

Political Contestation and Interest Attainment in Cultural Policymaking: The Rise and Fall of Indonesia's Music Bill

Mego Widi Hakoso¹, Syarif Hidayat², Maxensius Tri Sambodo³

¹Doctoral Program in Political Science, National University, Indonesia

²Lecturer in Political Science, National University, Indonesia

³Lecturer in Political Science, National University, Indonesia

Corresponding Author: Mego Widi Hakoso

HOW TO CITE:

Mego Widi Hakoso, Syarif Hidayat, Maxensius Tri Sambodo (2026). Political Contestation and Interest Attainment in Cultural Policymaking: The Rise and Fall of Indonesia's Music Bill. *International Journal of Special Education*, 41(13s), 1479-1488

COPYRIGHT STATEMENT:

Copyright: © 2026 Authors.
Open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

ABSTRACT:

The Indonesian Music Bill (Rancangan Undang-Undang Permusikan) emerged as one of the most contested cultural policy debates in contemporary Indonesia, generating intense conflict between actors supporting and opposing its legislative advancement. This study analyzes the modes of interest attainment employed by actors during the proposal, revision, and eventual cancellation of the bill. Using a qualitative case study approach, data were collected through document analysis, media analysis, and in-depth interviews with key actors involved in the legislative process. The findings reveal two major competing coalitions: the pro-deliberation coalition and the pro-cancellation coalition. The pro-deliberation coalition relied on open direct lobbying, closed elite lobbying, and symbolic legitimacy-building to advance the bill into the National Legislative Program. In contrast, the pro-cancellation coalition utilized counter-framing, negative propaganda, and public mobilization to delegitimize the legislative process. The study finds that while institutional access initially benefited the pro-deliberation coalition, the pro-cancellation coalition ultimately gained discursive dominance by framing the bill as a threat to artistic freedom and democratic participation. The study concludes that legislative success in cultural policymaking depends not only on institutional support but also on public legitimacy, transparency, and inclusive participation.

Keywords: Cultural Policy, Interest Groups, Legislative Politics, Music Governance, Policy Networks.

Introduction.

Public policy formation is rarely a neutral or purely technocratic process. Instead, it is shaped by complex interactions among state institutions, interest groups, civil society organizations, and informal actors seeking to influence policy outcomes according to their respective interests. Contemporary policy studies emphasize that

legislative outcomes are often products of negotiation, contestation, coalition-building, and power struggles among actors with unequal access to resources, legitimacy, and political influence (Rhodes, 2006; Howlett et al., 2020). In this context, policy formulation should not be understood merely as a formal institutional procedure but also as a political arena where formal and informal mechanisms—including

lobbying, agenda setting, framing, and public mobilization—play crucial roles in determining legislative trajectories.

Such dynamics were strongly reflected in the controversy surrounding the Indonesian Music Bill (Rancangan Undang-Undang Permusikan / RUU Permusikan). Initially proposed as a regulatory framework to strengthen the governance of Indonesia's music industry, the bill aimed to improve legal protection for musicians, establish better industry standards, and create a more sustainable national music ecosystem. Supporters argued that existing regulations, particularly copyright law, were insufficient to address broader governance issues across the music value chain, from production and distribution to professional welfare. They maintained that a dedicated law was necessary to protect musicians from economic vulnerability and institutional neglect.

However, the bill quickly became a highly contested political issue. Strong opposition emerged from independent musicians, cultural activists, and civil society organizations who viewed several provisions of the draft as problematic. Critics argued that the bill potentially threatened artistic freedom, expanded state intervention in creative expression, and introduced professional certification mechanisms that could marginalize independent artists. The controversy illustrates that cultural policy is not merely about administrative governance but also about contestation over authority, legitimacy, and control over cultural production (Hesmondhalgh, 2019; Flew, 2021).

The debate over the Music Bill is particularly significant because it reveals how cultural regulation can become a site of intense political struggle. On one side, pro-deliberation actors—including professional music organizations such as PAPPRI and KAMI Musik Indonesia (KMI), alongside supportive legislators—framed the bill as essential for institutional reform and industry development. On the opposing side, anti-bill coalitions, consisting largely of independent musicians and civil society groups, framed the proposed legislation as a threat to creative

autonomy and democratic participation. This polarization transformed the legislative process into a broader struggle over who has the legitimate authority to define the future of Indonesia's music ecosystem.

