

Analysis of Communication Barriers In The Implementation Of Universal Service Obligation (USO) Programme In Indonesia: A Literature Study

Qurata Ayuni¹, Yualifah², Erik Kalalembang³, and Emil Arsyad⁴

¹Center of Human Development and Research of Communication
and Informatics Office, Manado.

²Procurement Service Section of the Regional Secretariat, Maros.

³Division of Information and Communication Technology of Communication,
Informatics, Coding, and Statistics Office of West Sulawesi Province.

⁴Division of Prisons, Regional Office of the Ministry of Law and Human Rights
of South Sulawesi.

The corresponding author: qurathun@gmail.com

Abstract

This study is designed to explain the communication barriers affecting internal and external information flow in the implementation of the universal service obligation (USO) programme in many different areas of Indonesia. An Analysis of relevant literature will result in a comprehensive classification. There are serious horizontal and vertical communication obstacles between the central government, local government, equipment and service provider, communication and technology network provider, village apparatus as well as the society due to lack of socialisation, coordination and written rule as implementation guidance of the USO programme. Due to the existence of communication barriers, the Information and Communication Ministry and other stakeholders should form a strategic path and proffer solutions to effectively address the problems that could negatively influence the progress of the programme by efficient use of the USO budget.

Keywords: USO; Communication Barriers.

Introduction

The Indonesian government under Jokowi's administration has greatly improved societal welfare by making effort to ensure equal access to information technology. In this regard, the development of telecommunication infrastructure is an important aspect in providing information to the society in order to face the



challenges of the digital era. This development is not only for urban cities but also for villages, so as to reduce the digital gap between villages and cities, which causes unequal development and instability in the lives of citizens.

In order to provide full communication service, government should implement the Universal Service Obligation (USO) programme, which would help to develop villages, especially by providing information technology to areas with poor access. Actually, the provision of infrastructure for USO began since 2003/2004 by using national income. Government Regulation Number 28 of 2008 is relevant in this regard, and Information and Communication Ministry Regulation Number 15/PERM/M.KOMINFO/9/2005 stipulates that telecommunication operators are required to make USO contributions of 0.75 percent of their gross revenue per year since 2005. The USO contribution was increased to 1.25 percent by the Information and Communication Ministry Regulation Number 5/PERM/M.KOMINFO/2/2007.

The USO programme has been facing various clear obstacles in many areas. In the annual report of the Information and Communication Ministry in 2014, it was stated that the programme achieved just 41 percent, since some USO programmes had been halted in 2005. As a result, the USO programme was re-evaluated, redesigned and reformed by means of the Information and Communication Ministry Regulation Number 25 of 2015 regarding the Implementation of USO for Informatics and Telecommunication as well as Government Regulation Number 80 of 2015. The main point of the redesigned USO is to effectively implement the existing programme, but the its mechanism was changed to bottom-up approach, from local to central authority based on local need, ministry need, and the needs of other institutions and societal groups, not top-down approach (Ginting 2017). The development of infrastructure is not the only prominent part, but the most attention is paid to society ecosystem, content and application.

In the implementation of USO policy, there are three stakeholders that have important roles to play in achieving the purpose successfully. They are government, as policy maker; society, as object; and vendor, as device and technology provider. The most primary element in implementing the policy is the communication aspect; communication is defined as transference (Luthans, 1973) or exchange (Katz & Kahn, 1996). Without good communication, the organisation will experience difficulty in delivering and receiving messages. The message is not only information but also shared ideas, instructions, and feelings (Malone, 1997:170), related to government policies and decisions.

The Information and Communication Ministry carries out the communication activities of the USO programme on behalf of the central government, while the local government, entrepreneurs, society, and non-governmental organisations support the programme. Based on literature, there are communication problems regarding information flow from top to bottom and from bottom to top within an organisation (internal) and between the organisation and

other bodies (external). This causes the inability of government to perform its function, resulting in an ineffective programme and eventual failure of purpose.

However, the redesigning of the USO programme is not guaranteed to lead to effective communication between the communicator and audiences. There are great obstacles that disrupt the communication process, so the central government delegates socialisation and coordination to the local government, which have been unsuccessful. As a result, we (researchers) are interested in using literature research to analyse the hindrances to the communication process in the implementation of USO under the following government programmes: *Pusat Layanan Internet Kecamatan*, *Desa Informasi* and *Desa Broadband Terpadu*. This research is also aimed at offering advice and solutions to the existing problem.

Methodology

The purpose of this write-up is to explain the communication barriers between the following actors: the Information and Communication Ministry, as the body responsible for implementing the USO programme; the local government, who supports the programme; the vendor, who is the service provider; and the society, the recipient of the programme. The problems that have been formulated by exploring relevant literature are analysed and the obstacles affecting the processes of government communication, both internal and external, are discussed.

