https://doi.org/10.24198/jkk.v10i2.42009

The Creating Share Value communication of PT. Bio Farma in green livestock feed empowerment program

Agus Rahmat[1], Mansyur[2], Sarmedi[3], Tendry Firmansyah[4]
[1,2]Universitas Padjadjaran, Bandung, Indonesia
[3,4]PT. Bio Farma Persero, Bandung, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

One of the flagship Creating Share Value (CSV) programs by PT Biofarma in 2021 is the Re-Grass & Sustainability Village program. First, this program has been able to meet the demand for fodder for horses, which is one of the input rows in the production process at PT. Biofarma and also for the farming community around PT Biofarma's operations. Even the fostered community is able to supply the needs of green fodder for several breeders in other areas through fermentation activities (silage) and pellet feed. Second, the CSR program to build animal feed security also received MURI records for productivity and high protein content. Third, the results of the evaluation by calculating the value of Social Return on Investment (SROI) show the value of Rp. 7.37. Based on the indicators, there are questions about what kind of communication was built into the program so that it was able to achieve a high level of success. Research with qualitative methods was conducted to answer the questions. The results of the research show that the communication activities carried out include the integration and coordination of various channels and sources of information, designing and implementing various communication techniques, and utilizing the nature and characteristics of communicators according to their respective positions. Implementation of information diffusion of green fodder is also supported by facilities that can simplify and reduce the risk of loss to the target group in adopting innovations.

Keywords: Creating Share Value (CSV); information channel; communication; adoption of innovation; empowerment.

Komunikasi Creating Share Value PT. Bio Farma dalam program pemberdayaan pakan ternak hijau

ABSTRAK

***Salah** satu program Creating Share Value (CSV) PT. Biofarma yang menjadi unggulan di periode tahun 2021 adalah program membangun ketahanan pakan ternak hijau atau program Re-Grass & Sustainability Village. Pertama, program ini telah mampu memenuhi kebutuhan pakan ternak untuk kuda yang merupakan salah satu row input dalam proses produksi di PT. Biofarma dan juga untuk masyarakat peternak di sekitar (Komunitas) operasi PT BIofarma. Bahkan komunitas yang dibina mampu mensuplai kebutuhan pakan ternak hijau bagi beberapa peternak di daerah lain melalui aktivitas permentasi (Silase) dan pakan Pellet. Kedua, program CSR membangun ketahanan pakan ternak juga mencatat capaian rekor MURI untuk produktivitas dan kandungan protein tinggi. Ketiga, hasil evalasi melalui perhitungan nilai Social Return On Infesment (SROI) menunjukan nilai Rp. 7,37. Berdasarkan indikator keberhasilan ini terdapat pertanyaan mengenai, komunikasi seperti apa yang dibangun dalam program hingga mampu mencapai tingkat keberhasilan yang tinggi. Penelitian dengan metode kualitatif dilakukan untuk menjawab permasalahan. Hasil penelitian menunjukan bahwa aktivitas komunikasi yang dilakukan mencakup integrasi dan koordinasi dari berbagai saluran dan sumber informasi, merancang dan menerapkan berbagai teknik komunikasi serta memanfaatkan sifat serta karakteristik komunikator yang sesuai dengan posisinya masing-masing. Pelaksanaan difusi informasi pakan ternak hijau juga didukung oleh fasilitas yang dapat mempermudah dan mengurangi resiko kerugian kelompok sasaran dalam mengadopsi inovasi.*

***Kata-kata Kunci**: Creating Share Value (CSV); saluran informasi; komunikasi; adopsi inovasi; pemerdayaan.*

Correspondence: Dr. Agus Rahmat, M.Pd. Universitas Padjadjaran, Jl. Raya Bandung Sumedang KM.21, Sumedang, Jawa Barat, Email: agus.rahmat@unpad.ac.id

Submitted: 20 September 2022, **Revised:** 21 October 2022**, Accepted:** 21 October 2021, **Published:** 29 December 2022
ISSN: 2303-2006 (print), ISSN: 2477-5606 (online). Website: http://jurnal.unpad.ac.id/jkk

INTRODUCTION

In contrast to the acceptance of an understanding agreement, the importance of implementing Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) is more acceptable to many groups in the company. Both because it is perceived as an internal company need and moral, social, and humanitarian considerations, it is carried out because it is bound by laws and regulations, such as SOEs (Sarre et al., 2006).

