

Policy Entrepreneurship and Bureaucratic System: Exploring the Role of Strategic Actors and Implications for the Performance of Food Security Policy in Indonesia

Alwi¹, Gita Susanti²

Abstract

This study focuses on bureaucracy as a policy entrepreneur in implementing food security policy in Indonesia. Based on the results of the pattern matching techniques, the role of policy entrepreneurs is ineffective in implementing food security policy because the bureaucratic system does not allow for displaying social acuity, defining problems, building teams, and leading by example effectively. Therefore, the bureaucracy needs to build an entrepreneurial bureaucracy system so that policy entrepreneurs can make the internal and external cooperation of the government bureaucracy effective for the joint use of resources.

Keywords: *Policy Entrepreneurship, Bureaucratic System, Policy performance, Food security.*

Introduction

Public policy aims to solve public problems and needs (Alwi, 2022; Jones, 1984). This shows the complexity of achieving public policy goals. Then, policy implementation is no longer a simple process that simply realizes policy objectives determined by the political process, as identified by Goodnow in Shafritz, Hyde, and Parkes (2004) regarding the political-administrative dichotomy. However, policy implementation is a process that involves multiple stakeholders (Pressman and Wildavsky, 1984). In this case, it is concerned with the complexity of joint action, in which there is a diversity of stakeholders and perspectives of all levels of government that may generate a conflict in practice (Klijn, 2008).

To realize these policy objectives requires the ability of implementers - strategic actors, because in this process, there are many actors involved who have varying interests - some interests are in the same direction, competing, and some are contradictory.

This study attempts to reveal strategic actors as implementers because the studies regarding this, as far as literature searches, have all focused on the level of policy formulation. This study is urgent because a policy implemented in different places has different policy results and produces different results at different times (Goggin et.al, 1990). This shows that policy implementation is complex because apart from the policy itself, it is also determined by the ability and enthusiasm of the implementer. In this case, the strategic actors who

¹Professor in the Department of Administrative Science, Universitas Hasanuddin, Indonesia

²Lecturer in the Department of Administrative Science
Universitas Hasanuddin, Indonesia

Email: alwi@unhas.ac.id

implement the policy are policy entrepreneurs who think and act strategically to realize policy goals effectively. They are the ones who always take the time and resources they control to try to make more effective policy changes. They are also the ones who always push for policy changes that have not resolved problems and meet public needs, including always trying to improve policy performance.

Besides that, this study also focuses on bureaucracy as policy entrepreneurs in implementing policy because they were designed by the government for that. Therefore, this actor plays an essential role in attracting the attention of other strategic actors so that they are willing to spend time, energy, and funds to improve policy performance. The bureaucracy as the implementer of food security policy in Indonesia has not succeeded in attracting their attention (Akbar et al., 2022), so the performance of this policy has not shown encouraging results. Imports of rice as the primary food for Indonesian people will reach 429 thousand tons in 2022, and this will continue until February 2023, reaching 212.71 million kg. This shows that there needs to be a change in policy, including in its implementation.

Literature Review

Bureaucratic Governance and Policy Implementation

In implementing public services and policies, the government bureaucracy plays an essential role as an implementer because it was born to carry out these tasks (Ripley & Franklin, 1986). As an implementer, he must work with other stakeholders to achieve policy performance. This needs to be taken into account because the bureaucracy in organizing this is no longer capable without the presence of other stakeholders. Public demands to do more with less can no longer be avoided, and systematic collaboration with other stakeholders has become necessary in the era of quality public services (Hughes, 2003).

In carrying out his duties, he cannot be separated from bureaucratic mechanisms full of strict rules and are subject to orders from superiors as characteristic of Weberian bureaucracy. This mechanism is the main obstacle in carrying out its duties and establishing cooperation with other organizations outside the bureaucracy. Community and business-based organizations work oriented toward achieving results, while the bureaucracy works by prioritizing command-and-control procedures, narrow work restrictions, and inward-looking culture and operational model (Goldsmith & Eggers, 2004).