In an organisation, the meaning of downward communication is the flow of information from top to bottom in accordance with organisational hierarchy. Generally, in downward communication, messages may be in the form of compulsory instruction, how to run tasks, the explanation of policy procedure, explanation of vision and mission, and feedback to public servant. However, upward communication is the flow of information from bottom to top. In upward communication, the messages that are conveyed include report of job implementation, staff complaint, staff attitude and feeling about many things, how to improve techniques and procedures, production information and the achieved result (Sillahi, 2004).

The literature that is discussed in this study is, in general, the results of relevant research and, in particular, previous research on the problems of horizontal and vertical communication. Through this analysis, it was discovered that there are many different barriers militating against information flow in different areas in Indonesia, which brought about the need for the USO programme. Under the USO, several programmes were formulated including *Desa Informasi*, the central internet provider for sub-district, and *Desa Broadband Terpadu*, which began the process of redesigning that led to the new concept. The collection of appropriate secondary data is then done in order to get the conclusion as the basis for future improvement.

As mentioned earlier, the programme was stopped and designed again by utilizing top down approach from the central level to the local level, but it must be



based on local needs. The new path must involve all stakeholders, beginning from planning, implementing and controlling. It is hoped that this would be used as reference by academician, stakeholders and others when identifying the factors that constitute a barrier to the success of the USO programme in order to achieve the target of the programme.

Universal Service Obligation Programme

The USO programme is clearly defined by the Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia, Number 36 of 1999 Paragraph 1 of Article 16: Universal service obligation is the responsibility of telecommunication network providers by hosting network communication so that society needs, especially outer areas and/or undeveloped areas, of accessing telephone could be achieved. In choosing the area of universal service obligation based on geography, isolated and economically undeveloped areas are targeted as well as outer areas and/or border areas with other states.

Universal Telecommunication Service Obligation – “Universal Service Obligation” is the commitment of states integrated in the world telecommunication organisation, known as International Telecommunication Union (ITU), a special organ of United Nations. Based on the World Summit on Information Society Declaration, ITU states have the responsibility to facilitate telephone service access in all areas of the Asia-Pacific region. It is greatly hoped that this declaration would instigate the development of communication infrastructure, which would help in providing telecommunication services in undeveloped village areas as well as benefit the economy (Topohundoyo, 2011).

The telecommunication sector in Indonesia is under the authority of the Information and Communication Ministry. The ministry formed a body known as *Balai Penyedia dan Pengelola Pembiayaan Telekomunikasi dan Informatika* (House of Providing and Managing Financing of Telecommunication and Information Technology), hereinafter called BPPPTI, which controls the technical units in the Directorate General of Postal and Informatics Resources and set up *Pola Keuangan Badan Layanan Umum* (Financial Management Pattern of Public Service Body -- PK-BLU). The formation of *BLU* was based on the recommendation of the Finance Ministry and was implemented by the Information and Communication Ministry by means of the ministry's Regulation Number 35/PER/M.Kominfo/11/2006 regarding Organisation and Administration of Rural Telecommunication and Informatics Centres. After assessment by the Ministry of Finance, its decision was that the Ministry of Information and Communication had completed the requirements to implement *PK-BLU*, as it was based on the decision of the Ministry of Finance Number 1006/KMK.05/2006 about the Establishment of Rural Telecommunication and Information Centre at the Department of

Communication and Informatics, as the government institution that implemented the pattern of financial management of public service agency on 21 December 2006.

The implementation of USO covers the provision of ICT infrastructure and system in the universal service area and undeveloped communities. Based on a press release, Number 19/DJPT.1/KOMINFO/2007, *Balai Telekomunikasi dan Informatika Pedesaan (BTIP)*, as part of the Directorate General of Post and Information as well as the Communication and Information Ministry, clearly identified 42,517 villages accessing *Wilayah Pelayanan Universal Telekomunikasi (WPUT)*. The USO programme, which is implemented in those villages, consists of basic service programme like voice and internet services. In 2009, 31,824 villages could access telephone, and 4,218 districts had internet access in 2011 (Topohundoyo, 2011) as a result of the *Desa Informasi, Pusat Layanan Internet Kecamatan (PLIK)*, *Mobile-PLIK*, and *Desa Broadband Terpadu*. The purpose of these programmes is to create ICT infrastructure policy that suits the targeted achievement of the Indonesian society based on information in 2025.

In 2005, the government through the Information and Communication Ministry conducted an evaluation and redesigned the USO programme. Many problems had emerged in the implementation, which caused the government to change the mechanism. The new concept requires all stakeholders to be actively involved at the beginning from planning to implementing and controlling. In this way, there is good evaluation and monitoring to avoid repeating the mistakes of the previous USO programme.

