



GOING LOCAL FOR FOOD SECURITY: STRENGTHENING LOCAL COLLABORATIVE INSTITUTION IN IMPLEMENTATION OF FOOD SECURITY IN INDONESIA

Alwi*

Professor in Department of Public Administration,
Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Hasanuddin, Indonesia

Gita Susanti

Lecturer in department of Public Administration,
Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Hasanuddin, Indonesia

Novayanti Sophia Rukmana

Lecturer in department of Public Administrative Science,
Faculty of Social Sciences, Universitas Negeri Makassar, Indonesia

*Corresponding author

ABSTRACT

Public policy has multi-stakeholders and implemented through multi-level governance requires a going local approach to local collaborative institutions to improve the performance of a policy. The main objective of this study is to strengthen local institutions based on collaborative organizations for the implementation of food security policy. Based on the results of the pattern matching techniques, the performance of food security policy has not been effective. This is caused by the institutional system of this policy cannot be used as a driver to achieve value, namely increasing food productivity. This can be shown in the cognitive system of this institution is still dominated by mindset oriented funds. The normative system is still dominated by the government as a provider of resources and does not make effective resource sharing among stakeholders. Then, the regulative system still has a top-down approach so that it has not become binding for all stakeholders to improve the performance of this policy. Therefore, strengthening local collaborative institution becomes an important choice for the performance of public policy.

Keywords: Public Policy, Policy Implementation, Local Collaborative Institution, and Food Security.

Cite this Article: Alwi, Gita Susanti and Novayanti Sopia Rukmana, Going Local for Food Security: Strengthening Local Collaborative Institution in Implementation of Food Security in Indonesia, *International Journal of Management*, 11 (8), 2020, pp. 1998-2009.

<http://iaeme.com/Home/issue/IJM?Volume=11&Issue=8>

1. INTRODUCTION

One of the main tasks of the government is to solve public problems and meet public needs. For this, the government designs a public policy as a "tool" to solve public problems and meet public needs (Jones, 1984). Therefore, to design a public policy it is necessary to first understand the problems and needs of the public appropriately so that a policy can achieve its objectives. In addition, to be able to realize the objectives of the policy, the role of the policy implementer becomes very important. In this case, the implementer works to meet the needs of the policy target group. In the implementation process, the implementer is faced with the problem of lack of resources, such as funding, information, and authority so that collaboration between stakeholders (individuals or organizations) cannot be avoided to improve the performance of public policies and services (O'Leary et.al, 2009; Agranoff and McGuire, 2003; Goldsmith and Eggers, 2004; Isset, et.al, 2011; O'Toole and Montjoy, 1984).

Food security must include availability, distribution, and consumption factors. The fulfillment of food needs in the world continues to increase with increasing population. This increase in population is also accompanied by a decrease in agricultural land due to the conversion of land into settlements and industrial land that is often done by the community. This is a challenge as well as a threat for Indonesia in meeting food needs. Indonesia's population continues to increase. From the last three years data shows that the population in 2016 was 261.6 Million, increased in

2017 to 264.6 Million, and in 2018 there were 267.7 Million (World Bank 2019). Various policies are packaged in the government's strategic plan to increase food security including; Development of Availability and Handling of Food Insecurity, Development of Distribution Systems and Stability of Food Prices, Development of Diversity of Consumption and Food Safety This policy costs a considerable amount of IDR 775,112,392,738 over the past 3 years (Food Security Agency Performance Report, processed, 2019). However, the policy has not had a significant effect. Based on ASEAN data, Indonesia ranks second in the poverty rate of 51.8% of the 10 ASEAN countries. Then, Indonesia ranks 62nd among 113 countries in the Global Food Security Index (GFSI) published by EIU (Economist Intelligence Unit.2019). Indonesia ranked the lowest among countries in the region, under Singapore (ranked 1), Malaysia (ranked 28), Thailand (ranked 52), and Vietnam (ranked 54). The number of hunger from the Global Hunger Index (GHI) data, 2019, hunger rate in Indonesia is included in the serious category. Of the 117 Indonesian countries ranked 70th with a score of 20.1%.