Public policy is constantly faced with rapid changes in public demands, so policy needs to change as a consequence of the instruments presented by the government to meet public needs (Alwi, 2018). A policy like this requires the ability of actors to improvise or innovate in achieving the performance of the policy. This is possible if the system in the bureaucracy supports them in designing and implementing programs to achieve policy performance.

Such a system has actually been introduced in government called reinventing government (Osborne and Gaebler, 1992), which requires government management to use old methods that rely on rules but use resources in different ways to increase productivity. The essence is entrepreneurial bureaucracy, where this system encourages the entrepreneurial spirit of actors to implement public programs effectively and efficiently. The bureaucratic entrepreneur aims to improve lives by inventing entirely new ways of serving the public using the scarce resources at his or her disposal (Ohemeng, 2017). Such a bureaucracy has characteristics such as brainware, hardware, and software (Foroutfar, 2020). Based on these general characteristics, Foroutfar builds a bureaucratic entrepreneurship perspective similar to the reinventing government perspective popularized by Osborne and Gaebler

(1992), namely a catalytic bureaucracy, a community-owned bureaucracy, a competitive bureaucracy, a mission-driven bureaucracy, a result-oriented bureaucracy, a customer-driven bureaucracy, a decentralized bureaucracy, and a market-driven bureaucracy.

Strategic Actors as Policy Entrepreneurs in Policy Implementation

The current development of public organization and management studies shows that the government, as a provider of public services and policy, is no longer able to carry out these things on its own without the involvement of other stakeholders. This is because the government does not have adequate resources in the form of money, skills, technology, and information to carry out these activities, both in determining and implementing public policies. This shows that the network perspective in public policy studies, better known as policy networks, is very important for the effectiveness of implementing public policy and utilizing shared resources (O'Leary et.al, 2009; Agranoff and McGuire, 2003; Goldsmith and Eggers, 2004; Isset, et.al, 2011; O'Toole and Montjoy, 1984).

This can be successful because policy networks are relationships between network actors based on resource interdependence. In this case, each actor wants something from the other actors and carries out this exchange to get what they want (Compston, 2009). This was emphasized by Waarden (1992) that policy networks emerge from the interdependence between actors, which include administrators requiring political support, legitimacy, information, coalition partners against bureaucracy, and implementation support because interest groups want access to policy-making and implementation and concessions, for their interests.

This shows that the implementation of public policy, starting from formulation to implementation, is a complex matter because what is realized in the implementation is different from initial expectations. This difference can be shown when a policy was designed and implemented simultaneously but in different places showing different results (Goggin et.al, 1990). This proves that the implementation is in a complex system. Interactions exist between actors or sub-systems in an extensive network system (Alwi, 2022).

This shows the importance of policy implementation actors having an entrepreneurial spirit in determining and implementing public policies. The originator called this the term policy entrepreneur (Kingdon, 1984/1995: 122), stating that policy entrepreneurs "could be in or out of government, in elected or appointed positions, in interest groups or research organizations. But their defining characteristic, much as in the case of a business entrepreneur, is their willingness to invest their resources – time, energy, reputation, and sometimes money – in the hope of a future return."

In connection with the above, policy changes are determined by changes in resource exchange between network actors, which include changes in resources, preferences, and strategies of network actors. Exchange changes can run effectively if the network actors are policy entrepreneurs. Policy change will be successful by changing the exchange of resources carried out by policy entrepreneurs. This happens because they are energetic actors who work together with others to encourage more effective policy changes. Apart from that, these policy entrepreneurs always try to seize opportunities in larger changes in conditions and, at the same time, create opportunities and encourage other actors to support policy innovation or policy change (Mintrom & Luetjens, 2017)

Methods

Research Design and Strategy

The research design used is qualitative. The use of this design is to reveal and explain the role of strategic actors as policy entrepreneurs in implementing food security policy. Furthermore, this research uses a case study strategy with an explanatory type (Yin, 2000). This type explains the role of strategic actors in improving food security performance in Bone Regency as one of the food baskets in Indonesia.