From a public policy perspective, this conflict can be understood through the concept of modes of interest attainment, referring to the strategies used by actors to pursue political objectives. These strategies may include direct lobbying, closed-door negotiations, media propaganda, narrative framing, coalition building, and public mobilization. Interest group theory suggests that actors choose different influence strategies depending on the political opportunity structure and their access to decision-makers (Duverger, 1964; Lowery & Gray, 2004). Therefore, analyzing the modes through which actors pursue their interests provides valuable insights into how legislative agendas gain momentum, legitimacy, or resistance.

The case of the Music Bill demonstrates the simultaneous operation of at least two arenas of political influence. The first was the formal institutional arena, including public hearings, legislative body meetings, and inter-faction parliamentary discussions. This arena was primarily utilized by pro-bill actors to secure procedural legitimacy and ensure the bill's inclusion in the National Legislative Program (*Program Legislasi Nasional*). The second arena was the broader public sphere, especially digital and social media spaces, where anti-bill actors mobilized resistance through negative framing, public campaigns, and direct criticism of key political figures supporting the bill. The rise of digital activism amplified counter-narratives rapidly, transforming what began as an elite legislative issue into a nationwide public controversy (Castells, 2015).

Within these arenas, power relations among actors became central to the legislative process. Not all actors possessed equal capacity to influence outcomes. Some functioned as formal actors, openly representing institutions or coalitions advocating for or against the bill. Others operated as shadow actors, working

behind the scenes by leveraging networks, symbolic capital, and institutional access to shape the direction of policymaking without direct public visibility. This distinction is critical because legislative outcomes are often influenced not only by visible decision-makers but also by hidden actors controlling strategic resources such as political access, organizational legitimacy, and discursive influence (Bourdieu, 1986; Lukes, 2005).

In the case of the Music Bill, shadow actors played particularly important roles in shaping agenda-setting and lobbying processes. Informal networks between musicians, professional organizations, policymakers, and government institutions created channels through which strategic influence could be exercised outside formal deliberative spaces. Closed-door meetings, selective consultations, and informal negotiations became mechanisms through which certain interests gained privileged access to legislative processes. These dynamics highlight how policy influence often extends beyond officially documented procedures.

Despite widespread public debate surrounding the Music Bill, academic studies examining the operational strategies of actors involved in both the proposal and cancellation of the bill remain limited. Existing scholarship on cultural policy in Indonesia has largely focused on creative economy governance, copyright regulation, or freedom of expression. Comparatively little attention has been paid to actor-centered analyses that examine lobbying strategies, power relations, and political maneuvering during legislative contestation. This gap is significant because understanding legislative success or failure requires more than examining regulatory substance; it requires analyzing how actors build legitimacy, alliances, and political momentum.

This study addresses that gap by examining the modes through which actors pursued their interests during the proposal, revision, and eventual cancellation of the Indonesian Music Bill. Specifically, this study seeks to answer two main questions. First, how did pro-deliberation actors employ formal and informal lobbying

strategies to push the Music Bill into the national legislative agenda? Second, how did anti-bill actors construct resistance through framing, propaganda, and public mobilization to challenge and ultimately delegitimize the legislative process? By addressing these questions, this research contributes to public policy scholarship by providing a deeper understanding of legislative politics, power relations, and interest group behavior within cultural policymaking in Indonesia.

The practical contribution of this study lies in its implications for democratic policymaking. The findings are expected to demonstrate that legislation affecting creative sectors requires inclusive deliberation, transparency, and meaningful public participation to avoid large-scale resistance. Furthermore, this research highlights how interactions between formal and shadow actors can significantly shape policy trajectories, offering important lessons for policymakers seeking to design more legitimate and responsive cultural regulations.

Methods

This study employed a qualitative case study design to analyze the modes through which actors pursued their interests in the proposal, revision, and eventual cancellation of the Indonesian Music Bill (*RUU Permusikan*). A qualitative approach was selected because the research focused on understanding complex political interactions, power relations, strategic lobbying, and actor behavior within a specific legislative process. Qualitative inquiry is particularly suitable for examining policy contestation because it enables an in-depth exploration of meanings, motives, narratives, and informal political dynamics that are often not fully captured through quantitative approaches (Case Study Research and Applications; Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design).