In addition to the above, the urgency of this study can be shown by the results of previous studies, such as 1) Alwi, Aslinda, Susanti G. 2019. Cross-Sector Collaboration and Public Policy Accountability: Implementation Network of the Food Security Policy in Bone Regency. The results showed the accountability of food policy is still low in Bone because the performance of food policy implementers is still weak, and the process of collaboration across sectors has not been effective. 2) Novayanti, Alwi, Susanti G. 2019. Complexity and Public Policy: Network Model of Food Security Policy Implementation in Bone Regency. The results showed that the implementation of food security policies had not been effective. This is due to the lack of an integrated food program by all stakeholders. 3) Rossi Prabowo. 2010. Government Policy in Realizing Food Security in Indonesia. The results of his research show that to ensure the sustainability of food security through increasing the availability of national

food, especially rice while increasing the welfare of farmers, long-term and short-term policies are needed.

All of the research mentioned focuses on the interaction of actors in the implementation network of food security policy. This means that the research is different from this study, which focuses on strengthening local collaborative institutions. Concerning the above, the implementation of food security policy is a concentrated study with many stakeholders for which they have various interests. Then, this study focuses on the perspective of strengthening collaborative institutional in implementing a food security policy. This perspective aims to build shared values with all the various stakeholders.

2. THEORETICAL REVIEW

2.1. Collaboration and Policy Implementation

In the study of public policy, policy implementation is one of the important stages in the policy process, because this stage shows the achievement of a policy's performance. In this case, policy implementation is a proof stage of the success or failure of a policy to solve problems and meet public needs. Solving problems and meeting public needs are complex problems faced by policy implementers. Therefore, the involvement of various stakeholders is inevitable and also necessary joint efforts and collaborative action that policy problems in modern society can be solved (Klijn, 2008). This also shows the successful of a public policy is determined by cooperation among organizations and by coordination with the organization (O'Toole, Jr. 2005; Manzel, 1987). It shows the implementation of public policy is also a complex matter, because to realize the objectives of a public policy cannot be separated from the organization or other institutions.

The number of stakeholders involved in the process of policy implementation requires collaboration with them to realize the policy objectives. The collaboration referred to here is as stated by Roberts (2000), "*collaboration, translated as working together is premised on the principle that by joining forces parties can accomplish more as a collective than they can achieve by acting as independent agents*". Then, Gray is more likely to express elements of collaboration, involving: 1) the interdependence of the stakeholders, 2) the ability to address differences constructively, 3) joint ownership of decision, and collective responsibility for the future of the partnership (O'Leary et.al, 2009). This shows that collaboration cannot be avoided in solving wicked problems.

The study of collaboration is a study that is currently developing to solve complex and multi-

stakeholder problems (O'Leary et.al, 2009; Innes & Booher, 2010). This development was driven by the growing complexity of interaction in the public and private sphere (Klijn, 2008). This was triggered by the level of interdependency among stakeholders to achieve policy outcomes and organize service delivery. Besides, collaboration becomes important because it is expected to overcome various limitations of resources, such as money, information, authority (Agranoff & McGuire, 2003; Klijn, 2008; O'Leary et.al, 2009; Agranoff, 2012).

3. LOCAL COLLABORATIVE INSTITUTION: BUILDING THE VALUE OF TOGETHERNESS OF STAKEHOLDERS

In a collaboration perspective, collaboration organizations are important because they are a forum for network members to interact, discuss, and agree on solving problems that are difficult for organizations to solve individually. This perspective is also used for the implementation of multi- stakeholder policies and each has different interests (Klijn, 2008; O'Toole, Jr., 2005; Manzel, 1987; and O'Toole, Jr. & Montjoy, 1984). Even this perspective allows access to new

knowledge, sharing risks and resources, and joining complementary skills and capacities, which allows them to focus on their core competencies (Romero & Molina, 2011). Then, Imperial states “*collaborative organization are organizations composed other organizations that perform a variety of more traditional functions by institutionalizing rules, procedures, and process in to coordinating organizational structures*” (O’Leary et.al, 2009).

