environmental Aspect		
AMDAL (environmental) improvement of rules	5	10.4

The data above shows that 10.4% of interviewees favoured UUCK believing that the UUCK omnibus law would improve AMDAL regulations, while 29.2% of interviewees rejected it by stating that the law could potentially harm the environment. Regarding job creation, 12.5% of interviewees believed that UUCK would create many job opportunities for existing and new job seekers, 12.5% believed UUCK would also protect MSMEs and domestic entrepreneurs, and 16.7% believed this law would protect Indonesian workers. Meanwhile, of those who rejected the Omnibus Law UUCK, 22.9% believed that it would only benefit investors and prominent business players. 8,3% were worried that it would benefit foreign workers who would take over domestic work. 8.3% of the total interviewees who appeared in the discussions of all analysed videos believe that this law would threaten labour rights.

What are the Negative Impacts if UUCK is enacted?

The negative impact of the UUCK ratification is that it will lead to the legitimacy of those rejecting the UUCK, which also appeared on many similar issues: Investment, Economy and Business. In this case, the investors are seen as the party that benefits most from the enactment of UUCK. From an environmental standpoint, UUCK is considered harmful to the environment. This is very different from the secondary symbol of UUCK supporters who say that UUCK will protect the environment. In terms of regulations, the UUCK supporters brought in a narrative about the reasons for increasing investment. In this narrative, the interviewees described 11 negative impacts of UUCK on our education, human rights, Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK)'s performance, the agrarian sector, and many more. Meanwhile, in the field of employment, threats to workers' rights and the benefits of foreign workers are the most highlighted negative impacts.

Table 9. Negative Impacts of UUCK

Secondary-Symbols	Total (from 48 interviewees)	Percentage (%)
Investment, Economy & Enterprises		
Only benefit the investors and the big business players	11	22.9
Political economic power oriented	1	2.1
Environmental Aspect		
Will harm the environment	14	29.2
Disrupting land rules	2	4.2
Eliminate people's participation in protecting the environment	2	4.2
Threatening our food security	1	2.1
Undermine the protection of indigenous people	1	2.1
Mining will be a growing concern	1	2.1
Regulations		
Become another problem in the future	1	2.1
As a result of Indonesia's setback in terms of regulation	3	6.3
May not be effective	2	4.2
Resulting in criminal disparity	1	2.1

Disrupt education regulations	3	6.3
Bring up articles of immunity for institutions	1	2.1
Centralisation	3	6.3
Open up opportunities for corruption	3	6.3
Against the agrarian law	2	4.2
Allow the government to increase the country's debts	1	2.1
Further weakens the performance of the KPK (Corruption Eradication Commission)	1	2.1
Violate human rights	1	2.1
Employment		
Benefit the foreign workers	4	8.3
Threaten the rights of the workers	4	8.3

The data shows that 10.4% of respondents favoured UUCK believing that the UUCK omnibus law would improve AMDAL regulations, while 29.2% of respondents rejected the omnibus law because it would be harmful to the environment. Regarding job creation, 12.5% of interviewees believed that UUCK would create many job opportunities for existing and new job seekers, plus 12.5% of interviewees believed that UUCK would protect MSMEs and domestic entrepreneurs, and 16.7% believe this law will protect Indonesian workers. Meanwhile, among those who reject the Omnibus Law UUCK, 22.9% believed that the law would only benefit investors and prominent business players. Of the total interviewees who filled the discussion of all the videos analysed, 8.3% worried that the law would benefit foreign workers by taking over domestic jobs and 8.3% also worried that the law would threaten Labour rights.

Conclusion

This study finds that the academics' freedom of expression has been facilitated by YouTube, which can be easily created by anyone. However, this study identifies that although the voices of academics have not yet strongly influenced the general public, the content that is disseminated becomes an embryo for the possibility of elements of society discussing their voices in a more democratic and argumentative manner. YouTube provides an egalitarian, structured, intellectual and democratic discussion space compared to other social media platforms such as Twitter, Instagram and Facebook, which are problematic with hate speech issues (Lim

2017a); black propaganda and campaigns and anonymity (Hasfi, 2017), click activism (Lim, 2017, b), etc.

In the context of this study, the issue of UUCK is discussed more in the mainstream media, which in some cases has yet to fully provide the voice of academics. Lasut, Santosa, & Hasfi (2021) stated that television dialogue about UUCK brought more narratives from the government, presented by both government representatives and supporters of UUCK. Although it cannot be said that it is too soon if television provides support to the government, the setting agenda for television mass media has not seen academics as an essential part of this democratic process.

Research findings show that YouTube can be a space where academics can build agendas (agenda-building) on strategic issues that lack public involvement, such as UUCK. This can be seen from the players who became the interviewees to provide space for academics and researchers from universities which reached 61%, and the sentiment conveyed that 63% of the interviewees favoured UUCK. Among the interviewees, the narratives used by those favouring and rejecting the law covered the same issues: employment, economy and investment, environment and regulation.

