

**Research Article**

# Bureaucratic Challenges in the Implementation Network of Food Diversification Policy in Indonesia

Alwi<sup>1\*</sup>, Gita Susanti<sup>1</sup> and Novayanti Sopia<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Hasanuddin university, Jl. Perintis Kemerdekaan KM.10, Tamalanrea, Makassar City 90245, South Sulawesi Province, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup>Universitas Negeri Makassar. Jl. AP Pettarani, Makassar City 90222, South Sulawesi Province, Indonesia.

**Abstract.**

Network governance is an approach that can be used to overcome wicked problems and eliminate the main challenges of the bureaucracy, in the form of limited resources and strict regulations, in the delivery of public services and policies that involve multi-stakeholders. This study aims to explain the effectiveness of stakeholder interactions in the Food Security Council as a network governance mechanism. This study uses a qualitative design and a case study strategy to explain the challenges of bureaucracy in this policy. The data processing technique used is data reduction through data categorization and classification. Then, the pattern matching analysis technique is the theoretical pattern of the effectiveness of network governance. The results showed that the implementation of the food diversification policy was not yet effective. It can be showed that they do not try to build a collaborative food diversification program as a solution program for food problems. This is due to the lack of understanding of this mechanism, the lack of trust among them, many members and varying interests, unclear consensus network goals, and this mechanism is still weak in coordinating and facilitating interdependent action.

**Keywords:** Food diversification; policy; regulations; public services

Corresponding Author: Alwi;  
 email: alwifisip@gmail.com

**Published** 03 March 2023

Publishing services provided by  
**Knowledge E**

© Alwi et al. 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 PVJ-ISHESSH 2021 Conference Committee.

## 1. Introduction

The bureaucracy is formed by the government for certain interests, including implementation of a policy and public services purpose[1]. In this case, the bureaucracy becomes a tool utilized by the government to implement policies or programs that have been formulated. In the implementation process, the bureaucracy is dealing with environmental changes that are very fast and uncertain, and difficult to predict[2]. Along with this, solving problem and meeting public needs have become dynamic and increasingly complex. On the other hand, the bureaucracy has obstacles and limitations in the delivery of public services and policies. The main obstacle, in this case, is that the bureaucratic system is a rigid system due to strict and hierarchical

 **OPEN ACCESS**

rules[3] and the existence of limited resources. This is a challenge for the bureaucracy in networks between organizations both inside and outside the government to design and implement collaborative programs. The network perspective of policy implementation becomes a necessity to improve the performance of a policy because this perspective allows eliminating resource dependence and the complexity of interactions between stakeholders [4]–[6].

A network-based policy implementation mechanism is needed to manage the interaction of stakeholders with different interests. Such a mechanism is called network governance[6], [7]. The network governance approach allows the bureaucracy to get out of the challenge of facing a bureaucratic governance impasse which is subject to strict regulations because it is outside the system. This approach can be used to solve complex public problems and the delivery of public services and policies that have varied and even contradicting stakeholders.

Food diversification is one of the focused policy of the present study. This policy aims for the fulfilment of nutritious, safe, and balanced family food. It has not been effectively implemented indicated by hunger that is still a serious problem in Indonesia. *The number of hunger from the Global Hunger Index (GHI) data, 2019*, of hunger rate in Indonesia is categorized as serious. Of the 117 countries, Indonesia is ranked 70th with a score of 20.1%. This shows that this policy has not succeeded in empowering the Women Farmers Group (KWT) as the target group for this policy. Therefore, this study focuses on the effectiveness of stakeholder interaction in the Food Security Council as a network governance mechanism.

Public policy is a product of interaction process between political actors, while the implementation of public policy is an administrative task. This shows that policy implementation is a simple process to realize policy objectives. However, along with the increasingly dynamic and varied demands and needs of the public, it is a complex matter. If policies are implemented at the same time but in different places, it will result to different policy performance. It likewise occurs at the same place and different times [8]. The dynamics and complexity of the interests of a policy target group demand policy implementers to accommodate all stakeholders in the policy implementation process. Therefore, a network approach in policy implementation is inevitable for achieving multi-stakeholder policy performance. So that the public tendency to wick problems is no longer possible problem to be resolved by individual organisation but synergy between stakeholders[4], [5], [9].