The aspect of the programme that is related to technology should be utilized comprehensively from planning, infrastructure development, management system, supervision and maintenance of the device to its utilization by the community. Communication is needed for coordination between local and central governments to achieve effectiveness, which affects the success of this programme. With the establishment of coordination, the division of tasks and authorities among the stakeholders will be clearer and more transparent in the implementation of the work. The government formulated the following programmes utilizing USO budget to enhance the access of information in the society:

Pusat Layanan Internet Kecamatan (PLIK)

Pusat Layanan Internet Kecamatan (Internet Service Centre for District) began in 2010 and is funded by USO budget. *PLIK* is a programme from the Communication and Information Ministry of the Republic of Indonesia aimed at ensuring internet service for the vast majority of people. It aims to accelerate equity and utilisation of information in order to raise the intelligence and welfare of the people in the sub-district (Fardiah, Rinawati, & Kurniadi, 2014).

There are three stakeholders that play the pivotal role in the implementation of *PLIK*: (1) *BPPPTI*, as the regulator and facilitator, pays for internet services; (2) a company, as the provider of *PLIK*, provides and installs operational tools; and (3)



the *PLIK* manager, who operates and maintains the device. The process of communication among these three stakeholders involves the process of planning, executing and evaluating. Basically, *PLIK* programme will run smoothly if exchange of information among them goes on effectively.

In cities and districts, the implementation of *PLIK* is divided into three categories as follows: (1) failure; (2) stagnant; (3) success. In various studies, findings indicate that *PLIK* activities experience various problems in the implementation process. This is closely related, among others things, to knowledge, geographical location and lack of public understanding of this programme.

Table 1: The Amount of Operated USO Programme

Performance Indicator	∑ target 2011-2014	∑ actual construction of facilities and infrastructures (2011-2014)			
		2011	2012	2013	2014
The total of Base Transmission Station completed (BTS), of Informatics and Telecommunications in border area and most outer islands well known as Telfin-Tuntas	286 BTS	-	18 BTS	286 BTS	286 BTS
The total of Pusat <i>Layanan Internet Kecamatan (PLIK)</i> operated*	5,748 <i>PLIK</i>	5,748 <i>PLIK</i>	5,939 <i>PLIK</i>	5,956 <i>PLIK</i>	5,956 <i>PLIK</i>
The total of ring village operated*	33,186 SSL	30,413 SSL	31,092 SSL	32,918 SSL	33,184 SSL

Source: The report of Informatics and Communication Work in 2014

Desa Informasi

Desa Informasi (Information Village) is a programme of the Communication and Information Ministry funded by USO budget; it covers infrastructure development related to information and communication as well as community empowerment. *Desa Informasi* is not a single programme but a combination of several programmes coordinated by the Directorate General of Information and Public Communication and Directorate General of Post and Information Technology. Programmes that fall into the category of *Desa Informasi* are *desa berdering*, *desa pinter*, *radio komunitas*, community information group empowerment (*border area*), media centre, *TV recipient for broadcast subscription*, media of community performances, and *M-CAP /M-PLIK*.

The existence of *Desa Informasi* is expected to reduce the information gap, especially in border areas, in order to improve the economy of the community. This

is where the role of the formation of community information groups as stimulants pushes community's participation in village development covering various sectors, such as tourism, agriculture, economy and education. This policy began in 2009 and later became a national priority programme supported by Presidential Instruction Number 1 of 2010.

Since its inception until now, many studies have been conducted on *Desa Informatasi*. The results are mixed. A communication issue to note in this programme is the flow of information from the government to the community. Questions arising from this issue include how the government prepares the community to receive the programme, its socialisation, coordination and management.

Table 2: The Amount of Operated USO Programme

Performance Indicator	∑ target 2011-2014	∑ actual construction of facilities and infrastructures (2011-2014)			
		2011	2012	2013	2014
The total of <i>Desa Informatasi</i> completed by <i>radio komunitas*</i>	500 villages	80 villages	80 villages	80 villages	80 villages
The total of the Mobile – <i>Pusat Layanan Internet Kecamatan (M-PLIK)</i> operated*	1,907 <i>MPLIK</i>	1,907 <i>MPLIK</i>	846 <i>MPLIK</i>	1,802 <i>MPLIK</i>	1,857 <i>MPLIK</i>

Source: Performance Report of Informatics and Communication Ministry in 2014

Desa Broadband Terpadu

The Communications and Information Ministry through the Centre for Provision and Management of Telecommunications and Informatics Financing (*BPPPTI*) initiated the *Desa Broadband Terpadu (DBT)* programme in 2015. It started in 50 villages based on the term *3T (Tertinggal, Terpencil, Terluar)* and is expected to grow in the future. The mechanism of this programme is to provide ICT equipment grants, free internet networks and village website applications. In the Broadband Village, village guide groups will be formed as functioning agents of change in the society. Village guides are trained to operate Broadband Village equipment and learn how to promote village potentials, products and information to improve the economy of the village.