Informants

Information from many informants will be required to understand the role of strategic actors in implementing food security in the Bone Regency. The number of informants interviewed was 73, who came from various backgrounds, including: a) officials and staff of the Food Security Agency (9 people); b) members of local parliament (3 people); c) field facilitators (6 people); d) head of village (5 people); and e) members of farmer women's group (50 people).

Data Collection Techniques

Data collection techniques used in this research are observations, interviews, and documentation. Observations focused on tangible objects, such as coaching women's farmer groups (KWT), active group members, and plant maintenance.

The above was followed by in-depth interviews addressed to all the mentioned informants. Furthermore, various documents were collected, such as regulations, laws, and institutional activity reports relating to the policy implementation.

Techniques of Data Processing and Analysis

The analysis techniques used in this study involve pairing patterns and time series techniques. These techniques are utilized together to complete one another (Yin, 2000). In addition, data analysis used in this study covers three stages: data reduction, data display and drawing, and verifying conclusion (Miles, Huberman, & Saldana, 2014).

The gathered data obtained through observation, in-depth interviews, and documents were categorized and classified based on similarities and differences. The next step was data reduction, from which conclusion and analysis results were obtained. The explanation regarding data reduction is further explained in the next section.

Results and Discussion

As explained above, the focus of this study is the role of strategic actors as policy entrepreneurs in implementing food security policies. To reveal and explain this role through the basic elements of the policy entrepreneurship concept (Kingdon, 1984/1995; Mintrom & Luetjens, 2017), namely displaying social acuity, defining problems, building a team, and leading by example. The four dimensions are the basis for exploring the role of strategic actors in implementing food security policies in Bone Regency, Indonesia.

Displaying Social Acuity

Displaying social acuity is a dimension related to utilizing existing opportunities - windows of opportunity. This can be done by utilizing networks that have been built to understand the ideas, motives, and concerns of other people in the context of food policy implementation. Actors who reveal social acumen are identified as actors who understand the substance of their respective tasks and duties and the motives and concerns of society as policy objects (Mintrom & Norman, 2009). Actors can understand the conditions of policy objects or target groups (the poor) and then take advantage of opportunities to realize

the desired results. Displaying social acuity in implementing food policy towards poor communities in Bone district can be shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Displaying Social Acuity in Implementing Food Security Policy Towards Poor Communities in Bone District

Strategic Actors	Displaying Social Acuity
Food Security Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Providing balance sheets for food availability, supply and consumption ● Empowering extension workers to interact directly with the community
Agricultural Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Program orientation to poor communities ● The program orientation is based on mapping the potential of each region
Agricultural Extension Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Gradual increase in agricultural production ● Empowering Poor Communities through Women Farmer Groups
Village Head	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The village government's understanding is more objective ● Dependent on Direct Cash Assistance (BLT) ● Allocation of 20% of village funds for food security
Social Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Providing poverty data
Farmer Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Group members consist of people from the poor category ● There are still areas that do not have KWT ● Several KWTs know that poor people are given priority to join the group ● The importance of encouragement to work for the poor

Source: Data Reduction, 2023

Based on Table 1 above, the strategic actors do not yet have social considerations regarding the context and also do not understand the food needs of the community, especially the poor. This can be shown that there are no actors who determine what and how much and what type of food the poor people need in Bone Regency. They only show their routine activities in implementing food security policy, with each actor thinking and acting independently to overcome dependence on rice as the main food from other countries. Indonesia imported 1.59 million tonnes of rice from January to August 2023 (<https://databoks.katadata.co.id/datapublish/2023>).

