

## Trust in the Network of Food Diversification Policy Implementation in Bone Regency

Hartina<sup>1</sup>, Alwi<sup>2</sup>, Gita Susanti<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Administration Science, Universitas Hasanuddin, Indonesia.  
E-mail: tinahartina76@gmail.com

<sup>2</sup>Department of Administration Science, Universitas Hasanuddin, Indonesia.  
E-mail: alwifisip@gmail.com

<sup>3</sup>Department of Administration Science, Universitas Hasanuddin, Indonesia.  
E-mail: gitasusanti65@gmail.com

### ARTICLE INFO

**Keywords:** *Trust, network, public policy, food diversification*

**Kata kunci:**  
*Kepercayaan, jaringan, kebijakan public, diversifikasi pangan*

**How to cite:**  
Hartina, Alwi, & Susanti, G. (2020). Pengembangan Kapasitas Trust dalam jaringan implementasi kebijakan diversifikasi pangan di Kabupaten Bone. *JAKPP (Jurnal Analisis Kebijakan dan Pelayanan Publik)*, 6(2), 143-153.

### ABSTRACT

*Trust that is well built in the policy-making process in network organizations gives birth to an effective policy outcome in the form of decreased assumption levels. This research method uses a qualitative approach and a case study strategy to explain trust in the implementation of food diversification policies. The data was collected through in-depth interviews and observations. Data processing and analysis techniques are carried out in three stages, namely: data reduction, presentation and conclusion drawing. The informants in this study were as follows: a) Chair of the Women Farmers Group b). sub-district extension team; d) District extension team. The results showed that the trust that occurred in the interaction of actors, in this case the Food Security Service, Extension Officers and the Women Farmers Group in the implementation of food diversification policies in Bone Regency was not effective. This can be shown that there is no mutual agreement that can be used as a rule of the game for the actors involved in implementing this policy. Opportunistic behavior is a sub-concept that assesses the presence and absence of trust, which is not identified in this study, because there is no mutually agreed upon rule of the game. Then, the actors' good will trust does not emerge because they are still designing and running their respective programs. Therefore, the implementation of the diversification policy requires trust between them so that the performance of this policy can be realized.*

### Abstrak

*Trust yang terbangun dengan baik pada proses pengambilan kebijakan dalam organisasi jaringan melahirkan sebuah outcome kebijakan yang efektif. Metode Penelitian ini menggunakan pendekatan kualitatif dan strategi studi kasus untuk menjelaskan Trust dalam implementasi kebijakan diversifikasi pangan. Pengumpulan data dilakukan melalui wawancara mendalam dan observasi. Teknik pengolahan dan analisis data dilakukan melalui tiga tahap, yaitu: reduksi data, penyajian dan penarikan kesimpulan. Informan dalam penelitian ini sebagai berikut: a) Ketua Kelompok Wanita Tani b). tim penyuluh kecamatan; d) tim penyuluh Kabupaten. Hasil penelitian*

---

*menunjukkan Trust yang terjadi pada interaksi aktor dalam hal ini Dinas Ketahanan Pangan, Penyuluh dan Kelompok Wanita Tani dalam implementasi kebijakan diversifikasi pangan di Kabupaten Bone tidak efektif. Hal ini dapat ditunjukkan belum adanya kesepakatan bersama yang dapat dijadikan rule of the game para aktor yang terlibat dalam implementasi kebijakan ini. Perilaku opportunistic merupakan sub konsep yang untuk menilai ada dan tidaknya trust tidak teridentifikasi pada studi ini, karena tidak adanya rule of the game yang disepakati bersama. Kemudian, good will trust para aktor tidak muncul karena mereka masih tetap merancang dan menjalankan programnya masing-masing. Oleh karena itu, implementasi kebijakan diversifikasi memerlukan trust antar mereka sehingga kinerja kebijakan ini dapat teralisasi.*

---

## Introduction

A policy presents the behavior of a policy actor, for example an official, a group, or a government institution in a political activity. Meanwhile, in the interaction of a policy-making process, it often faces complex problems because in this process the dynamics that develop are difficult to predict as well as the diversity of opinions of actors in the process in a multi-actor and multi-sector environment (Klijn & Koppenjan, 2016). So that the high and low level of trust in the public policy network will affect the interaction process between these actors in realizing effective policy goals (Novayanti, 2020). The sub-dimension of trust in the process of actor interaction in a network organization is inseparable from the outcome that will be achieved in the process of actor collaboration in accordance with mutual agreement (Klijn, Edelenbos, & Steijn, 2010). Trust has a positive influence to increase cooperation in the interaction process, so that actors, both individual actors and actors in the group, do not deviate from the contract that has been agreed upon.

