

The Implementation of the Regulation of the Minister of Administrative Reform and Bureaucratic Reform No 29/2011 in Crisis Management of Government Public Relations

Rachmat Kriyantono

Universitas Brawijaya, Indonesia

author correspondence: rachmat_kr@ub.ac.id

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18196/jkm.112023>

Article Info

Article history:

Received 09 Aug 2019

Revised 17 Oct 2019

Accepted 13 Nov 2019

ABSTRACT

This study aims to evaluate whether Public Relations practitioners have implemented the principles of the Regulation of the Minister of Administrative Reform and Bureaucratic Reform (Permenpan-RB) No. 29 of 2011 concerning the Guidelines for Crisis Management within government agencies. A crisis is an unexpected event that threatens public expectations, has the potential to produce negative consequences, and affects the performance and reputation of an institution. In the era of democracy, the threat of a more significant crisis occurs because the public has a critical character, is free to give opinions, and is easier to access information from various channels, including the internet. The crisis must be managed well because a crisis is possible for every institution and it has a negative or positive impact on the institution. PR is communication management, and crisis develops due to communication factors so that PR is a crisis manager. By conducting a qualitative method, the researcher interviewed 23 government public relations practitioners. The study reveals that Permenpan-RB No. 29 of 2011 had not been fully applied. This study confirms that the structural position of public relations plays a vital role in public relations activities to get practitioners involved in strategic decision making. This research reinforces the literature review on crises that government public relations practitioners tend to devise ways to prevent crises after the cause of the crisis is known, and public relations practitioners are not yet proactive in crisis prevention planning. This research contributes to the study and practice of government public relations as socialization that public relations rules in Indonesia have adopted the ideal principle of public relations based on academic literature and government regulations.

Keywords: Crisis management; Democracy; Government Public Relations; Permenpan-RB No 29/2011.

ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini bertujuan mengevaluasi apakah praktisi Hubungan Masyarakat telah mengimplementasikan prinsip-prinsip Peraturan Menteri Pendayagunaan Aparatur Negara-Reformasi Birokrasi (Permenpan-RB) No 29 Tahun 2011 tentang Pedoman Pengelolaan Krisis di lingkungan instansi pemerintah. Krisis adalah peristiwa tidak terduga yang mengancam harapan publik, berpotensi menghasilkan hal negatif, memengaruhi kinerja, nama baik, reputasi, dan citra lembaga. Di era demokrasi, ancaman terjadi krisis makin besar karena public memiliki karakter kritis, bebas memberikan opini, dan bebas mengakses informasi dari berbagai saluran, termasuk internet. Krisis harus dikelola dengan baik karena krisis dimungkinkan dialami setiap lembaga dan berdampak negatif

atau positif bagi lembaga. Humas adalah manajemen komunikasi dan krisis berkembang karena factor komunikasi sehingga Humas adalah manajer krisis. Dengan melakukan metode Kualitatif, peneliti mewawancarai 23 praktisi Humas lembaga pemerintah, penelitian ini menemukan bahwa Permenpan-RB No 29 Tahun 2011 belum sepenuhnya diaplikasikan. Penelitian ini mengkonfirmasi bahwa posisi struktural humas memegang peran penting dalam aktivitas Humas untuk membuat praktisi dilibatkan dalam pengambilan keputusan strategis. Penelitian ini menguatkan kajian literatur tentang krisis bahwa praktisi humas pemerintah cenderung menyusun cara mencegah krisis setelah penyebab krisis diketahui dan praktisi humas pemerintah belum proaktif dalam perencanaan pencegahan krisis. Penelitian ini berkontribusi bagi kajian dan praktek Humas pemerintah sebagai sosialisasi bahwa aturan kehumasan di Indonesia telah mengadopsi prinsip ideal Humas berdasarkan literatur akademik dan beberapa peraturan pemerintah.

Keywords: Demokrasi; Humas Pemerintah; Manajemen Krisis; Permenpan-RB No 29/2011.

INTRODUCTION

In addition to typical situations, the Public Relations (PR) function in management activities will deal with different situations, including crisis situations (Cutlip, Center, & Broom, 2011; Kriyantono, 2017; Coombs, 2015). A crisis is an unexpected event that threatens the expectations of stakeholders, has the potential to produce negative consequences, affects the performance, good name, reputation, and image of the organization (Coombs, 2015; Kriyantono & McKenna, 2019). Every crisis develops due to factors of lack and excess information, and failure to provide and control the flow of information is the biggest failure in efforts to manage the crisis (Duke & Masland, 2002). A crisis is not triggered by an event, but as a result of handling the event (Harrison, 2005).

Therefore, the crisis must get the attention of PR practitioners to manage it well in line with the fact that a crisis is possible for every organization and has a negative or positive impact on the organization (Coombs, 2015). Because crises can produce a negative effect, crisis communication is needed by forming a crisis communication team (Wekesa, 2013). Implementing a crisis management strategy requires a communication function performed by public relations practitioners (Grunig, 2011). Communication becomes a crisis management strategy because the crisis raises the need for information that is processed to the public. In this connection, the PR practitioner is a crisis manager due to the crisis related to communication, which is the function of PR as communication management in the organization (Coombs, 2015).

The information and communication management function is also stated in the Regulation of the Minister of Administrative Reform and Bureaucratic Reform (Permenpan-RB) Number 30 and 31 of 2011 so that this crisis management function also applies to Government Public Relations. This crisis management function is also strengthened by Permenpan-RB No. 29 of 2011 concerning the management of crisis communication within government agencies. The literature also reinforces that crises also occur in non-profit institutions and public institutions (Heath, 2010) and crises can occur in every type of organization, both large and small scale (Taneja, Pryor, Sewell, & Recuero, 2014).

