

Addressing Groupthink: Political Communication Strategies in the Indonesian Parliament Efficient and Impactful Policies

LISA ADHRIANTI*

ALFARABI

RAFINITA ADITIA

Universitas Bengkulu, Indonesia

MERANTI

Universitas Nasional, Indonesia

LELY ARRIANIE

LSPR Institute of Communication and Business, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

This research emphasises the presence of symptoms of groupthink due to the perceived failure of judgements made under the Public Information Disclosure Act (PID) from the standpoint of civil society. The techniques employ instrumental case study inside the member group of Commission 1 of the Parliament of Indonesia. The findings demonstrated effective approaches to mitigate groupthink. The study utilises both primary and secondary data sources. Primary data refers to information that is obtained directly from the topic or thing being investigated. They serve as a research informant. The main source of information in this study was the official records of the meetings of Commission I of the House of Representatives from 2004 to 2009, where the discussion on the PID Bill took place. Furthermore, this study is supported by interviews conducted with carefully chosen informants who can provide evidence of the accuracy of the current meeting minutes or possess the necessary information required for this research. The chairman of the meeting in the commission I group is regarded as an adept moderator who can effectively handle and include all comments and criticisms from its members. The second tactic noticed involves conducting public hearing meetings to solicit expert opinions from academics, practitioners, and NGOs. The third tactic that emerges from the group dynamics during the discussion on defining public bodies is the involvement of certain group members who openly assume the position of devil's advocate.

Keywords: *Groupthink, political group, communication, Indonesian parliament, Public Information Disclosure Act.*

INTRODUCTION

This study seems from the idea that political decision-making is a communication phenomenon that can essentially occur in various. Understanding the dynamics of workgroup functions has received a lot of interest since the advent of work groups during the last few decades (Bakar, 2017). For example, the decision-making process that refers to optimal logical outcomes taking into account decision-making values and risk preferences, is rationality (Drugova & Kalachikova, 2019). But decision-making in the scope of political activity becomes more interesting to more attractive see and hear that many political decisions are taken, leaving various polemics/controversies and even different interesting behind it related to

*Corresponding author: lisaadhrianti@unib.ac.id

E-ISSN: 2289-1528

<https://doi.org/10.17576/JKMJC-2025-4103-07>

Received: 15 November 2023 | Accepted: 7 February 2024 | Published: 30 September 2025

attraction or bargaining of various interests among the people involved in making the decision. It is also can be defined as the employment of many communication tactics by various players (politicians, media, and citizens) in an attempt to influence others through instrumentalisation or discourse (Zebib, 2023). This is actually very common in political activity that is closely related to power.

The dynamics of communication in the decision-making process is a complex and challenging phenomenon in group communication activities, especially for a political decision that usually has large and wide implications for the political group, even for the surrounding public. Communication has a strong effect on the sender of the messages so, in every communication, it is expected to be able to receive more feedback and be sourced from various channels (Abatayo et al., 2020). In this case, the element of harmony in a group (cohesiveness) is something that is certainly there / formed in a group from the beginning of the group members decide to be part of the common goal created by the group. In the parliament context, a lack of evidence about the impact of independence on MPs' performance may lead to different forms of interaction in relationships between members (Osazevbaru, 2021).

In the contemporary political landscape, the outcomes of political decisions often provoke debate and controversy across various segments of society. These outcomes are sometimes perceived as irrelevant or inappropriate, leading to accusations of failure. The animosity surrounding these decisions helps to define the group's position within society. The relationship between different factions in society establishes boundaries that shape the collective perspective of the group, while simultaneously fostering an aggressive stance from certain segments of the population (Mahadian, Hashim, & Hustafa, 2023). This dynamic can be explained through the groupthink theory developed by Irving Janis, which offers an intriguing perspective on how high cohesiveness within a group can lead to unanimous decisions, often overriding realistic decision-making processes that could generate alternative strategies.

The groupthink theory, originally conceived by American sociologist William H. Whyte in 1952, was later expanded by Janis (Booker, 2018). The concept was inspired by the term doublethink from George Orwell's novel 1984, which refers to the ability to hold two contradictory beliefs simultaneously. Groupthink is particularly observable in situations where strong group solidarity creates an environment that pressures individuals to conform to group consensus, often disregarding more rational alternatives. Historical examples, such as the rise of communism and Nazism, illustrate how groupthink can shape ideologies within societies. For instance, in the People's Republic of China during the 1950s, the promotion of Marxist-Leninist thought as the only correct ideology post-Stalin served to prevent ideological deviation and maintain unity, reflecting a significant example of groupthink in political systems (Turk, Avci, & Baytimur, 2021).

According to groupthink theory, the phenomenon occurs when a group's cohesiveness is so strong that members believe their group is invulnerable or superior to others. This solidarity often leads to the suppression of dissenting opinions and the prioritization of maintaining group harmony over considering viable alternatives. The intensity of this cohesiveness negates the importance of individual perspectives, which becomes particularly problematic when it leads to poor decision-making. Interaction within such groups is not only based on direct communication but also on symbols and shared meanings that must be

understood and internalized by the members (Kartika, Syafrie, Utaridah, Noviera, & Abdurrahman, 2023).