The importance of trust in a process of actor interaction in network organizations because trust has the ability to stimulate innovation (Klijn, Edelenbos, & Steijn, 2010). The second is related to reducing transaction costs. Fukuyama (1995) in Tahili (2017) asserts that "guaranteeing rights (property, contracts, and trade law is an institution that has a role to create a modern market-oriented economic system, but it is possible to change it into an economic form that substantially has transaction costs, if there are several institutions that can provide support in the form of "social capital & Trust." The third is that Trust will be able to increase the likelihood that an actor will invest the resources he has, such as money, knowledge and so on in the Cooperation, thereby creating stability in relationship and they will show closer cooperation (Nooteboom, 1998, Nooteboom, Berger, & Noorderhaven, 1996; Parker & Vaidya, 2001; Sako, 1998; Tahili, 2017). Klijn, Edelenbos, & Steijn (2010) use three Trust measure parameters, namely: (a) Trust in goodwill (Goodeill Trust); (b) Trust in the contract agreement (Agreeme NT Trust); (c). Absence of opportunistic behavior.

One of the interaction processes of actors in network organizations to create an effective policy is the implementation of food diversification policies. Food Diversification is the government's step in diversifying local food so that people do

not focus on just one food. The cause of the birth of the food diversification policy in Indonesia is that Indonesia's consumption of rice is high, even its participation reaches 100% of food needs. As a result, cases of malnutrition continue to recur every year, especially in Eastern Indonesia. Examples of cases of malnutrition in Asmat, Papua, which was busy some time ago. According to him, the case of malnutrition which has resulted in casualties was due to the fact that residents no longer planted tubers which had been their food base for a long time. On the other hand, what happens is that the community is just waiting for the distribution of rice, whose distribution is not easy to do. This is a consequence when the anticipation and assumption are high. The community no longer grows local food.

In 2018 the Ministry of Health's research showed that Indonesia's stunting rate still reached 30 percent of babies aged 5 years. Meanwhile, WHO requires that this figure be at least below 20 percent. The cause is not far from insufficient nutritional needs.

In South Sulawesi Province, one of the districts with a high level of rice production is Bone District. The condition of food security in a region greatly affects the level of national food security. Meanwhile, Bone Regency is one of the rice barns in South Sulawesi Province. Based on the results of the calculation of the 2018 Food Security Index by looking at aspects of food availability, food affordability, and aspects of food utilization based on 9 indicators for the district area. Bone Regency is in the order of 166 with a score of 77.17 out of 412 districts in Indonesia. So it is natural that the level of stunting and malnutrition in Bone Regency is still high. Based on data released from the Bone District Health Office, 2019, the number of malnutrition from 2016 continues to increase. In the last three years, it has reached 45 people. The stunting rate in bone district reaches 40, 36%. Another consequence of the high level of rice production in Bone Regency is that food consumption is also not yet diverse, it still dominates one commodity (Food Pattern Report, 2019). So that the food diversification policy in Bone Regency really needs to be implemented effectively.

The trust sub-dimension in this study will examine trust in the interaction of the network of actors involved in the implementation of food diversification policies in Bone Regency, measured by the confidence of each actor in trust in goodwill, agreements / contracts, and the absence of operative behavior as according to Kljin, Edelenbos & Steijn. (2010) actors in the implementation of the food security policy program agreed upon in the implementation of the Food Diversification Policy in Bone Regency.

## **Literature Review**

### ***Concept of Trust***

The role of trust is an important dimension for building better inter-organizational relationships, creating information exchange, awareness, and mutual support in meeting organizational resources, financial needs, and reducing conflict within the organization. Therefore, this becomes very important in encouraging the successful implementation of public policies (Alwi & Tahili, 2017).