Because the crisis is a communication problem, the researcher believes that the crisis is closely related to changes in the social system of Indonesian society in the era of democracy. Democracy guarantees the public's right to access information as the fundamental right to achieve people's welfare by providing what they need (Dalton, Shin, & Jou, 2007; Peter, 2013; Sulhan, 2019). Accessing this information includes the need to exchange meaning, express personal thoughts, ideas, and opinions (Mon, 2015). This public right has been guaranteed in the 1945 Constitution, article 28F concerning the right of everyone to communicate and obtain information and the right to seek, receive, possess, store, process, and convey information using all types of available channels. It is also regulated in Law No. 14 of 2008 concerning disclosure of public information.

In previous studies, the link between democracy and access to information for the public was also proven to prevent corruption. Democracy has pushed government agencies in Brazil to be more open

to public opinion about government programs (Adorno & Cardia, 2013). The right of access to information in India, encourages information transparency and accountability for government activities to the community, thereby reducing corruption (Rout, 2014; Singh, 2014). The right of access to information is applied by the Nigerian government by utilizing the press to share information while overseeing acts of corruption (Nwanne, 2014). Democracy can reduce the level of corruption because it offers transparent communication and public participation (Montinola & Jackson, 2002). It can be said that the right of access to information is the key to good governance because it makes the community more participatory (Borah, 2013).

It can be said that the function of public relations communication in managing crises is getting more substantial along with the development of communication technology. The internet makes the public free to access as much information as possible through information technology. The public has two-way dialogue without limits (Freeman & Quirke, 2013), and the level of public participation increases (Platnner, 2012). In Indonesian, all of that also became a public character in the reform era (Kriyantono, Ramadlan, & Setiawan, 2015). Related to crises, this public character is important because it determines the success of crisis management, namely how the interpretation and reaction of the public and management to crisis events (Coombs, 2015).

This free public expression can lead to consequences of rumors spreading through the internet that can threaten the credibility of the institution because the public can write complaints against the institution through social media (Einwiller & Steilen, 2015). Rumors, referring to Coombs (2015), may be related to an event that threatens the reputation of the institution so that it can cause a crisis because the public thinks wrongly about the organization. It can be concluded that democracy has the opportunity to stimulate a crisis.

On the other hand, some research still finds that Government Public Relations in Indonesia still do not function well compared to the private sector because Public Relations do not yet have a high structural position (Kriyantono, 2017). Government public relations are still lacking coordination, resulting in overlapping communication and information management (Ajianto, Kriyantono, & Wulandari, 2018).

However, research on the condition of PR in Indonesia is still broad in nature, namely the overall public relations activities, and has not specifically examined aspects of crisis management. In addition, the crisis has been recognized as a public relations function, and management guidelines have been formulated for government agencies in Permenpan-RB No. 29 of 2011. It can be said that the rules that contain these crisis management guidelines are a plan for a crisis. An organization can handle crises when they have crisis management plans in preparation to deal with difficulties and minimize the impact of the crisis (Kriyantono & McKenna, 2019; Wekesa, 2013; Yew Tan, Pang, & Kang, 2019). Therefore, the purpose of this study is directed to address the problem of how is Permenpan-RB No. 29 of 2011 concerning crisis management in Government Public Relations practitioners implemented?

Based on the description of literature and previous research, the researcher concludes that, first, the characteristics of democracy and the public are strictly related to the need for crisis management because a crisis is a communication problem. Second, PR is communication management; therefore, crisis management is a function of PR. Third, crisis management has been mandated by Permenpan-RB No. 29 of 2011. Fourth, democracy can trigger a crisis that hits institutions. Based on this conclusion, the researcher made an initial research proposition: In the era of democracy and information disclosure, Government Public Relations practitioners have implemented the crisis management function appropriately in accordance with Permenpan No. 29 of 2011. The problem formulation in this study needs to be answered at once to be able to confirm the initial proposition of this study.

This research is also driven by data from previous studies that Government Public Relations in Indonesia are still not categorized as implementing public relations functions in general properly. Public Relations practitioners' understanding of the crisis is also still lacking. Based on the statements of Taneja, Pryor, Sewell, and Recuero (2014), the phenomenon that often arises is that public relations practitioners do not know the fundamental measures in determining crisis situations. Another study by Miller (1999) explained that public relations managers have erroneous assumptions regarding crisis management, such as assuming that crisis planning is carried out only once when a crisis occurs. In addition, organizations act reactively, meaning that organizations take action when negative public thought has dominated (Jaques, 2007, p. 148). Not a few managers of an organization that does not have a crisis management plan (Galloway, 2012), although planning contributes

effectively to prevent potential crises and is prepared to respond to crises when they occur (Coombs, 2015; Kriyantono, 2017). Jaques (2007) stated proactive action is needed in the context of crisis because it shows the process of crisis prevention, crisis preparation, and crisis recovery.

The ineffectiveness of public relations practitioners in crisis management is mostly found in government agencies, namely half of the 107 government agencies surveyed in the US do not have a plan for crisis communication because human resources do not understand the role in crisis situations and media relations (Horsley & Baker, 2002). There are several other studies related to the inability of government public relations practitioners in mastering crisis management as a result of a lack of understanding of the crisis which causes adverse impacts during crisis management. Lyle (2015), with a focus on case studies on public relations responses from the Vietnamese Ministry of Health, found that the institution's reputation deteriorated due to inadequate response to the scandal, namely refusing to visit the families of victims due to the poor quality of the hepatitis vaccine. Lee (2009) pointed out the failure of the communication crisis by the Hong Kong government in 2003 which resulted in the loss of public trust. Asemah and Asogawa (2012) analyzed the causes of the incessant crisis in the regional government of North Jos, Nigeria, and found that the public relations activities of the regional government in North Jos were inadequate due to the lack of relationships built to the public.

Referring to government institutions in Indonesia, there is research into the role of government public relations in Indonesia which is less effective in crisis management. Research Tamher and Najib (2011), analyzing the local government of Tual City faced a crisis in 2008 related to the burning of traditional markets, Pasar Tual, and found that local government public relations were slow and had no crisis planning. Febrianingsih (2012) found that information from government agencies was challenging to reach or access to the public so that many publics were not aware of government policies.

