

The Problem of Tagline and City Branding Formulation in Purbalingga Regencies: Bureaucracy Groupthink Domination and the Cohesiveness Illusion of Stakeholders

Estining Pamungkas¹, Ismi Dwi Astuti Nugraheni², Andre Novi Rahmanto³

¹ Student at Master Degree Program of Communication Studies,

Faculty of Social and Political Sciences Sebelas Maret,

University Surakarta-INDONESIA

^{2,3} Lecturer at Master Degree Program of Communication Studies,

Faculty of Social and Political Sciences,

Sebelas Maret University Surakarta - INDONESIA



Abstract - The purpose of this study is to describe the reality of the process of tagline formulating and city branding of Purbalingga district from the perspective of groupthink theory. This is so interesting because the new tagline of Purbalingga district (called *sehati*) is "one way" bumped into the pro and contra. Especially when the tagline will also be projected as city branding. This research is a qualitative study with interpretive approach. Primary data are extracted from the text or discourse on the intended issue that occurs in the community, especially those expressed through social media. Secondary data were obtained from relevant literature and prior research. The data were analyzed with the *groupthink theory* by Irving L Janis, with emphasis on the assumptions of structural dominance and the illusion of stakeholder cohesiveness. The results showed that the formulation of the new tagline acronym "*sehati*" prove that the group communication activity receiving pressure from bureaucratic domination. There is a part of stakeholders showed groupthink theory, so the criticism mentality or just a comparison opinion from other stakeholder members is not accommodated. This group deliberately illustrates how the stakeholders are really up to it. This maximum cohesiveness illusion negates the possibility of other ideas and creativity.

Keywords – Tagline; City Branding; Domination; Bureaucracy; Groupthink.

I. INTRODUCTION

It is believed that the tagline of a city is one of the important identities. The slogan then fills the region of human memory of an object, which in this discourse is the tagline of a city. Once the importance of a slogan, then discourse is not the full rights of a regional head (regent). Moreover, the discourse on the formulation of slogans is the responsibility of thinking within the local public domain. The case in Purbalingga district is an important proof of how the formulation of everything

concerning regional identity in a holistic dimension (in this case the slogan) cannot be unilaterally triggered by the power structure. The power holder along with the small scope of his cluster morally should not hegemonize the formation of discourses on changes to the tagline of the city. Purbalingga's power holders negate the ideas of the wider community that might also be applied in the formulation of the new slogan. As is known, the regents of Purbalingga have received much criticism and counter-attitude from their own citizens about the change of the slogan. The slogan is like a philosophical spell (*mantra*), so

if it is not formulated in the same breath of rhythm between the ruler and the people, the spark of trouble will arise. Although power could have dampened the counter-idea waves, yet unconsciously the ruler had smothered his arrogance in his whole body. A wave of counter-society attitudes is articulated through social media with a variety of content and word choices. Some citizens even complained to the Governor of Central Java, Ganjar Pranowo. Her society even also directly conveys their expressions through official account managed by government Purbalingga.

Furthermore, the problem of formulation of slogan that is considered Purbalingga unilateral society is actually a reflection that there are any problems about communication in the bureaucracy of Purbalingga district. It appears that power with the small scope of the group assumes that all stakeholders will agree with the agenda. They illustrate how all members of the group / stakeholder are alike and, fused and cohesive. In this case the other stakeholders dominated by groupthink that negate the egalitarian communication. This paper will describe the problem of formulating the new slogan with *groupthink* theory perspective, as an attempt to explain the problems from communication disciplines.

II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

A. Groupthink Theory

The birth of groupthink theory as one of communication theory cannot be separated from long research by Irving Janis. The terminology of *groupthink* refers to a mode of thinking group of people that had cohesiveness, in an atmosphere of maximum effort of the members of the group to reach agreement. At this point there is an opportunity to negate the motivation to judge the options of action realistically. Groupthink can be understood as a situation in the decision-making process that shows the decline of mental efficiency, reality testing, and moral judgment caused by group pressures (Mulyana, 1999). Another notion by West and Turner (2008) is a method of consideration that group members use when their desire for agreement goes beyond their motivation to assess all existing action plans. So *groupthink* is a decision-making process that occurs in highly cohesive groups, where members try to maintain group consensus so that their critical skills are no longer effective. Next, group members often involved in a style or atmosphere of consideration where consensus search is more important than rationality. In real life, we may have been involved in a group, where the desire to achieve a common goal is more