Without Trust in the process of actor interaction in an organization it is quite difficult to face all the challenges of complex problems as well as in network interactions it will be difficult to do coordination and the limited possibility of successful coordination in the completion of a work contract and organizational changes (Tahili, 2017). Trust, by experts in the flow of organizational studies has benefits, including: (a) Reducing Uncertainty; (b) Assist in obtaining information and learning; (c) Strengthening a stable relationship and all of these factors play an important role in improving performance or the use of strategy within the group within the company (Ring & Van Der Cen 1992; Deakin & Michie, 1997; Sako, 1998; McEvily & Zaherr, 2006; Tahili, 2017 ).

There are three characteristics that explain trust in a network: (a) Trust must be based on the readiness of each actor to be open in any interaction process that occurs in realizing a policy (Deakin & Michie, 1997; Deaking & Wilkinson, 1998); (b) That actors must be prepared for the risks that will be encountered in the interaction process that occurs in the policy-making process or in the implementation of a public program (Gambetta, 1988a, 1998b; Lane & Bechmann, 1998); (c) Actors must have positive expectations of the intentions or motives of other actors (Lane & Benchmann, 1998). The existence of trust is able to reduce uncertainty, and uncertainty and ambiguity in the interaction process of the behavior of the actors involved (Zucker, 1986).

The level of trust between each actor involved will affect the cooperation between them. A high level of trust indicates more and better cooperation than a low trust level network organization. Another consequence of the influence of Trust is that in the interaction process the actors will exchange more information so that it is possible to find more innovative solutions, and a high level of trust will create more satisfying results from complex decision-making processes in network organizations. The dimensions of trust in the government network (Kljn, Edelenbos, & Steijn, 2010) are: (a) agreement trust; the parties involved in the network organization generally follow the agreements stipulated in the contract which are mutually agreed upon; (b) absence of opportunistic behavior (the absence of opportunistic behavior); none of the parties in the organizational network take advantage of themselves and harm other actors. The actors in the network carry out the program indifferently; (c) Trust in goodwill (goodwill trust); parties in this activity think that basically goodwill from other parties is beneficial for the success of the program.

### ***Network Perspectives on Policy Implementation***

Network recently has become a conversation among various parties, both on the government, scientists (social and natural), business practitioners, as well as the public in general. Network theory can be used in various levels of activity in the policy process such as formulation, implementation of policies and service programs effectively and efficiently through the use of available resources together (Rahmat, et al., 2016). Various opinions from various experts explain the definition of Network which can be seen in the following table which has been summarized by Jones, et al., 1997:

**Table 1. Differences in Network Definition**

Reference	Term	Definition of Government Network
Alter & Hage, 1993	Interorganizational network	An unlimited or restricted group of organizations, which by definition are nonhierarchical collectives of legally separate units.
Dubini & Aldrich, 1991	Network	Patterns of relationships between individuals, groups and organizations.
Kreiner & Schultz, 1993	Network	Informal Interorganizational Collaboration.
Larson, 1992	Network Forms	Long-term recurring exchanges that create interdependence rely on the entanglement of obligations, hopes, reputations and common interests.
Liebeskind, Oliver, Zucker, & Brewer, 1996	Social Network	Individual collectivity includes ongoing exchanges supported only by trustworthy norms of behavior
Miles & Snow, 1986, 1992	Organization Network	Group companies or special units are coordinated by market mechanisms
Powell, 1990	The form of the Organization network	Lateral or horizontal exchange patterns, independent resource flows, reciprocal lines of communication

*Source: Jones, et al., 1997.*

Based on several network definitions by several experts above, it shows that the network in a policy-making process and providing services to the public plays an important role because by using a network perspective every organization is able to deal with all unpredictable complexity. Another reason why the role of the network is needed is that every existing organization is not in a single, versatile space in dealing with every problem that exists, but they are in a social space that is interdependent and in need of each other. In addition, the advantages of the coordination network in both the public and private sectors are considerable, including improved learning, more efficient use of resources, increased capacity to plan and solve complex problems, greater competitiveness, and better service to clients and customers (Alter & Hage 1993; Brass et al., 2004; Huxham & Vangen, 2005). On the other hand, Williamson in Loi (2002) states that a network is a complex organizational form that cannot be reduced. Furthermore, Loi C. Sauvee added that government directives consider the components of organizational design, namely the allocation of decision rights and mechanisms between organizations.