Collaborative organizations as implementers of public policy need to have the ability to realize policy objectives or be able to solve problems and/or meet the needs of their target groups. In this era, the complexity of public problems and the implementation of public policy can no longer be avoided (Goggin et.al, 1990), so the collaboration approach in policy implementation becomes important and unavoidable. The government as a policy implementer is always confronted with the classic problem of limited resources. Other institutions as stakeholders have different interests and even conflicts of interest often occur because they have contradictory interests. The result is that the policy fails to meet the needs of its target group. Such conditions, based on network perspectives, require collaborative organizations so that the stakeholders involved can eliminate these contradictory interests.

This organization is different from other organizations (individual organizations) where it always promotes togetherness and consensus in designing and carrying out its programs. So that the main concern in this study is whether this organization has values and systems that prioritize consensus and togetherness in carrying out public policies, such as food security policies in Indonesia. One theory that explains this phenomenon is institutional theory. This theory explains how an organization can improve its ability to grow and survive in an environment that is completely competitive by being trusted (legitimate) in the eyes of its stakeholders (Jones, 2004; Jaffee, 2012). To be legitimate, this organization needs to build its internal through institutionalizing rules, procedures, and processes so that it has the ability and stability to deal with its environment. According to Scott (2001), institutions *are composed of cultured-cognitive, normative, and regulative elements that, together with associated activities and resources, provide stability and meaning to social live. Institutions are transmitted by various type of carriers, including symbolic systems, relational systems, routines, and artifacts. Institutions operate at multiple levels of jurisdiction, from the world system to localized interpersonal relationships*”. Then, he asserted that the institution has three important elements, namely regulative, normative, and cultural- cognitive systems.

The regulative system as one of the important elements in institutions to limit and regulate the behavior of members in an organization or community. This system shows what is permitted and not and should be done by members of the organization. Therefore, this system runs through the coercive mechanism by manipulating sanctions in the form of rewards or punishments to direct the behavior of members of the organization. This mechanism can be done informally in the form of shaming or shunning activities and can also be done with highly formalized (Scott, 2001). However, collaborative institutions do not focus on formal regulations that emphasize penalties to direct members in designing and implementing public policy, because the regulatory system is designed together and is not penalty-oriented. The second important element of the institution is the normative system. This system includes values and norms. The value in question is the conceptions of the preferred or the desirable, together with the construction of standards to which the existing structure or behavior can be compared and assessed. Norms are specified how things should be done; the define legitimate means to pursue valued ends. Normative systems define goals and objectives but also design appropriate ways to pursue them (Scott, 2001).

Collaborative institutions have the value that may not be or are difficult for individual organizations to achieve. This is caused by the complexity of the interests of the stakeholders of public policy. In a Collaborative organization, the complexity of these interests is eliminated

by a consensus between them, because they are in this organization to solve problems and meet common needs. The determination of goals and objectives and ways to achieve them are always agreed by the stakeholders so that the problem of lack of resources in the design and implementation of policy can be overcome by the joint utilization of resources. Therefore, the normative mechanism built in this organization is a mechanism that is built and agreed upon together. Furthermore, another important element of the institution is the cultural-cognitive system. This system includes common beliefs and shared logic of action. This system shows that collaborative organizations require common beliefs and shared logic of action for all stakeholders in designing and implementing a public policy (Scott, 2001). This is important because this organization has a variety of stakeholders and faces complex problems both at the level of policy determination and implementation.

4. RESEARCH METHOD SETTING

Food security policy is a policy that maintains the sustainability of food availability, distribution, and consumption. This policy is a top-down approach that places local government only as of the implementer of this policy. The local government prepares the main infrastructure of this policy, namely the farmer group as a farmer-based institution that will be the main focus or target group of this policy. Determination of Bone Regency as a case in implementing the policy because it is one of the food storage areas in Indonesia which is considered ineffective in implementing this policy. Based on the Performance Report of the Food Security Agency, 2019, Bone Regency has a score of 77, 17 which is ranked 12th at the level of South Sulawesi Province and ranked 116th at the national level.

5. RESEARCH DESIGN AND STRATEGY

The research design used is a qualitative approach and the research strategy used is a case study. Use this research design and strategy to uncover and explain the values, norms, and collaborative processes in the implementation network of food security policy.

6. INFORMANTS

To understand this collaboration process, information is needed from informants, namely: a) the Food Security Council; b) Food Security Task Force; c) Government Agencies relating food; d) Food counselors and facilitators; e) Farmers and farmer groups; f) village head; g) Farming community leaders.