METHODS

This study used a constructivist paradigm. This paradigm assumes that reality exists in an individual's mind so that the meaning of reality becomes diverse because it is influenced by the individual's social, economic, and cultural background. Individuals act as subjects by giving meaning to reality and constructing it according to their wishes (Creswell, 2014).

The Researcher chose the constructivist approach because the research conducted was related to the construction of public relations practitioners about crisis management. Public Relations practitioners interviewed about the crisis management process were associated with Permenpan-RB No. 29 of 2011, such as the dimensions of detection and identification, crisis prevention, crisis planning, handling, and crisis recovery.

Public relations activities come from social construction carried out continuously, so that the construction of informants about the crisis brought diversity according to the background of his experience. Understanding of crises for public relations practitioners is based on their experiences constructed as social realities. That way, researchers chose a constructivist approach to explore the experiences of each diverse informant through in-depth interviews. Based on a constructivist approach, researchers used qualitative research methods to explain the most in-depth phenomena through profound data collection (Creswell, 2014).

The selection of informants was based on the ease of licensing, which is chosen based on the comfort or closeness with PR practitioners and the willingness to be an informant after being sent a permit (Convenience sampling). Adopting Ethics, Musa, and Alkassim (2016), it is permissible to use the principle of convenience, which includes researchers' access, geographical proximity, availability of time, and subject's willingness to be involved in research objectives. The licensing process until the interview took January 2017-August 2017 and was carried out in stages using the saturation principle (Hancock, Amankwaa, Revell & Mueller, 2016), where researchers conducted interviews with some of the most easily contacted informants in advance, if it was deemed to be lacking in data then the researcher would look for other informants by asking permission. After the data was sufficient, the researcher decided not to do the interview again. In qualitative research, the most important thing is not the number of informants but the depth of the data. If the data collected is in-depth and can explain the phenomenon then there is no need to look for other samplings (Creswell, 2014).

The informants of this study were 23 practitioners, they were the head of the Public Relations Office of the Batu City Communication and Information Agency, the Central Statistics Agency of Malang City, Malang City Police, East Java Regional Police Office, Malang State Prosecutor, Malang City Government, Batu City Government, Malang District Court, Malang Religious Court, Malang

KPU, Malang National Sports Committee Indonesia (Koni) Malang City, Ministry of Public Works and Public Housing, Ministry of Transportation, Ministry of Administrative Reform and Bureaucracy Reform, Ministry of National Development Planning/Bappenas, Ministry of Communication and Information, Ministry of Research Technology and Higher Education, Corruption Eradication Commission, Brawijaya University, Airlangga University, Malang State University, Indonesian University of Education, and Kupang Agriculture Polytechnic. The informants came from several institutions located in Jakarta, Malang, Surabaya, and Batu City. Ease of access to get informants was a factor chosen by the researcher (convenience techniques).

Data analysis used three stages of analysis: Condensation of data, presentation of data, and drawing conclusions or verification (Miles, Huberman, & Saldana, 2014). Condensation data refers to the process of selecting, focusing, simplifying, and transforming field data into a full paragraph through interview transcripts, documentation, and other empirical material. Presentation of data to describe an organized matter so that the display of data helps simplify information by highlighting conclusions. Conclusions are drawn, and verification is done to make final conclusions until the data collected is deemed sufficient and fulfilled.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The data showed that there were 23 informants, 19 of whom were men, and 4 were women. Men dominating the number of informants (82%) appeared to be related to some previous studies. Although PR is a profession that is mostly filled by women (Simorangkir, 2013), the positions of managers or heads of PR are populated mainly by men (Pompper & Jung, 2013). In the context of this study, what the manager meant was that the head of public relations was the informant.

Regarding the latest educational background, data showed that 57% had a non-communication education degree, and only 43% had a communication education degree. This further strengthened the findings of Kriyantono & McKenna (2017); Sisco, Collin, & Zoch (2011) contended that public relations are multi-disciplinary fields where everyone can work in it. From a number of practitioners who were educated in non-communication sciences, 42% of whom were educated in law, and 17% were in public administration. This seems to reinforce the research of Fitzpatrick (1995) and Fearn-Banks (2012), who found that law and public relations are often opposites in practice. Fitzpatrick also found that two-thirds of organizations prefer a legal approach to deal with crises and are ineffective because they tend to be closed.

How is the crisis interpreted?

Understanding of the crisis plays an important role because referring to Coombs (2015) and Lando (2014), every institution may experience a crisis, and according to Kouzmin (2008, p. 155), a crisis can have positive and negative impacts, "Crisis as a dilemma, opportunity, or both is still unresolved and relatively undebated issue." It is also stated in Permenpan-RB No. 29 of 2011 that mistakes in crisis management can cause risks that have a negative impact, such as the intensity of the problem, public scrutiny, negative media coverage, and the government's credibility falls. Referring to Widiyowati, Kriyantono, and Prasetyo (2018), a crisis is also able to create conflict so that it is needed to be resolved.

After conducting interviews with several public relations practitioners of government agencies, researchers found that a diverse understanding of practitioners. Some understanding of the crisis of the practice is that crisis was understood as the emergence of problems, such as the difference between public expectations of public services, the distrust of the community, the lack of communication that exists between the organization and the community, the crisis as a problem due to differences in understanding between the information provided by the institution and received by the public, and the public is no longer able to access information from institutions, so there is no more information disclosure.

It appears that the informants' answers did not reflect an understanding of the actual crisis. The literature says that not all problems can be categorized as crises. A crisis is different from a problem because a crisis can occur if a problem has a broad impact, disrupting the entire operation of the institution. Coombs (2015) called the crisis "a sudden and unexpected event that threatens to disrupt an organization's operations and positions both a financial and reputational threat."