This research adopted a single embedded case study, with the Indonesian Music Bill serving as the central case. The case was selected due to its significance as one of the most controversial cultural policy debates in contemporary

Indonesia, involving strong contestation between formal legislative actors, music organizations, and civil society coalitions. The embedded units of analysis consisted of two major actor groups: the pro-deliberation coalition, which supported the continuation of the bill's legislative process, and the pro-cancellation coalition, which opposed the bill and advocated for its withdrawal. These actor groups were examined to identify their strategies, resources, and modes of influence throughout the legislative process.

Data were collected from three primary sources. First, this study used document analysis involving official legislative records, draft versions of the Music Bill, parliamentary meeting minutes, legal documents, and institutional reports related to the legislative process between 2017 and 2019. Key documents included records of the Public Hearing Meeting (*Rapat Dengar Pendapat Umum / RDPU*), reports from the Legislative Body (*Badan Legislasi / Baleg*), National Legislative Program documents, and the official draft of the Music Bill. Second, media content analysis was conducted using news reports, public interviews, opinion articles, press releases, and digital campaign materials from both supporting and opposing groups. Media sources were selected because they provided evidence of public framing strategies, discourse contestation, and propaganda efforts during the policy conflict. Third, in-depth semi-structured interviews were conducted with key informants directly or indirectly involved in the Music Bill controversy, including musicians, representatives of music organizations, policy observers, and legislative insiders.

Purposive sampling was used to select informants based on their relevance to the research objectives. Informants were categorized into four groups: (1) formal political actors, including legislators and parliamentary staff; (2) music organization representatives from groups supporting the bill; (3) musicians and activists involved in opposition movements; and (4) expert observers, including academics and policy analysts. This sampling strategy ensured the inclusion of actors with diverse perspectives and direct knowledge of lobbying processes and

political negotiations. Interviews focused on understanding how actors constructed strategies, built coalitions, framed narratives, and mobilized support or resistance.

Data collection was conducted from March 2024 to September 2025, allowing sufficient time for triangulation between interviews, archival materials, and media narratives. All interviews were recorded with participant consent and subsequently transcribed verbatim for analysis. Documentary data were organized chronologically to reconstruct the sequence of political events surrounding the Music Bill, from initial proposal to eventual cancellation.

Data analysis employed thematic analysis combined with political process tracing. Thematic analysis was used to identify recurring patterns, strategies, and narratives across interview transcripts and documentary evidence. Following the framework proposed by Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology, analysis was conducted in six stages: data familiarization, initial coding, theme development, theme review, theme definition, and interpretation. Codes were generated inductively from the data while remaining guided by theoretical concepts of power relations, lobbying, and interest group politics.

To strengthen causal interpretation, this study also applied process tracing, which enabled the reconstruction of sequential political events and strategic interactions among actors during critical phases of the legislative process. Process tracing was particularly useful in identifying how specific lobbying actions, framing strategies, and political interventions influenced the trajectory of the Music Bill. Through this approach, the study traced causal mechanisms linking actor strategies to key legislative outcomes, including the bill's inclusion in the National Legislative Program and its subsequent cancellation.

The analytical framework distinguished between formal actors and shadow actors. Formal actors were defined as individuals or institutions openly visible in the legislative process, such as legislators, formal organizations, and public

spokespersons. Shadow actors referred to influential individuals or networks operating behind the scenes through informal access, personal relationships, and strategic coordination. This distinction enabled a more nuanced analysis of power distribution and influence patterns in policy formation.

To ensure research credibility, this study applied source triangulation, data triangulation, and member checking. Information obtained from interviews was cross-verified against official documents and media reports to reduce interpretive bias. Triangulation was essential because the study dealt with politically sensitive issues involving competing narratives and contested claims. Member checking was also used by returning selected interpretations to key informants for confirmation and clarification. Ethical considerations were carefully addressed throughout the research process. All participants were informed about the purpose of the study and provided voluntary consent before interviews. Confidentiality was maintained by anonymizing sensitive identities where necessary, particularly for informants discussing closed-door lobbying and informal political negotiations. Given the political sensitivity of legislative contestation, the study prioritized participant safety and responsible handling of sensitive data. Through this methodological framework, the study sought to generate a comprehensive understanding of how actors employed formal and informal modes of influence to advance or resist the Indonesian Music Bill, while revealing the deeper power structures shaping cultural policymaking in Indonesia.