In this case, it is very difficult to show social acuity in meeting public needs in the form of food if only done individually because public needs are very complex. Some needs or interests are in the same direction, some are competing, and some are contradictory (Alwi, 2018). Therefore, to be able to understand public concerns and ideas clearly and comprehensively, the network approach is a solution approach to food issues as a public problem (Mintrom and Norman, 2009). This approach prioritizes the joint use of resources (Mintrom & Norman, 2009; Morh, 1969) so that information about the availability, distribution, accessibility, and consumption of food can be provided comprehensively and accurately. This approach makes it possible to gather information about contextual public needs.

Defining Problems

The social acuity of the actors is expected to trigger awareness of causality problems that cause the performance of food policy implementation for the poor to be less than optimal, so objective problem definitions are very necessary for policy implementation, as stated by (Fisher, Roger, and Patton, 1991; Heifezt, 1994). Effective problem-solving requires a combination of social acumen with skills in conflict management and negotiation. This can

be done by presenting evidence that shows that a problem in policy performance occurred. The following is a definition of the problems of each actor in implementing food policy for poor communities in the Bone Regency.

Table 2. Defining problems for actors in implementing food policy toward poor communities

Strategic Actors	Defining Problems
Food Security Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Low public knowledge
Agricultural Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● A limited number of instructors ● There is a disintegration of poverty data
Agricultural Extension Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● There is a tendency to depend on direct cash assistance (BLT) ● A limited number of instructors ● Disintegration of poverty data
Village Head	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Assistance is not yet on target ● The tendency of people not to want to work ● Budget limitations ● Not yet maximum KWT ● Disintegration of poverty data ● The dilemmatic condition of the village head's authority
Farmer Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Lack of public awareness ● The public is not interested ● Unclear market problems

Source: Data Reduction, 2023

Table 2 above shows variations in problem definition by strategic actors in implementing food policy for poor communities in Bone Regency. Apart from that, actors do not define food problems clearly, so this has implications for variations in actors' actions in each region in efforts to optimize food policy for poor communities. In this case, the programs built to overcome food problems become less clear. The Food Security Agency, as the main actor (leading sector) in food policy at the local level, only has one program to date, namely the Sustainable Food Yard (P2L) program. This program is a diversification of food in community gardens to form food that is diverse, nutritious, balanced, and safe. This phenomenon is in line with the view of (Mintrom M & Norman, 2009), which suggests that problems in the policy field always have many attributes; the definition of the problem influences how actors/individuals relate certain problems to their interests. Therefore, policy entrepreneurship will act to provide authentic evidence that shows a problem has occurred.

The differentiation of food problems put forward by actors as policy entrepreneurs shows that the food problem is a wicked problem (Alwi, 2018). Hence, they must be together to define it (Alwi, Susanti, Rukmana, 2020). Apart from that, actors need to spend time, energy, and other resources as policy entrepreneurs (Mintrom & Norman, 2009; Kingdon, 1984/1995), devoting all their thoughts and skills to taking concrete steps to increase food productivity, distribution, and food accessibility in a poor society. It is known that the number of poor people in March 2023 will be 25,898.55 thousand (Central Statistics Agency, 2023) and is dominated by rural areas. In this case, the government needs to highlight this in terms of how to ensure food accessibility for the poor; this requires policy changes, both in terms of increasing productivity and in terms of food availability for the poor, where the problem needs to be defined precisely. Strategic actors as policy entrepreneurs still need high social acumen, especially regarding food issues in poor communities, because these communities cannot express their needs (Nelson, 1984 & Stone, 1997).

Building Teams

One of the essential components of entrepreneurship policy is building teams. It is the power to make changes or implement policy through the ability to work effectively with other people, not with one's own abilities. The context of team building is the same as building a network of actors to exchange resources to optimize the implementation of food policy for poor communities. The following is an overview of building a team of stakeholder actors in implementing food policy for poor communities in Bone Regency.