Understanding of the crisis from the informant is also different from the crisis definition according to Permenpan-RB No. 29 of 2011, which is anything or events that do not work correctly that have the potential to cause negative impacts. "An issue ignored is a crisis ensured" (Regester & Larkin, 2008, p. 95). "Without outrage, there is no crisis" (Miller, 1999, p. 5).

The understanding of the crisis by the informants also seems to be influenced by the field of affairs of the government institutions where the informants work. Malang Public Relations Attorney practitioners, for example, stated that all cases handled are a form of the problem so that the potential for a crisis exists. Crisis, according to General Election Commissions' public relations, is as an issue related to election socialization to the public:

"Well, this crisis is the problem faced in public relations activities, namely the lack of funds for the socialization of KPU products and the lack of concern for the public about the election. For example, in public relations, what we do is update information on websites and social media, we submit. But, the level of community awareness by looking at our website then becomes a follower on our social media, it becomes a benchmark that the level of public awareness is still low" (Interview, 3 February 2017).

The Ministry of Transportation's public relations practitioner said that the crisis was something that could affect trust and reputation. "For example, yesterday's crisis regarding aviation. When considered a failure, the Ministry of Transportation's reputation was bad in public. Finally, it was built from scratch by looking for other issues that give a good and positive impression. But once again we are different from companies that if they are in crisis can close down. Government agencies do not logically like that" (Interview, 27 April 2017).

The informants from the Central Statistics Agency constructed the crisis as a lack of understanding of statistical activities through their interactions with the media and the public:

"So, in the media, sometimes on the internet, print media also often asked when there are BPS data releasing poverty that many pouts. How come there is so much poverty data? Well, in my opinion, this is a form of their lack of understanding of the statistical concept. What is poverty, what is the general ratio, calculated using what method? They do not know. This is a crisis in my opinion. Why is the crisis because the people's understanding of statistics is very lacking" (Interview, 30 March 2017).

Although the understanding of crises varies, researchers found the tendency of understanding of crises can be put into three broad categories: Crisis is a deficiency in organizations; a crisis is a problem or a problem; and negative coverage about the organization.

What is the cause of the crisis?

The results of other construction about the public relations practitioners' understanding of government agencies, notably about what could be the cause of the crisis in government institutions, were explored by the researcher. There was a tendency that informants interpret the causes of the crisis as community factors. Take the following interviews as examples:

The cause of the crisis occurred because of differences in opinion between service providers and service recipients. Public relations practitioners of Polresta Malang considered the issue as the cause of the crisis because there were differences in people's views of the actual activities in the police (Interview, February 8, 2017). This opinion was also in tune with the East Java Regional Police public relations' statement that the issue of which the truth was uncertain and the news that defamed the Police could encourage a crisis for the police (Interview, 17 April 2017).

The cause of the crisis due to the lack of understanding from the community was also acknowledged by the informant from the Central Statistics Agency as a trigger for the crisis. Often the Central Statistics Agency officers faced problems when collected statistical data such as the public answering questions from the Central Statistics Agency in a haphazard manner. Another thing, many people with high social status refused to be asked for data collection by the Central Statistics Agency officials (Interview, 30 March 2017). This lack of understanding was also conveyed by informants of the Malang City Religious Court that the litigants who were dissatisfied with the results of the decision felt that no justice was given by the religious court. Furthermore, this dissatisfaction was caused because they did not understand the legal rules that were considered by the decision (Interview, 27 April 2017).

General Election Commission's public relations practitioners mentioned that there were two causes of the crisis that occurred in General Election Commission institutions, including limited budgetary funds and lack of public awareness of the importance of election (Interview, 3 February 2017). The cause of the crisis was the limited budget of the government from the government also felt by the public prosecutor of the Malang District Attorney. The budgeted funds were insufficient to solve many cases so that this becomes a problem for the internal organization. The problem arose because, behind the limited funds, the demands of the community were higher related to speed in resolving cases. In addition, in the case handling process, it was not uncommon for reporters and those who were reported to postpone scheduled meetings (Interview, March 13, 2017).

Another opinion was raised by public relations practitioners from the National Sports Committee, who considered the lack of information available to be the cause of the information crisis, especially in the field of public relations (Interview, February 17, 2017). The cause of the crisis conveyed by the National Sports Committee's public relations was supported by the Batu City Government's public relations that mentioned that the lack of communication caused the information was not conveyed. This lack of communication still arose because various parties in the government were still grasping their egos so that personal character can also trigger a crisis (Interview, 18 April 2017).

In general, the events can be described as the cause of a crisis depending on the issue and the community because there were differences in people's expectations of public services; budget constraints; lack of information; negative coverage; the community did not consider information from the institution as useful; no more communication exists between the organization and the community; no more communication exists between the organization and the community; and communication is less intertwined and the character of each person in government.

In theory, the construction of the informants seemed relevant to the description of the causes of the crisis (Coombs, 2015; Kriyantono, 2017). There was a crisis because of the organization's operations. Informant answers about the causes of the crisis because the service can be interpreted because of the operational dimensions of the organization. Another cause of the crisis was the confrontation between the institution and the public, which based on the informants' answers can be in the form of differences in people's expectations of public services, and there was no more communication between the organization and the community.

However, the causes of the crisis, according to literature and Permenpan-RB No. 29 of 2011, were not all conveyed by the informants. All informants answered the cause of the crisis in the category of crisis that could be anticipated while the crisis that could not be anticipated was not yet considered the cause of the crisis. The causes of the crisis that cannot be anticipated include natural disasters or climate change.