Results

Before presenting the detailed findings, it is important to clarify the analytical structure of this section. The findings indicate that the legislative dynamics surrounding the Indonesian Music Bill (*Rancangan Undang-Undang Permusikan*) were shaped by contestation between two major coalitions, namely the pro-deliberation coalition and the pro-cancellation coalition. The pro-deliberation coalition aimed to institutionalize the Music Bill through formal legislative

mechanisms, while the pro-cancellation coalition sought to delegitimize and ultimately halt the bill through public resistance and counter-discourse. The results are organized into two major dimensions: first, the modes of interest attainment employed by actors supporting the bill, and second, the modes used by actors opposing it. The findings reveal that both coalitions employed strategic lobbying, symbolic legitimacy construction, and political communication to advance their respective interests. Source: processed from interviews, parliamentary archives, and field documents.

Modes of Interest Attainment by the Pro-Deliberation Coalition

The findings reveal three primary strategies employed by the pro-deliberation coalition: open direct lobbying, closed direct lobbying, and symbolic legitimization through public reception of the 2018 National Music Conference. These strategies collectively demonstrate that the coalition relied heavily on institutional channels, elite political access, and symbolic narratives to consolidate support for the Music Bill. The central formal actors were KAMI Musik Indonesia (KMI) and Anang Hermansyah, while the major shadow actor operating behind the scenes was PAPPRI, which played a strategic role in shaping lobbying efforts and agenda-setting.

Open Direct Lobbying through the Public Hearing Meeting (RDPU)

The first major mode of interest attainment involved open direct lobbying, particularly during the Public Hearing Meeting (*Rapat Dengar Pendapat Umum / RDPU*) held at the Indonesian House of Representatives on 7 June 2017. This forum became the first formal legislative arena where the coalition publicly articulated the urgency of the Music Bill.

The findings show that Glenn Fredly, representing KMI, served as the central articulator of musicians' concerns. His statement during the hearing emphasized the strategic importance of music in Indonesia's cultural, economic, and educational development:

"Starting from a song, this Republic eventually has a vision. Today we gather here. This is history for us. Music has provided livelihoods for many people, created networks, and that has already happened. Our main purpose in being here is how Indonesian music, as part of Indonesian culture, can have a law that regulates governance from upstream to downstream, so that it can advance welfare and even civilization. Music plays an important role today for the younger generation in expressing aspirations... but until now, music has been neglected because it lacks proper governance... we want Indonesian music to be sovereign." (Glenn Fredly, RDPU, 7 June 2017)

This statement illustrates how Glenn strategically framed music beyond entertainment. He positioned music as a pillar of civilization and national sovereignty, thereby elevating the issue from sectoral welfare to national governance. His rhetorical strategy strengthened moral legitimacy by portraying the Music Bill as a response to the collective anxiety of musicians rather than an elite political agenda.

Academic legitimacy was reinforced by Agus Sardjono, who provided legal and intellectual justification for the proposal.

"Based on our research, there is indeed evidence that music workers have not fully achieved welfare through the music industry itself. When I say music workers, I do not only mean musicians like Glenn Fredly, but also songwriters, producers, and all music workers. The micro objective of this law is to ensure that music workers can obtain welfare from their profession." (Agus Sardjono, RDPU, 7 June 2017)

Agus Sardjono's statement shifted the discourse toward structural welfare issues. By broadening the definition of "music workers," he justified the need for comprehensive regulation across the entire music ecosystem. His contribution provided intellectual legitimacy that strengthened the coalition's policy credibility.

Political legitimacy emerged through Rieke Diah Pitaloka, who explicitly supported the legislative advancement of the bill.