The implementation of CSR in Indonesia has shown encouraging results. It is based on the company's performance rating report program in environmental management at the Ministry of Environment and Forestry in showing the achievement of energy efficiency reaching 663.9 million GJ, reducing GHG emissions by 93.8 million tons of CO2 e, reducing emissions of 1.91 million tons of air, 17.75 million tons of B3 waste reduction, 9.92 million tons of non-B3 waste 3R, 459.89 million m3 of water efficiency, 50.59 million tons of water pollution reduction and various efforts to protect biodiversity (*Program Penilaian Peringkat Kinerja Perusahaan Dalam Pengelolaan Lingkungan*, 2021). Compared to 2018, 2019 achieved an increase in innovation of 46%. If calculated in rupiah, the cost savings successfully carried out by companies implementing the Electronic Reporting System (SIMPEL) were as many as 2045 companies reaching Rp. 192.63 Trillion (*Program Penilaian Peringkat Kinerja Perusahaan Dalam Pengelolaan Lingkungan*, 2021).

Even though the following years (2019 to 2021) are a pandemic, the implementation of CSR in Indonesia continues to show sustainable development. It can be seen from reports, among others, from the increase in the number of companies that received gold proper, which is the highest award given to companies that have managed the environment over what is required (Beyond Compliance). Another success is also shown by the development of innovations number produced in 2021 to reach 697 innovations produced by the company. It means that there has been an increase in the number of innovations by 103 innovations from the previous year. These innovations were able to save a budget of IDR 102.49 trillion. Other results as a manifestation of increased CSR implementation by companies in Indonesia can also be seen through the recycling of B3 and non-B3 waste, which increased 31% from 16.4 million tons to 21.54 million tons and 5.03 million tons to 6.59 million tons. From the evaluation of social innovation, there are 103 varied innovations (*Program Penilaian Peringkat Kinerja Perusahaan Dalam Pengelolaan Lingkungan*, 2021).

One of the companies that have a high commitment to the implementation of CSR is PT. Bio Farma. This company, recognized globally since 1997, has become one of 30 vaccine-producing companies and is trusted to meet the vaccine needs of more than 130 countries (Bio Farma, 2020). Although not a goal, but the result of high commitment to the implementation of CSR, the assessment results since 2008/2009 PT. Bio Farma has been declared to have managed the environment more than required (Beyond Compliance) and has even received the highest award (*Program Penilaian Peringkat Kinerja Perusahaan Dalam Pengelolaan Lingkungan*, 2021).

In 2021, PT Bio Farma also obtained its sixth proper gold with a flagship program or a stretcher from the Re-Grass & Sustainability Village Program to create animal feed independence by planting special grass with high nutritional content. The placement of the Re-Grass & Sustainability Village is a good program for PT. Bio Farma's proper in 2021. It is based on the consideration that this program has shown many successes. Such as reducing fuel, renewable energy, saving feed, increasing livestock quality & productivity, increasing milk production & quality, cultivating new commodities, collaboration, synergy, cooperation, and improving the beneficiaries' quality of life (Bio Farma, 2020).

The success of the Re-Grass & Sustainability Village Program is also shown through evaluations carried out by academics and with encouraging results, for example, calculating the SROI value. The results of calculations compared the total value of benefits (Rp. 3.25 billion) divided by the program's total cost (Rp. 441 million) reached 7.37, meaning that everyone expenditure for the program generates Rp. 7.37 million in the community) (Bio Farma, 2020). Meanwhile, the evaluation was carried out through the Community Satisfaction Index (IKM) of program participants during the process, and activity results showed an excellent

score (87.34) (Rahmat et al., 2021).

By looking at the efforts in the Re-Grass & Sustainability Village Program, this success is related to communication. Some of the considerations that form the basis of the researcher's belief that this success is related to communication are the conclusions obtained by researchers from the results of studies such as Ault (1977), who refers to Rogers & Shoemaker (1971) thinking that, first, the adoption of new ideas (innovation) related to communication. (1) innovation, (2) that is communicated through channels, (3) over time, (4) among members of the social system; second, the conclusion from the FAO (2002b) shows that communication is a vital aspect: third, Thomas' (2013) findings that communication is an important instrument to achieve common goals in economic recovery, poverty eradication, empowerment. Four, the findings study by Ayirebasia (2008) about communication produces substantial changes; five, Kanozia (2016) about communication impacts on development; Sixth, Aronczyk & Edwards (2017) argues that throughout history, communication and information have been the primary source of power. Communication in the Re-Grass & Sustainability Village Program is carried out by Community Development Officers from the Environmental Social Responsibility, General & Assets division (TJSL, General & Assets) of PT. Bio Farma. It is one of the divisions directly responsible for implementing CSV or Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) (Bio Farma, 2020).

This study's creating Share Value (CSV) is similar to Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR). The researcher realizes that using this kind of will cause disagreement among some people because, until now, even the relatively old concept (CSR) is still debated, even its existence itself, CSR remains a debate. However, most people accept the need for company involvement in dealing with social problems; even Carol & Shabana (2010) stated that social responsibility had been the dominant term in academic literature and business practice in recent years. Solving social problems carried out by companies, according to Porter & Kramer (2017) and Shukla (2016), starts from the idea that companies can act to tackle social problems in a way that benefits both the company and society. In the same sense, other disclosures say that business and society live side by side and develop together by creating value by companies for society (Daood et al., 2017; Ghoshal & Moran, 1997). According to Daood et al. (2017), the purpose of this CSV run is to serve the public and self.