This shows the bureaucratic governance that promotes the use of traditional methods in service delivery and public policy because it is not neutral in their policy preferences,

nor it is fully controlled by any outside forces[1]. As a tool, it runs what is the desire of the government and often becomes an instrument of domination of the authorities to maintain power. Based on this, bureaucratic governance will find it difficult to implement a public policy that has many stakeholders because it is difficult to interact with the agency outside government without being constituted by clear rules. Cooperation and coordination of inter-agency within the government will work effectively because it is supported by clear mechanisms and procedures. Such policy implementation would be a challenge for the bureaucracy to achieve the performance of the policy because it does not have a network with other stakeholders.

The implementation process of the policy can no longer be viewed as a form of completion of the process of policy formulation, but it is a complex process. Complexity can be seen from the process that involves many stakeholders, which is where their interests are often competing and even contradicting. This leads to bureaucratic problem adapting to the condition as it was in policy implementation. It is always confronted with strict regulations and focused on routine work that aggravates the program implementation that involves inter-agencies.

The study of network governance, including [10] the theory of network governance is the result of the integration of transaction cost economy and social network theory. This study gave birth to a general theory of network governance and the social condition explains the exchange mechanism that has not been outlined by experts in this field. The present study focuses on network effectiveness to overcome the bureaucratic deadlock for the implementation of the multi-stakeholder policy. According to [7] "network effectiveness is defined here as the attainment of positive network-level outcomes that could not normally be achieved by individual organization members acting independently." This represents a public policy that has many stakeholders that will be unable to achieve its objectives effectively through the mechanism of network governance. The effectiveness of network governance is determined by four factors, namely trust, size, goal consensus, and the nature of the task [7].

Trust as one of the factors influencing the effectiveness of network governance has an important role in the mutual understanding of differences of interests and behaviour among the member of the network. the role of trust is an important dimension for building better inter-organizational relationships, the creation of information exchange, awareness, and mutual support in meeting organizational resources, financial needs, and reducing conflict within the organization [6]. Every actor involved in network organizations has strategic resources in solving problem [11]. The existence of trust among the members of the network will foster a commitment to them as a condition for the design

and implementation of collaborative programs [12]. It is a strong foundation for them to build relationships (dyadic relations) so that trusts will be strong at the governance network level [7]. Besides, the number of members' network (size) determines the effectiveness of network governance. The less the actors involved, the more effective of the policy implementation will be, and vice versa. The implementation of public policy has many stakeholders in which they have interests that differ from one another. Similarly, those inside and outside the government, so the interests are very varied.

Network goal consensus is one of the factors that influence the effectiveness of network governance. Their consensus on the goal of a network-based organization will facilitate the achievement of the goals of this organization. The aim is the direction and the main indicator that determines the success or failure of an organization. However, when the hostility takes place due to sharp differences of interests then this goal will be difficult to achieve. Consensus towards a high goal will enable the network of participants to build commitment and make it easier for them to build unity to achieve the objectives of this organization. Need for Network-Level Competencies (NAO) is one of the factors determining the success of network governance. Organization-based network requires different competencies with individual organization. Internally, these organizations require high competence in facilitating interdependent action to coordinate and network their members. Then, externally, it would face the roles of buffering, or protecting the network from environmental shocks such as shifts in funding or new regulations, and bridging, roommates might include the roles of lobbying, seeking out new members, acquiring funding, building external legitimacy, and so on [7].

## 2. Methods

Food diversification policy is one of the policies that support food security in Indonesia. This policy is designed by the central government and implemented by the local government in stages. The central government provides financial resources to cover all the operational implementation of this policy. Bone Regency is one of the national food storage areas, but it has not been successful in implementing food diversification policy. This can be seen in 2018 that it was ranked 166 with a score of 77.17 out of 412 regencies in Indonesia. The same thing this region ranks 10 out of 24 regencies in South Sulawesi province.

This study used a qualitative design and strategy case study to explain the bureaucratic challenges in food diversification policy implementation network in Indonesia.

