Comparative Study of Advertising Implementation by Three Different Local Governments: Sleman Regency, Bantul Regency and Yogyakarta Municipality

University of Miyazaki	Student Member	Ratna Wahyu Mulyaningsih
University of Miyazaki	Member	Tetsunobu Yoshitake
University of Miyazaki	Member	Chikashi Deguch

1. Introduction

Advertisement provides a big contribution to regional income, but the growth of advertisement has become somewhat unarranged and unsightly, especially in street living. The high density of advertisements and their irregularities get much attention from various parties in Yogyakarta. A legislative council member for Sleman Regency, Farchan Hariem states that a concrete action is needed from a related department to reorganize these advertisement irregularities¹⁾. However, the Head of the Indonesia Advertising Company Association, Eddy Purjanto, has said that government policy does not yet do enough to accommodate the growth of advertisement and boost it as a tool of innovation and economic development¹⁾.

On the other hand, based on the Decision of the Public Work Minister 06/PRT/M/2007 on the General Guidelines for the Building Arrangement and Environment Plan, streetscape planning has to consider consistency principles, such as:

- 1. Comprehensive signage planning within an area.
- 2. Streetscape element design that considers the environment, street user circulation and minimizes excessive sign boards.

Complexity can harm consistency, which makes people pay less attention to the sign board and the message on it. Complexity is also influenced by the size and intensity of the advertisement²⁾, which are specified in complexity principles.

The aim of this research is to analyze the implementation of advertisement control and physical characteristics in relation to the consistency of its arrangement. Three different local governments: Sleman Regency, Bantul Regency, and Yogyakarta Municipality are offered as case studies. These entities serve as regulator of signs to create effective roadside communication. The research objectives are

- 1. Learn how advertisement arrangement relates to complexity in Yogyakarta urban areas.
- 2. Understand the implementation of advertisement regulations, as they relate to complexity characteristics for the three different local governments.

2. Evaluation Method

Three arterial road sections were chosen as samples to describe the process of advertisement implementation. The criteria used for sample choosing were:

- a. The street sections have 80%³⁾ or more of their building functions related to commercial activities.
- b. The sample is taken from around the ring road area because these places have the same characteristics as an urban commercial street within agglomeration area.

Those sections are evaluated by complexity concept related to elements order that form an aesthetic composition⁴⁾ that are size, shape, arrangement, quantity and density. These five principles are related to two main issues that provoke irregularity at Yogyakarta urban area.

2.1. Incomprehensive design

Incomprehensive or unarranged design occurs between commercial advertisements and their surroundings, including building facades, high variation of advertisements and their

Member		Chikashi Deguchi		
hysical characteristics.	This issue is	analyzed by size, shape		

physical characteristics. This issue is analyzed by size, shape and arrangement.

Size refers to advertisement board surface and can be analyzed by standard deviation in each section. Shape means the kinds of advertisement format in a section. And arrangement refers to any irregularity spatial arrangement of an advertisement along an axis. The axis represents the imaginary line on building facade where most advertisements are located.

2.2. Visual overload

Visual overload is provoked by excessive numbers of advertisements and recognized by knowing its quantity and density. Quantity means the number of advertisements located in one section, while density reflects the number of signs located within a specific roadside area⁵⁾. The higher the density, the greater clutter in the user's eyes, and the lower amount information delivered to the user.

Individual characteristics of advertisement affect the entire streetscape section. To know how advertisement arrangement relates to complexity, each principle will be scaled based on its complexity value rated from 1 to 3. The higher the value, is the higher the complexity. To understand the implementation of advertisement regulations by the three different local administrations, complexity parameters were used, as shown in Table 1.

Principles	Design Complexity			
Finciples	Low	High		
Size	ANOVA			
Shape	Less than 2shapes	More than 2shapes		
Arrangement	Less than 30% of ads	More than 30% of ads		
	outside the axis	outside the axis		
Quantity	Less than 3 times of	More than 3 times of		
	building number	building number		
Density	A single building has 3	A single building has 4		
	ads or less	ads or more		

3. Data and Analysis



Figure 1 Yogyakarta Urban map and sample sections identified



Figure 2 Street section A at Yogyakarta Municipality

This stage investigates advertisement implementation at three sections, shown in Figure 1 as actualization of the advertisement implementation by three different local governments. Section A at Yogyakarta municipality was 125 m in length and 29 m in wide, Section B at Sleman Regency was 131 in length and 29 m in wide, and section C at Bantul Regency was 130 m in length and 20 m in wide. Each section is captured and analyzed based on the complexity principle. (Figure 2 for section A).