Understanding the causes of the crisis is the process of identifying the causes of the crisis, which is called issue management. The issue is "a condition or event, both internal or external to the organization, which if continued will have a significant effect on the functioning or performance of the organization or on the interests of the organization in the future." (Regester & Larkin, 2008, p. 44). "The capacity to understand, mobilize, coordinate and direct all strategic and policy planning functions, and all public affairs or public relations skills, toward the achievement of one objective: meaningful participation in the creation of public policy that affects personal and institutional destiny" (Jaques, 2007, p. 337). □

The identification of the causes of this crisis is parallel with Permenpan-RB No. 29 of 2011. It was written that the crisis began with rumors or rumors that could have a negative impact, Handling of slow and prolonged problems and communication that did not work well could develop into a crisis. Therefore, the identification of the causes of the crisis was placed first in the crisis management steps in Permenpan-RB No. 29 of 2011. The ability to identify problems was also recognized by several informants, such as from the University of Indonesia's Education as an essential capability that public relations practitioners have. Cutlip, Center, & Broom (2011) made it the role of the expert prescriber.

Who is responsible for the crisis?

At first, it is interesting to explore how the practitioners define a crisis situation. Generally, the research reveals different perceptions about a crisis, and the perceptions can be grouped into some categories. First, the crisis was defined as a problem, such as a gap between public service and the public's opinions regarding public services. Second, practitioners also defined the crisis as there is no

public trust toward the government. Third, the crisis was also defined as the impact of negative news which was spread through mass media and social media. The definitions of crisis led to how crisis management was conducted. For example, if the practitioners defined a crisis as the impact of negative news, they would focus on increasing the quality of media relations. □

Situational Crisis Communication Theory has put PR as the crisis manager (Coombs, 2015; Kriyantono, 2017). Permenpan-RB No. 29 of 2011 explains that the task of handling the crisis is in the hands of public relations practitioners. After conducting interviews with the informants, the researchers found data that the actors in crisis management were handed back to each division responsible for the crisis. Thus, the statement from the informant also showed that public relations practitioners tended to call the crisis occurred in every part or function in government institutions rather than an organizational crisis. It means that the crisis was interpreted as partial, not holistic responsibility of all members of the organization.

In general, the informants acknowledged that the public relations department was authorized to manage the crisis. However, they did not have the full authority to make decisions. Every decision regarding a crisis management strategy must have prior approval from the leadership. The independence of crisis management also cannot be full because in some crisis handling events it required outsiders so that the leadership invited external parties who were capable in their fields to solve crisis problems.

The partial and dependent management of the crisis management policy was also acknowledged by the public relations practitioners of the Public Prosecutor's Office that the responsibility in managing the crisis was held by the respective head of departments concerned for the emergence of the crisis. This is because each division already has a portion of work based on their duties and functions and based on standard operational procedures. If the crisis has entered the organization's work system as a whole, then the person responsible for resolving the crisis was held by the Chief Prosecutor (Interview, March 13, 2017).

Public relations practitioners of the Polresta also shared the same view regarding the actors in crisis management in their institutions. According to Polresta public relations practitioners, public relations cannot make decisions in resolving crisis issues because the decision is in the Head of Operations. Public Relations helped solve the problem of crisis to a limited extent as a function of public relations (Interview, February 8, 2017).

Public relations would have full authority if the crisis occurred due to the duties of public relations. The authority for crisis management in the East Java Regional Police was given to the sub-information and documentation or cyber sub-units to counter the negative news about the police (Interview, 17 April 2017). The Batu City government public relations mentioned that management related to the communication crisis will be overcome by the public relations and public relations sub-sections. However, if the topic that raised the crisis was not from the public relations of the City Government then it would be returned to the relevant section that is more understanding (Interview, 18 April 2017).

Responsibility for crisis management in district courts was held by the deputy head of the district court. Crisis management was based on existing risk management in each unit. The vice-chairman monitored the implementation of risk management in each unit (Interview, February 20, 2017). In general, researchers grouped the answers of informants about the person in charge of crisis management. Public relations was not involved in crisis management because it was carried out by organizational leaders (17%). Crisis management was handled by each crisis-related division (67%), crisis responsibilities of all members (8%), and public relations and external parties who were competent in crisis-related fields (8%). Interestingly, there were public relations practitioners who were not given responsibility for managing the crisis (17%). This figure was even greater than the answer to informants, who said that public relations were responsible for crisis management, which is only 8%.

Regarding the person in charge of the crisis, it can be said that the authority of the public relations as the crisis manager has not applied the provisions of Permenpan-RB No. 29 of 2011. In this regulation, it did not explicitly refer to public relations as the crisis manager or as the person in charge of the crisis, but this rule that constructed that crisis was a matter of communication and conveyed the scope of public relations. Therefore, the meaning of this rule can be interpreted as public relations. In addition, this rule addressed public relations crises, which were not defined as crises in public relations, but crises in organizations related to the ineffectiveness of public relations functions. Related to the public relations function, according to Permenpan-RB No. 30 of 2011, crisis

management was explicitly in the domain of Public Relations, although this regulation did not cover crisis management procedures, such as Permenpan-RB No. 29 of 2011.

Based on the data findings, it can be proved that the structural position of Public Relations also influences. This is also related to research from Grunig (2011) that contended that public relations are called excellent if it is in a high structure and had a managerial role, which is called dominant-coalition, which enables decision making. Kriyantono (2017) found that many public relations institutions of higher education do not have a managerial role. Public relations should be given authority in making decisions to manage crises because public relations' reputation is also at stake if it fails in crisis management (Kent & Boatwright, 2018). □

This is where the role of public relations since crisis management is a process that uses public relations activities to overcome negative consequences, such as damage experienced by organizations. Wigley and Zhang (2011) in their research concluded that crisis management, including communication in crisis situations, is often the responsibility of public relations.

Media Relations

The media has a symbiotic mutualism relationship with public relations practitioners (Kriyantono, Ramadlan, & Setiawan, 2015). The media is the most important external public in the information dissemination process (Cutlip, Center, & Broom, 2011; Kriyantono, 2017). Concerning crises, crises develop because of information, and every crisis is bound to experience media-scrutiny. The researcher helped explore the construction of government public relations practitioners about the role of the media for their organizations. Government public relations practitioners had opinions that tended to be the same: the media is a means of conveying information. Behind this trend, there are other government public relations practitioners who believed that the media acted as a control for the organization because it brought sound in the form of criticism or suggestions from the public.