important than rationally solving problem. A group that bears inter-similarity members and have intimate relationships, generally not aware of the opposite opinion. They suppress conflicts just so they can get along well, or when group members do not fully consider all existing solutions, they are vulnerable in *groupthink*. In the context of this atmosphere *groupthink* get out of the individual mind and focus on group level processes. The group decisions are the problem solving faced by all group members. In the mood, the group will use one of the following three methods: (1) *authority*: the members voice their feelings and opinions, but the bosses, leaders, or directors make the final decision. (2) *The majority rule*: the group agrees to comply with the majority decision and allows voting to solve one problem, and (3) *consensus*: the group will only arrive at a decision if all group members agree (De Vito, 1997).

Then, there are three main assumptions that are very important (West & Turner, 2007) of *groupthink*: (1) there are conditions in which promote a group in high cohesiveness. The first assumption states that the group has the cohesion characteristic. The definition of cohesiveness refers to high spirit (*esprit de corps*), which are members of the group have the will to work together within certain limits. The existence of this cohesiveness makes the group members become united, like glue that can glued to each other. Furthermore, the (2) the group problem solving, in essence, is a unified process. The problems solving that occurred in the group is an activity that was always in small groups. All members in small groups will try to connect with each other. Every member of the group will actually participate, because they are actually afraid of rejection. This condition makes group members tend to withhold feedback from others. They have a tendency to maintain relationships among group members rather than focusing on issues that are still considered by the group.

Lastly, the third (3) decision making process by the group is a complex ctivity. The third assumption is referring to a situation that occurred in group decision making and group-oriented tasks. The decision-making process of small groups is often complex. Differences in age, competitive nature, group size, intelligence, gender composition and leadership style are some of the things that cause the complexity of decision-making.

B. Tagline and City Branding

The first important concept to explore and exploit is the concept of city branding. In order to understand the purpose of the concept of city branding, the definition of brands plays a key role. This is because brands make it possible to create an identification and, therefore, differentiation of the place or the product, since it include meanings, symbols and values (Aitken & Campelo, 2011), which help to reveal and influence the creation of identities, both collectively and individually . Moreover, since it supports all the features mentioned, gives it the power to influence the mind of the consumer, attitudes, and behaviours. Furthermore, brand creates impact on culture, since it reinforces the meaning in people's lives (Schroeder, 2009). To conclude, the branding are all affections, beliefs, feelings, and expectations that the brand, service, product, give us.

When associated a place to a brand, the result is the concept of city branding. It is easy to see that this concept is born from the joining of two well-known words of our daily lives, which are branding and place, which means, there is an application of the concept of branding to places, not just to products. As Kotler refer that cities are just like products that must be designed and marketed (Kotler & Gertner, 2004). The concept of city branding has three essential characteristics that are image, uniqueness and authenticity. The image of a city refers to urban elements, monumental buildings, public spaces, basely, special features. And, consequently this image creates personality that allows a city to differentiate itself from others and put them in a more favorable position. However, it is not a set of images that define a city. To create an identity and differentiate itself, truly, there has to be a compelling articulation of all the social, cultural and economic activities of a city (Zhang & Zhao, 2009). The objectives of city branding are define a unique and attractive image for people outside the country, speak well of tourists, investors and business people. On the other hand, focused to the insiders of the city: involve people in a social process which improves morality and spirit, creating a psychological route where people meet and identify the surroundings in a common environment (Ashworth, 2009).

III. RESEARCH METHODS

This research is a qualitative study with interpretive approach. Primary data are extracted from the text or discourse on the intended issue that occurs in the community and society, especially those expressed through social media. Secondary data were obtained

from relevant literature and prior research. The data were analyzed with the groupthink theory of Irving Janis, with emphasis on the assumptions of structural dominance and the illusion of stakeholder cohesiveness. Then, doing more detailed, research procedures in the travel are: (1) The researchers conducted an inventory and identification of literature related to groupthink and the formulation of public policy, (2) analyze the factors that explain the relationship of groupthink and the formulation of public policy, and (3) criticize the decision-making process, and last is to formulate a conclusion.