Referring to the conditions that occur regarding CSR, according to several researchers, as previously stated, the researcher argues that judging from the idea, CSV is the same as CSR. It is also expressed by Visser (2010), which states that CSV is CSR 2.0. In implementing CSV in the community, it appears that the company, through its officers, either the Division or Public Relations department, Corporate Social Responsibility Department, or other assigned departments (PT. Bio Farma is in the TJSL, General & Assets Division). In this context, the company's officers place themselves in the function of an agent (Holtzhausen & Voto, 2002; Sison, 1983).

The success of change agents in implementing CSV or CSR program activities is primarily supported by their ability in the field of communication, as stated by many other researchers (Bjorneseth & Almir, 2017; Schiefelbein, 2012). Corporate social and communication are closely related and inseparable (Ligeti & Oravecz, 2009; Schiefelbein, 2012). It is no wonder that in the end, the CDO of PT. Bio Farma, in collaboration with other communicators in the program coverage area, is required to develop communication, both through providing information channels, as stated by Bjorneseth & Almir (2017), Golob & Bartlett (2007), and Cadiz (2005). Communication development is also carried out through interpersonal communication with the determination of persuasive communication based on the consideration that the target audience has limitations in the use of communication technology (Bales & Gilliam, 2004; Nisbet & Kotcher, 2009). The message is developed by minimizing scientific terms and replacing them with local idioms. The content of the message was developed by multiplying statements and stories related to the program so that the language used was considered more straightforward, easy to digest, and simple (Odongo et al., 2019).

In the implementation of the CSV program, communication does not only occur between social change agents and the community (vertical communication), but

it is believed that communication occurs a lot between the community themselves (horizontal communication). If opinion leaders widely use the first communication to access information about innovation, then this second communication in the community, especially breeders, is considered to occur more often. One reason is that breeders often monitor and perceive other breeders' experiences, and they learn and discuss their own experiences with friends and neighbors (Monge & Halgin, 2008). This research aims to reveal what kind of communication is being carried out by the Re-Grass & Sustainability Village Program. It refers to the success of PT. Bio Farma's CSV activities in community empowerment through the Re-Grass & Sustainability Village Program for guided breeders, on the one hand, and the belief in the vital role that communication has for the success of the program.

RESEARCH METHOD

Exploratory data is needed to answer research problems through communication conducted by CDO in the Re-Grass & Sustainability Village program. It means that the research method used is more appropriate using qualitative research methods. The selection of this qualitative research method is based on the premise that qualitative research methods are most suitable for exploratory studies (Zhang, 2010). Qualitative methods allow deeper exploration of the construction of social reality (Geertz, 1973; Marshall & Rossman, 1999; Stake, 1995). It is revealing that qualitative methodologies offer depth, detail, and a detailed description of communication phenomena.

The use of purposive sampling is in line with the thoughts of researchers (Guest et al., 2013; Miles et al., 2014; Morse, 1993). To help the researchers explore the depth, detail, and meaning beyond what is apparent, they used the interview technique, commonly used in qualitative research (McCracken, 1988; Potter, 1996). With this technique, they have confidence in exploring and explaining how socio-political, cultural, and economic forces interact in everyday life. Based on the consideration that this study uses a qualitative method with an exploratory nature, the researchers conducted interviews with purposively selected informants. Scholars usually use purposive sampling rather than a random selection of participants in exploratory qualitative research (Guest et al., 2013; Miles et al., 2014; Morse, 1993).

Interviews were conducted with representatives of three groups assisted by the Re-Grass & Sustainability Village program, namely, the Panglipur Galih Livestock Breeders Group (KTT). It is located in Cipeureu Village RT 03 RW 09 Ciptagumati Village, Cikalongwetan District, West Bandung Regency; Bale Sawargi group located in Bale Village Rw 10, Cipada Village, Cikalongwetan District, West Bandung Regency; and the Azkia Raya Livestock Breeders Group (KTT) located in Pangheotan Village, Mandalamukti Village, Cikalongwetan District, West Bandung Regency.

The selection of informants was carried out purposively, coming from three groups. First, the change agents consist of Community Development Officers (CDO), namely TJSL officers of PT. Bio Farma, the livestock field trainers in the District of Cikalong Wetan and District of Cisarua. Second, opinion leaders who were early adopters of the Re-Grass & Sustainability Village Program, and the third is a member of the group that is included in the late adopter category.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Cikalong Wetan District, one of 16 sub-districts in West Bandung Regency (KBB), is one of the areas in West Bandung Regency which has a reputation in the field of animal husbandry for the growing and fattening of beef cattle and goats and sheep. Therefore, several breeders groups in this region have been established with various achievements. They are first, second, and third winners of the livestock group competition at the district level from 2015 to 2016.