The mutualism symbiotic at the time of the crisis was delivered by public relations. Police said that: "We must exchange information with the media because even though we already have online media ourselves, it is not possible if we have activities, we make our own news, and they do not know. If they (the media) do not know, they will not stick out (Interview, February 8, 2017). Similarly, Batu City Government Public Relations said that the media was important as a media publication. The publication material can be in the form of policies or activities that are being carried out by Batu City Government. Information for Batu City Government was also able to be obtained from journalists, in addition to the media managed by City Government, public relations become a place for sharing information from the public (Interview, 18 April 2017).

Referring to the data above, government public relations practitioners constructed the role of the media from the positive and negative sides. The positive value of the role of the media was to convey information from the organization to the public and also looked at feedback from the public. However, the media also had a negative side, which included news about organizations whose truth has not been confirmed. The media contained news that has a sale value but was detrimental to a government institution. The role of the mass media in crises is a consequence of the demands on crisis managers to always provide correct and responsible information to initiate crisis communication to preserve the image and reputation of the organization.

Data in the field also showed that all informants said the mass media were the main external public. Head of Brawijaya University public relations said: "Relations with the media are very important because it will provide convenience, for example, it is easier to count negative news, they are easy to believe." The media needed public relations to obtain effective, efficient, interesting and informative news material for the public while public relations requires journalists as audiences, mediators and gatekeepers to convey information and respond to the public's need to know and public relations in charge of building a positive image (Cutlip, Center, & Broom, 2011; Kriyantono, 2017).

Crisis Management Strategies

Coombs (2015, p. 20) referred to crisis management as "a set of factors designed to combat crises and to reduce the actual damages inflicted ... to prevent or reduce the negative outcomes of a crisis and to protect the organization, stakeholders, and/ or industry from damage." The purpose of crisis

management is to stop the negative impact of an event through the efforts to prepare and implement several strategies and tactics.□

The researchers found various informants' answers about crisis management strategies. Public relations practitioners at the Ministry of Public Works said that the crisis management process did not only occur during a crisis but was carried out long before the crisis arose. According to him, the initial step was always to work well and professionally to reduce the gap of problems. Apart from that being active in managing issues, it was also the best step to avoid conflict. Nonetheless, if the crisis has already occurred then what is done is to create an emergency response team, rehabilitation in which there are coordination, synergy, and joint resolution steps. The crisis management process also did not stop until this phase but is balanced by strengthening the role of the media in every ministry activity (Interview, 28 April 2017).

The results of an interview with the head of the public communication department of the state apparatus utilization department stated that the crisis management strategy that was carried out was started since the monitoring and analysis of the issue. Another thing that must be prepared from the beginning was important data related to all ministry activities. According to another informant, establishing good media relations with journalists and their own media.

The researcher found a tendency that both public relations who were a part of themselves and those under other coordination were not fully involved in decision making when managing crises. The importance of the meaning of public relations in government institutions has not been embedded because the tendency of public relations was still a part of the coordination of other parts. Data in the field showed that public relations were under the section of the general administration bureau, secretariat, deputy chairman, complaint, operational section, and administration. According to the theory of excellence, public relations can solve organizational problems through communication management, both for organizations and the external public (Grunig, 2011). One of the processes of excellence in public relations can be marked by the existence of a separate public relations section in an organization, but this has not been realized evenly in Indonesian government institutions.□

For tertiary institutions, it was found that almost all of the higher education public relations used as informants had their own sections directly responsible to the Chancellor. However, the public relations department was apparently not in an elevated structure. The top structure in a tertiary institution was at least the level of bureau chief. Only the Kupang Polytechnic Agricultural Public Relations was not independent because it was under the coordination of other parts, namely under the coordination of the Head of Administration. It links to Malang District public relations' statement that the position affects coordination.

Although not in a high structure, the informant whose public relations stand-alone claimed to be involved in the decision making the process at the leadership meeting. They claimed to have the opportunity to submit their suggestions directly to the highest leadership in the institution. However, most of them said they were not satisfied with the quality of their involvement. If related to the still low structure, the researchers perceived that dissatisfaction was due to the low structure so that practitioners became more parties who provide information, listen to meetings, without being involved in decision making.

The data also showed that most public relations agencies of the government acknowledged that the crisis will be resolved by each section directly related to the crisis. Government public relations tended to divide crises based on their share. For example, a communication crisis arose in the public relations department while a financial crisis occurs in the financial section. According to government public relations, the public relations department would not understand the problems that existed in other parts because each of them carries out their duties according to their duties. It can be said that government public relations cannot yet make itself a dominant coalition. Public Relations as a dominant coalition will emerge characters that can be trusted and able to convey opinions from various parties well.

The researcher also found that government public relations practitioners tended to make crisis planning after the cause of the crisis was known, not having a crisis plan. Government public relations practitioners tended to analyze the causes of crises after crises so they do not do an analysis or estimation of what will happen in the future. This phenomenon showed that government public relations practitioners tended not to have plans or strategies to prevent crises. As Galloway (2012) explained, planning contributed effectively to prevent potential crises while minimizing the impact caused by the crisis. Therefore, if an organization does not have a plan, then the level of complexity of the crisis will increase and have a broad impact on both the organization and stakeholders (Taneja,

Pryor, Sewell, & Recuero, 2014). It also emphasizes the role of public relations practitioners who have not yet realized the importance of crisis planning as a form of crisis prevention, preparation, and recovery (Jaques, 2007).

Several definitions were summarized by Ahmed (2006, p. 9) which included issues management efforts to prevent crisis as part of crisis management, namely this definition from the Director of Crisis Management Burson-Marsteller, USA, Michael Seymour: "Crisis management is not simply responding to crises as they occur but a preparatory process against a crisis occurring"; and Peter Green's definition: "A crisis is a final instance. The most crisis would not crises if the issue of management was successful."

