

Communication Participation in Community Empowerment for Energy Independent Tourism Villages in the Pandemic Era

*Moch. Imron Rosyidi*¹, *Anissa Hakim Purwantini*², *Lintang Muliawanti*¹, *Bagiyo Condro Purnomo*³, and *Andi Widyanto*⁴

¹ Department Communication Science, Universitas Muhamadiyah Magelang, Raya Tidar No 21, Magelang, 56126, Indonesia.

² Department Accounting, Universitas Muhamadiyah Magelang, Raya Tidar No 21, Magelang, 56126, Indonesia.

³ Department Automotive Engineering, Universitas Muhamadiyah Magelang, Jl. Mayjend. Bambang Soengeng, Magelang 56172, Indonesia.

⁴ Department Technical Information, Universitas Muhamadiyah Magelang, Jl. Mayjend. Bambang Soengeng, Magelang, 56172, Indonesia.

Abstract. Energy autonomy is still a big problem nationally In Indonesia, with only 4% of energy use outside fossil energy in general. Indonesia has made a major policy in this regard, with Government Regulation No. 79 of 2004 concerning National Energy Policy until 2050 on October 17, 2014. Potential maximization efforts would be interesting with utilizing the potential of energy independence into a tourism village conducted by the DRPM PPDMM UMMagelang Team. These efforts certainly require a maximum community participation. This study was conducted in Gedangan Village, Cepogo District, Boyolali Regency. The method used is descriptive qualitative approach to action research participation, where researchers are directly involved in community development. Informants are selected through a purposive criteria for the actors and empowerment targets. The results showed that up to July 2020 the program had run 70%. Community participation is important in achieving this. The pandemic era is also not an obstacle for the local community to keep up with the activity. Because according to Habermas consensus can not only occur in direct communication media but also digital communication media. To reach consensus not only talk about direct participation but participation through various media.

1 Introduction

The problem of energy independence in Indonesia is still a common concern, because only 4% of energy use excludes fossil energy in general. Indonesia has made major policies related to these issues, with Government Regulation Number 79 of 2004 concerning National Energy Policy until 2050 on 17 October 2014 [1]. Efforts to increase capacity through energy production outside of fossil energy are the main discourse in this regulation.

One of the energies that can be maximized is the use of biogas energy. In Boyolali District, the livestock sector has contributed 10.4% to the Regency's GRDP. The superior product in Boyolali Regency is Dairy Cows. Dairy cows are cultivated in the sub-districts of Cepogo, Musuk, Mojosongo, Selo and Ampel. The current livestock population is 62,038 with 29.18 breeders. The largest population of dairy cows in Cepogo District was 10,784 heads in 2009. With such a large potential, efforts to develop biogas energy are very large [2].

Table 1. Distribution of Dairy Cow Breeders in Cepogo District

Village	Number of Breeders
Gedangan	9 breeders
Sumbung	6 breeders
Mliwis	6 breeders
Sukabumi	3 breeders
Genting	2 breeders
Cepogo	5 breeders
Jelok	3 breeders
Bakulan	2 breeders
Cabeankunti	3 breeders
Candigatak	8 breeders
Gubug	5 breeders

The society of Gedangan Village have been using biogas energy for more than 5 years for their daily cooking activities. However, it has not been used for electrical energy as a substitute for electricity needs from PLN (State Electricity Company) supply which originates from fossil energy. This program is implemented within a period of 3 years in order to convert biogas energy into village electrical energy which will later aim to develop energy-independent tourism villages.

Efforts to maximize existing potential are certainly interesting. One of the ways is the utilization of biogas energy potential to become a tourism village by the UMMagelang DRPM PPD (Muhammadiyah Magelang University Directorate of Research and Community Service, Partner Village Empowerment Program)Team. This effort certainly requires maximum community participation so that the program objectives can be achieved properly.

In development communication, participatory communication is important in accordance with the multiplicity paradigm of society [3]. Many cases of development program failures are the result of a lack of community participation, which is the problem most studied to date [4].

Leaving community participation is tantamount to starting a new conflict [5]. Symbolic violence even to the physical level can occur, so that the development program which is an effort to empower the community becomes a new disaster that goes unnoticed. Society is even able to fight against the domination of structure and capital [6].

Several studies have shown that development must be based on group consensus [7]. In fact, participation is the spearhead in building a village. As a result, all the people involved feel they own the program and the success rate is expected to be higher [8]. Especially in the Pademi Era like today, another approach is needed in community empowerment. Based on the explanation above, this study aims to describe Community Empowerment Participation in the Development of Energy Independent Tourism Villages in the Pandemic Era.