7. DATA COLLECTION TECHNIQUES

Data collection techniques include in-depth interviews, focused group discussions (FGD), and documentation. In-depth interviews were aimed at all 25 officials, village heads, and community leaders. Furthermore, the FGD focused on 10 farmer groups, totaling 30 people. Documentation in the form of official reports relating to food security.

8. DATA PROCESSING AND ANALYSIS TECHNIQUES

The data analysis technique used in this study is the pattern matching technique (Yin, 2000). The pattern used as the basis of this study is a theoretical pattern, namely strengthening local collaborative institutions that can improve the performance of policy implementation. This institutional strengthening includes cognitive, normative, and regulative systems.

9. RESULT AND DISCUSSIONS

9.1. Implementation of Food Security Policy in Indonesia

The government holds a very important role in realizing Food Security in Indonesia. This role is done through policies that are top-down approaches. This policy is based on the mandate of the Food Security Act No. 18 of 2012 that states are obliged to realize the availability, affordability, fulfillment of food consumption that is sufficient, safe, quality, and balanced nutrition, both at the national and regional level to individuals evenly throughout the territory of the Republic of the Unitary Republic Indonesia all the time by utilizing local resources, institutions and culture. In line with the mandate of the food law, the 2015-2019 Medium-term Development Plan (RPJMN) prioritizes increasing food sovereignty as one of the priority sub-agendas to realize the national development agenda, namely economic independence by moving the strategic sectors of the domestic economy. In an effort to increase and strengthen food sovereignty, the general policy in the 2015-2019 Medium-Term Development Plan (RPJM) is directed at 1).

Strengthening food security towards food self-sufficiency by increasing the production of staple food; 2). Food price stabilization; 3). Improved quality of food consumption and community nutrition; 4). Mitigation to improve the quality of food consumption and community nutrition, and 5). Increasing the welfare of food businesses. The Medium-Term Development Plan is then outlined in the Annual Food Security Agency's Annual Performance Plan. In accordance with its duties and functions in 2015-2019, the Food Security Agency implements the Community Diversity and Food Security Improvement Program. The program is implemented with three (3) main activities, namely a). Development of distribution systems and price stability; b). Development of availability and handling of food insecurity; and c). Development of diversified food consumption and increased fresh food safety. This effort certainly requires a large cost to finance various programs for Increasing diversification and community food security in Indonesia. This can be shown in table 1 below.

Table 1 Food Security Policy in Indonesia

Year	Programs	Cost (IDR)
2017	Development of distribution systems and food price stability	157,980,000,000
	Development of availability and handling of food insecurity	137,480,000,000
	Development of diversified food consumption and increased fresh food safety	67,670,000,000
2018	Development of distribution systems and food price stability	247.518.291.919
	Development of availability and handling of food insecurity	88.440.988.766
	Development of diversified food consumption and increased fresh food safety	170.787.817.142
2019	Development of distribution systems and food price stability	112.199.664.692
	Development of availability and handling of food insecurity	11.567.165.516
	Development of diversified food consumption and increased fresh food safety	116.184.812.703
	Total	775.112.392.738

Source: Performance Report of the Food Security Agency, (the Year 2017 - 2019)

Based on table 1 above shows that the government's efforts in the form of policy to increase and strengthen the diversification and food security of the community should be appreciated. These various development programs have cost a lot, around IDR 775,112,392.738 for 3 years (2017 - 2019). This shows the enthusiasm of the government to increase and strengthen the diversification and food security of the community is very large, but at the level of implementation has not shown a step-up in food productivity, as shown in Table 2 below.