Network theory focuses on objective patterns that connect members of society both individually and collectively. One of the characteristics of network theory is its attention to micro to macro structures so that network theory includes

actors, be they individuals, groups, or communities. Relationships that are built in the network can occur at the level of a broad-scale social structure or at a more micro level. Ritzer and Goodman (2004) state that this is based on the fact that each actor has limitations in accessing resources such as power, wealth and information so that certain components depend on other components. As quoted in Novayanti's (2020) article, network theory focuses both on the micro to the macro structure. This view means that in network theory, actors can be individuals, groups, companies, and communities. The occurrence of relations can be at all levels, both at the level of broad-scale and small-scale social structures. Granoveter (1985) describes relationships that occur at the micro level as actions that are "attached" to concrete personal relationships and in the structure (network) of those relationships. This relationship is based on the idea that each actor (individual or collective) has different access to valuable resources (wealth, power, and information) so as to result in a structured system that tends to be stratified, certain components depend on other components.

Meanwhile networking is a valuable tool that can be used to contribute to the achievement of multiple goals, and there are specific contexts in which network activity is particularly appropriate (Alberta Heritage Foundation for Medical Research, 2003). On the other hand, Willam (1983) in Ritzer & Goodman, (2004) expresses his views on the main objectives of network theory. Network analysis starts with a simple but very strong idea, that the main effort of sociologists is to study social structures. A direct way to study social structure is to analyze the bond patterns that connect its members. Network analysis experts trace the structure of the sections that fall under the usual tissue patterns that often surface as complex social systems. Actors and their behavior are seen as being forced by this social structure. Thus, the focus of network analysis attention is not on voluntary actors, but on structural forces.

Meanwhile, Mark and Rhodes (2006) define government networks as self-organizing, inter-organizational networks. In addition, government networks can be defined as a complex set of institutions and institutional relationships defined by social roles or functions. Furthermore, Mark and Rhodes (2006) say that proper governance network governance is exploring government institutions by studying the unity that informs the actions of individuals involved in all types of regulatory practices.

Meanwhile, Klijin and Koppenjan (2012) state that government network territory is closely related to complexity, interdependence and dynamics of problem solving and delivery of public services. The theory of developing network (governance) is characterized by the use of the following core concepts and assumptions: (a) Actors, interdependency and frames. Policy and service delivery is shaped and implemented in a network of interdependent actors; (b) Interactions and complexity. As a consequence of the interdependence between actors and the diversity of perceptions and strategies, complex interactions and negotiation patterns emerge in problem solving and policy implementation. The government network approach emphasizes that the results of public policies and services are a

consequence of the interaction of many actors and not the actions of a single actor (Mandell, 2001; Agranoff & McGuire, 2003; Kickert et al 1997); (c) Institutional features. Interaction patterns lead to the institutionalization of relationships between actors. This is understood as patterns of social relations (interactions, power relations etc.) and patterns of rules. However, institutional relationships also involve the emergence of rules governing behavior in networks; (d). Network management. The complexity of processes in a network requires guidance and management of interactions, this is commonly referred to as network management (Gage & Mandell, 1990; Kickert et al, 1997; Meir & O'Toole, 2007). This activity aims to facilitate interaction, explore content and manage interactions between actors. The horizontal nature of network management implies that it is a distinct activity compared to traditional intra-organizational management.

### **Research Method**

This study applies a qualitative approach and a case study strategy to explain trust in the implementation of food diversification policies. Data collection was carried out through in-depth interviews and observations. Data processing and analysis techniques are carried out in three stages, namely: data reduction, presentation and drawing conclusions (Miles and Huberman, 1992). Data are categorized and classified based on similarities and differences and then show certain patterns that explain this strategy. Informants in this study are primary data sources that provide information on conditions and realities and are directly involved in policy implementation. The informants in this study were as follows: a) Chair of the Women Farmers Group b). sub-district extension team; d) District extension team

### **Results and Discussion**

#### ***Trust in the Network of Food Diversification Policy Implementation in Bone Regency***

Trust is a component that plays an important role in the interaction of actors in the organizational network because it can support organizational outcomes in realizing its goals. One of the other goals of trust in the network is that other actors are able to refrain from opportunistic behavior (taking advantage of the opportunities that exist) even though when an opportunity arises, they do not want to guarantee that other groups will follow their actions (Deakin & Michie, 1997; Deakin & Wilkinson, 1998). So that actors involved in network organizations have trust and expect these actors to be able to make changes and try to improve their actions (Rousseau, et al., 1998; & Nooteboom, 2002). This is important when actors are involved in situations that are uncertain and full of risks (Tahili, 2017).

