

## Research Article

# Capacity Development of Food Institutions in the Regency of Timor Tengah Selatan

**Nursalam**

Faculty of Social and Political Science, University of Nusa Cendana

**ORCID**Nursalam: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0322-3923>**Abstract.**

One of the problems faced in efforts to increase local food production in Timor Tengah Selatan regency is that institutional performance is still low. Food institutions play an important role in facilitating and participating in efforts to increase food production. Empirical facts show that food institutions such as farmer groups, farmer groups associations, Karang Taruna, PKK groups, and instructors and companions' capacities have not been optimal in providing support for increasing food production in the Timor Tengah Selatan Regency. This research aims to find out the capacity of rural food institutions in Timor Tengah Selatan regency, using qualitative research methods. Research informants were determined purposively which included implementing policies at Food Security Service; village head; farmer group leader; Karang Taruna leader; leader of PKK groups, instructor/companion. Based on the results of the study, it is known that there are several aspects of institutional capacity that contribute to increasing food production in the regency of Timor Tengah Selatan, namely: (1) resources, (2) skills and knowledge, and (3) politics and power. In order for food institutions to function properly, it is necessary to have the active involvement of all food stakeholders to always empower existing food institutions in rural areas in Timor Tengah Selatan regency.

**Keywords:** institutional capacity, performance, food security, food production

Corresponding Author:

Nursalam; email:

[nursalamjeppu@yahoo.com](mailto:nursalamjeppu@yahoo.com)**Published** 21 June 2023Publishing services provided by  
Knowledge E

© Nursalam. This article is distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use and redistribution provided that the original author and source are credited.

Selection and Peer-review under the responsibility of the ICoGPASS Conference Committee.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The food institutions are one of the important aspects in increasing food production. Food institutions in rural areas or farmer institutions such as farmer groups, farmer groups associations, agricultural instructor. The rural agricultural agribusiness system recognizes an institutional system which is a supporting service subsystem, plays a role in the procurement of production facilities, farming, processing of agricultural products and marketing. Agribusiness will run well if there is no gap between supporting institutions and farming activities [1]. The participation of food institutions in increasing local food production in the Timor Tengah Selatan (TTS) regency will increase food production [2].

 OPEN ACCESS

Problems related to food institutions are related to capacity so that their role is not optimal in helping to increase rural food production. Institutional capacity is related to organizational resources, skills and knowledge of its members, organizational structure, policies and power within the organization, and incentives obtained by organizational members. The success in carrying out the tasks and functions of the organization is determined by the capacity of the organization in the assigned tasks and functions. The following data shows the performance of food institutions in TTS Regency.

TABLE 1: Village Food Security Improvement program.

No	Program	Target	Realization	Percentage
1	Village food barn	IDR.434.555.000	IDR.402.044.200	92,51
2	Self-sufficient	IDR.196.602.167	IDR.167.688.500	85,25
3	Yard utilization	IDR.432.764.500	IDR.401.312.400	92,82

Source: TTS District Food Security Agency

Based on the data above, the performance of food institutions is still not optimal. Capacity is the ability to use and access required resources and thus exceed the sole availability of these resources [3]. In addition, capacity is often rooted in resources that are endogenous to society and rely on traditional knowledge, indigenous skills and technologies and solidarity networks [4].

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

### 2.1. Capacity Concept

Capacity refers to the concept of individual competence and joint ability, competence includes skills, mindset, and individual motivation. Shared capability is the group’s ability to manage change and create a performance culture, coordinate action, and maintain political support [5]. The essence of the concept of capacity is; (a) commit and participate; (b) carry out tasks to achieve goals; (c) develop mutual relationships within the organization and outside the organization; (d) learn and adapt to environmental changes; and (e) managing the balance and dynamics of the organization. Based on the description above, organizational capacity is the overall ability of the organization including combining and organizing competencies and capabilities into the organization’s functional system. A system with capacity includes legitimacy, relevance, achievement of goals, organizational resilience, and sustainability.