Table 3: List of *Desa Broadband Terpadu*
(Source: www.broadband-desa.go.id/front/about -- accessed on May 4th 2018)

Province	District	Sub-District	Village	Website
Riau	Bengkalis	North Rupat	1. Kadur	http://kadur.desa.id
		Bengkalis	2. Wonosari	http://wonosari.desa.id
	Meranti Islands	Rangsang Pesisir	3. Tanah Merah	
		West Rangsang	4. Bokor	http://bokor.desa.id
Riau Islands	Bintan	Tambelan	5. Kampung Hilir	Hilirbetuah.desa.id
	Batam	Belakang Padang	6. Tanjung Sari	tanjungsari.kelurahan.batamkota.go.id
East Nusa Tenggara	Kupang	East Amfoang	7. Kifu	kifu.desa.id
		Mutis	8. Naekake A	http://naekakea.desa.id
	North Centra Timor	Bikomi Niluat	9. Niluat	http://nilulat.desa.id/
		North Bikomi	10. Napan	http://napan.desa.id/
		North Insana	11. Oesoko	http://oesoko.desa.id
		East Tasifeto	12. Silawan	http://silawan.desa.id
		Raihat	13. Tohe	http://tohe.desa.id
	Belu	Lasiolat	14. Maneikun	http://maneikun.desa.id
		Lamaknen	15. Fulur	http://fuulur.desa.id
		South Lamaknen	16. Lutha Rato	http://lutharato.desa.id
	Malaka	East Kobalima	17. Alas	alas.desa.id
	Sambas	Sajingan Besar	18. Kaliau	http://kaliau.desa.id/
	Bengkayang	Jagoi Babang	19. Jagoi	http://jagoi.desa.id/
West Borneo				
	Sanggau	Sekayam	20. Kenaman	http://kenaman.desa.id
	Sintang	Ketungau Hulu	21. Senaning	http://senaning.desa.id
	Kapuas Hulu	Puring Kencana	22. Sungai Antu	http://sungaiantu.desa.id/
Malinau		Kayan Hulu	23. Long Nawang	http://longnawang.desa.id/

		Pujungan	24. Long Pujungan	http://longpujungan.desa.id/
		Lumbis Ogong	25. Suyadon	http://suyadon.desa.id/
			26. Binter	http://samunti.desa.id/
			27. Ubol	http://ubolalung.desa.id/
			28. Sri Nanti	srinanti.desa.id
North Borneo	Nunukan	Sei manngaris	29. Tabur Lestari	http://taburlestari.desa.id
		Sebatik	30. Balansiku Liang	http://balansiku.desa.id/
		West Sebatik	31. Liang Bunyu	http://liangbungyu.desa.id/
		Central Sebatik	32. Aji Kuning	http://ajikuning.desa.id
		North Sebatik	33. Pancang	http://seipancang.desa.id/
		East Sebatik	34. Sei Nyamuk	http://seinyamuk.desa.id
Maluku	Aru Islands	Pulau-Pulau Aru	35. Jabulenga	http://jabulenga.desa.id/
			36. Durjela	http://durjela.desa.id/
			37. Wangel	
			38. Galay Dubu	
			39. Siwalima	
	Southwest Maluku	Wetar	40. Ilwaki	http://ilwaki.desa.id/
			41. Hiay	http://hiay.desa.id/
		Pp. Terselatan	42. Oirata Barat	http://oeratabarat.desa.id/
			43. Wonreli	http://wonreli.desa.id/
	West-Southeast Maluku	South Tanimbar	44. Matakus	Matakus.desa.id
			45. Olilit	
	Merauke	Sota	46. Rawa Biru	http://rawabiru.desa.id
		Naukenjerai	47. Kuler	
Papua		Mindiptana	48. Mindiptana	http://mindiptana.desa.id
	Boven Digoel	Mandobo	49. Persatuan	http://persatuan.desa.id/
		Jair	50. Getentiri	http://getentiri.desa.id/

With regard to the implementation of the *Desa Broadband Terpadu (DBT)* programme, *Direktorat Jenderal Sumber Daya dan Perangkat Pos dan Informatika (Ditjen SDPPI)* had in 2016 conducted a research entitled "Broadband Village Risk Management in Indonesia" using the Network Enabling Transport System (NETS) approach, and the result shows that some high-risk areas are vulnerable to failure. The NETS approach divides the organisational aspects into six, namely infrastructure networks, traffic network services, regulatory networks, communication and information networks, auxiliary network and service, and skill networks (Amin, 2017). Each aspect has relevant connection with the other. If the relationship is low or there is none at all, then the potential failure of the programme is higher.

Process of Government Communication

Organisational communication in the government highlights the same process of communication in general, which begins by the source sending messages to other parties through certain ways and channels in the hope of behaviour changes according to the contents of the messages. In the theoretical level, there are two communication perspectives, namely the cognitive perspective, which is the use of symbols to achieve the same meaning or share information about an object or event, and the behavioural perspective (traced to B.F. Skinner), which views communication as a verbal or symbolic behaviour; the sender seeks to get a response through the verbal symbols acting as a stimulant for a response (Sendjaja, 2004).