2. Literature Review

Habermas is a communication science expert who belongs to the Frankfurt school of thought, his study focusing on deliberative democracy [9]. This research has an approach based on his thinking. One of the most interesting Habermas ideas is the rationality of communication against instrumental rationality [10]. In short, a communicative society is an equal society and is no longer hegemonic in its social interaction activities [11]. The rationality of this communication will ultimately create community or participatory community participation [12].

Research on community participation in development has been widely carried out. Such as the influence of group dynamics in strengthening the capacity of farmer groups in the Kulonprogo sand farming community [13]. This research shows that group capacity is important in building a group network.

Another study was conducted in Surabaya on salt farmers [6]. This research shows that in a precarious situation and full of pressure, the community can even fight back. This shows that community participation is a central issue in community development.

In addition, there is a research on the success in the village of Papringan, Temanggung Regency, in building a tourist destination. In practice, they are even truly equal and are not tied to the official structure in the management of the tourism awareness group [8]. As a result, there is no domination in efforts to empower the surrounding community. All participate in the process and are responsible.

From this explanation, this research has never been done, in terms of location and theme with previous research. The similarity of the participatory approach is an important point of this study. This indicates that participation is a central issue in several development studies.

3 Method

This study was conducted in Gedangan Village, Cepogo District, Boyolali Regency. The method used is descriptive qualitative with a participatory action research approach, where researchers are directly involved in community development [14]. Informants were selected through purposive criteria and empowerment targets.

4 Result and Discussion

The people of Gedangan Village, Cepogo District, Boyolali Regency, actually already have knowledge of technology development by utilizing the surrounding potential. It is recorded that they have been using biogas for cooking for more than 5 years as a substitute for LPG (Liquified Petroleum Gas) Several biogas reactors have been installed in people's homes and close to cow sheds.

This potential knowledge is a big asset for the UMMagelang PPDM DRPM (Muhammadiyah Magelang University Directorate of Research and Community Service, Partner Village Empowerment Program) team to carry out an empowerment activity. As of July 2020, the program has run 70%. This is proven by the construction of a 20% energy independent workshop as a tourist destination. As well as developing the use of biogas energy for electricity needs of around 40% of the population. Community participation is important in this achievement.



Fig. 1. PPDM training activities

Table 2. Increased public knowledge

No	Description	Before the Program	After Program
1	Increased knowledge about the conversion of biogas energy to electrical energy	20 %	70%
2	Citizens knowledge of the potential of the region and the importance of homestays to be developed into energy independent tourism	49%	81%

The increase in knowledge capacity is a result of the active role and participation of the community. Some of the training conducted by the Team even led the community to abandon their daily routine to attend training. Youth youth organizations even prepare evening activities to check connectivity. Pandemic constraints have made several activities carried out online. However, community support and participation was effective enough that distance was not the main obstacle.

“masyarakat berperan aktif. pemuda turut mengikuti semua arahan, beberapa pemuda juga anggota pokdarwis. Program ini bisa tercapai sampai tahap ini akibat partisipasi pemuda dan masyarakat”. Pomo 17/07/2020.

The rationality of community communication has been assessed that the message of energy-independent tourism development is a top priority. If the habermas instrumental rationality focuses more on "orders" or instructions, then communication rationality is a matter of understanding consensus [15].



Fig. 2. Online Community Training Through Zoom

Youth and society no longer even wait for instructions or orders from the village head. This was during online training activities due to the pandemic. Boyolali Regency is still in the Red Zone so that some trainings are conducted online. This did not dampen the interest and participation of the community in activities.

"Youth and the community play an active role, we are not waiting for orders from the village head or the head of the pokdarwis, they are taking the initiative themselves, bro. For example, like the zoom time (online training). They are the setting themselves". Pomo 17/07/2020

Like Habermas' concept of thinking about participatory rationality of communication, which will only be achieved if it has reached a public consensus. The community consensus has been formed as evidenced by the fact that they have survived for more than 5 years using biogas as an energy substitute for cooking and so on.



Fig. 2. Biogas conversion generator installation to electricity

The pandemic era is also not an obstacle for the surrounding community to continue to participate in these activities. Because according to Habermas consensus can occur not only in direct communication media but also in digital communication media [16]. So that to reach consensus is not only talking about direct participation but participation through various media [17]. In the future, it can be predicted that when this program ends, the people of Gedangan Village will be able to mobilize on their own initiative.