Capacity refers to resources and assets people must endure, cope with, and recover from the shocks of the disasters they experience [6]. Capacity can be optimized when

the situation is under pressure, states that capacity can be mobilized during a crisis reflects a coping strategy [7]. The coping strategies refer to the ways in which people and organizations use available resources to achieve various beneficial goals during unusual or abnormal conditions.

## 2.2. Institutional Capacity

The institutional capacity is different from individual capacity (staff) so that it is applied to build capacity differently [8]. The lack of qualified staff greatly complicates organizational capacity building. The problems faced by public organizations are much more complicated than those of private organizations. Although private organizations do not always have the desired staff, they operate flexibly. Private organizations are always overwhelmed by rigidity in carrying out their duties. The local governance focuses on institutional changes [9]. The success of governance at the local level is closely related to the strength of institutional capacity. The following matrix shows the dimensions and indicators of institutional capacity.

TABLE 2: Village Food Security Improvement program.

1. Resource	- Quantity and Quality
	- Materials and Equipment
	- Micro Credit
	- Budget Support
2. Skills and Knowledge	- Trainings
	Formal Education
3. Politics and power	Organizational Management
	Organizational Innovation
	Institutional Empowerment
	Access to Banking institutions
	Relationship with Stakeholders
	Institutional participation in decision making

Organizational capacity provides a structural instrument as a means to achieve organizational strategic goals [10]. Organizations that have the capacity to be decisive in managing various organizational problems in the internal environment, while adapting to the development of the external environment are carried out. Organizational capacity is the key in organizational order, achieving goals and exercising power and authority. Organizational capacity refers to the organizing activities, processes and structures in which collective action occurs [11]. Institutional capacity involves concepts and material

instruments are conceptual instrumentation, a strategy assessment tool through innovative ideas and rules [12]. The key to organizational capacity is structural capacity, such as centralization, decentralization and structural arrangement. Organizational capacity is also related to the efficiency, effectiveness, and quality of shared and organizational behavior regulation.

### 2.3. Institutional Theory

Institutional is not only limited to official government organizations, but also concerns the third sector of the organization which shows the differences between public institutions and private institutions [13, 14]. Institutional perceive organizations are limited to social conceptions of the rules, roles, norms, expectations that limit individuals or groups to choose and behave.

## 3. METHODS

This study uses a qualitative research type [15], research focus on institutional capacity development, among others; resources, skills and knowledge, and politics and power. Meanwhile, the informants include the head of the farmer group, the chairman of the farmer group association, agricultural extension workers, food security officers in the TTS Regency.

### 3.1. Overview of Research Area

The condition of the TTS regency area that has links to the institutional development of farmer groups can be seen in table 2 below.

TABLE 3: The Condition of the TTS regency area.

No	Item	Fact	Data
1	Region Area	3.955 Km2	
2	Number of Districts	32	
3	Number of villages	266	
4	Revenue From Property Tax	IDR.4.330.934.314	94,20%
5	Rice Production	24.501 Ton	50,2 %
6	Maize Production	3.913.596 Ton	60,2 %

Source: TTS District Food Security Agency

Based on the data above, the production capacity of farmer groups ranges from 50.2% to 60.2% of the target that has been set. This indicates that the institutional capacity of farmer groups in implementing the program has not been maximized. Other activities that are directly carried out by farmer groups and farmer group associations are; (a) food self-sufficiency program; (b) the Village Barn Program; and yard utilization programs.

## 4. DISCUSSION

The institutional capacity development is an important aspect in improving the performance of an organization. The findings in the research on the capacity of food institutions are very important to improve the performance of food institutions in the rural areas of Timor Tengah Selatan Regency. The following is a description of the basic aspects of food institutions in increasing food production in the regency of Timor Tengah Selatan.

### 4.1. Organizational Resources

The rural food institutions studied were farmer groups, farmer groups association. Data quoted from the Food Security Service of TTS Regency, the number of farmer groups and association of farmer groups that are still active is 1,075 groups with 16,125 members. Formal education level of its members, which generally only graduated from Junior High School and the rest are graduated from Senior High School.