However, the livestock business is only a sideline. It is carried out traditionally (maintenance based on knowledge acquired from generation to generation), so it is not surprising that this farm has not provided significant income for welfare, especially family income. According to the management of the livestock group Azkia Raya and Panglipur Galih, the average monthly contribution of the livestock sector in the breeder group is Rp. 1,000,000 rupiah while for the Bale Sawala group, Rp. 500,000.

Table 1 Average Ownership of Sheep in the Assisted Group

Bale Sawala		Azkia Raya		Panglipur Galih	
< the Year 2018	The year 2021	< the Year 2018	The year 2021	< the Year 2018	The year 2021
4	9	7	16	9	19

Source: Research results, 2021

For the community, livestock breeding is not new, especially in the breeder group. They have been doing it from generation to generation, from parents, grandfathers, and before. Knowledge has been passed down orally from previous generations, starting with how to select breeds, the feed to be given, how to breed, sheepfold building, and so on. However, this livestock raising business in 2018 has yet to develop for several reasons: first, limited time to look for green fodder because most of the time, they worked meanly for labor and farming; second, limited animal feed. So far, breeders have relied on wild grass around their homes or fields, containing under 6% protein. Therefore, the community maintains the livestock number at the same amount. It is because the increase in the number of livestock was believed to have consequences for the emergence of problems, especially in the number of animals to be fed (Table 1).

According to livestock supervisors and justified by the manager of breeder groups, efforts to solve the problem of animal feed have been carried out for a long time, including through counseling on the cultivation of Mott grass starting around 2015. Seriousness to increase green fodder (from Mott grass) counseling is only carried out by Field Breeding Advisors from Bandung District. This counseling is carried out through direct communication activities, especially with the managers of the Bale Sawala breeder group and the Azkia Raya breeder group (at this time, the Panglipur Galih breeder group still needed to be formed).

According to the informant, the extension activities at that time, from the view of the extension material, were quite complete. However, compared to this time, they think that the information conveyed about grass planting was incomplete and less detailed, so at that time, they could not imagine the shape of the grass, the economic benefits of the new grass, or the knowledge of the protein of Mott grass. So far, their knowledge was limited to weeds that grew around and are commonly used by breeders to feed the cattle, let alone technical knowledge of Mott grass, such as planting and growing operational standards.

The need for breeders' knowledge is about Mott grass as a new type of grass that is better and more profitable for breeders in the three groups. It has led to an understanding that new grass or Mott as the grass will not make a difference to breeders compared to the grass used as fodder for sheep.

Apart from direct communication by livestock supervisors, efforts to persuade the adoption of Mott grass cultivation were also carried out by giving grass seeds directly to the Bale Sawala breeder group and the Azkia Raya breeder group. Until 2016 both groups still refused to adopt (planting new grass). Early adopters were only two breeders. The first adopter, a breeder in the Azkia Raya group, had more sheep than other breeders. However, his grass-planting method needed to follow the planting steps according to standard procedures. The second adopter was one of the breeders from the Panglipur Galih group. At that time, this adopter was a person who was leading in raising sheep (and fighting lambs) and was sent to take part in livestock building training at BPPT Margawati. This adopter became interested after seeing the Mott grass growing around the training building because, like the first early adopter from the Azkia Raya group, this adopter did plant the grass without following the proper standards.

Bio Farma. The interest of breeder groups in adopting or accepting Mott grass cultivation by the Azkia Raya and Bale Sawala breeder groups and the Panglipur Galih group (established in 2018) began to emerge in December 2019. The interest occurred after representatives from the three breeder groups saw firsthand and enjoyed the first harvest by the Re-Grass & Sustainability Village program at PT's grass-planting research center. During the Mott grass harvesting process, direct and interpersonal communication began between the Community Development Officer (CDO) of

PT Bio Farma and several members of the three breeder groups. The communication process carried out by CDO to the community is carried out to persuade breeders to plant Mott grass. The results of the CDO's early communication stages with breeders create interest in some breeders to grow, not grass.

According to the CDO, breeders' interest in growing Mott grass was shown by verbal communication from breeders. Verbal communication is shown through questions, such as how to grow grass harvested then, how to get grass seeds, and whether anyone can guide them to plant Mott grass.

Based on what happened in the early stages of communication, PT Bio Farma's CDO conducted research involving some breeding supervisors from the government and breeding experts at Universitas Padjadjaran. The research analysis collected information to find out what kinds of communication has been done about green animal feed, methods, and communication steps that should be taken for the success of the Re-Grass & Sustainability Village Program.

