



Food Security and the Futures of Farmers in Decentralisation Era: a Case Study From Sigi District Central Sulawesi

Sayuti✉, Sultan, M. Nur Alamsyah

Tadulako University, Indonesia

Permalink/DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15294/komunitas.v7i1.3620>

Received : January 2015; Accepted: February 2015; Published: March 2015

Abstract

A progress of an area directly influences its society. Decentralization is a form of democratization of the area for development. The formation of new autonomous regions (DOB) has created the land conversion and the politicization of society. Food security policy as an instrument of regional distributive does not provide a meaningful impact in the region, especially in building farmers' work ethic and behavior. This situation has contributed to the failure of the state to achieve food security as the constitutional rights of society, particularly farmers. Through qualitative methods to bring together all the stakeholders (farmers, local authorities) by conducting focus group discussions and in-depth interviews, it is known that the policy still is formalistic. There is no better information dissemination, attitude and commitment to the policy, limited resources, and no standard work. The regional council of food security is not optimized and there are institutional barriers. In addition, there is no involvement of the community in accessing programming and there is high politicization on agriculture which is all managed by top down in the area.

Abstrak

Desentralisasi merupakan wujud demokratisasi daerah untuk pembangunan. Pembentukan daerah otonom baru (DOB) melahirkan terjadinya alih fungsi lahan dan politisasi masyarakat seperti petani daripada penguatan ketahanan pangan dan penguatan petani. Penelitian ini bertujuan meneliti kebijakan Kabupaten Sigi dalam hal penguatan ketahanan pangan dan petani. Melalui metode kualitatif dengan mempertemukan pemangku kepentingan (petani, pejabat daerah) melalui diskusi kelompok terfokus dan wawancara mendalam, diketahui bahwa kebijakan masih bersifat formalistik. Tidak ada sosialisasi informasi secara baik, sikap dan komitmen terhadap kebijakan kurang, keterbatasan sumber daya, tidak ada standar kerja. Dewan ketahanan pangan daerah belum optimal, hambatan struktur dan kelembagaan, tidak ada keterlibatan masyarakat dalam mengakses penyusunan program serta tingginya politisasi pada bidang pertanian yang semuanya dikelola secara top down di daerah.

Keywords: policy; local government, food security; decentralization

How to Cite: Sayuti, Sultan, & Alamsyah, M. N. 2015. Food Security and the Futures of Farmers in Decentralisation Era: a Case Study From Sigi District Central Sulawesi. *Jurnal Komunitas*, 7 (1): 118-132 doi: 10.15294/komunitas.v7i1.3620

© 2015 Semarang State University. All rights reserved

INTRODUCTION

The decentralization after the reform, especially the region expansion, provides functional and structural change in the social and cultural dimensions. The policy influences the society including in the farming culture. Indonesia as the agricultural nation puts farmer on a high achievement obsession in terms of production quality and quantity. This obsession is part of the efforts to fulfill the community consumption needs as well as a strategic investment for a sovereign nation. Because of this important value, the effort of farmers must be able to improve their household income in order to fulfill their basic needs.

The capacities which include the knowledge, behavior, and skill aspects of farmer in recognizing the potential and business opportunity, farming management, and domestic economic activities have become an important part for the sustainability of mode of production to be able to work together effectively. Global reality, through a capitalistic market, establishes a pressured socio-cultural phenomenon. This phenomenon encourages people to work partially so they cannot create an acceleration of social change and will eventually co-opt the community into a short-term practical need.

At this position, farmers often get caught up various dimensions helplessness of social life which immediately needs to be fulfilled as part of the current market demand and life cycle. The existing policies mostly serve only as part of a supporting pledge for food production cycle for the people who are not prepared as a model of policies which can trigger work ethic.

Food in the context of nationality is a dimension which must be well prepared by the government. Therefore, based on the Government Regulation No. 68 2002, the Indonesian government has established a policy foundation for their food security. Food security is defined as the fulfillment of the conditions of food for households reflected in the food availability which is sufficient, (both in quantity and quality) safe, equitable, and affordable as contained in the article 1 point 1 and according to the Law No. 7 of

1996 on Food, Article 1 point 17. And the efforts to achieve food supply is done by relying on the resources, institution, and local culture as contained in Article 2 paragraph (2) item a PP 68/2002.

Food security in national commitments is described as a condition in which each individual at all times has physical and financial access to get sufficient, safe, and nutritious food according to their dietary needs and taste to be able to live healthy and active (Kemenristek, 2006). Agriculture which is dominated by traditional production mechanisms puts it as a source of dependence of life. This situation is threatened and potentially degraded, not only the quantity but also the quality, if a shift in the ethos or culture of farmers from rural communities which characterized by existence of farmers to a community which emphasizes the aspects of service of urban community (rural), related to the development of city functions in the decentralization era.