Communication process begins with senders who try to communicate with bureaucratic apparatus, community and other organisations. The sender may convey information in the form of words, signs or symbols that are appropriate and easily understood by the recipient. Messages can be policies, working procedures, rules, or decisions. They can be delivered verbally (speaking or writing) or by using non-verbal means (messages in the form of images or symbols). In choosing a communication channel, letters, memos, facsimiles, bulletins, phones, direct meetings, and so forth are considered capable of delivering messages effectively without a hitch. The next process concerns the recipient of the message, who begins to give interpretation to the message presented. The last stage is to provide feedback, which can be in words or actions. This feedback could be used as a basis for evaluating the effectiveness of communication (Sendjaja, 2004). The process of government communication involves the legislature, staff, entrepreneur and society. Each of those involved in this communication process can become a sender at one time and a recipient at another.

The purpose of government communication process is to influence attitudes, understanding, and behaviour of bureaucracy and society, so the information submitted is not only limited to public policy but is also related to organised

activities used to carry out commitment in the form of cooperation. According to Conrad (Tubbs and Moss, 2005), there are three functions of organisational communication regarding social and commercial issues: (1) The function of command with respect to members of the organisation having the right and obligation to discuss, accept, interpret and act on an order. (2) Relational function with regard to communication enabling members to create and maintain productive business and personal relationships with members of other organisations. (3) Management functions: with regard to the choice in organisational situations, they are often made in very ambiguous circumstances.

Communication Barriers

Obstacles in communication systems constitute serious problems in government communications. These barriers may occur in all three stages of the communication process, which are start, delivery, and acceptance (Stilman, 1992). Similarly, organisational communication does not always run smoothly and fluently as expected. From various literature studies, there are several obstacles that hinder the implementation of USO programme, both regarding internal and external communication.

A. Internal Communication

Government communication within an organisation aims to send and receive messages among members of the organisation, such as between the administrator and the staff, the leadership and subordinates, subordinates and subordinates, and others. According to Effendy (2009), internal communication is comprised of two types, namely vertical communication and horizontal communication. Vertical communication flow includes all downward and upward information transactions that occur between superiors and subordinates.

1. Vertical Communication Barriers from Top to Bottom (Downward Communication)

Organisations mostly apply this communication flow in which the message delivery flows from the supervisor to the subordinate. This stream is used to transmit commands, instructions, policy goals, and memorandum to a lower level within the organisation (Situmeang, 2016). A fundamental shortcoming of this type of communication is that it does not provide feedback from below based on certain assumptions, and as a result, lower level workers do not push themselves to solve organisational problems.

According to Situmeang, there are two barriers to this type of communication: limitation and uncertainty (Situmeang, 2016). However, based on

literature, the barriers to downward communication in the implementation of USO programme by the central government to the regions are as follows:

a. The Limitation of Information

Based on research by Susanto (2014) in the programme of PLIK, limitation of information occurred that the local government was not invited for communication at the start of the *PLIK* project deployment, so the local government does not know anything about its responsibilities, and the *PLIK* asset delegation procedure or takeover is not very clear. Another research by Fardiah et.al (2014) also find that the limitation caused the sub-district party only provides a place, but operational and management aspects are not clear.

The limitation of information also occurred in the programme of *Desa Broadband Terpadu*. The absence of specific technical guidance and instructions on *DBT* programme training founded by Ginting (2017). Unclear incentives for managers and lack of understanding of village apparatus about *DBT* programme due to lack of central government socialisation regarding this programme, as result of Amin's study (2017).

In the programme of *Desa Informasi*, the central government is less concerned with the socio-cultural aspects of the beneficiary location, especially in institutional strengthening. The lack of coordination, especially among sectors that handle infrastructure, content and programme managers from district government and public institutions at the village level, has not been addressed, suggesting that this programme is spontaneous and incidental (Wahyono, 2011). Meanwhile, Buntoro et.al (2014) noted that the Ministry of Communication and Information needs to design the form of organisational management of *Desa Informasi* and its working procedure. Finally, each USO programme looks its own way without good coordination.

b. Central Government Lacks Understanding of Local Needs

Several research had result that central government lacks understanding of local needs. According to Susanto (2014), there is a need to relocate some *PLIK* programmes to areas in need, especially areas that are beginning to develop information technology system. It's result similar to research by Wahyono (2011) and Ginting (2011) about *DBT*. They were concluded that the selection of the village location is not done optimally because it does not involve local people, so it becomes improperly targeted.

Regarding to Buntoro et.al (2014) the central government has to – refer to the community of market villages VI in Kualanamu is made up of majority of immigrants from Java – using *wayang kulit* (Javanese Traditional Puppet) performances are needed as a medium of show. It's the result for effectivity of *Desa Informasi* programme.

c. Lack of Training Programmes to Improve the Quality of Human Resources

Another one of the barriers to downward communication in the implementation of USO programme by the central government to the regions is quality of human resources. Several research found people lack understanding of open source operating systems and the technical knowledge of the *PLIK* manager is still low in repairing the equipment. Also, understanding of *PLIK* business management is needed for sustainable programme (Damanik, 2012 and Susanto, 2014).