Table 3. Building a Team in Implementing Food Policy for Poor Communities in Bone District

Strategic Actors	Building Teams
Food Security Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Collaboration between regional organizations ● Extension agents are used as companions to supervise, monitor and evaluate
Agricultural Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Efforts to submit a proposal to Bank Indonesia ● Prioritize coordination between the actors involved ● Intervention Each regional apparatus organization through its respective service programs
Agricultural Extension Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Maximized through synergy between extension workers and between OPDs ● Direction of villages to form groups of women farmers
Village Head	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Building harmonious relationships with extension workers and other actors ● Prioritize coordination to obtain valid information ● Carrying out partnerships to form industries based on village potential
Farmer Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The supervision of extension workers greatly influences the increase in KWT productivity ● KWT members work together to carry out seeding and planting is done independently

Source: Data Reduction, 2023

Table 3 above shows that strategic actors try to collaborate with others to improve food security performance. However, this collaboration is not in a team, a joint forum for designing and implementing food security. The Food Security Agency, the leading sector that drives and encourages food security through a government program called the Sustainable Food Yard (P2L), is still identified as an individual program - not the result of teamwork. He is expected to facilitate and encourage forming a work team with other actors, but he only continues to carry out his routine program.

The strategic actors above have not attempted to build cooperation both internally and externally with the government to make policy changes, - to increase food productivity. Internal government actors still utilize and rely on internal government resources to implement food security policies, so the results are not yet optimal. It has not demonstrated efforts to build a team by involving actors not only internal but also external to the government to obtain strategic resources. This is a manifestation of networks between actors, especially joint action and joint use of resources (Klijn, 2008). The result is that there is no synergy between actors to think and act together to make apparent policy changes. Synergy in designing and implementing food security programs and also synergy in the use of shared resources.

Based on Table 3 above, only internal government actors play a role in implementing food security policy. This role takes the form of both designing and implementing food security programs as well as providing financial resources and skills. The Sustainable Food Yard

(P2L) is a food security program funded by the central government. This program is classified based on the division into 3 zones, which are allocated to 4,500 beneficiary groups namely, zone 1 gets the assistance of IDR 50,000,000; Zone 2 receives the assistance of IDR 60,000,000; and Zone 3 receives the assistance of IDR 75,000,000 (Ministry of Agriculture, 2021).

The program does not involve actors outside the government, so the results do not benefit society in general, only being limited to members of women farmer groups (KWT). Apart from that, the regional government has designed a Vegetable Bank program, but only in certain areas. This shows that central and regional governments design limited programs because they have limited resources.

Leading by Example

Leading by example is an essential component of entrepreneurial policy. As an actor who determines policy or decides decisions, innovative ideas are essential in proposing policy changes. Next, these ideas need to be turned into tangible actions to gain credibility from other parties. Credibility is at the heart of leading by example, as they must inspire the team with their vision for the future, which must be realistic (Mintrom 2000). This credibility can be achieved by demonstrating expertise, holding a particular position, or generally demonstrating what is needed (Mintrom 2019,2020). Thus, the attributes of friendliness and credibility are essential incentives for policy entrepreneurs' strategies to optimize food policy implementation. The following describes leading activities by giving examples of actors in implementing food policy in the Bone district.

Table 4. Leading by Example in Implementing Food Security Policy in Bone District

Strategic Actors	Leading by Example
Food Security Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Intervening in all sub-districts in distributing food aid
Agricultural Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Extension intervention to assist farmer groups
Agricultural Extension Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Conduct training in villages ● Assist farmer groups ● Conduct visits to absorb community aspirations regarding their needs
Village Head	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The village government takes part in every activity that is positive for the village ● Fighting for validation of poverty data ● Carrying out training to empower poor communities
Farmer Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● KWT seeks to involve poor communities so they can earn income ● The village head intervenes with the community to utilize yardland

Source: Data Reduction, 2023

Based on table 4 above shows that the actors have not succeeded in motivating the community by providing examples of providing and cultivating productive land for women farmer groups (KWT). The Food Security Agency, as the leading sector and other actors, does not provide gardens as examples for their land use. The P2L program is a home garden land utilization program for KWT that has been established for a long time, but none of the actors have a garden as an example for them. This shows that the P2L program cannot be expected to help them improve their welfare. This also shows that access to adequate food for them is still difficult because, apart from the lack of success of this program, it is also due to the increasingly high price of rice as the leading food of the Indonesian people. The market price of rice reaches IDR 13,200 per kilogram, which is far above the poverty line in Indonesia. 550,458 per month (Central Statistics Agency, 2023).