Groupthink theory highlights how errors in group decision-making, resulting from a failure to consider diverse viewpoints, can lead to unfavorable outcomes (Forsyth, 2020). In terms of political decision-making, the mental and physical processes of individuals within the group play a crucial role in shaping collective outcomes. As decision-making strategies are influenced by both cognitive processing and social dynamics, the group's strong desire for cohesion often leads to decisions that align with the group's prevailing norms, even when those decisions may not be in the best interest of the broader society (Lau et al., 2018).

When discussing the bill in the context of groupthink, one of the primary mistakes made during the decision-making process was the failure to account for the broader public interest. Groupthink tends to create an environment where dissenting voices are either discouraged or ignored, leading to decisions that reflect the interests of a specific group rather than those of the public at large. For instance, when some political parties prioritise party loyalty or internal cohesion over the public good, they may engage in compromises that could result in suboptimal policy decisions. In the case of the bill under discussion, certain compromises were made without fully considering whether they benefited society or reflected the public's needs and expectations.

While compromise is often seen as a necessary political strategy, it becomes problematic when it disregards critical issues or results in decisions that harm the public. Some factions, particularly those who advocate for more transparency or public welfare, may argue that compromises made during the bill's discussions were detrimental if they led to watered-down policies that did not serve the greater good. From their perspective, such compromises are not seen as a virtue but as a failure to properly represent the interests of society at large. Groupthink and the Public Interest.

A key issue with groupthink in political decision-making is that it often leads to a narrow focus that does not consider the public interest. Members of highly cohesive groups may suppress individual opinions or concerns that do not align with the group's consensus. In political settings, this means that lawmakers may ignore or downplay the importance of public opinion, expert advice, or the long-term consequences of decisions. As a result, decisions may be made based on the need for group conformity or internal party agreements, rather than on what is best for the citizens they represent. Therefore, understanding how groupthink manifests in political contexts is crucial, as it highlights the potential risks of excluding public interests from the decision-making process.

LITERATURE REVIEW OR RESEARCH BACKGROUND

The groupthink theory, which originated in the United States, is primarily associated with a purely democratic system that lacks inherent values. However, it is intriguing to observe the occurrence of groupthink in the context of political group communication in democratic transition countries like Indonesia, where multiple political factions exist and values play a significant role. This situation has the potential to generate cohesion among various factions. Particularly within the context of parliamentary activities, such as those carried out in the Parliament of Indonesia. Groupthink refers to the phenomenon when there is pressure inside a group for individuals to withhold views that are seen as unpopular (Sudaryati & Kusuma, 2018).

The study is based on the idea that cohesive groups are prone to groupthink. Furthermore, the groupthink phenomena can manifest itself in any group decision-making process, regardless of its size, and may also be observed in decision-making that is inclusive and receptive to external inputs. Furthermore, it is important to note that unfavourable or contentious outcomes do not necessarily always reflect the outcome of groupthink within the decision-making group. Conversely, there may be instances where decisions that are perceived as successful might be attributed to groupthink. Furthermore, political decision-making outcomes are not solely influenced by the political parties that a politician is affiliated with, but can also be influenced by external forces that can shape their decision-making attitudes within their social circles. These external forces can include factors such as kinship, regional or tribal affiliations, or personal hobbies. Despite challenges in achieving fairness and accuracy, there are effective methods for evaluating individual interests (Frank et al., 2019).

This study identifies signs of groupthink in political decision-making groups within the Indonesian parliament, particularly in relation to the development of the Public Information Disclosure Act (PID). The formulation of this act involves lengthy discussions that span two terms of membership in the House of Representatives. The discussion of the PID Law holds a significant place in the legislative history of Indonesia. The new PID Law was successfully enacted within a timeframe of around eight years, despite undergoing a change in government in 2004.

When considering the extensive duration and complex legislative procedure involved in discussing the PID Law, it is evident that it inevitably leads to compromises in diverse political interests. During some moments of compromise, it is intriguing to notice the significant potential for groupthink in the discussion of the PID Law. The goals and concerns of parliamentary representatives will have a significant impact on the development of state policy (Rasoulizadeh & Khoeini, 2019). Groups employ many strategies to exert their influence on public policy. Some of these strategies encompass interacting with the media, establishing a foundation of supporters, and contributing financial resources to his political party and grassroots efforts (Cullerton et al., 2019).

Individuals interred within a dynamic collective, such as the House of Representatives, who possess diverse political party affiliations and identities, yet maintain strong attachments to specific interests, are susceptible to diverging from the ideologies of their respective political parties that have become integral to their identity. The cohesiveness of a heterogeneous small group with a temporary interaction period, confined by specific duties and functions, is intriguing to observe and analyse, particularly in relation to the development of groupthink.

Groupthink can be defined as a phenomenon in which all members of a group consistently make incorrect decisions over an extended period of time (Harel et al., 2021). However, the crucial element in decision-making is a strategic approach that encompasses the incorporation of pertinent information, thorough evaluation, and the selection of various courses of action (Lau et al., 2018).

The longest discussion arises when observation and analysis are solely directed towards judgements that are deemed highly controversial and subject to prolonged arguments. This particularly pertains to the formation of the definition of Public Bodies as stated in Article 1, paragraph 3 of the PID Law of 2008. The House of Representatives suggested that State-Owned Enterprises (SOE) and Regionally Owned Enterprises (ROE) should be considered as Public Bodies according to Article 1, paragraph 3. However, the

Government disagreed and proposed that Political Parties and Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) should be included in the definition of Public Bodies. Ultimately, it was agreed that SOE (State-Owned Enterprises) and ROE (Regional-Owned Enterprises) would be classified as Public Bodies based on a thorough explanation and confirmation of their essence, purpose, and operations. Article 14 of the text specifies which aspects of SOE/ROE can be disclosed to the public, which ones are exempted, and which ones cannot be made public. However, it is worth noting that the initial proposal by the House of Representatives did not include the mention of the inclusion of SOE/ROE in Article 1, paragraph 3.