Table 2 Land Area, Production, and Food Productivity (Rice) in Indonesia

Year	Land Area (Ha)	Production (Ton)	Productivity (Ku/Ha)
2014	13,797	70,846	51.35
2015	14,117	75,398	53.41
2016	15,156	79,355	52.36
2017	15,712	81,149	51.65
2018	15,995	83,037	51.92

Source: Center for Agricultural Data and Information Systems, Secretariat General Ministry of Agriculture, 2019

Based on table 1 above, it turns out that food security policy does not contribute significantly to increasing food productivity in Indonesia. This can be demonstrated during the period of implementation of this policy, - from 2014 to 2018, food productivity growth was very volatile and it tended to decline. However, various programs and activities have designed for developing food security programs. This can be shown to be a spectacular increase in grants compared to previous years (see table 1 above). This is caused by the ineffectiveness coordination of the stakeholders in the implementation of this policy (Novayanti, Alwi, & Gita, 2020). This also shows the complexity in the implementation of public policy, so that the objectives are difficult to realize. This phenomenon shows the food security policy which aims to increase food production but the design of this policy is only carried out by the Central Government without involving street-level bureaucracy as a policy implementer. The same thing policymakers never interact and discuss with farmers as target groups and especially farmer groups as collaborative organizations as implementers at the street level.

This shows that public problems and needs are not easily identified and even tend to be wicked problems (Robert, 2000; Klijn, 2008; Head & Alford, 2015; & Termeer et.al, 2015). Therefore, there needs to be together and synergy between stakeholders so that the above problems do not occur. Togetherness and synergy between stakeholders in the determination and implementation of policy can take place if they are in an organization based on collaboration so that all actions that take place are joint efforts and collaborative actions (Klijn, 2008; Ansell and Gash, 2007). This is necessary because stakeholders have varied interests. Traders and entrepreneurs have an interest in making as much profit as possible. Farmers and farmer groups are trying to obtain quality seeds and high-quality agricultural technology and equipment. The facilitator tries to change the behavior of the farmer groups. The government always hopes that policy performance can be achieved.

The phenomenon of a drastic increase in the budget for this policy and at the same time there is a decline in food production. This shows that policy implementation is a complex process, not just carrying out political will, but it is becoming a process that determines the performance of a policy. It also shows the urgency of implementation so Goggin et.al (1990) called it the implementation era. In this case, implementation can no longer be seen as a simple process, but rather as a complex process, because a policy implemented at different times will produce different performance, so also at different places will produce different performance.

To understand more deeply the role of farmer groups as implementing institutions for food security policy in Bone Regency, as one of the main food production in Indonesia, then this can be explained below.

10. LOCAL COLLABORATIVE INSTITUTIONS: CASE STUDY OF THE ROLE OF FARMER GROUPS AS IMPLEMENTERS OF THE FOOD SECURITY POLICY IN BONE REGENCY, INDONESIA

In this study, farmer groups are identified as local collaborative institutions that act as a driver for increasing food security. It is said that because it is a forum for stakeholders to discuss and simultaneously implement various programs to improve food security. In this case, it is a policy implementing institutions to improve food security at street level. As an institution, it certainly has collaborative-based organizational values, norms, and culture that can unite stakeholders' interests to improve it. This is described in detail below.

Cognitive System in the Implementation of Food Security Policy

One important component of an institution is the cognitive system. This system shows the institutional framework for action, which includes common beliefs and share the logic of action. Common beliefs show the trust shared by stakeholders. In this case, they believe that farmer groups as collaborative institutions will lead them to achieve this policy performance. There is such a belief encouraging them to hold meetings and mutual cooperation (share logic actions) to design and implement completing joint programs. This can be shown in table 3 below.

Table 3 Cognitive System in the Implementation of Food Security Policy through Community Food Business Development

Stakeholders	Common Beliefs	Share logic of action
Farmers Group	Get financial assistance	Meeting, Mutual cooperation
Government: Food Security Agency	Implementation of food security programs	Provision of resources in the form of budgets, assistants and production facilities
Government: Field Facilitator	Implementation of food security programs	Providing guidance and assistance to farmer groups, composite of farmer groups, and farmer women's groups
Government: Head of Village	Implementation of food security programs	Fostering and coordinating farmer groups, composite of farmer groups, and farmer women's groups

Sumber: Data Reduction, 2019

Based on table 3 above, stakeholders have a common belief and share the logic of actions that is different from the others. Organized groups such as farmer groups, composite of farmer groups, and farmer women's groups have the confidence to always get financial assistance from the government. This shows that farmers are only to hunt or get help from the government so that many farmers have more than one group of farmers on crops that are the national and regional superior or priority.