These actors have not yet shown themselves as policy entrepreneurs who dedicate energy, time, and other resources to meet the food needs of the community, especially the poor (Mintrom & Norman, 2009; Kingdon, 1984/1995). Leadership based on examples that can be followed by KWT members as the target group for this policy has not been able to encourage them to meet their needs on an ongoing basis therefore, disparities between places are needed based on the characteristics and potential of each region, so that efforts to optimize food policy for the poor oriented towards social sharpness and realistic problem definition (by community needs). In this case, bureaucratic leadership as the main internal government actor is still based on routine and still tends to be rule-based (Alwi, Susanti, & Rukmana, 2020). This hurts the involvement of other actors, especially external government actors. Toko Tani, as a container that accommodates local products and KWT, which is under the auspices of the District Food Security Agency, have not effectively carried out its function because it does not involve external government actors. Strategic actors have not demonstrated credibility in the eyes of their target groups.

Conclusion

Policy entrepreneurship is not only urgent in the process of designing a policy but also important in the process of realizing the goals of policy change. So far, the implementation of the food security policy has not been effective in achieving its objectives because strategic actors within the government have not attempted to involve external actors in implementing the food security policy. This bureaucratic system does not allow or is not accustomed to working with external bureaucratic actors.

Bureaucratic actors who are the main players in implementing this policy are less sensitive to the situation that occurs in poor communities as their target group (displaying social acuity). This causes them to be unable to determine food security issues clearly. The lack of effectiveness in achieving this policy goal is because bureaucracy makes it less possible to build work teams to solve food problems. The big challenge the bureaucracy faces is that they are not used to or lack the skills to provide an example to the women farmers group as the target group for this policy. Therefore, to increase food productivity, the bureaucracy needs to build an entrepreneurial bureaucracy system so that policy entrepreneurs can make internal and external cooperation of the government bureaucracy effective for the joint use of resources.

References

- Agranoff, Robert and McGuire, Michael. (2003). *Collaborative Public Decision Management: New Strategies for Local Government*, Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Akbar, M. F., Alwi, Susanti, G., & Nahrudin, Z. (2022). Collaborative Arrangement in the Implementation of Food Security Policy in Indonesia. *Public Policy and Administration*, 21(2), 39–48. <https://doi.org/10.13165/VPA-22-21-2-08>
- Alwi, Susanti, G., & Sophia Rukmana, N. (2020). Going Local for Food Security: Strengthening Local Collaborative Institution in Implementation of Food Security in Indonesia. *International Journal of Management (IJM)*, 11(8), 1998–2009.
- Alwi. (2018). *Kolaborasi dan Kinerja Kebijakan: Tantangan dan strategi dalam penentuan implementasi kebijakan* (1st ed.). Kedai Buku Jenny.
- Alwi. (2022). *Governance dan Kebijakan Publik* (1st ed.). UPT Unhas Press.
- Badan Pusat Statistik. (2023a). <https://www.bps.go.id>. <https://www.bps.go.id>
- Badan Pusat Statistik. (2023b). *Profil Kemiskinan di Indonesia Maret 2023*. 47, 5.
- Compston Huge (2009). *Policy Network and Policy Change: Putting Policy Network Theory to the*