The decision to introduce the new article is the outcome of a compromise reached through a trade-off process in the lobby. This compromise had been earlier agreed upon by Commission I and the Government at a hotel in the Jakarta Petamburan Area. The recent article (14, 15, 16) demonstrates that the commission's desire to incorporate State-Owned Enterprises (SOEs) and Regional Owned Enterprises (ROEs) as public entities can be achieved. Additionally, the government's aspiration to include political parties and Non-Government Organisations (NGOs) as public entities is also fulfilled. The section regarding private entities that were also suggested as public entities during the 1999-2004 development period has been removed. The Civil Society Coalition, including former Chairperson Paulus Widiyanto during the KMIP period of 1999-2004, finds this situation highly regrettable.

Since 1999, research on groupthink has not only been influenced by political factors but has also been extensively explored in other non-political domains. However, the methodological approaches employed in these studies mostly consist of case studies, questionnaires, and literature reviews.

This theory focusses on decision-making that typically occurs when a group experiences great external pressure, leading to the emergence of remarkable emotions. Group communication places greater emphasis on maintaining relationships rather than collectively achieving the overall mission. In relatively small groups, leadership plays a crucial role in determining the success or failure of decision-making (Tilton, 2019). The inclination of political groups in parliamentary institutions in Indonesia, during the country's transition to democracy, to engage in groupthink will persist. However, the scrutiny of whether there is an effort to mitigate groupthink in this instance also warrants investigation. This study will examine the techniques employed by the group to mitigate the occurrence of groupthink. The objective of this research is to elucidate the tactics implemented by the group to mitigate the prevalence of groupthink.

METHODOLOGY

This study uses qualitative research methodologies, namely empirical observation, to uncover the law of causation. Qualitative approaches can be employed to forecast broad trends in specific social symptoms. The raw materials used for research and development consist of data sets obtained from qualitative studies. These studies are conducted using selected information that meets specific criteria. The purpose is to gain an overview of decision-making processes influenced by environmental, social, cultural, institutional, and individual practices (Bravington et al., 2022). The research employs a post-positivistic paradigm approach. This strategy aims to establish an interactive engagement between researchers and the things being studied, with the constraint that the observer must maintain a high degree of neutrality in order to minimise the level of subjectivity. Qualitative attachment relies on an investigative approach to provide detailed descriptions. A researcher seeks to gain a comprehensive

understanding of the signs of groupthink throughout the discussion and decision-making process about the definition of Public Bodies in the Public Information Disclosure (PID) inside Commission 1 of the Indonesian Parliament.

The study is based on the post positivism paradigm. The research to be conducted diverges from theory by employing empirical observation to validate the rule of causation, which can be utilised to forecast common patterns of specific social symptoms using qualitative methodologies. Qualitative research represents a methodological approach that addresses the limitations of the positivism paradigm. Within the postpositivist paradigm, the researcher engages in an interactive interaction with the object of study. It is important for the observer to maintain a high level of neutrality in order to minimise subjectivity.

The methodology employed in this study is the utilisation of case studies. Case studies are employed to examine problems that have been identified based on data that corroborate the hypothesis of the case study. The citation for this source is Ruiz and Guevara (2020). The objective of this study is to collect substantial quantities of material pertaining to the research themes through the use of case studies. The information pertains to the cohesiveness of a group and the dynamics of interaction that are indicative of groupthink. The working committee group of Commission 1 of the House of Representatives for the period 2004-2009 is now examining the definition of Public Bodies as stated in Article 1, paragraph 3 of the PID Bill.

The focus of the discussion is on group cohesiveness and dynamic interactions through decision-making situations. The study will investigate the impact of individual group members' failure to collaborate and establish direct personal connections with leaders on in-group conversations (Barber, 2019). Moreover, it is examined through the process of investigating, elucidating, or interpreting inside a comprehensive and authentic setting, without any external interference.

This research employs instrumental case studies to examine the creation of the PID Law, which is characterised by its intricate and captivating nature, as it entails a lengthy process and sparks extensive deliberation. Case studies employing the suggested methodology (Abdel-Basset et al., 2018). The instrumental case study aims to enhance comprehension of the subject and to cultivate and polish the theory.

Research is carried out by gathering data or information directly from informants through comprehensive interviews supplemented by document analysis. Researchers utilised in-depth interview procedures to conduct comprehensive interviews with informants. Guidelines for researcher interview guides, which consist of open-ended questions. Interviewing is used as a method to gather data, together with probing, in order to obtain more complete, comprehensive, and easily comprehensible information about case studies on group decision-making (Zhang et al., 2018).

This study utilises both primary and secondary data sources. Primary data refers to information obtained directly from individuals or entities closely related to the object of study. In this case, the primary data were derived from two main sources. First, the official minutes of the meetings of Commission I of the House of Representatives during the 2004–2009 period, with a particular focus on discussions concerning the Public Information Disclosure (PID) Bill. Second, to enrich and validate the contents of these meeting records, the study conducted purposive interviews with selected informants who were directly or indirectly involved in the legislative process.