The first stage of the green fodder planting program showed that most of the target community, represented by the three target groups, did not accept Mott grass as a form of innovation. In contrast, in the diffusion of innovations or communication interventions, success was measured by the extent to which the target breeders adopted green grass (Thomas, 2013). This condition can be interpreted that disseminating information through communication being only one of the necessary ingredients. However, more is needed to change behavior or to achieve development success.

Another thing that appears as a finding from this first stage, that is, refusal to plant green grass forage, is related to the context surrounding the initial dissemination of information about green fodder in the word "grass." There are two types of communication contexts that cause refusal to adopt green fodder, namely: First, it relates to the relationship between the core of the material being communicated with previous events or the so-called message relation (Kapur, 2020). The word "grass" is always around them and is familiar for feeding cattle. For the number of livestock they have kept, this "wild grass" is considered sufficient to meet the livestock needs, even though it can take up to half a day to get it. Even breeders who have cattle over ten must ask other people, and in the dry season, the distance to get the grass can reach 2 to 3 kilometers. Second, it relates to the knowledge and experience of livestock obtained traditionally or what is called a pragmatic context (Kapur, 2020).

Based on these two phenomena, the achievement of communication goals is in the form of adopting innovations from the Re-Grass & Sustainability Village program. The first thing that needs to be done is to update the initial knowledge and beliefs or the context of the message content and their pragmatic context regarding grass. The renewal of knowledge and beliefs of the target regarding "grass" is directed to the term "green fodder" with its various aspects, carried out through communication. To renew the knowledge and beliefs of breeders regarding new animal feed, they accompanied by efforts to create information accessibility for breeders, the steps taken are to add channels that can become sources of information for breeders. If, in the beginning, the communicators are only breeding supervisors, then the communicators added with CDO from PT. Bio Farma and breeding experts from Universitas Padjadjaran.

The follow-up to this condition is that communication no longer relies on counseling but adds to it by involving several breeders in direct practice through pilot projects in each area of the fostered breeder groups. The understanding obtained from the experience of two early adopters in the supervised breeder group shows that knowledge alone is not enough for behavioral changes to occur in the target breeders. The need to be urgent and monitoring (seeing) what is already in place or other breeders is one-factor driving green animal feed adoption.

In the pilot project, breeders gain hands-on knowledge and experience in the form of practices from seed selection, tillage, and maintenance, to determine harvest time. In this activity, the communication that occurs between PT. Bio Farma's CDO, breeding supervisors, and early adopters of the training participants become more frequent and prolonged.

To avoid overlapping communication on the diffusion of innovations in the Re-Grass & Sustainability Village program, the division of labor is carried out through the division of tasks that refer to the functions that have been carried out so far. Breeding supervisors have

been active, emphasizing introducing breeders to new sources of knowledge and being a place to consult about raising cattle (results and processes). Referring to the thoughts of Ault (1977) in the Planned Adoptive Change Model, planned change holds more position as a change consultant. Based on the activities that CDO has carried out from PT. Bio Farma and Universitas Padjadjaran, these communicators play a more role in training breeders to improve skills & methods regarding Re-Grass & Sustainability Village. The techniques and methods given to the training participants from the trained breeder groups are the results of research and evaluation on green animal feed conducted by PT. Biofarma and Universitas Padjadjaran. Referring to (Ault, 1977) thinking, these characteristics indicate that communicators from CDO and Universitas Padjadjaran position themselves more as trainers and researchers.

Communicated message content was directed to project pilot participants' acceptance of the Re-Grass & Sustainability Village program. In the training activities, verbal communication carried out by CDO and Universitas Padjadjaran expertise showed a fast character both in speaking and responding to feedback. Verbal communication also showed assertiveness, such as many words "do not," "that is okay," and "do it now." Another thing that appears in CDO's verbal communication is the disclosure of facts or data, which is always done before statements are made. Referring to how CDO presents itself through verbal communication in front of the communicant, it seems close to the characteristics stated by Pfeiffer (1998), namely, the commander communicator.

The appearance of a CDO communicator who shows more as a specialist than a "command" communicator has something to do with the position of the CDO itself. They are PT. Biofarma employees are given the responsibility to achieve the success of PT. Biofarma's Re-Grass & Sustainability Village program, where their failures and successes will be used to evaluate the performance of the CDO in the company.

In contrast to the verbal communication of CDO, the verbal communication of breeding supervisors (PPL) during the Re-Grass & Sustainability Village program showed a relatively slower characteristic when speaking and responding to participant feedback. Breeding supervisors (PPL) communication characteristics are softer and pay excellent attention to vocal inflection. Another characteristic of PPL's verbal communication seems to be more focused on people or participants to be an effort to maintain harmony with the trained breeder groups. Another thing that stands out from the PPL's appearance when verbally communicating is that they do not express many statements but rather increase their opinions or stories (mostly experiences from breeder groups in other places, both successful and unsuccessful). The way breeding supervisors (PPL) present themselves when communicating verbally in front of members of the fostered breeder group shows that these characteristics are closer to those of (Pfeiffer, 1998) relationship-building communicators.