The interviewees grappled with the pros and cons narratives of the four issues, which led to significant conclusions that ; UUCK is accepted on the grounds that it protects the workforce and provides job opportunities; opens investment to improve the economy of the Indonesian people; ensures environmental preservation because the AMDAL is approved by a competent person and contains simpler

regulations so that it opens up investment opportunities. Meanwhile, the UUCK was rejected by some interviewees with legitimacy if UUCK was detrimental to Indonesian workers. The UUCK is legally flawed because there was no transparency in the decision-making process; UUCK is only taking into account the opinions of the entrepreneurs and elites, so the intention is not for the sake of improving the public economy, and finally, on environmental issues, UUCK shut off community involvement in the AMDAL process.

This study may contradict the findings of Conway et al. (2015: 374), who said that the agenda built by the public shapes the media agenda in the mainstream media. It is similar to the findings of Bekkers, Beunders, Edwards, & Moody (2011) of the use of the internet to protest against education policies in the Netherlands. This study discovers that mainstream media provides limited space for public voice, and the public - in this case, academics - builds space for discussion on YouTube to protest the positive issues of UUCK built by mainstream media.

Agenda-building in this study, as stated by Elder and Cobb, 1984 and Denham, 2010 is related to efforts to negotiate social interests and forces involving the elite and the public in general and other parties who are allegedly behind the ratification of UUCK such as businessmen and the government, and environmental activists, workers, indigenous peoples, MSME actors, etc. This research sees that YouTube shows the voice rejecting UUCK is more dominant than that favouring it.

Lastly, judging from the aspirations that emerged from the agenda-building on YouTube regarding UUCK, there are problems in the UUCK ratification process: no transparency. The data shows that UUCK is a complex issue involving many stakeholders that should require public consultation, not just public outreach as the government does. The informant's statement, which is quite essential to underline, believes that as an academic, it is necessary to decipher who will benefit the most and who will not benefit from this issue. In the theory of democracy, it is clear that the public who should benefit from determining policy is the public.

References

Alika, R. (2020). Ramai Penolakan Omnibus Law Cipta Kerja Sepekan Jelang Pengesahan. https://katadata.co.id/ameidyonasution/berita/5f749666613fd/ramai-penolakan-omnibus-law-cipta-kerja-sepekan-jelang-pengesahan.

Asosiasi Penyelenggara Jasa Internet Indonesia. (2020). Laporan Survei Internet APJII 2019 - 2020. (https://apjii.or.id/survei)

Bekkers, V., Beunders, H., Edwards, A., & Moody, R. (2011). New media, micromobilization, and political agenda setting: Crossover effects in political mobilization and media usage. The Information Society, 27(4), 209-219.

Brasil, F. G., & Jones, B. D. (2020). Agenda setting: Policy change and policy dynamics A brief introduction. Revista de Administração Pública, 54, 1486-1497.

Camaj, L. (2018). Blurring the boundaries between journalism and activism: A transparency agenda-building case study from Bulgaria. Journalism, 19(7), 994-1010.

Cobb, R. W., & Elder, C. D. (1971). The politics of agenda-building: An alternative perspective for modern democratic theory. The Journal of Politics, 33(4), 892-915.

Cobb, R., Ross, J. K., & Ross, M. H. (1976). Agenda building as a comparative political process. American political science review, 70(1), 126-138.

Conway, B. A., Kenski, K., & Wang, D. (2015). The rise of Twitter in the political campaign: Searching for intermedia agenda-setting effects in the presidential primary. Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 20(4), 363-380.

Denham, B. E. (2004). Sports Illustrated, the mainstream press and the enactment of drug policy in Major League Baseball: A study in agenda-building theory. Journalism, 5(1), 51-68.

Denham, B. E. (2010). Toward conceptual consistency in studies of agenda-building processes: A scholarly review. The Review of Communication, 10(4), 306-323.

Dokumen Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat dpr.go.id/dokakd/dokumen/BALEG-RJ-20200605-100224-2372.pdf).

Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Towards clarification of a fractured paradigm. McQuail's reader in mass communication theory, 390-397.

Fraksi Rakyat Indonesia, 2020. Kertas Posisi Fraksi Rakyat Indonesia (FRI): 12 Alasan Menolak Omnibus Law RUU Cilaka (#Cilaka12) igj.or.id/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/12-ALASAN-MENOLAK-OMNIBUS-LAW-RUU-CILAKA.pdf).

Hasfi, N. (2017). Politik Keshalehan Personal dalam Pemilihan Presiden 2014 dalam Media Sosial Twitter. Jurnal Pemikiran Sosiologi Volume, 4(2).

Hsieh, H. F., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. Qualitative health research, 15(9), 1277-1288.

Jungherr, A. (2016). Twitter use in election campaigns: A systematic literature review. Journal of information technology & politics, 13(1), 72-91.