"I persuaded the leadership to schedule this hearing. I understand the hardship of musicians when they grow old, when they get sick, and so on. Musicians need legal

protection, social security, labor guarantees, and legal protection for the music industry. Therefore, I propose that the Music Bill become an initiative of the Legislative Body and immediately enter the National Legislative Program." (Rieke Diah Pitaloka, RDPU, 7 June 2017)

This demonstrates that Rieke functioned as the bridge between musicians and formal legislative institutions. Her lobbying transformed social and academic legitimacy into political momentum.

The findings indicate that the RDPU created a three-layer legitimacy structure: social legitimacy through musicians, intellectual legitimacy through academics, and political legitimacy through legislators. This tripartite structure significantly strengthened the early position of the pro-deliberation coalition.

Closed Direct Lobbying through Elite Networks

The second mode involved closed direct lobbying, conducted outside public visibility. Unlike the RDPU, this strategy relied on informal meetings, elite access, and organizational networks.

The study identifies PAPPRI as the primary shadow actor. Its influence became evident through closed meetings involving senior figures and state institutions.

Johnny Maukar, then Secretary General of PAPPRI, described a strategic meeting with Triawan Munaf:

"We met Bekraf through Mr. Triawan Munaf to help the academic drafting process so we did not need to visit many regions. We held a meeting at a restaurant in Gandaria City. Bekraf supported us so PAPPRI did not need to travel region by region. We simply gathered resource persons in Jakarta to become material for the academic manuscript and the Music Bill." (Johnny Maukar, interview, 9 March 2024)

This interview reveals how PAPPRI used institutional connections to centralize and control the drafting process. By limiting consultations to selected resource persons in Jakarta, the coalition gained greater control over discourse formation and policy framing.

Support for this finding is reinforced by Anang Hermansyah:

"I was criticized because people said I received a huge project from certification politics. But yes, I fought for certification. I entered parliament to fight for certification. Baron helped me. Together with Baron, Andi Ayunir, and Johnny Maukar, we came to BNSP to present why music professionals needed certification. BNSP asked where the funding would come from. Eventually Bekraf helped."

(Anang Hermansyah, 2021 archival interview)

This statement confirms that certification—one of the most controversial aspects of the Music Bill—was not a spontaneous proposal but the result of strategic closed lobbying involving PAPPRI, parliament, BNSP, and Bekraf.

These findings demonstrate that closed lobbying functioned as a mechanism for agenda control, coalition consolidation, and resource mobilization. PAPPRI's role as a shadow actor became particularly significant in shaping policy substance behind formal public processes.

Closed Lobbying within Baleg and Entry into Prolegnas

The third finding concerns lobbying within the Legislative Body (Baleg), where the coalition sought to secure the bill's inclusion in the National Legislative Program.

On 4 September 2017, Rieke Diah Pitaloka lobbied directly during a Baleg meeting:

"We support and ask for support from the Minister of Law and Human Rights so that today's meeting can produce a political decision for the Music Bill to enter the longlist of the National Legislative Program."
(Rieke Diah Pitaloka, Baleg Meeting, 4 September 2017)

This marked a crucial institutional breakthrough, as the Music Bill successfully entered the legislative longlist.

Rieke continued her lobbying in a later meeting on 23 October 2018:

"I only want to remind this forum about one bill supported by all factions in Baleg. The Music Bill has entered the

longlist but not yet the priority program. I ask for support again so the Music Bill can enter the 2019 priority legislative program. If we remain united, by September 2019 we could already have a Music Law protecting Indonesian musicians and improving the music industry."
(Rieke Diah Pitaloka, Baleg Meeting, 23 October 2018)

This quote illustrates sustained political lobbying. Rieke repeatedly leveraged procedural momentum and cross-party consensus to push the bill toward legislative priority status.

As a result, the Music Bill successfully entered Prolegnas Priority 2019, reflecting the peak institutional success of the pro-deliberation coalition.

Modes of Interest Attainment by the Pro-Cancellation Coalition

The findings further reveal that the pro-cancellation coalition employed three dominant strategies: open direct resistance, negative framing of the Music Bill, and negative framing targeting Anang Hermansyah. Unlike the pro-deliberation coalition, which relied on institutional channels, this coalition depended heavily on discursive power and public mobilization.

A key actor in this coalition was Wendi Putranto, who criticized the lack of transparency in the drafting process.