A breeding supervisor (PPL) has a task, one of which is monitoring the operational conditions of each breeder in his work environment. To carry out one of these main tasks, the thing that must be maintained by breeding supervisors (PPL) is to maintain good relations with breeders on an ongoing basis, or communication activities of breeding supervisors would create conflict with their supervised breeder group.

The way breeding supervisors (PPL) present themselves when communicating verbally, which is more likely to be a relationship builder, has to do with PPL's position in the community.

Implementing the green fodder planting pilot project, providing knowledge, and instilling attitudes in raising cattle with various aspects gave the trainee breeders (early adopters) technical abilities. From experience gained during the training, the pilot project trainees have become channels of new information or communicator. However, the communication, especially the verbal communication shown by the early adopters, is different from the verbal communication shown by the CDO and breeding supervisors (PPL). From the direction of communication flow, the communication carried out by the CDO and PPL of livestock is more of a vertical communication, while the communication of early adopters with other breeders is more of a horizontal communication.

In communicating with other breeders, early adopters have their position. Early adopters who become fellow breeders (late adopters) who need to consult with CDO and PPL directly are

friends to ask questions and share experiences of late adopters in growing green fodder and raising livestock as well as other new things. As a motivator for late adopters to plant grass, as stated by Monge & Halgin (2008), a position like this, it is not surprising that in the diffusion process, early adopters have a strategic position as research findings (Monge & Halgin, 2008).

In addition to differences in the direction of information flow, the communication characteristics shown by early adopters are, in some ways, characteristic of CDOs and breeding supervisors (PPL). Characteristics of verbal communication shown by early adopters are. First, communication is done relatively quickly. These characteristics relate to freedom and openness when communicating with people considered close physically (neighbors) and psychologically equal. Second, early adopter communication with other breeders relies more on statements. Very few scientific sentences, phrases, or words appear in early adopter communication with members of other breeder groups. Early adopters replace sentences, phrases, and scientific terms with statements that point to the thing in question. Third, relatively strong (black-and-white statements) communication, such as "want to participate or not," "accept or not," and "if you want to come, come on, but if you do not, it is okay." It appears related to communication activities carried out without the burden of adopting the innovation. The three communication characteristics that appear in the early adopters are the same as the communication characteristics of the CDO.

The fourth verbal communication characteristic of early adopters appears in voice inflections. It is closer to what is called "slang." Early adopters exist in each group (region), so the language and "slang" are similar to other breeder members. Fifth, focus on people. Members of a group of breeders come from the community from one village administration area. Therefore, the things that all breeders guard are harmony as neighbors, relatives, or fellow regions. Sixth, other verbal communication that stands out from early adopter breeders to other breeder members is more about sharing experiences. Early adopters say more about what they know, feel, get, and how they do it. No communication characterizes a society that patronizes other communities. These three early adopter communication characteristics are characteristics possessed by breeding supervisors (PPL).

The communication characteristics of the CDO, breeding supervisors (PPL), and early adopters, as well as the positions held by the three change agents as well as the integration between actors as mentioned by Howaldt & Schwarz (2016) in the Re-Grass & Sustainability Village program, are briefly shown in Table 2.

Research findings on communication in the Re-Grass & Sustainability Village program show that communication is carried out by many people who become communication channels with various characteristics. It is no different from the findings (Thomas, 2013), which essentially show that communication works best in multi-branches. Another important thing from this finding is that although there are many communication channels for this program, it still exists in coordination so that the positions and roles are distinct. However, to a certain extent, there are similarities, and everyone who becomes the channel is in a proper position. It is a must for effective communication to occur (Thomas, 2013).

In addition to persuasive communication, communication between livestock CDO, PPL, and early adopters is also carried out through providing incentives. Conditions like this suggest PT. Bio Farma to be more effective in receiving and supporting the Re-grass & Sustainability Village program. Communication needs support to facilitate the process of testing acceptance of innovation (learning). The provision of facilities to support communication is necessary (FAO, 2002a). Incentives given to breeders in the green animal feed program provide infrastructures, such as green fodder seeds, grass chopping machines, feed mixing machines, and machines for making pellets. The provision of this infrastructure was felt by the participants to reduce the risk significantly borne by the community in adopting new green animal feed and was considered a guarantee of the seriousness of the program's sustainability.