There are two conditions of an organization, namely organizations that have readiness and organizations that are vulnerable (Sheaffer & Mano-Negrin, 2003). Having readiness means an organization is ready to predict and can effectively deal with potential inevitable crises. The opposing condition is that the organization is at a vulnerable point because it is not aware or negligent of the warning signs that triggered the crisis (Sheaffer & Mano-Negrin, 2003). Organizations without a crisis plan tend to ignore warning signals before a crisis occurs (Vargo & Seville, 2011). It can be said that an organization must pay attention to the preparation of a crisis plan because it can provide benefits such as increased organizational communication and strengthening organizational networks.

The lack of proactive government public relations in crisis planning seems to reinforce the findings of Avery, Graham & Park (2016) that government agencies are less aware of the importance of understanding crisis and preparing for a crisis. Preparation and strategic planning can reduce or limit the impact of the crisis, especially for the government, the level of preparedness and ability to detect crises early is fundamental because they receive a lot of supervision from the community (Avery, Graham & Park, 2016). Lando (2014) also said that organizations that have crisis planning can deal with crises appropriately and better and can return to normal in a relatively short time.

The researcher believes that the absence of a crisis plan was due to the position of Public Relations who were not in a managerial role as a contributing factor because they did not yet have the authority in making broad decisions. Miller (1999) found that so far some managers have wrong assumptions in applying crisis management. Managers often assume that crisis management is an activity that is carried out only once during a crisis, namely by making a crisis plan in the event of a crisis (one only process). The truth is, crisis management is "on-going process" and "continuous process", which is a process that has already begun or is a continuation of the issue management activities (Miller, 1999).

CONCLUSION

This study has confirmed that the initial proposition in this study was not sufficiently proven because of the crisis management guidelines in Permenpan-RB No. 29 of 2011 have not been fully applied. The data findings also have reinforced the theory of Excellence and the results of previous studies that the structural position of public relations plays an important role in public relations activities. Although it cannot yet be categorized as effective, the public relations that become a separate part have been involved in decision making when managing crises rather than or under other coordination.

This study has affirmed that public relations practitioners have two distinctive opinions regarding mass-media. Although the mass-media is important partners, the practitioners believe that the role of the media can be positive and negative. The positive value of the role of the media is to convey information from the organization to the public and also look at feedback from the public. However, the media also have a negative side, which includes news about organizations whose truth has not been confirmed.

This study also reinforces the literature review on crises that government public relations practitioners tend to devise ways to prevent or anticipate crises after the cause of the crisis is known, and government public relations practitioners have not been proactive in crisis prevention planning. For further research, it is recommended to conduct a survey with more respondents so that broader data generalizations can be made. In addition, a comparative test is needed between government and private-public relations regarding crisis management. It also recommended that it can conduct qualitative research for further research to gain a detailed description of the motives and the background of crisis management.

REFERENCES

- Adorno, S., & Cardia, N. (2013). The importance of access to information, past, and present: Humans rights in contemporary Brazil. *American International Journal of Social Science*, 2(8), 20-29.
- Ahmed, M. (2006). *The principles & practice of crisis management: The case of Brent Spar*. New York: Palgrave McMillan.
- Ajianto, I. D., Kriyantono, R., & Wulandari, M. P. (2018). Praktik PR Excelent Humas Pemerintah daerah. *Jurnal Aristo*, 6(1), 30-38.
- Asemah, E.S., & Asogwa, E.E. (2012). Public relations strategies and the administration of jos north local government area, plateau state, Nigeria. *Researchers World*, 3(4), 72-82.
- Avery, E. J., Graham, M., & Park, S. (2016). Planning makes (closer to) perfect: Exploring united states local government official sevaluations of crisis management. *Journal of contingencies and Crisis Management*, 24 (2), 73-81.
- Borah, S.K. (2013). Right to information act: A key to good governance. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention*, 2(2), 11-22.
- Coombs, W.T. (2015). Crisis communication and its allied fields. Dalam Coombs, W.T., & Holladay, S.J. (Ed.). *Handbooks in communication and media: The handbook of crisis communication* (h. 54-64). United Kingdom: Blackwell Publishing.
- Cutlip, S.M., Center, A.H., & Broom, G.M. (2011). *Effective public relations*. (T. Wibowo, Terjemahan). Jakarta: Kencana.
- Creswell, J.W. (2014). *Research design pendekatan kualitatif, kuantitatif, dan mixed*. 3th ed. (A. Fawaid, Terjemahan). Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Dalton, R., Shin, D.C., & Jou, W. (2007). Understanding democracy: Data from unlikely places. *Journal of Democracy*, 18(4), 142-156.
- Duke, S., & Masland, L. (2002). Crisis communication by the book. *Public relations Quartely*, 47(3), 30-35.
- Einwiller, S.A., & Steilen, S. (2015). Handling complaints on social network sites: An analysis of complaints and complain responses on facebook and twitter pages of large US companies. *Public Relations Review*, 41(2), 195 – 204.
- Etikan, I., Musa, S.A., & Alkassim, R.S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, 5(1), 1-4.
- Fearn-Banks, K. (2012). *Crisis Communication: A Casebook Approach*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Febrianingsih, N. (2012). Keterbukaan informasi publik dalam pemerintahan terbuka menuu tata pemerintahan yang baik. *Jurnal Rechtsvinding*, 1(1), 135-156.
- Fitzpatrick, K.R. (1995). Ten guideline to reducing legal risks in crisis management, *Public Relations Quarterly*, 40(2), 33-39.
- Freeman, J., & Quirke, S. (2013). Understanding e-democracy. *Jedem*, 5(2), 141-154.
- Galloway, C. (2012). Developing risk-literate public relations: Threats and opputunities. *Asia Pacific Public Relations Journal*, 13(1), 20-44.
- Grunig, J.E. (2011). Public relations and strategic management: Institutionalizing organization – public relationship in contemporary society. *Central European Journal of Communication*, 4(1), 11-31.
- Hancock, M., Amankwaa, L., Revell, M. & Mueller, D. (2016). Focus group data saturation: a new approach to data analysis. *The Qualitative Report*, 21 (11), 2124-2130.
- Harrison, G. (2005). *Communication Strategies as a Basis for Crisis Management Including Use of the Internet as a Delivery Platform*. Dissertation. Georgia State University. Georgia.
- Heath, R.L. (2010). Introduction crisis communication: efining the beast and de-marginalizing key public. Dalam Coombs, W.T., & Holladay, S.J. (Ed.). *Handbooks in communication and media: The handbook of crisis communication* (h. 1-12). United Kingdom: Blackwell Publishing.
- Horsley, J.S., & Barker, R.T. (2002). Toward a synthesis model for crisis communication in the public sector an initial investigation. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 16(4), 406-440.