A total of ten individuals were interviewed, selected based on their relevance and contribution to the PID Bill deliberations. These informants included five members of Commission I of the House of Representatives from the 2004–2009 period, all of whom participated directly in the discussions surrounding the bill. The remaining five informants were representatives of external institutions, including a member of the civil society coalition advocating for transparency, an official from the Ministry of Communication and Information, the Secretary of Commission I, a Commissioner of the Central Information Commission, and a legal expert on public information disclosure. The interviews, including observations of verbal and non-verbal cues, provided important contextual data that helped interpret the legislative intent and policy debates captured in the official meeting documents (Chung et al., 2021). The following table lists the anonymized identity and institutional affiliation of the interviewees:

Table 1: Research informants

No.	Name/Initials (Anonymized)	Position/Institution
1	Member of Commission I (1)	Member of Commission I, House of Representatives (2004–2009)
2	Member of Commission I (2)	Member of Commission I, House of Representatives (2004–2009)
3	Member of Commission I (3)	Member of Commission I, House of Representatives (2004–2009)
4	Member of Commission I (4)	Member of Commission I, House of Representatives (2004–2009)
5	Member of Commission I (5)	Member of Commission I, House of Representatives (2004–2009)
6	Civil Society Representative	Member of Civil Society Coalition for the PID Bill
7	Ministry of Communication Official	Official from the Ministry of Communication and Information
8	Secretary of Commission I	Secretary of Commission I, House of Representatives (2004–2009)
9	Central Information Commission Member	Commissioner, Central Information Commission
10	Legal Expert on Public Information	Academic or legal expert on public information disclosure

Secondary data refers to additional information that is acquired indirectly from sources other than the subject or thing being studied. This secondary data comprises textual information such as documents, publications, specific records, traces, and diaries. Secondary data is derived from sources such as books, recordings, publications, etc., which can provide evidence to support the reliability of primary data, both from original sources and online literature. The primary data collecting for research is conducted at the House of Representatives building, situated in Senayan Jakarta, along with other designated areas as agreed upon with the informants. Comprehensive data is acquired through two methods of data collection: direct observation of committee debates (Alfandari, 2019) and the primary strategy employed in published literature (Bikbov et al., 2020).

The focus of this study is to identify the precursor elements and symptoms of groupthink within the group discussing the definition of Public Bodies in Article 1 paragraph 3 of the PID Bill in Commission 1 of the House of Representatives. The units of response in this investigation were individuals and documents. The research focuses on specific working groups within Commission 1 of the House of Representatives of Indonesia. The primary source for this research is the meeting minutes from discussions on free public information. The authors of this study examine and analyse certain insignificant practices that occur during encounters, which they consider to be crucial and distinctive moments in the process of knowledge production (Mnasri & Papakonstantinidis, 2021).

This study utilises two research instruments: the primary instrument and the auxiliary instrument. The primary tool utilised is the self-researcher, who conducts direct field research. The supporting tool consists of a comprehensive set of enquiries. Furthermore, there are various auxiliary amenities available, such as recorders, cameras, and stationery, which are used for the purposes of gathering and documenting information.

Data analysis involves the process of interpreting and assigning significance to information provided by informants. In order to mitigate the influence of subjective bias from researchers, analysts rely on the informant's perspective, using selected snippets of their remarks along with the corresponding contextual information. Portions of these remarks will also be showcased as reinforcements in the process of data analysis.

FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

Groupthink may manifest when group members perceive themselves as belonging to a select or privileged group (Lynøe et al., 2019). Groupthink is frequently linked to the inclination of individuals to engage with others who share similar characteristics or opinions (Fincham, 2019). The study has found many scenarios in which solutions might be implemented to prevent groupthink, namely:

- a) First strategy: appointing a Chairman who is skilled in moderating meetings and adept at handling diverse perspectives and criticisms from commission members. The role of the chairman is not seen as a suppressor in discussions and decision-making. The chairman ensures that the agreed conclusions from each meeting are remembered and controls the direction of the meeting when conditions are unfavourable. Typically, the chairman will adjourn the meeting at the designated hour. It is indeed fitting for a policymaker to instruct a discerning assessor to evaluate each member thoroughly and encourage the group to embrace dissent and scepticism. The leader's attitude plays a crucial role in supporting this component, as they must be open to accepting criticism from their evaluation. This will help to minimise the likelihood of members disagreeing with each other and ultimately lower the pressure inside the group, which might potentially lead to poor decision-making. However, the leader's strong bond and connection with the team are essential for effectively accomplishing the job of completing the jump. The component of attraction towards peers and leadership is well-balanced. This is ultimately what prevents the group from escaping a groupthink predicament. The leadership's fascination with the dominating member of the group might lead to groupthink. Groupthink syndrome does not occur when group members have negative feelings towards each other and do not consider their membership in the group to be important.
- b) The second strategy observed is noticed involves Commission I conducting Public Hearing Meetings to listen to expert perspectives. These meetings invite academics, practitioners, and NGOs. This aligns with the recommended measures to mitigate groupthink. Every member of the policy-making group is required to regularly provide updates to the group regarding their unit's progress and share the resulting feedback received from a reliable partner. It is advisable to have one or more external experts in each policy-making group who are not part of the core members. These experts can analyse the perspectives of the core members. This is important since individuals often take into account how others would evaluate their moral decisions (Bavel et al., 2020). Through interviews, the