IV. DISCUSSION

A. The Domination of Bureaucracy's Top Structure

In the government organizations, the power hierarchy certainly displays the level of authority of its officials. In the era of regional autonomy, governors, regents or mayors become small kings, with absolute authority on the scope of their territory. Bureaucratic structures at the district level for example, oriented or centered on the top of the local bureaucracy, the regent. No wonder if the regent has great power, so as to impose his personal ideas and thoughts. Although the idea has a wide impact on society, the forces force it hard to dam. Moreover, the regent has a legal umbrella, which can also be made he. In short, structural factors are other factors that cause this group think. This factor include: *isolation* and *lack of leadership communicative group*. Isolation of the group means that the time when a group tries hard not to be influenced by the situation and the world of thought that is beyond it. This condition is deliberately taken, and resulted the group's limited structure becomes immune to external reality or situations that occur outside of its group. Moreover, if there are external elements willing and able to contribute, this limited group is likely to be negated. With certain motives, they are so strong to be unaffected and deliberately avoided to pass. This kind of situation is certainly not always good to implement. However, each group should not be blind to what is happening around them. Primarily when making decisions, groups need meaningful input so that what will be decided can be good for the group. In the case of the formulation of a slogan of one accord to replace the slogan of officers in Purbalingga district, the group isolation phenomenon actually occurred. The top structure of the district bureaucracy, isolating itself from other groups in the formulation. Other group elements will react to the out-put of the regent act. For example, a petition was raised by a Purbalingga resident through

the *Change.org.com* page. Through that page, Agus Sugiyanto invites Purbalingga people to reject the new tagline, namely " *sehati* ". The reason is, that many people refused to change the slogan because it was announced suddenly by the regent. The previous slogan of " *perwira* " has been embedded in the memory of society, not the property of bureaucrats, but belonging to the whole community of Purbalingga. No fewer petitions have been signed handle up to 1500 people, as part of a community's representation.

The local bureaucracy leadership is impartial. That is a leadership typical that has an orientation or personal interest towards the final outcome only. At the height of its authority, a leader who decides on his own one matter and ignores input from other bureaucratic elements will lead to *groupthink* reality. In a common bureaucratic practice, a leader has decided something; generally the underlying structure is conditioned to be obedient, just following what has been decided by the peak of power. Even in the perspective of a group member or subordinate structure, even the wider community, there are still shortcomings in the policy / decision. However, if the leader has to p messenger who has been rounded to the final outcome, then members cannot do anything anymore. The illustration is casuistic as happened in Purbalingga (liputan6.com)

In this case, one thing seems strong stand (although not awarded by the regent), is typical of impartiality leaders that led to the thought difference between members of the bureaucracy and even the public at large. The impartial typical of a bureaucratic leader sees everything from his or her own perspective, so that it can be believed that process orientation and results orientation are the self-centered outcomes. But the impartial orientation, diverted on the pretext of sociological that is in the interest of the wider community. In this case there is a kind of unsuitable reality between the execution of thought and the leader's policy with sociological facts in society. In a more philosophical view, the ruler is marking his existence. The slogan of 'one mind' 'the work of a groupthink expected as artifacts ruling on the future of how there are traces of the creative have been inscribed in the history of Purbalingga district. His personal orientation, one of which is to install a stake in the existence of a ruler in a time interval, to be remembered. If Rene Descartes says I think, therefore I am, while in the context of this question, the ruler wants to say I am creative, therefore I am.

B. The Illusion of Stakeholder Cohesiveness

In sociological reality, the group has a cohesiveness that was certainly different from one other. There is a group that has the usual level of cohesiveness, but there are also groups that have a solid cohesiveness level. The differences in cohesiveness generally result in different results / decisions. A group with a high level of cohesiveness will be able to perform their organizational tasks. This high cohesiveness generally shows that the satisfaction of group members is associated with high cohesiveness. This kind of thing is of course beneficial to the group. However, it was found that the cohesiveness level was not good for the group. This is because the high level of cohesiveness member i pressure on group members to comply with what has become the group's decision. Each member of the group will be very careful not to raise a different opinion with the other members. Usually group members are not willing to raise objections to a solution that he deems unsuitable. This kind of situation often occurs in groups. Each member does not want to take risks, if he is different from the decision taken by the group then it seems as if he will be considered a strange person and could be excommunicated by other members.