Table 2 Advertisement size

Size (m ²)	Number of Boards-		oards		
	Α	В	С		
0.1-2	40	55	35		
2.1-4	7	8	5	*	
4.1-6	15	4	1	101	
6.1-8	0	1	0	d.f denominator = 2.74 d.f 0.02	
8.1-10	0	0	4	3.74, 0.1 = 0.92	
10.1-12	0	0	0		
12.1-14	0	0	0		
14.1-16	0	1	0		
Standard deviation	2.32	2.23	2.46		
\blacktriangleright d.f denominator = 9.54, d.f = 2.76					

3.1. Size

Table 2 explains advertisement size standard deviation as 2.32, 2.23 and 2.46 at A, B, and C, respectively. The lowest standard deviation (B) meant the lowest complexity.



Figure 5 Building silhouette and advertisement boards for Section C

3.2. Shape

Figures 3, 4, and 5 explain that most of the board shapes are rectangular. Only 2 oval advertisements were located at A and 2 irregular shapes were at C, whereas the advertisement shapes at B were all the same (rectangular). Thus the lowest shape complexity was at B.

3.3. Arrangement

Figures 3, 4, and 5 describe the axis of each section (blue line). Because most of the advertisement size (Table 2) was 0.1-2 m in size, the advertisement axis area was assumed as being 2 m. Advertisements were considered outside of the axis if they didn't reach 1 m above or below the line. A had the highest advertisement reaching outside from axis or 28 advertisements (45%), B had 24 advertisements (34%), and C had 18 advertisements (42%).

Table 3 Buildings, advertisement number for Sections A, B, C

	Length	Building	Number	Quantity	Board	Density of
	(m)	number	of ads	(ads/building)	Surface	section
					(m ²)	(m ² /m)
А	125	9	62	6.89	138	1.1
В	131	12	69	5.75	104.8	0.8
С	130	8	45	5.62	84.21	0.65

3.4. Quantity

Table 3 describes the advertisement quantity of each building. A had 6.89 ads/building, B had 5.75 ads/building and C had 5.62 ads/building. A had the highest quantity. 3.5. Density

Table 3 also shows the total board surface of A as 138 m^2 and 1.1 m^2/m^2 in density, B at 104.8 m^2 in wide and 0.8 m^2/m^2 in density, and C at 84.21 m^2 in wide and 0.65 m^2/m^2 in density.

Based on these analyses, if the results are ranked with 3 as the most complex and 1 as the least, the advertisement complexity characteristic of the three sections is shown in Table 4. The most complex section was A, the middle complexity was C, and the lowest was B. Advertisement implementation of each principle showed there was no

Table	e 4 Complexity for e	each s	ectio	n	
Complexity principles		Α	В	С	1
1.	Size variation	2	1	3	0
2.	Shape	2	1	3	f
3.	Arrangement	3	1	2	į
4.	Quantity	3	2	1	5
5.	Density	3	2	1	
	Total	13	7	10	
Note: $3 = most$, $2 = middle$, $1 = least$					

significant difference among sections A, B or C, as can be seen from the ANOVA analysis in Table 2. This analysis was occurred because the degrees of freedom (d.f) which became

counter standard of data Section A, B and C (0.92) were smaller than the d.f denominator (3,74). While the d.f of advertisement size (9.54) was larger than its denominator (2.76). It means that there was a significant difference between advertisement sizes. This circumstance is also supported by each section arrangement that has more than 30% advertisements outside the axis, more than 3 advertisement. Although the shape complexity of each section was low because there were 2 or fewer advertisement shapes, that aspect doesn't alleviate the determined complexity value.

4. Conclusion

- 1. Advertisement arrangement related to complexity in the Yogyakarta urban area at Section A (Yogyakarta municipality) was the most complex, followed by C (Bantul Regency) and then B as lowest (Sleman Regency).
- 2. Advertisement implementation by three different local governments' showed that there are no significant differences although each does have different regulation of advertisements. It means that regulation implementation by all three local governments do not handle well.

References

1) Jogja Daily Newspaper, p.8 24 March 2010.

- 2) Pieters, Rik, Michel Wedel, & Rajeev Batra: The Stopping Power of Advertising: Measures and Effects of Visual Complexity. *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 74, pp. 48–60,2010.
- 3) Portella, Adriana Araujo: Evaluating Commercial Signs in Historic Streetscapes: The Effects of the Control of Advertising and Signage on User's Sense of Environmental Quality, p.158, Oxford, 2007.
- 4) Batra, Rajeev, John. Myers, David A Aaker: Advertising Management. Dorling Kindersley, New Delhi. 2006.
- 5) Morris, Marya, Mark L. Hinshaw, Douglas Mace, Alan Weinstein: *Context-Sensitive Signage Design: American Planning Associate*, p. 181, Chicago, 2001.