Kim, J. Y., Xiang, Z., & Kiousis, S. (2011). Agenda building effects by 2008 presidential candidates on global media coverage and public opinion. Public Relations Review, 37(1), 109-111.

Kiousis, S., Ragas, M. W., Kim, J. Y., Schweickart, T., Neil, J., & Kochhar, S. (2016). Presidential agenda building and policymaking: Examining linkages across three levels. International Journal of Strategic Communication, 10(1), 1-17.

Lange, P. G. (2007). Publicly private and privately public: Social networking on YouTube. Journal of computer-mediated communication, 13(1), 361-380.

Lariscy, R., Avery, E., Sweetser, K. D., & Howes, P. (2009). An examination of the role of online social media in journalists' source mix. Public Relations Review, 35(3), 314-316.

Lasut, B. A., Santosa, H. P., & Hasfi, N. (2021). Aktivisme Digital Fandom ARMY Indonesia dalam Menanggapi Isu RUU Cipta Kerja (Omnibus Law) di Twitter. Interaksi Online, 9(4), 84-95.

Lasut, B. A., Santosa, H. P., & Hasfi, N. (2021). Aktivisme Digital Fandom ARMY Indonesia dalam Menanggapi Isu RUU Cipta Kerja (Omnibus Law) di Twitter. Interaksi Online, 9(4), 84-95.

Lim, M. (2017a). Freedom to hate: social media, algorithmic enclaves, and the rise of tribal nationalism in Indonesia. Critical Asian Studies, 49(3), 411-427.

Lim, M. (2017b). Klik yang tak memantik: aktivisme media sosial di Indonesia. Jurnal Komunikasi Indonesia, 35-50.

Linvill, D. L., Boatwright, B. C., Grant, W. J., & Warren, P. L. (2019). "The Russians Are Hacking My Brain!" investigating Russia's internet research agency twitter tactics during the 2016 United States presidential campaign. Computers in Human Behavior, 99, 292-300.

McCombs, M. E., & Guo, L. (2014). Agenda-setting influence of the media in the public sphere. The handbook of media and mass communication theory, 251-268.Agenda-setting influence of the media in the public sphere. The handbook of media and mass communication theory, 251-268.

Morales, E. A., Schultz, C. J. P., & Landreville, K. D. (2021). The Impact of 280 Characters: An Analysis of Trump's Tweets and Television News Through the Lens of Agenda Building. Electronic News, 15(1-2), 21-37.

Morales, E. A., Schultz, C. J. P., & Landreville, K. D. (2021). The Impact of 280 Characters: An Analysis of Trump's Tweets and Television News Through the Lens of Agenda Building. Electronic News, 15(1-2), 21-37.

O'Boyle, J. (2019). Twitter diplomacy between India and the United States: Agenda-building analysis of tweets during presidential state visits. Global media and communication, 15(1), 121-134.

Parmelee, J. H. (2014). The agenda-building function of political tweets. New media & society, 16(3), 434-450.

Ragas, M. W., & Kiousis, S. (2010). Intermedia agenda-setting and political activism: MoveOn. org and the 2008 presidential election. Mass Communication and Society, 13(5), 560-583.

Saffer, A. J., Yang, A., Morehouse, J., & Qu, Y. (2019). It takes a village: A social network approach to NGOs' international public engagement. American Behavioral Scientist, 63(12), 1708-1727.

Sayre, B., Bode, L., Shah, D., Wilcox, D., & Shah, C. (2010). Agenda setting in a digital age: Tracking attention to California Proposition 8 in social media,

online news and conventional news. Policy & Internet, 2(2), 7-32.

Seethaler, J., & Melischek, G. (2019). Twitter as a tool for agenda building in election campaigns? The case of Austria. Journalism, 20(8), 1087-1107.

Selvi, A. F. (2019). Qualitative content analysis. In The Routledge handbook of research methods in applied linguistics (pp. 440-452). Routledge.

Serrano, Bernaola I. (2022). Effects of the 2008 Crisis on Agenda Building: Internally Originated Content Versus External Dependence. Journalism Practice, 1-18.

Shumate, M., & Lipp, J. (2008). Connective collective action online: An examination of the hyperlink network structure of an NGO issue network. Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 14(1), 178-201.

Vu, H. T. (2020). Agenda Building. The International Encyclopaedia of Media Psychology, 1-5.

Vu, H. T., Blomberg, M., Seo, H., Liu, Y., Shayesteh, F., & Do, H. V. (2021). Social media and environmental activism: Framing climate change on Facebook by global NGOs. Science Communication, 43(1), 91-115.

We are social. (2021). https://datareportal.com/reports/digital-2021-indonesia).

Yang, A., & Saffer, A. (2018). NGOs' advocacy in the 2015 refugee crisis: A study of agenda building in the digital age. American Behavioral Scientist, 62(4), 421-439.