Data collection techniques used were observation, interview, and documentation. In-depth interviews addressed to the informant that includes a) the Chairman of GAPOK-TAN; b) district extension team; c) District extension team; d) Head and staff of the Food Security Service; e) Head and staff of the Department of Agriculture. The data processing technique used is data reduction through data categorization and classification. Then, the pattern matching analysis technique [13], where the pattern that becomes the reference is the theoretical pattern of the effectiveness of network governance, namely trust, size, goal consensus, and the nature of the task.

### 3. Results and Discussion

Food diversification is the diversification of food consumption that aims not to replace the rice fully, but to change and improve consumption patterns so that more diverse in terms of both the type and quality of nutrition. To measure the level of success of the policy of food diversification consumption can be seen from the achievement Hope Dietary Pattern (PPH). Food consumption patterns show the tendency that is less diverse than the type of food and nutritional balance. Based on the data from the Food Security in 2017, consumption patterns indicate that the rice still dominates the menu portion of consumption up to 60% which is ideally a maximum level of rice consumption by 50% so that people can live healthier, active, and productive. If compared to the level of rice consumption in other Asian countries, rice consumption level of Indonesian society is high at 139.15 kg per capita/year, while the world average rice consumption is only 60 kg/year. The data of the report Dietary Pattern Hope Bone regency in 2019 show that the grains food group still dominates the pattern of food consumption of Bone regency when compared to other types of food which is by 27.0 PPH Score, this figure is still high of a score of national PPH that is 25.0. This means that the implementation of food diversification program has not been successful, even though this area is the national food which is rich with various kinds of other food. In this case, DKP identified as network governance in present study has not effectively implemented this policy. It is caused by a trust, a number of members, goal consensus, and need for network Level Competencies [7].

#### 3.1. Trust

Trust in the network organization is described by their willingness to cooperate among other stakeholders. Confidence in the other actor is to believe that other actors will

not perform opportunistic behaviour even if the opportunity was there[14][15]. Food Security Council (DKP) of Bone regency involves many stakeholders. Some of them are the Department of Food Security, Agriculture, Health, Industry and Trade, Department of Public Works and the Department of Industry and Trade. Food diversification policy, which is one of the programs involves the Women Farmers Group DKP (KWT) as the target group. KWT utilizes yard to meet the needs of the family nutritious food, safe and balanced as well as helpful in terms of the family economy. DKP as a network organization has not done regular meetings to discuss food issues. The absence of regular meetings conducted by stakeholders led to the lack of a collaborative program generated together. Each department's own program is run by itself so that there is no sharing activity that happens. It is caused by low levels of trust between the actors that exist in the Food Security Council, whereas Trust in the network organization is important to tackle the problem more complex, because their trust will facilitate decision making at-risk[15]–[17].

### 3.2. Number of participants

The main characteristic of the network organization is their involvement in designing and implementing a collaborative programs. A slightly large number of stakeholders involved will influence the level of effectiveness of the network organization. It is caused by a fundamental problem in this organization, the needs, activities and interests of all actors in this organization to be accommodated and coordinated by the organization's own network[7]. From different activities and the needs and interests must be accommodated which is what makes organizations increasingly complex networks. Bone Regency Food Security Council involved multi-agency with their respective roles. Each agency involved in the DKP has different roles and different interests. Here is the role of each agency in the District DKP Bone.

In general, stakeholders are obliged to formulate and implement policies related to food security following the construction sector. Food security policy implementation by the Food Security Council in Bone regency is still not effective. This is caused by DKP Bone regency so far still involves only government agencies as implementer in food security policy and not involving stakeholders from other sectors outside of government, namely the private sector and community-based organization (CBO), such as a group of women farmers (KWT) as a target group of this policy. DKP is a network organization in the form of a network administrative organization (NAO)[7]. One of the main characteristics of this organization is centralized. In this case, the policy was

TABLE 1: Role of Government Agency in Food Security Council.

No	Government Agency	Role
1	Food Security Agency	Food consumption information, Skill, Facilities
2	Agriculture Agency	Skill, Information Food production, Information needs for irrigation, Information of production facilities
3	Health Agency	Information nutritious food
4	PublicWorks Agency	Finance, Information needs of agricultural infrastructure
5	Trade Agency	Information on price stability and the ability of economic agents.
6	Cooperatives and UMKM Agency	Skill improvement, enhancement of management capability, provision of capital

Source: Calculated based on secondary data, in 2018

determined by the central government and local government implementation through the organization. DKP membership in the area covers all local government relating food security agencies. NAO has a greater participant than the other forms of network, such as shared governance and the lead organization, Because it has its own unique administrative structure that will be able to handle larger number of diverse participants [7]. However, It was not able to implement this policy effectively because it is designed like a bureaucratic organization.