Meanwhile, in terms of equipment resources owned by this farmer group is very limited, in general they only have a secretariat or meeting place in the form of a lopo which is the wrong ownership of its members. Other equipment is very limited, for example, notice boards and loudspeakers and so on. Funding for the operational activities of farmer groups is sourced from membership fees. Contributions are very small and non-binding. They can carry out the program that has been planned, not apart from the assistance allocated by the government.

In addition to financial assistance from the government, the source of financing for the activities of farmer groups and farmer group associations is loan funds from banks, groups have sufficient access to loans. The policy on easy loans for farmer groups is a government decision because farmer groups are considered as the spearhead in increasing food security in rural areas.

Referring to the empirical conditions as stated above, institutional capacity is the main instrument to achieve organizational goals [16]. Organizations that have the capacity to manage various organizational problems and become a key factor in maintaining organizational authority and power. Organizational capacity is the basic capital so that organizations can carry out standard operating procedures, establish relationships with other organizations that have the same duties and functions, and resolve organizational problems.

Organizational capacity development focuses on efforts to increase the income of organizational members because increasing income becomes motivation for organizational members [17]. Organizational performance will increase when members work well, have good responsibilities, work in hierarchies, structured rules and procedures [18].

## 4.2. Skills and Knowledge

Organizational strengthening through training activities is the most efficient way to develop capacity, it is assumed that the constraints that bind performance achievement can be handled effectively by the ability of members. Organizational members are organizational machines in achieving goals, therefore they should be equipped with adequate competencies so that their duties and functions can be carried out properly.

In addition, the organization and its trained members do not work in a vacuum; their ability to carry out assigned responsibilities is strongly influenced by the wider context in which they operate. Diagnosis at the organizational level factors that affect ability are economic, social, and political. Despite the importance of broader contextual settings for organizational activities, a large number of capacity building efforts are designed without considering these environmental factors.

The capacity development should be reflected in the organization, members of the organization must be able to carry out their responsibilities [19]. Interventions designed to improve organizational performance focus on improving systems for accomplishing specific tasks, introducing new technologies, increasing incentives for personnel, and strengthening accountability and control mechanisms. Most organizations that perform well are those that have a culture that emphasizes flexibility, problem solving, participation, teamwork, shared professional norms, and a strong organization [20].

### 4.3. Politics and Power

Capacity is the ability to perform tasks effectively, efficiently and sustainably. In turn, capacity building refers to increasing the ability of an organization, either singly or in collaboration with other organizations, to perform appropriate tasks. Capacity in the field of politics and power is the ability possessed by the Institution to be involved and have access in making decisions related to the interests of the Institution.

The political capacity and power of the institution is influenced by several dimensions, namely; (a) the economic, social and political environment of action; (b) the institutional context of the public sector; (c) task network; (d) organizational conditions; (e) availability of educated human resources. In fact, the obstacles that arise in capacity building are at the organizational level. Organizational structures, processes, resources and management styles influence how they set goals, structure work, define authority relationships, and provide incentive structures.

These factors drive and restrict of performance because they affect organizational output and shape the behavior of the people who work in it [21]. Meanwhile, in the context of public sector institutions, which include the rules and procedures established for the operation of the government and public officials, the financial resources owned by the government, and responsibilities do not appear to affect the politics and power of the organization.

## 5. CONCLUSIONS

In the public sector, organizational capacity has been broadly defined as the ability to organize, develop, direct, and control its financial, human, infrastructure and information resources, while in the nonprofit sector capacity is defined as a set of management practices, processes, or attributes that help organizations fulfill its mission.

The concept of capacity has been used to describe both goals and ways to achieve goals, some experts define the perspective that capacity includes qualities that hinder or encourage the achievement of organizational goals. Capacity is a broad concept, covering how to run the engine of organizational systems, carry out organizational decisions, and translate political and collective will into action through implementation. Capacity requires developing and providing services for the maintenance of systems and the provision of security and order in the organization.