Furthermore, group meetings and mutual cooperation are shared logic of actions of farmer groups as a local collaborative organization. In general, meetings were held once a month and included meetings that discussed funding from the government. The mutual cooperation

activities of the members of the farmer groups are carried out in 1) clearing the land of sustainable food houses, rice fields, and plantations; 2) pest and disease control. This mutual cooperation activity is a form

of joint action generally carried out once a year in rotation on each farm and plantation group members.

Governments at various levels have the same common belief, namely the implementation of food security policy, but share different logic of actions, because they have different functions. In implementing this policy, the government as a provider of resources that includes funds and skills to support these programs and activities. Specifically, for the Bone Regency Government, after receiving assistance from the central government, he also provided funds for the "Food Diversification" program. This program is a form of local government's commitment to the development of food security programs.

This phenomenon shows that farmers are very dependent on financial assistance from the government. The same thing also shows they do not devote their time and energy to certain potential food crops so that the results they get are not optimal. If traced to its origin, the formation of farmer groups in Indonesia is only intended to get financial assistance from the government, because the assistance program is only given to farmers who have a group. Until now this kind of mindset still dominates the minds of farmers, so that when assistance stops, group activities for business development will also stop.

Resource assistance to farmers included in the food security policy implementation scheme turned out not to be the power to solve problems and meet their needs, but only to weaken their creativity into a fund mindset. This shows that farmer groups as implementing institutions do not yet have a cognitive system that is able to change the mindset oriented fund into creative and strategic thinking oriented in the implementation of this program. The existence of a group is a symbol for local collaborative institutions that show various collaborative activities for the implementation of community food security policy. However, the symbol of this institution has not shown common beliefs and shared logic of actions of the stakeholders, so that the performance of this policy as an effort to increase food security has not been achieved.

11. NORMATIVE SYSTEM IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF FOOD SECURITY POLICY

The normative system is one of the dimensions of the institution. This dimension consists of values and norms. Value is the main goal to be achieved, while the norm is an effort to achieve this main goal. The main goal of this policy is to increase food productivity. Then, efforts to achieve this value, farmer groups are the "tools" of this policy that are identified as a local collaborative institution seeking to manage interdependence among stakeholders so that the implementation of the policies and programs is effective. As an inseparable part of this policy, resources become important as a support for the implementation of this policy. Resources identified here are assistance both quantity and quality of farmer assistants. The amount of assistance issued by the central government to support this policy activity through the community food security program in Bone Regency was IDR 481,334 million in the period 2016 - 2018 (Source: processed based on statistical data of the Agriculture Agency, Bone Regency, 2019). Furthermore, in addition to agricultural technology assistance that is provided farmer groups, other infrastructure facilities are also provided.

An institution is able to survive because it has a normative mechanism which on the one hand provides limits on social behavior and on the other hand can empower and enable actions that lead to the achievement of values (Scoot, 2001). Local collaborative institutions have not demonstrated a normative mechanism that can encourage the independence of a farmer group, especially innovative collaborative programs. This is caused by the formation of farmer groups

not based on awareness of togetherness to complete work, but to obtain financial assistance from the government and until now it has become a fund mindset oriented.

Local collaborative institutions are identified as "tools" for solving complex problems and implementing multi-stakeholder policy (Isett, 2011; Klijn, 2008; O'Toole, Jr., 2005; and O'Toole, Jr. & Montjoy, 1984) it turns out that this institution is not able to achieve the value that is expected, namely increasing food productivity. This happens because the existing norms do not provide "innovative space" to achieve this value. This can be demonstrated during the Diversification and Food Security Program (2016 - 2018) that there are no farmer groups that have designed innovative methods or methods in managing agricultural and plantation land that can increase food productivity in this region. As the implementer of this policy, the local collaborative institution has not yet developed a normative mechanism that can meet the needs of the farming community as a target group for this policy. This happens because in addition to not yet developing innovative methods in managing agricultural and plantation land, also the spirit and work of mutual cooperation are no longer dominant in solving joint problems and carrying out collaborative activities.