"It was very difficult to access the Music Bill draft. Even though public policy drafts should be accessible under public information law, this draft was extremely hard to obtain. When we finally got it, we were shocked."
(Wendi Putranto)

This statement indicates that secrecy became a major trigger of resistance. Limited public access created suspicion and delegitimized the drafting process.

The coalition framed the bill as restrictive and dangerous to artistic freedom, particularly regarding certification and the proposed Music Council.

Wendi further stated that PAPPRI had lost relevance among younger musicians and no longer represented contemporary music

communities. This criticism weakened PAPPRI's symbolic legitimacy and shifted support toward younger, independent musicians.

Simultaneously, negative propaganda increasingly targeted Anang Hermansyah, portraying him as the symbol of elite-driven regulation. This personalized framing proved effective because it simplified a complex legislative issue into a public conflict between independent musicians and political elites. Digital platforms amplified this opposition. Public criticism spread rapidly, turning what was initially an elite legislative matter into a national controversy involving musicians, activists, and broader civil society. As public resistance intensified, institutional support weakened.

Discussion

The findings of this study demonstrate that the legislative trajectory of the Indonesian Music Bill was not merely a legal drafting process but a political arena characterized by contestation, strategic lobbying, and power negotiation among actors with unequal access to institutional resources. The proposal and eventual cancellation of the Music Bill were shaped by two opposing coalitions employing different modes of interest attainment. The pro-deliberation coalition relied primarily on institutional lobbying and elite political access, whereas the pro-cancellation coalition mobilized discursive resistance through public framing and symbolic delegitimization. These findings reinforce the argument that policymaking is fundamentally political, involving not only formal procedures but also hidden struggles over agenda control, legitimacy, and influence (Lukes, 2005; Duverger, 1964).

One important finding concerns the role of open direct lobbying during the 7 June 2017 Public Hearing Meeting (RDPU). The results show that the hearing functioned as a formal arena for transforming the concerns of music communities into a legislative issue. The participation of Glenn Fredly, Agus Sardjono, and Rieke Diah Pitaloka created a convergence of three forms of legitimacy: social legitimacy, intellectual

legitimacy, and political legitimacy. Glenn articulated the collective anxiety of musicians regarding welfare and governance, Agus Sardjono translated these concerns into legal-academic language, while Rieke provided institutional access within the Legislative Body. This triangular relationship suggests that successful lobbying often requires multidimensional legitimacy rather than relying on a single actor or institution. This finding supports the policy network perspective, which emphasizes that policy outcomes emerge from interactions among interdependent actors operating across institutional boundaries (Rhodes, 2006). In the case of the Music Bill, legitimacy was strategically produced by connecting musicians, academics, and legislators into a unified advocacy network.

The study further reveals that closed direct lobbying played an equally significant role, particularly through informal meetings between PAPPRI, Bekraf, and parliamentary actors. Such interactions reflect indirect political influence, where actors shape policy not through public persuasion alone but by gaining privileged access to decision-makers (Duverger, 1964). More importantly, these findings indicate that lobbying was not only about promoting the bill but also about controlling the scope of participation. By centralizing consultations in Jakarta rather than conducting wider regional consultations, the pro-deliberation coalition effectively managed which voices were included in the drafting process. This selective inclusion strengthened administrative efficiency but simultaneously reduced procedural inclusivity, which later became a source of criticism.

A central theoretical contribution of this study lies in the distinction between formal actors and shadow actors. The findings indicate that while KAMI Musik Indonesia and Anang Hermansyah operated as visible formal actors, PAPPRI functioned as the primary shadow actor influencing the legislative process from behind the scenes. PAPPRI exercised significant influence over agenda-setting, coalition-building, and policy substance, particularly regarding professional certification and the proposed Music Council. This hidden influence aligns closely with

Lukes' third dimension of power, where power operates by shaping preferences, controlling agendas, and determining which issues become politically visible or invisible (Lukes, 2005).

Another important finding concerns the gradual shift in power from institutional actors to public discourse actors. Initially, the pro-deliberation coalition dominated because it possessed superior institutional access, stronger elite networks, and formal legislative support. However, the emergence of the pro-cancellation coalition significantly altered the balance of power. Opposition actors challenged not only the substance of the bill but also the legitimacy of its drafting process, particularly criticizing limited transparency and the controversial inclusion of professional certification. This indicates that legislative legitimacy depends not only on procedural approval but also on public trust and perceived inclusivity.