### 3.3. Goal Consensus

One of the functions of the Food Security Council is to produce a collaborative program that will be implemented by the government agencies as executor or implementer of this policy. This collaborative program is produced through a process of interaction and common perception of problems so as to be able to present alternatives for solutions to food problems. DKP in Bone Regency has not run as it should be because it has not set clear collective goals. This is indicated by the absence of collaborative programs produced as a network organization. The food security program that has been implemented so far is a program of each agency. The program implemented is a representative of the existing agencies, not a representative of a network organization. Members in network organizations should be able to work without significant conflict, but can work simultaneously to achieve common goals because trust is not always related to a consensus of goals. The goal of consensus is based on common action [7], [18], [19].

### 3.4. Evaluation

In general, the ability of an organization can be assessed from the skills and competencies it has. The same is true for network-based organizations, each stakeholder has diverse skills and competencies, so this organization needs to coordinate their abilities. DKP as a network-based organization whose main task is to maintain the availability, accessibility, distribution and consumption of food at the household and individual level needs to coordinate the skills and competencies of those involved. They have different abilities from one another so that DKP also needs to have coordination and integration capabilities in the form of a collaborative program. The diversity of skills and competencies of actors involved in DKP can be seen from their respective programs, as shown in table 2 below.

TABLE 2: Skills and Competencies of Actors Involved in DKP Bone Regency.

Government Agency	Skill & Competence
Food Security Agency	Diversification of food, utilization of house yards
Agriculture Agency	Agricultural / Plantation Food Security Improvement Program, Improvement Program, Application of Agricultural / Plantation Technology, development of irrigation networks, Increased Food Production
Health Agency	Conducting surveys related to food security (malnutrition rate, stunting rate), socializing nutritious, safe & balanced food.
Public Works Agency	Provide agricultural access such as irrigation and farm road infrastructure.
Trade Agency	Strengthen the economy and maintain price stability in the market
Cooperatives and UMKM Agency	Managing savings and loans for community food products, as well as being involved in preparing capital for farmer groups, forming UMKM

Source: Processed from Secondary Data of Each Local Government Agency, Bone Regency, 2018.

DKP has not succeeded in implementing policies and programs for food security, because it has not effectively coordinated and integrated the various abilities that each actor has. It can be seen that DKP has not created a program as a result of coordination and integration in the form of a collaborative program. In this case, they run the program independently.

### 4. Conclusions

The bureaucracy is still a challenge to carry out multi-actor and multi-interest policies. Although DKP has been identified as NAO, which is a form of network governance, it has not been effective in overcoming these challenges. This is caused by: 1) trust



owned by actors involved in DKP is a trust that has not encouraged this network to create a collaborative program; 2) All actors in the DKP are local government agencies, each of which prioritizes their interests; 3) the problem of food and its diversification has not become the goal of the consensus of the actors involved; and 4) Each actor has different skills and competencies, but this has not become a power for effective program effectiveness. Therefore, to overcome challenges in implementing multi-actor and multi-interest policies, DKP needs to have the ability to coordinate and manage relationships between the actors involved, so that it can design and implement collaborative programs.

## Acknowledgments

We would like to thank the Bone Regency Government, especially the related agencies and the chairman and members of the women farmer groups who have been willing to provide data about this.