outcomes of meetings and excavations revealed that there are more opportunities in a legislative committee compared to the executive. However, when it comes to the alignment and decision-making process regarding the definition of public bodies within Commission 1 of the House of Representatives, the lack of open-mindedness between the Government and the House of Representatives makes it extremely challenging to find a common ground and reach an agreement. Ultimately, a decision was reached to reach a compromise and implement a public information regulation, relinquishing the outcomes of the compromise decision. The decision was made through compromise due to time constraint and weariness. This compromise was reached by a group of reformers, resulting in the formation of a symptom known as groupthink, which generated a false sense of agreement. According to one informant from the Civil Society Coalition, it is widely considered that nobody is genuinely satisfied with the compromise. The reason is that both the House of Representatives and the Government are unable to accomplish their desired goals and protect their own interests. Chapters 14, 15, and 16 have been added to address the desires and concerns of both the parliament and the government, resulting in their being in equally unfavourable circumstances. The effective outcome of the impact resulting from the implementation of the PID Law has not been stated.

- c) Third, The attempt that appears during the discussion process to determine the definition of a public body, certain members of the group assume the role of a devil's advocate by presenting opposing arguments to challenge the prevailing viewpoint. The members of this group do not hold a contrary opinion to the argument, but rather seek to assess the soundness of the argument. This is demonstrated by some individuals in the meeting minutes who assume this duty. For instance, the Democratic Party faction, which consisted of government supporters, always maintained a neutral stance and refrained from explicitly endorsing members of their own group. This approach may be seen as diverging from the prevailing opinion of their organisation's allies. However, the reason is that there are no other members of his group present in Commission 1. According to him, this group had a tendency to willingly accept and endorse the establishment of State-Owned Enterprises (SOEs) and Rules of Engagement (ROEs) similar to governmental organisations. However, the group's colleagues are making an effort to determine the rationale behind the government's proposal by directly requesting clarification from the government.

Furthermore, the government plays the position of a devil's advocate within the group, actively participating as a party while also being a member of the Commission I group that deliberates on the measure. The Government holds a contrasting viewpoint with the majority of members in Commission I of the House of Representatives. However, their intention is not to disregard the formulation of the institution, but rather to engage in a rational discussion regarding the urgency of including State-Owned Enterprises (SOE) and Regional-Owned Enterprises (ROE) as public bodies, as proposed by the parliament. By assuming the role of a "devil's advocate" inside a group, the negative or unsuccessful outcome of a choice can be mitigated.

In the context of political communication in Indonesia, the phenomenon of groupthink that occurred within Commission 1 of the Indonesian House of Representatives illustrates how group dynamics in decision-making processes can lead to homogeneous thinking, which tends to disregard alternative views. The presence of a "devil's advocate" was expected to voice

differing opinions, but its role proved ineffective as the individual also conformed to the dominant view. This illustrates how group cohesion can lead to decisions that are not based on objective or comprehensive deliberation. According to Janis (1972), the groupthink theory explains how the pressure to achieve consensus can suppress dissenting opinions, thus preventing a critical evaluation of alternative policies. In the case of the Public Information Disclosure (PID) Bill, this dynamic was evident as compromises were made between the legislative factions, often resulting in decisions based more on maintaining group harmony than on the merits of the policy.

This phenomenon can also be framed within political communication theory, which suggests that communication processes in political decision-making are often influenced by internal group dynamics rather than public interests (McNair, 2017). Political communication theory posits that political decisions are shaped not only by ideological beliefs but also by personal interests, party affiliations, and socio-political contexts. In the case of the PID Bill, the compromise reflected the need to balance diverse political interests within the House of Representatives, as well as to maintain political alliances. This illustrates the complex role of groupthink in shaping legislative outcomes, where the group's desire for consensus can overshadow rational deliberation and the pursuit of public interest.

Social interaction theory in social psychology indicates that communication within groups, whether among individuals or between groups, cannot be separated from psychological processes (Gergen, 2009). According to symbolic interactionism, group communication plays a significant role in shaping group identity and influencing decision-making processes (Blumer, 1969). The interaction between members of Commission 1 of the House of Representatives, characterized by political affiliations and individual interests, shows how groupthink can arise when members prioritize interpersonal relationships over the rational evaluation of policy issues. This dynamic is critical to understanding how group decisions are formed in political contexts, especially when socio-emotional factors outweigh the need for objective assessment.

The failure of the devil's advocate role in preventing groupthink is also reflected in the theory of communication and decision-making, where small groups under pressure often make poor decisions due to the dominance of certain voices and the suppression of dissent (Lau et al., 2018). This theory aligns with the findings of Tilton (2019), who emphasizes that groupthink is more likely to occur in cohesive groups under high-pressure situations, such as political negotiations, where maintaining unity becomes a priority over critical thinking.

Convening a group meeting and engaging in multiple forms of communication, such as phone calls or emails, might aid in the process of reaching a consensus among participants (Bhasin et al., 2018). A decision can be deemed favourable if it is solely focused on accomplishing the task, particularly when there is a collective strategy in place to mitigate the negative effects of poor decision-making caused by the Government and Commission Group 1's tactics of reducing voltage to achieve similarity and satisfaction in the ultimate decision. The process of decision-making in a group should rely on the adjustment of comparable ideas to enhance group consensus (Dong et al., 2018).

Nevertheless, it is important to recognise and reflect upon the fact that when examined from a broader perspective, the decision that is perceived as effective has failed to address the fundamental objective. The primary objective of the people Information Disclosure Act is to uphold the rights of the people, as outlined in Article 28f of the 1945 Constitution, to access information.