The resistance movement against the Music Bill also highlights the growing importance of discursive power in the digital era. The opposing coalition mobilized public opinion through framing strategies that portrayed the bill as a threat to artistic freedom. This framing proved highly effective because it shifted the narrative from musician welfare to freedom of expression and state overreach. Such narrative transformation reflects Bourdieu's concept of symbolic struggle, in which actors compete to impose dominant meanings and legitimate interpretations of reality (Bourdieu, 1986). In the Music Bill case, the coalition that successfully controlled public discourse ultimately gained greater influence over the policy outcome.

The findings also indicate that cultural policymaking differs from policymaking in other sectors because it directly intersects with identity, creativity, and freedom of expression. Regulations affecting cultural production are more likely to trigger emotional and ideological resistance because they are perceived not merely as administrative rules but as interventions into creative autonomy. This explains why the Music

Bill generated stronger resistance than many other legislative proposals. The controversy reflects a broader governance dilemma in creative industries, where states seek regulation while cultural actors resist excessive intervention (Hesmondhalgh, 2019).

5. Conclusion

This study concludes that the legislative trajectory of the Indonesian Music Bill (RUU Permusikan) was shaped by complex political contestation involving formal and informal actors competing to influence policy outcomes. The findings reveal that the pro-deliberation coalition successfully advanced the bill through a combination of open direct lobbying, closed elite lobbying, and symbolic legitimacy-building. The coalition strategically utilized institutional access, policy networks, and political sponsorship to secure the bill's inclusion in the National Legislative Program. However, the pro-cancellation coalition gradually gained discursive dominance by reframing the bill as a threat to artistic freedom, transparency, and democratic participation.

The study highlights that policy outcomes in cultural governance are determined not solely by institutional power but also by symbolic legitimacy and public acceptance. Theoretically, this research contributes to public policy scholarship by demonstrating the relevance of power relations, policy network theory, and symbolic capital in explaining legislative contestation in creative sectors. Practically, the findings suggest that policymaking in the cultural sector requires broader public participation, procedural transparency, and inclusive consultation to avoid legitimacy crises. This study is limited by its focus on a single legislative case within Indonesia's music sector, which may restrict broader generalization. Future research may examine comparative cases in other creative industries or cross-national contexts to better understand how cultural policymaking evolves under different political and institutional conditions.

References

- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241–258). Greenwood.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Castells, M. (2015). *Networks of outrage and hope: Social movements in the internet age* (2nd ed.). Polity Press.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Sage.
- Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Republik Indonesia. (2017). Minutes of Public Hearing Meeting on the Indonesian Music Bill (RUU Permusikan). Legislative Body Secretariat.
- Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Republik Indonesia. (2018). Minutes of Legislative Body Meeting on the Music Bill. Legislative Body Secretariat.
- Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Republik Indonesia. (2019). National Legislative Program (Prolegnas) Priority List 2019. DPR RI.
- Duverger, M. (1964). *Political parties: Their organization and activity in the modern state*. Methuen.
- Flew, T. (2021). *Global creative industries*. Polity Press.
- Hesmondhalgh, D. (2019). *The cultural industries* (4th ed.). Sage.
- Howlett, M., Ramesh, M., & Perl, A. (2020). *Studying public policy: Principles and processes* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- KAMI Musik Indonesia. (2017). Policy advocacy documents for the Indonesian Music Bill. Internal document.
- Lowery, D., & Gray, V. (2004). A neopluralist perspective on research on organized interests. *Political Research Quarterly*, 57(1), 163–175. <https://doi.org/10.1177/106591290405700115>
- Lukes, S. (2005). *Power: A radical view* (2nd ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Persatuan Artis Penyanyi, Pencipta Lagu, dan Pemusik Republik Indonesia (PAPPRI). (2017). Internal policy documents related to the Music Bill proposal.
- Rhodes, R. A. W. (2006). Policy network analysis. In M. Moran, M. Rein, & R. E. Goodin (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of public policy* (pp. 423–445). Oxford University Press.
- Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.). Sage.