In addition, as the above mentioned two lacks of procedures in decision-making can lead to the emergence of groupthink. Some groups have many procedures that have been arranged in such a way as to make important decisions and some groups have only simple procedures. Procedure is necessary if one group will decide one problem. This is because what has been decided will bring a certain consequence uensi very important; let alone concerning the public interest. If the result is good, of course the decision-making procedure is declared appropriate. but if the results are poor, of course the decision-making procedure gets noticed and should be improved. Decision-making cannot be influenced by the dominant voice in the group. Nor can it be influenced by the dominant voice of the person occupying an important position. Therefore proper procedures can minimize the occurrence of errors in decision making. Finally, the factors that lead to *groupthink* is a pressure group. This pressure can be a powerful push from within (internal) and from outside (external). When deciding something within the group will usually appear high pressure both from within and from outside. External pressure from someone who is very interested, for example your lecturer who wants the task must be completed within two days. This results in you

and your group likely to approve it. Similarly when there is pressure from members of the group to take quick decisions, typically would be approved without much hindrance. Such situations often occur in groups so that there are members who cannot control their emotions. The case of the formulation of the slogan of Purbalingga district is evidence that the peak structure of power (out of consciousness) illustrates that all stakeholders will be cohesive, so there will be no discordant voice regarding the policy pursued. In terms of the plot of decision-making logic, there is a kind of procedure that is violated. The absence of pre-launch slogan socialization, lack of socialization will be the change in slogan is an action that can be categorized as a negation procedure. In light of the possibility of pressure from others or at least the influence of external elements, the formulation of a new slogan of Purbalingga may be perceived as such. When examined, the election terminology of " *sehati*" as if contrary to the previous slogan, "*perwira*". From the meaning of the word (not the word compiler acronym) would have been different. Different meanings definitely have different thinking orientations. The public can not be prevented from imagining the orientation of thinking the regent refers to in determining the word as an acronym of the values in question.

V. FINAL WORD

The power relations in the bureaucratic structure are a necessity, which is united with the body of the regent himself. The design of decisions that concern the public is often elaborated in the power relations. This is where groupthink is entrenched because it is in fact closely related to the political dimension. The ruler may be subject to his sustaining power and also subject to his own ego. The top bureaucracy and bureaucratic structure are the groupthinks whose influence can extend to the public. And groupthink manifestation is a political manifestation. The case of the formulation of the slogan of the Purbalingga district boiled in the vessel thought a small group of people plus the rulers was the story that the fledgling groupthink was so mighty.

The phenomenon of such groupthinks can be actually prevented by taking a few steps. This preventive effort is intended to make the group decision-making process run in an egalitarian and democratic way. Control measures system and look at the idea or even refutation group members (stakeholders) makes the decision-making process can be run democratically. The move gives the probability to all members of the group to contribute and play an active role. Synthesis of mutual

control functions will automatically be established, so that the phenomenon of groupthink can be blocked.

REFERENCES

- [1] Aitken, R., & Campelo, A. (2011). *The four Rs of place branding*. Journal of Marketing Management, (Vol. 27): 913-933.
- [2] Ashworth, G. (2009). *The instruments of place branding: How is it done?* European Spatial research and policy, (Vol. 16)(1): 9-22.
- [3] De Vito, Yoseph.A. 1997. *Komunikasi Antarmanusia*. Jakarta : Proffesional Books
- [4] Knapp, Duanne E, 2001. *The Brand Mindset*. Yogyakarta:ANDI
- [5] Kotler, Philip & Gary Armstrong, 2004. *Dasar-Dasar Pemasaran*. Jakarta: PT.Indeks
- [6] Mulyana, Deddy. 2005. *Pengantar Ilmu Komunikasi*. Bandung : Remaja Rosda Karya
- [7] Nuradi. Dkk,1996. *Kamus Istilah Periklanan Indonesia*, Edisi Pertama, Penerbit PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama, Jakarta
- [8] Schroeder, J. E. (2009). *The cultural codes of branding*. Marketing Theory, (Vol. 9): 123-126.
- [9] West. Richard. Turner. Lynn.H. 2007. *Teori Komunikasi Analisa & Aplikasi*. Jakarta : Salemba Humanika
- [10] Zhang, L., & Zhao, S. X. (2009). *City branding and the Olympic effect: A case study of Beijing*. Cities, (Vol. 26): 245-254.