The implementation of the PID Law is anticipated to foster the active engagement of the general people and governmental organisations in order to achieve effective governance in Indonesia. Nevertheless, there are still numerous disappointments that arise in relation to the decision-making process, particularly from the Civil Society Coalition, which was the initial proposer of the KIP Law. The limited disclosure of information to public entities, particularly state-owned enterprises (SOEs), and the exclusion of Private Business Entities as public entities, has received a quite unfavourable rating of 65%. However, there is hope that these policies can be reconsidered and altered. Practical application in the field has demonstrated that, thus far, the requirement for every public organisation to have information and documentation management officers, as mandated by the PID Law, has not been fully complied with by all business entities. There are still numerous incidents of information disputes documented at the Information Commission.

The lenient legal penalties imposed on public bodies that fail to fulfil their obligation to provide information, which include a maximum prison sentence of only 1 year and a fine of up to Rp 5,000,000, - appear to be insufficient to deter large business entities with trillions of assets from taking the right to information seriously. Nevertheless, the Government recognised that the implementation of legal penalties for cases involving public information also generated a noteworthy record of internal deliberations. Consequently, it was ultimately determined that the prescribed punishment would serve as a mere embellishment or supplement to the existing legislation, solely derived from the authority of the state. Hal is unable to fully comprehend the realisation of public rights due to the presence of weak penalties that subsequently impede public attention, making it difficult for them to be more engaged in and understand this law. Therefore, it is challenging to assert that the implementation of the inclusion of State-Owned Enterprises (SOEs) as public entities in the PID Law has demonstrated significant success.

In the context of information transmission, power ties can ultimately play a significant role (Bruns & Nuernbergk, 2019). The conflict between the imperative to conform to societal norms and the risk of social rejection can result in feelings of isolation and estrangement (Rawson, 2021).

The phenomenon of groupthink in a politically active and evolving group, such as the parliament of a transitioning democracy like Indonesia, differs somewhat from the conditions observed in political groups in the extensively studied case of the United States, which served as the basis for the emergence of the groupthink theory. The United States grants significant importance to individual liberties, allowing individuals the opportunity to overturn governments if they believe their freedoms are being restricted. In the case of Indonesia, the government holds legitimacy as the representation of the people's sovereignty, which allows it to exert influence on the dynamics between political groupings inside the government (Banka, 2023).

In the context of the United States, the Government is not considered a separate entity from the country itself. However, in the case of Indonesia, the Government is regarded as a distinct entity that represents the country. Therefore, the House of Representatives has approved the Government's request to classify NGOs and Political Parties as public bodies, notwithstanding the perceived burden. The reason for this is that the Government, being synonymous with the state, is bound by the PID Law, which is essential for the functioning of the state and guarantees the right to information, as stated in Article 28(f) of the 1945 Constitution. The potency of this option is admittedly improbable to appease all stakeholders

and discrepancies in decision-making are nevertheless anticipated (Murad et al., 2018). However, it is still necessary to have effective techniques to enhance attention in decision-making (Luo et al., 2018).

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Strategies were discovered that serve as preventive measures against groupthink throughout the decision-making process of the PID Bill in the working group of Commission I of the House of Representatives. The mitigation of groupthink is observed under specific circumstances, primarily when the Chairman of the meeting in the commission 1 group demonstrates effective moderation skills and is capable of accommodating diverse ideas and criticisms from its members. Furthermore, Commission 1 organises a Public Hearing Meeting where experts, including academics, practitioners, and NGOs, are invited to share their ideas and insights. Furthermore, there were certain individuals within the group who purportedly assumed the position of devil's advocate. Specifically, two members from the Democratic Party faction, which happened to be the ruling party at that time, consistently voiced opinions that were impartial and did not overtly endorse any group members. Consequently, their stance can be regarded as divergent from the prevailing consensus at that particular juncture. His circle of acquaintances. However, the main point is that they are not supportive of their fellow group members in Commission 1. This is evident in their tendency to agree to approve State-Owned Enterprises (SOE) and Return on Equity (ROE) as Public Bodies. However, it appears that they are interested in understanding the logical arguments of their group colleagues by directly asking the Government to clarify the reasons behind the proposed measures.

Furthermore, the government plays the role of a devil's advocate as an external entity within the Commission I group, consistently participating in the collective deliberation of the law. The Government holds a divergent viewpoint from the majority of group members in Commission I of the House of Representatives. This indicates a desire to deviate from the parliament's definition and instead seek reasonable validation regarding the importance of including SOE and ROE as public entities, as advocated by the Indonesian parliament. In the future, this study's findings may aid in identifying the factors that contribute to group cohesion, which should be avoided to prevent the formation of groupthink, a phenomenon that can lead to erroneous decision-making.

Based on these findings, it is recommended that the Indonesian House of Representatives, particularly within parliamentary commissions, continues to foster inclusive and dialogic communication processes. Leadership training for commission chairs should emphasize facilitative moderation skills to better accommodate varying perspectives and constructive criticisms. The institutionalization of public hearings and external expert consultations should also be maintained and strengthened to inject diverse and critical viewpoints into parliamentary debates. Encouraging members of parliament to adopt an independent and critical stance—even when it diverges from party lines—can contribute to the overall quality of decision-making and minimize the risk of groupthink. Additionally, the role of government representatives as external interlocutors should be preserved and even strategically utilized to serve as counterbalances during policy formulation. Ultimately, fostering a culture that values open dialogue, critical debate, and transparency can enhance the effectiveness of parliamentary communication and lead to more robust and accountable legislation.