In fact, the development of food institutional capacity in Timor Tengah Selatan district has not been maximally carried out, the indicators assessed such as the resources

possessed, the skills and knowledge of its members, and the politics and power of the organization in interacting with its environment are still in the low quality category.

## References

- [1] Indrayati S. Peran Performa Kelembagaan Tani Terhadap Pengembangan Subsystem Agribisnis Hilir di Kota Metro. *Journal of Food System dab. Agribusiness*. 2019;2:83–93.
- [2] Nursalam. Bun'yana Saleh, 2020, Partisipasi kelembagaan pangan Pedesaan Dalam Meningkatkan Ketahanan Pangan di Kabupaten Timor Tengah Selatan. *Jurnal Administrasi Publik*. Oktober 2020;16(1).
- [3] Kuban R, MacKenzie-Carey H. Community-wide vulnerability and capacity assessment (CVCA). Office of Critical Infrastructure Protection and Emergency: Preparedness: Ottawa. 2001.
- [4] Gaillard JC. Vulnerability, capacity and resilience: Perspectives for climate and development policy. *J Int Dev*. 2010;22(2):218–232.
- [5] Morgan PJ, Baser H, Morin D. Developing capacity for managing public service Reform: the Tanzania experience 2000-2008. *Public Adm Dev*. 2010;30(1):27–37.
- [6] Davis I, Haghebeart B, Peppiatt D. Social vulnerability and capacity analysis. Discussion Paper and Workshop Report, Pro Vention Consortium, Geneva. 2004.
- [7] Brinkerhoff DW. Developing capacity in fragile states. *Public Adm Dev*. 2010;30(1):66–78.
- [8] Bremer JA. Building institutional capacity for policy analysis: An alternative approach to sustainability. *Public Adm Dev*. 1984;4(1):1–13.
- [9] Gibbs DC, Jonas AEG, Reimer S, Spooner DJ. Governance, institutional capacity and partnership in local economic development: Theoretical issues and empirical evidence from the Humber Sub-Region, Royal Geographical Society, ISSN 0020-2754.
- [10] Farazmand A. Building administrative capacity for the age of rapid globalization: A modes prescription for the twenty-first century. *Public Adm Rev*. 2009;69(6):1007–1020.
- [11] Waldo D. *The enterprise of public administration: A summary view*. Novato (CA): Chandler & Sharp; 1992.
- [12] Farazmand A. Building administrative capacity for the age of rapid globalization: A modes prescription for the twenty-first century. *Public Adm Rev*. 2009;69(6):1007–1020.



- [13] Kettl DF. Managing boundaries in american administration: The collaboration imperative [Special issue]. *Public Adm Rev.* 2006;66 s1:10–19.
- [14] Salamon L. *Beyond privatization: The task of government action.* Washintong (DC): Urban Institute Press; 1989.
- [15] Creswell JW. *Research design qualitative and quantitative approach.* New Delhi, California, UK: Sage-Publication; 1994.
- [16] Farazmand A. Building administrative capacity for the age of rapid globalization: A modes prescription for the twenty-first century. *Public Adm Rev.* 2009;69(6):1007–1020.
- [17] Lindaeur DL, Nunberg B. *Rehabilitating government: Pay and employment reform in Africa.* Washington (DC): World Bank;<https://doi.org/10.1596/0-8213-3000-4>
- [18] Grindle MS, Hilderbrand ME. Building sustainable capacity in public sector: What can be done? *Public Adm Dev.* 1995;15(5):441–463.
- [19] Klitgaard R. *Institutional adjustment and adjusting to institutions,* Office of Director-General for Operation and Evaluation, World Bank. 1995.
- [20] Atkinson R. Discourses of partnership and empowerment in contemporary British Urban Regeneration. *Urban Stud.* 1999;36(1):59–72.
- [21] Grindle MS, Hilderbrand ME. Building sustainable capacity in public sector: What can be done? *Public Adm Dev.* 1995;15(5):441–463.