12. REGULATIVE SYSTEM IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF FOOD SECURITY POLICY

The regulative system is one important element of the institution. This system is a guideline for network members to behave. In this case, it regulates what should and should not be done in the context of achieving value, namely increasing the productivity of food crops. To achieve this value, the government created programs including, food diversification and sustainable community food security programs. Diversification and community food security programs apply several rules where each farmer who wants to get help must first form a group with other farmers. After that, he was given assistance based on a scheme of assistance that had been set by the government, namely increased skills, assistance in agricultural technology equipment or other infrastructure. During the implementation of this policy, each group is only allowed one time to get help. According to resource providers (government), the assistance provided to farmers through groups is a trigger for them to sustain food security. But for farmers, this is not the case, because they always demand help from the government.

As is usual in empowerment programs that provide facilitators, this program is also like that called the Extension Team or Facilitator. They assist farmers through farmer groups. They were assisted during the program, but the facilitators were still inadequate in terms of both quantity and quality. There are still many of them who do not yet possess the skills for certain food crops. This shows that the existing regulatory system in farmer groups still uses a top-down approach. In this case, the applicable regulations all come from the government as a provider of input resources for food

security. However, sanctions for those who violate and rewards for those who comply or those who excel are not yet clear, so the increase in productivity of food commodities is also unclear. To achieve value, the regulatory system that needs to be developed in a local collaborative institution is that regulations need to be built and agreed upon among all stakeholders both rewards and punishments. Togetherness in this system will be able to provide motivation for members of farmer groups to achieve rewards, because someone will tend to carry out an activity if it provides value for himself, as the value proposition of Homans (Ritzer & Goodman, 2004). Rules and sanctions impose limits and influence the behavior of institutional members.

13. CONCLUSION

To improve the performance of the public policy, the local collaborative institution becomes important because in addition to being part of the policy implementer it is also an institution that can bind all stakeholders. This institution can eliminate competing and contradictory interests, so that all stakeholders direct their resources to improve policy performance. The implementation of this policy has not been effective because local collaboration institution do not yet have mechanisms or institutional systems that can encourage increased crop productivity. The cognitive system of this institution is still dominated by funds mindset oriented. The normative system is still dominated by the government as a provider of resources and does not make resource sharing effective among stakeholders. Then, the regulative system still has a top-down approach so that it has not become binding for all stakeholders to improve the performance of this policy. Therefore, strengthening local collaborative institution becomes an important choice for the performance of public policy.

REFERENCES

- [1] Agranoff, Robert (2012) *Collaborating to Manage: A Primer for the Public Sector*, Georgetown University Press, Washington, D.C.
- [2] Agranoff, Robert and McGuire, Michael (2003) *Collaborative Public Decision Management: New Strategies for Local Government*, Georgetown University Press, Washington, D.C.
- [3] Anggraeny, A. S. . (2020). The Effect of Implementing the Financial Management Information System on the Quality of the Presentation of the Pangkep Regency Government's Financial Statements. *Journal of Advanced Research in Economics and Administrative Sciences*, 1(1), 32-44. <https://doi.org/10.47631/jareas.v1i1.17>
- [4] Ansell, Chris and Gash, Alison (2007) 'Collaborative Governance in Theory and Practice', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. JPART 18.pp.543–571.
- [5] Alwi, Aslinda, & Susanti, Gita, 2019. Cross-Sector Collaboration and Public Policy Accountability: implementation network of food security policy in Bone Regency. Proceeding IAPA, pp. 88-103.
- [6] Head, Brian W. & Alford, John (2015) 'Wicked Problems: Implications for Public Policy and Management', *Administration & Society*. Vol. 47(6) 711–739.
- [7] Goenadi, Didi H. (2005) *Prospek dan Arah Pengembangan Agribisnis Kakao di Indonesia*, Badan Penelitian dan Pengembangan Pertanian, Departemen Pertanian. Jakarta.
- [8] Golgsmith, Stephen and Eggers, William D. (2004) *Governing by Network: The New Shape of the Public Sector*, The Brookings Institution, Washington D.C.
- [9] Gulati, Ranjay, and Gargiulo, Martin (1998) *Where Do Interorganizational Networks Come From?*
- [10] <<http://www.ranjaygulati.com/new/research/interorg.pdf>> (Accessed 3/30/2004).
- [11] Innes, Judith E. & Booher, David E., (2010) *Planning with Complexity: An Introduction to Collaborative Rationality for Public Policy*, Routledge, New York.
- [12] Isett, Kimberley R. Et.al, (2011) 'Network in Public Administration Scholarship: Understanding Where We Are and Where We Need to Go', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, JPART 21.pp. i157–i173.
- [13] Jaffee, David (2001) *Organization Theory: Tension and Change*, McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc., New York.
- [14] Jones, Charles O. (1984) *An Introduction to the Study of Public Policy*, (3rd Edition), Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, California.
- [15] Jones, Gareth R. (2004) *Organizational Theory, Design, and Change: Text and Cases*, Pearson Education, Inc., Upper Saddle River, New Jersey, USA.