Ginting (2017) and Amin (2017) found that limited knowledge and skills of human resources in management and utilization of the programme, and low level of education and managerial skills for DBT programme. Meanwhile, Siahaan (2011) stated lack of public interest to take advantage of internet facilities is strongly influenced by the ability of people to use the computer or internet. He advice to Managers get lessons about the use of the device by the installation contractor on a limited basis, so managers do not fully understand how to operate and maintain the device.

d. Lack of Response by the Central Government to Problems Occurring in the Field

The role of village guides has not been maximized in providing understanding and mastery of ICT to the community is one of barriers of DBT according to Ginting's research in 2017. Meanwhile Buntoro and Ratnawati (2014) was found that The formation of the *Kelompok Informasi Masyarakat Daerah Perbatasan (KIMTas)* has not yet been implemented, so dissemination of community information is not working effectively. Also, facilities of *Desa Informasi* are not functioning properly and have not been well utilized because of their location in the village office.

2. Communication Barriers from Bottom to Top (Upward Communication)

This type of communication is communication from subordinate to supervisor in providing feedback for management. Workers use this channel of communication as a means of conveying their ideas or notions. According to Situmeang (2016), upward communication has four main types:

- a. Information on workers' attitudes, morale and efficiency as it relates to policy, planning, and problems;
- b. Significant development in departmental units;
- c. Errors that decrease efficiency;
- d. Problems that cannot be solved by workers.
- e. The obstacles of upward communication in the implementation of USO programmes from communities, managers and local governments to the central government based on various sources of literature are shown below:



Based on analysis of several studies and research, upward communication barriers to the implementation of USO programmes in different regions are as follows:

- a. The absence of good control and control system on *PLIK* quality from all of the related parties (Susanto, 2014)
- b. Confusion of who the manager should communicate with at the time of hardware device or internet software problem (Fardiah et.al, 2014).
- c. *PLIK* organizer complaints about device malfunction are responded to slowly by the provider and complaints from the manager through official phone numbers often get no response, so managers are reluctant to file complaints and instead contact other computer technicians (Sidauruk, 2013).
- d. The occurrence of irregularities -- corruption at the district level as a consequence of ignoring communication and evaluation problems (Iskandar, 2013).
- e. The system of *Desa Informasi* facilities aimed at disseminating information on village activities has not been completed. They are still in the input stage and have not touched the economic sectors of the not been completed. They are still in the input stage and have not touched the economic sectors of the community, especially the creative industries (Ginting, 2017).
- f. People's creativity is still low to hold performances such as traditional information media (Buntoro, 2014).
- g. The assumption from community members that the village phone (village programme rings) is only for village officials (Harahap, 2015).

3. Horizontal Communication Barriers

According to Situmeang (2016), horizontal communication includes all the delivery of information that flows laterally within an organisation. These transmissions can be grouped as follows:

- a. Among the members of the same working group;
- b. Among the groups who have equal social status or between departments.
- c. Horizontal communication flow is also known as cross communication and provides the most powerful understanding in the communication process.

The concern of this communication is on the coordination of tasks, problem solving, information sharing, and conflict resolution. In the implementation of USO programmes, horizontal communication occurs between managers and providers. The barriers to horizontal communication occur because of lack of coordination by relevant agencies at the provincial and district levels as well as between communities themselves as consumers who take advantage of the programme.

According to Sidauruk (2013), the horizontal communication barriers are the device had not been installed by the technician, whereas the manager had

handed over a deposit security of 9 million Rupiah to the field coordinator of *PLIK* providers, until two months. Besides managers do have letters of cooperation agreement with *PLIK* providers but never read them.

Meanwhile, the community conducted a deliberation on the storage location of the *DBT* equipment, and the result was the office of the village head. However, the location is quite far from the centre of the population and the community hesitate to access the device in the office of the village head. *DBT* operators have initiated socialisation through social media, such as Facebook and Twitter, but these are ineffective because some people do not have social media. This last result is study by Ginting (2017).

B. External Communication

External communication is the type of communication between the leadership of an organisation and audiences outside the organisation, according to Effendy (2009). In government agencies, such as departments, directorates, offices, and large corporations, due to the breadth of scope, communications are conducted by public relations officers more than the leaders themselves. Communication undertaken by the leadership itself is limited to matters that are deemed very important. This model cannot be used for other issues, such as negotiations concerning organisational policy. External communication consists of a reciprocal path:

1. Communication from organisations to audiences. This communication is information that is handled in such a way that the audiences feel involved and have a sense of belonging.
2. Communication from audiences to the organisation. This communication is a response or feedback from the communication activities undertaken first by the organisation.