The dimensions in this study will explain the confidence of the actors involved in this case the Food Security Service, Extension Officers, and Women's Farmers Group, on the implementation network of food diversification policies in Bone Regency. Where these dimensions are used as parameters according to Klijn,

Edelenbos, & Steijn (2010), namely (a). Trust in good will, (Goodwill trust), (b). Trust in the contract agreement (Agreement of Trust), and (c). The absence of opportunistic behavior (The Absence of Opportunistic Behavior). The following is a table of trust that occurs in actors involved in this case the Food Security Service, Extension Officers and Women Farmers Groups in the implementation network of the food diversification policy in Bone Regency based on the results of data reduction:

**Table 2. Trust in Food Diversification Policy Implementation in the Regency of Bone**

Sub Dimension	Food Security Agency	Field Officer	Women Groups
Trust	Agreement trust	Not existed	Not existed
	The absence of opportunistic behavior	Not existed	Not existed
	Goodwill trust	the achievement of food diversification policies has not been effective	Not effective

*Source: Primary data, 2020*

The table above describes the trust that occurs in the interaction of actors in the network of implementing the food diversification policy by seeing these three parameters as ineffective. First, in the dimension of trust in the contract agreement for the implementation of the food diversification program, this can be seen from there are still many women farmer groups who do not understand the purpose of this program, there are many obstacles when planting seeds, such as natural constraints, high levels of stunting and level of consumption. rice is still high. The following table is the number of malnutrition:

**Table 3. Total malnutrition in the last three years**

Year	Number of cases
2016	14 cases
2017	15 cases
2018	16 cases
2019	45 cases

*Source: Bone District Health Office, 2019*

Second, in the absence of opportunistic behavior, it shows that there is no contractual agreement between the actors involved so that there is no desire to deviate from the actors involved. Third, in the dimension of belief in goodwill, it has not been effective either. Although there is a willingness for all actors involved, such as a willingness to attend the meeting between KWT and extension agents in terms of assistance, the program implementation process in this policy has encountered many obstacles including the provision of unequal assistance so that there are still many women farmer groups who use their own seeds. the resulting consequences such as a lack of understanding of planting is less. This shows that



the lack of cooperation between actors is still lacking which results in the ineffective trust in goodwill in this policy.

## Conclusion

The interaction of actors involved in the implementation of food diversification policies in Bone Regency has not shown any trust. This can be demonstrated through: (a) Trust in goodwill which is indicated by a willingness to attend meetings between KWT and extension workers in terms of assistance. However, the meeting did not produce a joint program to improve the performance of this policy; (b) Trust in a contractual agreement (Agreement of Trust) is shown that there is no rule of the game that is developed together in the implementation of these multi-actors policies; (c) The absence of opportunistic behavior (The Absence of Opportunistic Behavior is characterized by the absence of activity or collective agreement among the actors involved so that deviant behavior by the actors involved is not identified in this policy.

## Acknowledgment

The authors would like to thank both the anonymous reviewer and the Ministry of Research and Technology who funded this study