- [16] Linden, Russel M. (2002) *Working Across Boundaries: Making Collaboration Work in Government and Non-profit Organization*, Jossey-Bass, USA.
- [17] Manzel, Donald C, (1987) 'An Interorganizational Approach to Policy Implementation, *Public Administrative Quarterly* (1986 – 1998). Spring 1987. 11,1. ABI/ INFORM Complete.
- [18] Klijn, E.H. (2008), Networks as Perspective on Policy and Implementation in: S.Cropper, M. Ebers,
- [19] C. Huxham, P. Ring (2008), *Handbook of Inter-Organizational Relations*, Oxford: Oxford University Press: 118-146.
- [20] Miles, Matthew B. and Huberman, A. Michael (1992) *Analisis Data Kualitatif*. UI-Press, Jakarta.
- [21] Narayan, Deepa (2002) *Empowerment and Property Reduction, A Sourcebook*. World Bank, Washington DC.
- [22] Neuman, W. Laurence (1997) *Social Research Methods, Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*, 3rd, Allyn and Bacon, USA.
- [23] O'leary, Rosemary; Gazley, Beth; McGuire, Michael; and Bingham, Lisa Blomgren (2009), Public Managers in Collaboration, In O'leary, Rosemary and Bingham, Lisa Blomgren (Editor), (2009), *The Collaborative Public Manager: New Ideas for the Twenty-First Century*, Georgetown University Press, Washington, D.C.
- [24] O'Toole, Jr, Laurence J., (2005) 'Interorganizational Relations in Implementation', In B Gay Peters & Jon Pierre. 2005. In *Handbook of Public Administration*, SAGE Publications Ltd, London.
- [25] O'Toole, Jr, Laurence J. and Montjoy, Robert S., (1984) 'Interorganizational Policy Implementation: A Theoretical Perspective', *Public Administration Review*. Vol. 44. No. 6. pp. 491–503.
- [26] Ritzer, George & Goodman, Douglas J. (2004) *Teori Sosiologi Modern*, Edisi VI, Prenada Media, Jakarta.
- [27] Roberge, Ian, Dunea, Dona M, and Williams, Russel Alan (2015) 'The Break-Up: Policy Network Structure and the Politics of Financial Service', *International Journal of Public Policy*, Vol.11, Nos. 1/2/3. 2015, pp. 1–15.
- [28] Romero, David and Molina, Arturo (2011) 'Collaborative Networked Organizations and Customer Communities: Value Co-Creation And Co-Innovation In The Networking Era' *Production Planning & Control*. Vol. 22, Nos. 5–6, July–September 2011, 447–472.
- [29] Roberts, Nancy (2000), *Wicked Problems and Network Approaches to Resolution*, In *International Public Management Review*. Vol. 1, Issue 1. – Electronic Journal <<http://www.ipmr.net>> (Accessed 10/18/2003).
- [30] Rukmana, NS., Alwi, & Susanti, Gita (2019). Complexity and public policy: Network model of food security policy implementation in Bone Regency. *Proceeding IAPA*. pp. 522-534
- [31] Scott, W. Richard. (2001) *Institution and Organizations* (2nd), Sage Publications Inc., USA.
- [32] Termeer, Cartrien, J.A.M., Dewulf, Art., Breeman, Gerard., & Stiller, Sabina J. (2015) 'Governance Capabilities for Dealing Wisely With Wicked Problems, *Administration & Society*, Vol. 47(6) 680 –710.
- [32] Yin, Robert K. (1989) *Case Study Research, Design and Methods*, (Revised Edition), Sage Publication, Inc., California.