In the implementation of the USO programme, external communication occurs from the central government and local governments to providers who are private companies that won the auction for the process of procurement of facilities and USO programme infrastructure. In addition, the flow of communication is also established between the government and the audiences, and in this case, the community in the location where the programme is implemented. Based on several research, the various barriers are as follows:

- a. Delivery of *PLIK* vouchers at the site often suffers from delays due to the number data of ISP network (Damanik, 2012).
- b. The relationship between *BPPPTI* and providers in terms of function, monitoring and control tests is less clear in the legal aspects and not effective (Susanto, 2014).



- c. The private sector as a provider has little understanding of operational procedures, takeover mechanism and the development of entrepreneurial spirit in the community (Susanto, 2014).
- d. Differences in interpretation between *BPPPTI* and stakeholders on the contractual articles on the elements that determine when payment should be made and if the work is up to standard (Susanto, 2014).
- e. The allocation of USO funds does not involve service and telecommunication network providers as contributors (Susanto, 2014).
- f. Managers are difficult to contact because their phone numbers are inactive and they do not have email or social media (Fardiah et.al., 2014).
- g. Lack of understanding from the managers regarding the purpose of holding *PLIK* programme (Fardiah et.al., 2014).
- h. Competition with other cafes and other medias such as mobile phones and laptops (Fardiah et.al., 2014).
- i. *PLIK* nameplate thrown in order to be damaged by other cafe owners who are afraid to compete with the *PLIK* existence (Sidauruk, 2013).
- j. Lack of socialisation from the central and local governments to the community about *DBT* programme (Ginting, 2017).
- k. Certain groups like farmers and fishermen still have low understanding of the importance of information technology (Ginting, 2017).
- l. The community is not fully involved in the utilisation of services (Wahyono, 2011).
- m. Between the central government, district government, village government and providers, it is not yet clear who is responsible for the assets (Buntoro et.al., 2014)
- n. The presence of operator services makes people prefer to communicate via mobile phone with the outside area compared to using the village phone;
- o. There is absence of socialisation programmes by the district and the central governments, so people do not know and understand that this facility is meant for them (Harahap, 2015).

Conclusion

Based on the aforementioned points, the communication barriers that occur in the implementation of the USO programme in various sub-districts and villages in Indonesia stem from ineffective internal and external information flows. Internal obstacles are divided into three, namely the obstacles of communication from top to bottom (downward communication), communication barriers from bottom to up (upward communication), and horizontal obstacles. Downward communication barriers include the following:

- (1) the lack of information by the local government regarding the programme management procedures;

- (2) the central government lacks understanding of regional needs, so the location of programme beneficiaries is not well targeted;
- (3) with the lack of training programmes to improve the quality of human resources, many people cannot use the computer, and most managers also cannot operate the device;
- (4) the central government is less responsive to the problems that occur in the field, which makes the programme run ineffectively; there are, even, locations that have stopped operation.

On the other hand, upward communication barrier include the occurrence of irregularities due to neglect of the problem and the low control of the parties concerned. Furthermore, horizontal communication barrier in this programme occurs between the relevant agencies at the provincial and district levels, between the provider and the field coordinator, between the operators and the community (related to socialisation), and between groups who are uncomfortable or afraid to utilize the facilities because the equipment is placed in the village leader's house or village apparatus, not in public space.

There are various findings on the external constraints of the USO programmes according to literature, such as between providers constrained by the pattern of bureaucratic systems and the Communication and Information Ministry, in this case represented by *BPPPTI*. Moreover, the legal aspects of the financial management by *BPPTI* need to be reviewed, especially regarding the procurement process. There is a need for transparency and accountability regarding the management of USO funds to USO contributors in order for management accountability to be maintained.

Hence, socialisation by the central and local governments is needed, so that the public understands the objectives of the USO programme and offers its support in order that the competition between community groups, such as managers and cafe owners, can be avoided.

Each policy must be contextual because each region is different; a policy should not have the same implementation in all regions. USO policy should be based on connectivity and ability of stakeholders to communicate, not only by providing or subsidizing certain technologies or services (Rappoport & Banerjee, 2010). Subsequently, communication has an important role in development activities if they are to achieve the goals of development itself. The task of development communication is to convey information to the community about the development undertaken (Nasution, 2004). In this context, the public, as audiences, need to be involved in making decisions. Therefore, dialogue involving all stakeholders needs to be done to listen to the opinions of the people and to create a smooth flow of information from various sides.