BIODATA

Dr. Lisa Adhrianti, S.Sos., M.Si, is a Senior Lecturer and Associate Professor at Department of Communication, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Bengkulu, Bengkulu 38122, Indonesia. Email: lisaadhrianti@unib.ac.id.

Dr. Alfarabi, S.Sos., M.A, is a Senior Lecturer and Associate Professor at Department of Communication, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Bengkulu, Bengkulu 38122, Indonesia. Email: alfarabi@unib.ac.id.

Rafinita Aditia, S.Sos., M.I.Kom, is a Lecturer at Department of Communication, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Bengkulu, Bengkulu 38122, Indonesia. Email: raditia@unib.ac.id.

Meranti, M.Si, is a Lecturer at Communication Science Study Program, Universitas Nasional Jakarta, Jakarta 12520, Indonesia. Email: meranti@civitas.unas.ac.id.

Prof. Dr. Lely Arrianie, M.Si, is a Senior Lecturer and Professor at Faculty of Communication, LSPR Institute of Communication and Business, Jakarta 10220, Indonesia. Email: lely.a@lspr.edu.

REFERENCE

- Abatayo, A. Lou, Lynham, J., & Sherstyuk, K. (2020). Communication, expectations, and trust: An experiment with three media. *Games*, 11(4), 48. <https://doi.org/p6h8>
- Abdel-Basset, M., Manogaran, G., Gamal, A., & Smarandache, F. (2018). A hybrid approach of neutrosophic sets and DEMATEL method for developing supplier selection criteria. *Design Automation for Embedded Systems*, 22(3), 257–278. <https://doi.org/gd6stp>
- Alfandari, R. (2019). Multi-professional work in child protection decision-making: An Israeli case study. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 98, 51–57. <https://doi.org/p6h9>
- Banka, A. (2023). Dark money, US security guarantees and the twisting of allied arms. *International Politics*, 60, 1093–1112. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41311-023-00434-y>
- Barber, N. W. (2019). Populist leaders and political parties. *German Law Journal*, 20(2), 129–140. <https://doi.org/10.1017/glj.2019.9>
- Bakar, H. A. (2017). Explaining cohesion linkages in workgroups: The cooperative communication: The cooperative communication in collectivism and high power distance workgroup context. *Jurnal Komunikasi: Malaysian Journal of Communication*, 33(3), 157–177. <https://doi.org/10.17576/JKMJC-2017-3303-10>
- Bavel, J. J. V., Baicker, K., Boggio, P. S., Capraro, V., Cichocka, A., Cikara, M., Crockett, M. J., Crum, A. J., Douglas, K. M., Druckman, J. N., Drury, J., Dube, O., Ellemers, N., Finkel, E. J., Fowler, J. H., Gelfand, M., Han, S., Haslam, S. A., Jetten, J., ... Willer, R. (2020). Using social and behavioural science to support COVID-19 pandemic response. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 4(5), 460–471. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-020-0884-z>
- Bhasin, S., Brito, J. P., Cunningham, G. R., Hayes, F. J., Hodis, H. N., Matsumoto, A. M., Snyder, P. J., Swerdloff, R. S., Wu, F. C., & Yialamas, M. A. (2018). Testosterone therapy in men with hypogonadism: An endocrine society. *Journal of Clinical Endocrinology and Metabolism*, 103(5), 1715–1744. <https://doi.org/10.1210/jc.2018-00229>
- Bikbov, B., Purcell, C. A., Levey, A. S., Smith, M., Abdoli, A., Abebe, M., Adebayo, O. M., Afarideh, M., Agarwal, S. K., Agudelo-Botero, M., Ahmadian, E., Al-Aly, Z., Alipour, V., Almasi-Hashiani, A., Al-Raddadi, R. M., Alvis-Guzman, N., Amini, S., Andrei, T., Andrei, C. L., ... Murray, C. J. L. (2020). Global, regional, and national burden of chronic kidney disease, 1990–2017: A systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2017. *The Lancet*, 395(10225), 709–733. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)30045-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30045-3)
- Blumer, H. (1969). *Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Booker, C. (2018). *Global Warming: A Case Study in Groupthink*. London: The Global Warming Policy Foundation.
- Bravington, A., Chen, H., Dyson, J., Jones, L., Dalglish, C., Bryan, A., Patnick, J., & Macleod, U. (2022). Translating qualitative data into intervention content using the Theoretical Domains Framework and stakeholder co-design: A worked example from a study of cervical screening attendance in older women. *BMC Health Services Research*, 22, 610. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-022-07926-2>
- Bruns, A., & Nuernbergk, C. (2019). Political journalists and their social media audiences: New power relations. *Media and Communication*, 7(1), 198–212. <https://doi.org/gh5rms>
- Chung, C. Y., Awad, N., & Hsiao, H. (2021). Collaborative programming problem-solving in augmented reality: Multimodal analysis of effectiveness and group collaboration. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 37(5), 17–31. <https://doi.org/p6jib>