## References

- Alter, Catherine. "J, Hage (1993). Organizations Working Together." *Newbury Park/London/New Delhi: Sage*.
- Alwi., & Tahili, M. H. (2017) Creating a Trusted Public Organization-- Organizational Trust Analysis in Implementation Network of the Education Quality Assurance Policy in Indonesia. In *International Conference on Administrative Science (ICAS 2017)*. Atlantis Press. 4,1-16
- Bachmann, R., & Lane, C. (Eds.). (1998). *Trust Within and Between Organizations: Conceptual Issues And Empirical Applications*. Oxford University Press.
- Brass, D. J., Galaskiewicz, J., Greve, H. R., & Tsai, W. (2004). Taking stock of Networks and Organizations: A Multilevel Perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47(6), 795-817.
- Deakin, S., & Wilkinson, F. (1998). Contract law and the Economics of Interorganizational Trust. *Lane and Bachman (eds.)*, 1998, 146-172.
- Deakin, S., and J. Michie. (1997). *Contract, Cooperation, and competition; studies in Economics, Management and Law*, Oxford University Press. Oxford.
- Fukuyama, F. (1995) *Trust: The social virtues and the creation of prosperity*, New York: The Free Press.

- Gambetta, D. (1988). *Trust: Making and breaking cooperative relations*. Blackwell, Oxford.
- Hidayat, A. R., Alwi, A., & Susanti, G. (2016). Model Jaringan Kebijakan Publik (Perumusan Kebijakan Masyarakat Adat Ammatoa Kajang Di Kabupaten Bulukumba). *Jurnal Analisis Kebijakan & Pelayanan Publik*, 1(2), 209-218.
- Huxham, C., & Vangen, S., (2005). *Doing Things Collaboratively: Realizing the Advantage or Succumbing to Inertia? Organizational Dynamics*, 33(2), 190-201.
- Jones, Candace, William, Hesterly, Borgatti, Stephen P. (1997). A General Theory of Network Governance: Exchange Conditions and Social Mechanisms. *Academy of Management Review*. 2(4). 911-945
- Klijin, E.H. & Joop Koppenjan. (2016). *Governance Networks in the public sector*. Routledge. New York.
- Klijin, E. H., Edelenbos, J., & Steijn, B. (2010). Trust in governance networks: Its impacts on outcomes. *Administration & Society*, 42(2). 193-221.
- Muharram, S. (2020). Kebijakan "Revolusi Hijau" Paman Birin dalam Menjaga Kerusakan Lingkungan di Provinsi Kalimantan Selatan. *Jurnal Analisis Kebijakan dan Pelayanan Publik*, 6(1).49-64.
- Nooteboom, B. (1998). Management van Partnerships (Management of Partnerships). In Klij, E.H., & Koppenjan, J., (2012). *Governance Network Theory: Past, Present and Future, Policy & Politic*, 40(4). 187-206.
- Nooteboom, B., Berger, H., & Noorderhaven, N., (1996). Effects of Trust and Governance on relational risk, *Academy of Management Journal*, 40(2).308-338.
- Parker, D., & Vaidya, K. (2001). An economic perspective on innovation networks. *Social Interaction and Organisational Change: Aston Perspectives on Innovation Networks*, 125-163.
- Ring, P. S., & Van de Ven, A. H. (1994). Developmental processes of cooperative interorganizational relationships. *Academy of management review*, 19(1). 90-118.
- Ritzer, G., Goodman, J.D. (2004). *Teori Sosiologi Modern*, Kencana, Jakarta.
- Rousseau, D. M., Sitkin, S. B., Burt, R. S., & Camerer, C. (1998). Not so different after all: A cross-discipline view of trust. *Academy of management review*, 23(3.), 393-404.
- Rukmana, N.S., (2020). *Analisis Governance Network dalam jaringan implemmentasi kebijakan ketahanan pangan di Kabupaten Bone*, tidak dipublikasikan di Universitas Hasanuddin.
- Sauvee, Loi C. (2002). *Efficiency, Effectiveness and the Design of Network Governance*. Jurnal dipublikan di *International Conference on Chain Management dalam Agribusiness and the Food Industry Noordwijk an Zee*. Oficina PENSA

- Sako, M. (1998). *Does trust improve business performance? Trust within and between organizations*. Dalam C. Lane and R. Bachmann. *Trust within and between Organizations: Conceptual Issues and Empirical Applications*, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Tahili., M.H (2017). *Model Kepercayaan Dalam Jaringan Implementasi Kebijakan Penjaminan Mutu Pendidikan Di Kabupaten Banggai*, tidak dipublikasikan di Universitas Hasanuddin.
- Zucker, L. G. (1986). Production of trust: Institutional sources of economic structure, 1840-1920. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 8, 53-111.