Recommendation

In connection with the above conclusions, the USO programme that has been run with large funding is not in vain and can be made to achieve its goal. Logically, we provide some suggestions that could lead to the improvement of the USO programme implementation in the future as follows:

1. Providing massive training to people who are recipients of USO programme about the importance of utilizing technology in daily activities. If that is done, when the programme is conducted on site, people can enthusiastically receive and use technology tools;
2. Socialisation, communication and coordination both internally and externally between the central government, provincial government, regency and/or cities government, providers, PT. Telkom, village apparatus and community groups are the paramount issues that should be resolved before the USO device is placed at the sub-district level. If this is done, when the programme is launched, it is very likely that the relevant parties already know their own authority and duties;
3. *BPPPTI (Balai Penyedia dan Pengelola Pembiayaan Telekomunikasi dan Informatika)*, as the supervisory board managing the programme, should communicate with local governments, such as the Office of Communications and Informatics and the sub-district office, to make specific instructions or clear SOP (Standard Operating Procedures) on the implementation of the programme;
4. To achieve sustainability, managers should improve their skills in operating, maintaining and repairing devices or networks. Community coaching is also important so that they can apply the sophisticated technologies in completing daily tasks.
5. In addition to fostering skills, it is also necessary to develop entrepreneurship, which improves the economic sector through the use of technology in marketing products from the USO programme. The industry and trade department is indispensable in terms of paving the way in the business world and providing market guarantees through government policies;
6. Technical guidance on the maintenance and repair procedure of facilities and infrastructure between PT Telkom and the provider is needed, especially regarding installation of service and internet network. Similarly, communication is needed between providers and managers, such that providers are required to provide their contacts in the form of fixed phone numbers, email, or social media for the complaint process in case of devices or networks problems that cannot be overcome by the manager;

7. At the local level, the sub-district and district office of communication and informatics have to control the implementation and management of programmes in the field.***

References

- Amin, Mukhlis. 2017. "Risk Level Measurement of Integrated Broadband Village Program in Papua and East Nusa Tenggara Region." *Perkommas* 135-142.
- Buntoro, Heru Pudjo, and Atjih Ratnawati. 2014. "Managerial System Of Information Village In Supply Of Information Access To Society." *Jurnal Penelitian Pos dan Informatika* 107-123.
- Damanik, Marudur P. 2012. "Competence Of Managers In Overcoming Technical Problems At Sub-District Internet Service Center." *Jurnal Teknologi dan Komunikasi* 11-24.
- Fardiah, Dedeh, Rini Rinawati, and Oji Kurniadi. 2014. "Optimizing The Sub-District Internet Service Centers In Improving The Accessibility Of Communities To Information." *MIMBAR* 243-252.
- Faules, Don F, and R. Wayne Pace. 2015. *Organizational Communication: Strategy Improving Corporate Performance*. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Ginting, Meilinia Diakonia. 2017. "Implementation of Rural Broadband Integrated." *PIKOM* 19-30.
- Harahap, Abdul Rahman. 2015. "Effectivity Of Using Ringing Village Service In Bintan Buyu Regency Of Bintan Province Of Riau." *Jurnal Penelitian Komunikasi dan Pembangunan* 102-115.
- Iskandar, Abubakar. 2013. "Universal Service Obligation Optimization And Role Of Supply In Expanding Internet Telephone And Computer Networks At The Sub-District Level Through Snowball System Approach In Community Empowerment In Regional Sumatera." *Jurnal Komunikasi Pembangunan* 1-15.
- Nababan, Pirhot, and Darwanto. 2015. *Review of Information Technology and Communication Policy*. Jakarta Selatan: Institute for Criminal Justice Reform.
- Pala, Rukman. 2015. "Rural Community and Internet Selectivity Pattern." *Jurnal Studi Komunikasi dan Media* 169-180.
- Rappoport, Paul, and Aniruddha Banerjee. 2010. "Universal Service: A New Definition." *Telecommunications Policy* 86-91.
- Siahaan, Lasni Julita. 2011. "Internet User Behavior Research On Smart Palace Use Development Results With Techonology Approach Acceptance Model (TAM) In Central Java Province." *Buletin Pos dan Telekomunikasi* 71-92.

- Sidauruk, Paraden Lucas. 2013. "Role of Communication In Implementation Policy Internet Service Center District (Case In Bangka Belitung Islands)." *Jurnal Penelitian Pos dan Informatika* 81-113.
- Silalahi, Ulber. 2004. "Government Communication: Send and Receive Job Information and Public Information." *Administrasi Publik* 36-54.
- Silalahi, Ulber. 2004. "Komunikasi Pemerintahan: Mengirim dan Menerima Informasi Tugas dan Informasi Publik." *Jurnal Administrasi Publik* 36-54.
- Situmeang, Ilona V. Oisina. 2016. *Organizational Communication In An Objective And Subjective Perspective*. Yogyakarta: Ekuilibria.
- Subiakto, Henri. 2013. "Internet For Countryside And Usage For Community." *Masyarakat, Kebudayaan dan Politik* 243-256.
- Susanto, Anton. 2014. "Needs Analysis Of Information Technology (It) Governance For The Implementation Of Universal Service Obligation (Uso) Program." *Jurnal Penelitian Pos dan Informatika* 151-165.
- Topohundoyo. 2011. "Implementation Of USO Programs In Communication Aspect." *Buletin Pos dan Telekomunikasi* 23-47.
- Wahyono, S. Bayu. 2011. "Optimization Of Village Information Program Through Institutional Strengthening." *Jurnal Penelitian IPTEK-KOM* 29-42.