Apart from being successfully adopted by breeders, the Re-Grass & Sustainability Village program has also succeeded in updating breeders' knowledge, attitudes, and behavior in raising sheep. Raising livestock, done initially through traditional methods, has begun to be updated with better ways. For example, the aspect cage's form and function, how to breed

Table 2 Communication characteristics of CDO, PPL, and Early Adopter in the Re-Grass & Sustainability Village program

	CDO	PPL	Early Adopter
Characteristics of Verbal Communication	- Relatively fast	- Relatively slow	• Relatively fast
	- Many statements	- Fewer statements	• Many statements
	- Assertive	- Relatively soft	• Assertive
	- Flat tone	- Vocal inflection	• Aound inflection
	- Focus on the task	- Focus on people	• Focus on people
	- Using facts/data	- Use opinions/stories	• Use opinions/stories
Position	- Provide training to improve skills in growing grass and raising livestock	- Introducing breeders to new things about grass and sheep farming	- Motivator of grass-planting adoption and new things in livestock
	- Evaluating activities and planting grass, and following up on the results of the implementation evaluation	- Consultant on animal feed, grass & farming methods	- New breeder (late adopter) discussion partner in planting grass and raising livestock with some new things
	- Developing the best grass planting for breeders according to location	- Serving consultation on planting and developing grass and raising livestock.	- Late adopter colleagues consult with the CDO and PPL of the farm.

Source: Research Results, 2021

sheep, and how to select sheep for curbs so that in one year and a half, the breeds of sheep give birth twice. That means that in addition to impacting feeding security, the Re-Grass & Sustainability Village program has also increased the sheep population for breeders.

The worry of breeders in increasing their livestock population is related to the lack of animal feed. Even all the assisted groups can cover the need for animal feed, and since the last year, they have been able to supply the needs of green animal feed for other areas.

The success of the Re-Grass & Sustainability Village program is demonstrated through the adoption of green animal feed innovations sustainably by almost all members of the trained breeder groups. The development of green animal feed continues to grow seen from the size of the area. If the green fodder planting area was 1.5 hectares in the first year, the implementation program increased to 6 hectares in the second year. The green fodder planting area reached 30 hectares in the third year after the program implementation. The development of green fodder planting areas and the development of livestock in fostered breeder groups to date are ultimately shown in Table 3.

Table 3 Progress of Adoption Results of the Re-Grass & Sustainability Village program

	<2019	2019	2021	2022
Planted area	0.25 H	1.5 H	6 H	30
Number of sheep	464	502	787	1013
Income (in million rupiah)	0.5	0.5	1	2.5

Source: Research Result, 2021

CONCLUSION

Communities, groups, and individuals live and develop in their environment. Therefore, a communicator must understand the target's socio-economic conditions and culture (habits). The lack of concern for pragmatic and environmental conditions related to habits regarding the content of communication messages for the diffusion of green animal feed innovations has become an obstacle to adopting the green animal feed CSV program. The

first and most crucial step in overcoming this obstacle is to direct communication towards updating knowledge and understanding about green fodder and farming practices.

The study of the Re-Grass & Sustainability Village program shows that the successful adoption of innovation requires many communication channels (CDO PT. Bio Farma Persero, Breeding Supervisors, and opinion leaders) to make it easier for the target community to get the necessary information. However, the existing communication channels must still be integrated and in coordination so that it becomes clear the position or role played by each channel or program communicator.

Any information obtained before and during the process is valuable to be collected and analyzed to be used as a basis for empowerment implementers to take further action.

Communication activities in breeder empowerment through adopting green fodder innovation activities require the support of other aspects. They are providing or supplying facilities for adopters to carry out the learning process and reducing risks that may arise when learning or adoption trials are carried out and adopting innovations on an ongoing basis.

The experience gained by early adopter breeders, both in terms of convenience and facilities and benefits, has become an attraction for most other breeders (late adopters) to imitate or adopt green animal feed programs.

REFERENCES

Aronczyk, M., Edwards, L., & Kantola, A. (2017). Apprehending public relations as a promotional industry. *Public Relations Inquiry*, *6*(2), 139–155. https://doi.org/10.1177/2046147X17706411

Ault, R. E. (1977). *A Model for Initiating Change in Large Social Systems*. Western Michigan University.

Ayirebasia, A. (2008). *The Role of Indigenous Modes of Communication in Enhancing Development Support Communication in Ghana* [University for Development]. http://hdl.handle.net/123456789/226

Bales, S. N., & Gilliam, J. D. (2004). Communications for Social Good. In *The Foundation Center*. foundationcenter.org/gainknowledge/practicematters/

Bio Farma. (2020). *Laporan tahunan 2020 annual report dedicated to build sustainable future through life science*.

Bjorneseth, P. O., & Almir, C. (2017). *Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR): The Role of Internal Communication and Employee Engagement*. http://hdl.handle.net/11250/2447678

Cadiz, M. C. H. (2005). *Communication for empowerment: The practice of participatory communication in development*. Consejo Latinoamericano de Ciencias Sociales.

Carrol, A. B., & Shabana, K. M. (2010). the business case for corporate social responsibility: a review of concepts, research and practice. *International Journal Management Reviews*, *12*(1), 85–105.