- Jaques, T. (2007). Issue management and crisis management: An integrated, non-linear, relational construct. *Public Relations Review*, 33(2), 147-157.
- Kent, M. L., & Boatwright, B. C. (2018). *Public Relations review*, 44, 514-522.
- Kriyantono, R., Ramadlan, M. F., & Setiawan, A. (2015). Hidden advertising in local election era: Reducing the public's right of information and critical power of media in Indonesia. *International Journal of Development Research*, 5(10), 5875-5880.
- Kriyantono, R. (2017). *Teori public relation perspektif barat & lokal: Aplikasi penelitian dan praktik*. Jakarta: Kencana.
- Kriyantono, R., & McKenna, B. (2017). Developing a culturally-relevant public relations theory for Indonesia. *Malaysian Journal of Communication*, 33(1), 1-16.
- Kriyantono, R., & McKenna, B. (2019). Crisis response vs crisis cluster: A test of situational crisis communication theory on two crisis clusters in Indonesian public relations. *Malaysian Journal of Communication*, 35(1), 222-236.
- Lando, A. L. (2014). The critical role of crisis communication plan in corporations' crises preparedness and management. *Global Media Journal*, 7 (1), 5-19.
- Lee, K. (2009). How the Hongkong government lost the public trust in SARS: Insights for government communication in health crisis. *Public Relations Review*, 35(1), 74-76.
- Lyle, T.M. (2015). Government crisis assessment and reputation management: A case study of the Vietnam health minister's crises in 2013-2014. *International Journal of Pure Communication Inquiry*, 3(1), 32-46.
- Miles, M.B., Huberman, A.M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative data Analysis, a methods sourcebook*. USA: Sage Publications.
- Miller, K. (1999). Issues management: The link between organization reality and public perception. *Public relations Quarterly*, 44(2), 5-10.
- Montinola, G., & Jackman, R. (2002). Sources of corruption: a cross-country study. *British Journal of Political Science*, 32, 147-170.
- Nwanne, B.U. (2014). Another look at press freedom in Nigeria. *European Journal of Research in Social Sciences*, 2(4), 10-20.
- Peter, F. (2013). The human right to political participation. *Journal of Ethics & Social Philosophy*, 7(21), 1-16.
- Plattner, M.F. (2012). Media and democracy: The long view. *Journal of Democracy*, 23(4), 63-73.
- Pompper, D., & Jung, T. (2013). "Outnumbered yet still on top, but for how long?" Theorizing about men working in the feminized field of public relations. *Public Relations Review*, 39, 497-506.
- Regester, M., & Larkin, J. (2008). *Risk Issues and Crisis Management in Public Relations: A Casebook of Best Practice*. London: Kogan Page.
- Rout, C. (2014). Right to information act: An endeavour for deepening democracy. *International Journal of Research in Humanities, Arts, and Literature*, 2(2), 65-72.
- Sen, A.F. (2015). Communication and human rights. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 174, 2813-2817.
- Simorangkir, D. N. (2013). Lookism in Indonesia's public relations industry. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 40, 111-120.
- Singh, R.K. (2014). Right to information: The basic need of democracy. *Journal of Education & Social Policy*, 1(2), 86-96.
- Sheaffer, Z., & Mano-Negrin, R. (2003). Executives' orientations as indicators of crisis management policies and practices. *40(2)*, 574-603.
- Sulhan, M. (2019). Deliberative democracy and the new social movement: A case from the Bojonegoro media. *Komunikator*, 11(1), 52-66.
- Taneja, S., Pryor, M.G., Sewell, S., & Recuero, A.M. (2014). Strategic crisis management: A basis for renewal and crisis prevention. *Journal of Management Policy and Practice*, 15(1), 78-85.
- Tamher, R.S., & Najib, M.H.M. (2011). Peranan hubungan masyarakat dalam manajemen krisis pasca kasus kebakaran pasar indones kota tua. *Jurnal Komunikasi*, 3(1), 271-282.
- Vargo, J., & Seville, E. (2011). Crisis strategic planning for SMEs: Finding the silver lining. *International Journal of Production Research*, 49(18), 5619-5635.
- Wekesa, A.S. (2013). An Analysis of Team Effectiveness in Crisis Communication. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 3(7), 320-326.

106

- Widiyowati, E., Kriyantono, R., & Prasetyo, B. D. (2018). Model manajemen konflik berbasis kearifan lokal: Konflik perguruan pencak silat di Madiun. *Jurnal Komunikator*, 10(1), 34-47.
- Wigley, S., & Zhang, W. (2011). A study of PR practitioner use of social media in crisis planning. *Public relations Journal*, 5(3).
- Ye Tan, K. K., Pang, A., & Kang, J. X. (2019). Breaking bad news with CONSOLE: Toward a framework integrating medical protocols with crisis communication. *Public Relations Review*, 45, 153-166.
-