- Cullerton, K., White, T., & Lee, A. (2019). Doctors rule: An analysis of health ministers' diaries in Australia. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 16(13), 2440. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16132440>
- Dong, Y., Zha, Q., Zhang, H., Kou, G., Fujita, H., Chiclana, F., & Herrera-Viedma, E. (2018). Consensus reaching in social network group decision making: Research paradigms and challenges. *Knowledge-Based Systems*, 162(July), 3–13. <https://doi.org/ggtigx>
- Drugova, E. A., & Kalachikova, O. N. (2019). Bounded rationality, uncertainty, and complexity as decision-making contexts: A case of one university in Russia. *European Journal of Contemporary Education*, 8(4), 738–750. <https://doi.org/10.13187/ejced.2019.4.738>
- Forsyth, D. R. (2020). Group-Level resistance to health mandates during the COVID-19 pandemic: A groupthink approach. *Group Dynamics*, 24(3), 139–152. <https://doi.org/10.1037/gdn0000132>
- Frank, A. K., O'Sullivan, P., Mills, L. M., Muller-Juge, V., & Hauer, K. E. (2019). Clerkship grading committees: The impact of group decision-making for clerkship grading. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 34(5), 669–676. <https://doi.org/p6jc>
- Gergen, K. J. (2009). *An Invitation to Social Construction* (2nd ed.). London: SAGE Publications.
- Harel, M., Mossel, E., Strack, P., & Tamuz, O. (2021). Rational groupthink. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 136(1), 621–668.
- Janis, I. L. (1972). *Victims of Groupthink: A Psychological Study of Foreign-Policy Decisions and Fiascos*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin
- Kartika, T., Syafrie, A., Utaridah, N., Noviera, F. R., & Abdurrahman. (2023). Communication and social interaction between Chinese and indigenous ethnics in Bandar Lampung, Indonesia. *Jurnal Komunikasi: Malaysian Journal of Communication*, 39(3), 515–529. <https://doi.org/10.17576/JKMJC-2023-3903-28>
- Lau, R. R., Kleinberg, M. S., & Dito, T. M. (2018). Measuring voter decision strategies in political behavior and public opinion research. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 82, 325–350. <https://doi.org/10.1093/poq/nfy004>
- Luo, D., Wan, X., Liu, J., & Tong, T. (2018). Optimally estimating the sample mean from the sample size, median, mid-range, and/or mid-quartile range. *Statistical Methods in Medical Research*, 27(6), 1785–1805. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0962280216669183>
- Lynøe, N., Juth, N., & Eriksson, A. (2019). From child protection to paradigm protection - The genesis, development, and defense of a scientific paradigm. *Journal of Medicine and Philosophy (United Kingdom)*, 44(3), 378–390. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jmp/jhy015>
- Mahadian, A. B., Hashim, R., & Mustafa, H. (2023). Articulating Islamist sectarian group antagonism memes on the Indonesian politics. *Jurnal Komunikasi: Malaysian Journal of Communication*, 39(3), 124–144. <https://doi.org/10.17576/JKMJC-2023-3903-07>
- McNair, B. (2017). *An Introduction to Political Communication* (6th ed.). London: Routledge.
- Mnasri, S., & Papakonstantinidis, S. (2021). Detrivialization as a strategy to challenge organizational groupthink. *Electronic Journal of Knowledge Management*, 18(3), 224–235. <https://doi.org/10.34190/EJKM.18.03.003>
- Osazevaru, H. O. (2021). Conservative business strategy as moderator of board independence and corporate performance nexus in Nigerian financial companies. *Asian Economic and Financial Review*, 11(6), 46–456. <https://doi.org/gj9ij2>
- Rasoulizadeh, G., & Khoeini, G. (2019). The solutions to enhance performance of parliamentary friendship group and its position in parliamentary diplomacy. *Gênero & Direito*, 8(7), 439–463. <https://doi.org/10.22478/ufpb.2179-7137.2019v8n7.50044>

- Rawson, M. (2021). Communities of learning. *Steiner Waldorf Pedagogy in Schools*, 14(1), 132–157. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429319679-4>
- Ruiz, A., & Guevara, J. (2020). Sustainable decision-making in road development: Analysis of road preservation policies. *Sustainability*, 12(3). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12030872>
- Sudaryati, E., & Kusuma, T. A. (2018). The impact of framing and groupthink to the career selection decision of accounting major students. *Asian Journal of Accounting Research*, 3(2), 181–189. <https://doi.org/10.1108/AJAR-06-2018-0011>
- Tilton, S. (2019). Winning through deception: A pedagogical case study on using social deception games to teach small group communication theory. *SAGE Open*, 9(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019834370>
- Turk, M. S., Avcı, Ö., & Baytimur, T. (2021). Çin Halk Cumhuriyeti'nde Sovyet Revizyonizmi'ne Karşı Kitapların Propaganda Amaçlı Kullanımı [The use of books against soviet revisionism for the purpose of propaganda in people's Republic of China]. *Türk Kütüphaneciliği*, 35(2), 159-182. <https://doi.org/10.24146/tk.923450>
- Zebib, C. (2023). Political communication through the prism of social media: How are Lebanese political parties using Facebook in electoral campaigns? *Jurnal Komunikasi: Malaysian Journal of Communication*, 38(2), 87-106. <https://doi.org/m553>
- Zhang, P., White, J., Schmidt, D. C., Lenz, G., & Rosenbloom, S. T. (2018). FHIRChain: Applying Blockchain to Securely and Scalably Share Clinical Data. *Computational and Structural Biotechnology Journal*, 16, 267–278. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csbj.2018.07.004>