Daood, A., Menghwar, & Sagar, P. (2017). Understanding "creating shared value." *10th Annual Conference of the EuroMed Academy of Business*, 513–525.

Food And Agriculture Organization. (2002a). *The design and implementation of national information and communication policies for sustainable development in Africa: Issues and Approaches*.

Food And Agriculture Organization. (2002b). *The State of Food and Agriculture (SOFA)* (F. I. Division (Ed.)). FAO.

Geertz, C. (1973). *The Interpretation of Culture*. Basic Books, Inc.

Ghoshal, S., & Moran, P. (1997). Value creation by firms. In *Academy of Management Review*. London Business School.

Golob, U., & Bartlett, J. L. (2007). Communicating about corporate social responsibility: A comparative study of CSR Reporting in Australia and Slovenia. *Public Relations Review*, *33*(1), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2006.11.001

Guest, G., Namey, E. E., & Mitchell, M. L. (2013). Sampling in Qualitative Research. In *Collecting Qualitative Data: A Field Manual for Applied Research* (pp. 31–44). SAGE Publications, Ltd. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781506374680

Holtzhausen, D. R., & Voto, R. (2002). Resistance From the Margins: The Postmodern Public Relations Practitioner as Organizational Activist. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, *14*(1), 57–84.

Howaldt, J., & Schwarz, M. (2016). *Social innovation and its relationship to social*

change: verifying existing social theories in reference to social innovation and its relationship to social change.

Kanozia, R. (2016). Environment Communication for Sustainable Development in Punjab India. *Journal of Content, Community & Communication*, *4*(2), 41–49.

Kapur, R. (2020). The Process of Communication. *International Journal of Development in Social Sciences and Humanities, 3*(1), 58-66.

Programpenilaianperingkatkinerjaperusahaan dalam pengelolaan lingkungan, (2021) (testimony of Kementerian Lingkungan Hidup dan Kehutanan).

Ligeti, G., & Oravecz, A. (2009). CSR Communications of Corporate Enterprises in Hungary. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *84*, 137–149. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-008-9678-3

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (1999). *Designing qualitative research, 3rd ed*. Sage Publications.

McCracken, G. (1988). *The Long Interview*. Sage Publications.

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Monge, M., & Halgin, D. (2008). *How change agents and social capital influence the adoption of innovations among small farmers, evidence from social networks in rural Bolivia*.

Morse, J. M. (1993). *Critical issues in qualitative research methods*. Sage Publications.

Nisbet, M. C., & Kotcher, J. E. (2009). A two-step flow of influence? opinion-leader campaigns on climate change. *Science Communication*, *30*(3), 328–354. https://doi.org/10.1177/1075547008328797

Odongo, G., Jamin, M. M., E, M., & Abuya, W. O. (2019). The impact of CSR on Corporate-Society Relations. *Journal of Advanced Research in Sociology*, *1*(2), 1–7.

Pfeiffer, J. W. (1998). *Conditions that hinder effective communication*. Handbook for Group Facilitators; Jossey-Bass/Pfeiffer.

Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M. R. (2017). Strategy & society: the link between competitive advantage and corporate social responsibility. In *Corporate Environmental Responsibility*. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315259277-8

Potter, J. (1996). Representing reality: discourse, rhetoric and social construction. In J. T. E. Richardson (Ed.). *Handbook of qualitative researchmethods for psychology and the social sciences* (pp. 1–20). Sage Publications.

Rahmat, A., Herry, & Mansyur. (2021). Kepuasan peserta program corporate social responsibility PT. Biofarma dalam membangun ketahanan pakan ternak. *PRofesi Humas*, *6*(1), 133–153. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.24198/prh.v6i1.30596

Rogers, E. M., & Shoemaker, F. F. (1971). *Communication of innovations;: a cross-cultural approach* (2d ed.). New York: Free Press.

Sarre, R., King, S., & Bamford, D. (2006). *Remand in custody: critical factors and key issues*.

Schiefelbein, K. (2012). *Using the right CSR communication strategy: The impact on consumer attitude and behavior*. University of Twente.

Shukla, T. N. (2016). Corporate social responsibility through creating shared value. *International Journal of Current Research*, *8*(08), 37403–37410.

Sison, M. D. (1983). *Agents of conscience, control and/or compliance: the roles of Australian public relations practitioners in organizational value-setting*. School of Applied Communication, RMIT University.

Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Sage Publications.

Thomas, P. (2013). *Introduction: challenges for participatory development in contemporary development practice* (P. Thomas (Ed.); pp. 4–9). Australian National University.

Visser, W. (2010). The age of responsibility: CSR 2.0 and the NewDNA of business. *Journal of Business Systems, Governance and Ethic*, *5*(3), 7–22. https://doi.org/10.15209/jbsge.v5i3.185

Zhang, A. (2010). *Understanding Chinese public relations education: a critical and cultural perspective*. University of Maryland.