## References

- [1] Ripley G, Franklin RB. Policy implementation and bureaucracy. 640937126Brooks640937126sgsrobona gdistidar640937126-945443400Location of publisher/cole; 1986.
- [2] 640937115Alwi640937115sgsrobona gdistidar640937115-945443400Initial of author, Kasmad R. Local collaborative network: Is it smart implementer of the cocoa business development policy in Indonesia?. Int. J. 640937120Public640937120sgsrobona gdistidar640937120-945443400Full name of journal Pol. 2018;14(5–6):374–390. doi: 10.1504/IJPP.2018.096640.
- [3] Eggers S, Goldsmith W. Government by network: The new public management imperative. 6409371102004640937110sgsrobona gdistidar640937110-945443400Name and location of publisher.
- [4] Montjoy RS, O’Toole LJ. Toward a theory of policy implementation: An organizational perspective. 640937103Public640937103sgsrobona gdistidar640937103-945443400Full name of journal; end page no. Adm. Rev. 1979;39(5):465. doi: 10.2307/3109921.
- [5] Frederickson HG, Smith KB, Larimer CW, Licari MJ. The public administration theory primer. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. 6409370852018640937085sgsrobona gdistidar640937085-945443401Name and location of publisher.

- [6] Klijn JKEH. Governance networks in the public sector. 640937080Routledge640937080sgsrobona gdistidar640937080-945443401Location of publisher; 2015.
- [7] Provan KG, Kenis P. Modes of network governance: Structure, management, and effectiveness. *J. Public Adm. Res.* 640937071Theory640937071sgsrobona gdistidar640937071-945443401Full name of journal. 2008;18(2):229–252. doi: 10.1093/jopart/mum015.
- [8] Goggin M. Implementatiton theory and practice: Toward a third generation. Scott 640937064Foresman640937064sgsrobona gdistidar640937064-945443401Location of publisher Co; 1990.
- [9] Klijn EH. Complexity theory and public administration: What's new? 640937056Pub-lic640937056sgsrobona gdistidar640937056-945443401Full name of journal *Manag. Rev.* 2008;10(3):299–317. doi: 10.1080/14719030802002675.
- [10] Jones SP, Hesterly C, Borgatti WS. A general theory of network governance: Exchange conditions and social mechanism. *Acad. Manag.* 640937050Manag640937050sgsrobona gdistidar640937050-945443401Full name of journal, end page no.. *Rev.* 1997;22(4):911-.
- [11] Rukmana SG, Alwi NS. Managing complexity and resource-based strategy cases in the implementation of food security policy in 640937046Indonesia640937046sgsrobona gdistidar640937046-945443401Name of journal. 2021;9(1):172–178.
- [12] Kasmad R, Alwi, Tamba L. Discretion dilemma of street-level bureaucracy in implementation of the street vendors empowerment policy in Makassar City, Indonesia. *Am. J. Humanit.* 640937037Humanit640937037sgsrobona gdistidar640937037-945443401Full name of journal. *Soc. Sci. Res.* 2018;2(8):106–115.
- [13] Yin K, 640937024Robert640937024sgsrobona gdistidar640937024-945443402Initial of author. Case study: Design and method. Sage 640937029Publ640937029sgsrobona gdistidar640937029-945443401Location of publisher.; 2000.
- [14] . Michie J, Deakin S. The theory and practice of contracting. ESRC Cent. 640937018Bus640937018sgsrobona gdistidar640937018-945443402Location of publisher. *Res. Univ. Cambridge*; 1997.
- [15] Klijn EH, Steijn B, Edelenbos J. The impact of network management on outcomes in governance networks. *Public Adm.* 640937014Adm640937014sgsrobona gdistidar640937014-945443402Full name of journal. 2010;88(4):1063–1082. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9299.2010.01826.x.

- [16] Gambetta D. Trust: Making and beraking cooperative relations. 6409370041988640937004sgsrobona gdastidar640937004-945443402Name and location of publisher.
- [17] Lane R, Bachmann C. Trust within and between organizations: Concep-tual issues and emperical applications. 640936999Oxford640936999sgsrobona gdastidar640936999-945443402Location of publisher Univ. Press; 1998.
- [18] Monge S, Contractor PR, Peter NS, Contractor R, Noshir PS. Theories of communication networks. Oxford Univ. 640936995Press640936995sgsrobona gdastidar640936995-945443402Location of publisher.; 2003.
- [19] Powell WW, Koput KW, White DR, Owen-Smith J. Network dynamics and field evolution: The growth of interorganizational collaboration in the life sciences. Am. J. 640936990Sociol640936990sgsrobona gdastidar640936990-945443402Full name of journal. 2005;110(4):1132–1205. doi: 10.1086/421508.