- test. The UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Fisher, Roger, and Bruce Patton. (1991). *Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In*, 2nd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Forouharfar, Amir. (2017). The Entrepreneurial Bureaucrat. In A. Farazmand (ed). *Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy, and Governance*. USA: Springer International Publishing AG.
- Goggin, M. L., Bowman, A., Lester, J., & O'Toole, L. (1990). *Implementation Theory and Practice: Toward a Third Generation*. Illinois: Foresman and Company.
- Golgsmith, Stephen & Eggers, William D. (2004). *Governing by Network: the New Shape of the Public Sector*. Washinton D.C: The Brookings Institution.
- Goodnow, Frank J. (2004). *Politics and Administration*. In Shafritz, Jay M., Hyde, Albert C., Parkes, Sandra, J. (2004). *Classic of Public Administration (5th Edition)*. USA: Wadsworth/Thompson Learning.
- Heifetz, Ronald. (1994). *Leadership without Easy Answers*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hughes, Owen E. (2003). *Public Management and Administration: An Introduction (Third Edition)*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan
- Isett, Kimberley R., (2011). Network in Public Administration Scholarship: Understanding Where We Are and Where We Need to Go. In *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. JPART 21: i157 – i173.
- Jones CO. (1984). *An Introduction to the Study of Public Policy*, (3rd Edition). Brooks/Cole Publishing Company: California.
- Kementerian Pertanian. (2021). *Petunjuk Teknis P2L*. Kementerian Pertanian RI, 1–81.
- Kingdon, John W. (1984) 1995. *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*, 2nd ed. Boston: Little, Brown & Company.
- Klijn, E. H. (2008). Networks as Perspective on Policy and Implementation. In Cropper, M. Ebers, C. Huxham, P. Ring (2008), *Handbook of Inter-Organizational Relations*, Oxford: Oxford University Press: 118-146.
- Miles, M.B., Huberman A.M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook*. USA: Sage Publication. Inc.
- Mintrom, M., & Luetjens, J. (2017). Policy entrepreneurs and problem framing: The case of climate change. *Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space*, 35(8), 1362–1377.
- Mintrom, M., & Norman, P. (2009). Policy entrepreneurship and policy change. *Policy Studies Journal*, 37(4), 649–667. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1541-0072.2009.00329.x>
- Nelson, B. (1984). *Making an Issue of Child Abuse*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ohemeng, F. (2017). The Entrepreneurial Bureaucrat. In A. Farazmand (ed). *Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy, and Governance*. USA: Springer International Publishing AG.
- Osborne, D. & Gaebler, T. (1992). *Reinventing Government: How Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector*. New York: Plume.
- Olsson, J., & Hysing, E. (2012). Theorizing Inside Activism: Understanding Policy Making and Policy Change from Below. *Planning Theory and Practice*, 13(2), 257–273. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649357.2012.677123>
- O'Leary, Rosemary; Gazley, Beth; McGuire, Michael; & Bingham, Lisa Blomgren. 2009. *Public Managers in Collaboration*. In O'leary, Rosemary & Bingham, Lisa Blomgren (Editor). (2009). *The Collaborative Public Manager: New Ideas For the Twenty-First Century*. Washinton, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- O'Toole, Jr, Laurence J. & Montjoy, Robert S., (1984). Interorganizational Policy Implementation: A Theoretical Perspective. In *Public Administration Review*. Vol. 44. No. 6 (November –

1482 *Policy Entrepreneurship and Bureaucratic System: Exploring the Role of Strategic Actors and Implications for the Performance of Food Security Policy in Indonesia*

December 1984). pp. 491-503

Pressman, Jeffrey L., and Aaron Wildavsky. 1973. *Implementation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Ripley, Randal B. & Franklin, Grace A. 1986. *Policy Implementation and Bureaucracy* (Second Edition). USA: The Dorsey Press.

Stone, D. (1997). *The Policy Paradox: The Art of Political Decision Making*. New York: W.W. Norton. New York: W.W. Norton.

Waarden F.V.(1992). *Dimensions and Types of Policy Networks*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Netherlands.

Yin RK. (2000). *Case Study Research, Design and Methods*, (4th Edition). Sage Publication Inc: California.