Fig. 3. Application Habermas Concept in This Case

Community participation in this activity is maximized because of deliberative communication. The community is able to use applications and adaptations in the midst of a pandemic because the empowerment team does not hegemony. This phenomenon is in accordance with the habermas thinking that the public should be given the freedom to determine their needs [7].

5 Conclusion

Public participation is the key to success in community development or empowerment. Abundant potential and technological progress is not the main asset. The service program should arrive at communication rationality. Not on instrumental rationality that creates dependence on partners or society. By achieving the rationality of empowerment communication in the village of Gedangan, Boyolali Regency is not just finished with this program. It is proven by the existence of a pandemic, activities are still ongoing online and have reached the level of mutual consensus. In the future, it can be predicted that when this program ends, the people of Gedangan Village will be able to mobilize on their own initiative.

Acknowledgment. The team of writers would like to thank the Directorate of Research and Community Service (DRPM) of the Higher Education for supporting the funding for service activities in the PPDM Scheme by the Universitas Muhammadiyah Magelang Team.

References

1. S. Jenderal, D. E. Nasional, K. E. Dan, and S. D. Mineral, "RENCANA STRATEGIS 2015 s.d. 2019," 2014.
2. D. P. dan P. K. Cepogo, *Data Pemilik Ternak Di Kecamatan Cepogo*. Boyolali: UPT Disnakan Kecamatan Cepogo, 2019.
3. V. Baú, "Waving the flag for development communication: Why there is still hope for communication research," *Int. Commun. Gaz.*, vol. 78, no. 7, pp. 711–715, 2016, doi: 10.1177/1748048516655733.
4. E. M. Rogers, "Komunikasi dan Pembangunan: Perspektif Kritis," *LP3S. Jakarta. Rogers, EM dan FF, Terjem. Abdillah Hanafi,(1971). Commun. Innov. Memasyarakatkan Ide-Ide Baru. Usaha Nasional. Surabaya*, 1989.
5. M. J. Dutta, "A culture-centered approach to listening: Voices of social change," *Int. J. List.*, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 67–81, 2014.
6. Rosyidi, Moch Imron; Budi Guntoro; Raya, Alia Bihrajihant; Rasyid Erwin, "ANOMALI HETERODOKSA DALAM PRAKTIK KOMUNIKASI KELOMPOK MANTONGAN PADA PRODUKSI GARAM RAKYAT DI SURABAYA," *J. Komun. Pembang.*, vol. Vol. 18 (0, pp. 55–66, 2020, doi: 10.22500/18202028689.
7. K. Ott, "Variants of de-growth and deliberative democracy: A Habermasian proposal," *Futures*, vol. 44, no. 6, pp. 571–581, 2012.
8. D. Susanti, U. M. Magelang, P. Dwihantoro, U. M. Magelang, P. Sukmasetya, and U. M. Magelang, "Participatory Communication in the Development of Rural Tourism (Case Study : Temanggung Papringan Market)," vol. 459, no. Jcc, pp. 86–88, 2020.
9. "Koran Tempo," pp. 215–225.
10. F. B. Hardiman, "Menuju Masyarakat Komunikatif: Ilmu," *Masy. Polit. Postmodernisme Menurut Jurgen Habermas, Yogyakarta, Kanisius*, 1993.

11. [11] S. Susen, “Jürgen Habermas: Between democratic deliberation and deliberative democracy,” 2018.
12. D. Vitale, “Between deliberative and participatory democracy: A contribution on Habermas,” *Philos. Soc. Crit.*, vol. 32, no. 6, pp. 739–766, 2006.
13. A. B. Raya, “The Influence of Social Network Structure on the Farmer Group Participation in Indonesia,” *Asian Soc. Sci*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 119–129, 2016.
14. A. Tashakkori and C. Teddlie, *Sage handbook of mixed methods in social & behavioral research*. sage, 2010.
15. M. Zid, “Menelusuri Pemikiran Habermas tentang Gerakan Lingkungan,” *Region*, vol. I, no. 2, pp. 1–23, 2009.
16. B. Forchtner and C. Schneickert, “Collective learning in social fields: Bourdieu, Habermas and critical discourse studies,” *Discourse Soc.*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 293–307, 2016, doi: 10.1177/0957926516630892.
17. M. Hammond, “Deliberative democracy as a critical theory,” *Crit. Rev. Int. Soc. Polit. Philos.*, vol. 22, no. 7, pp. 787–808, 2019.