The government policy system should be a major part which can take part on the role in the middle of imbalances in agricultural production when it is not getting adequate production value in responding to the needs of the economy as part of the problems of farmers' life. In the era of decentralization, various cultural shocks attack the farmers' culture in the village. Village identity, as described by Herbert Spencer shows the indicators which are still modest, unpretentious, backward, and more identified as "traditional", while the urban is described as a level or a more complex situation that is labeled as a "modern" and "transitional".

The development progress from the expansion area has created several development challenges related to the following side effects. Through the expansion, such as the current condition of Sigi Regency after splitting in 2008, there is a development of countryside with the rural development which eventually leads to the villages' dependence on the product of the city (Soejad-moko in Mangunwijaya, 1993; 50).

This situation will also increase the stagnation (mandeg) in the village which in

the establishment of new autonomous region, should be stimulated on non-agricultural activities as part of self-fulfilling program as the general characteristics of villages in Indonesia. This fact is contradictory with the spirit of development, where in reality, regional expansion is only meant as a physical change of the city solely as 'red light' and building a permanent office (alamsyah, 2012).

Traditional paradigm shift in Sigi Regency communities who are culturally accustomed to the traditional agriculture will be dragged into the crowded growth of new cities and ignore farming as an alternative livelihood after the division of Induk Donggala Regency. Regional expansion which requires new land for offices and residential locations will inevitably erode agricultural land as well as affect the patterns of farming culture that has long existed into a more promising service sector.

According to (Darwanto, 2005; 164), the sustainability of food security through increased availability of national food, especially rice and farmers' welfare improvement, requires long-term and short-term policies. For the short term, the protection policy with restrictions on imports of rice farmers or incentive for local farmers is still needed, but it should be supported by policies that also encourage the increased production through improving rice productivity, especially in traditional rice-producing areas. This must be an important part of the government's strategy in Sigi Regency which has served as the center of agricultural development that sustains communities at three (3) districts, Sigi, Palu and Donggala Regencies.

And for the other polices, it is necessary to improve productivity and harvested area, both with expansion and increased cropping intensity per year to secure the availability of irrigation and agricultural inputs. The biggest obstacle in the autonomous region is the development process that focuses more on the office infrastructure and ignore the agricultural sector. This situation creates resistance and the degradation of the farmers' spirit from time to

time. Even agricultural production is urged to lands that are less or not suitable for agriculture. This marginal land management to conform to agriculture would require additional costs, such as for the development of water management systems, fertilizing, and raising the pH (Buku Putih Ketahanan pangan, 2006). It is mainly creating the land degradation due to natural disasters such as the case in Sigi Regency.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Decentralization as the implementation of democracy in the region should place food security as an orientation into the upstream basic needs of society. Because of that, the food security in the form and type of policies by Lowi in Parsons, (2006: 482) mentions several models to analyze a policy namely distributive, regulatory and redistributive policies. At this early conception, the food security policy in distributive policy is defined as the direction of the various fields in order to achieve the objectives of common interest and mutual needs in the context of the management of modern society which is the government.

Each policy requires an implementation policy to be managed in accordance with the plan. This situation is indicated if the application considers several factors. These factors according to Edwards III in Winarno (2007) are:

- 1) Communication is related to the process of delivering information and consistency of the submitted information. Communication is important for the ongoing process of coordination and implementation, which leads to the emergence of a thorough understanding of the program importance and a comprehensive agreement on the goals and objectives that will be achieved.
- 2) Resources are related to the four components, namely, the fulfillment of the number of staff, the quality of necessary information for the decision making, sufficient authority to carry out its duties and responsibilities, and supporting facilities.
- 3) Disposition (tendencies) is the attitude

and commitment of the implementers of the program, especially from those who become implementers of the program, which in this case is bureaucratic official.

- 4) The bureaucratic structure is the existence of a standard operating procedure (SOP) which regulates the flow of work and the implementation of the program.

The implementation of food security policies which becomes the focus of this study is a series of rules derived from the legal acts to the decision of the Mayor. It requires analysis to be able to demonstrate its effectiveness in its field practice, especially includes:

- a) Policy Determination which is the analysis that is related to the way of policy-making, why, when, and for whom the policy is made;
- b) The content of the policy is the analysis that includes a description of specific policy, in this case food security, and how it is developed from the previous policy. This analysis can also be based on the information provided by the theoretical framework which tries to provide a critique to the policy.

The existence of the above points in building the behavioral patterns of society is very essential because the main object of the success by this food security program is the community of farmers and not local governments. Stimulus to the community with the different level of acceptance and understanding is an empirical reality that inevitably has to be accepted and understood on the mechanisms of state management by the regency administration.

METHODS

This research was conducted in Sigi Regency as the new autonomous region and is a center for the traditional farming cultivation which provides supply for Palu and Donggala cities. The qualitative research was used with the field observation and in depth interview techniques through the use of questions list from the Regent (Ir. Aswadin Randalembah), chief of Bappeda (Alm. Drs.

Mohammed Salmin), Head of the Food Security Office (Siti Sudarmi, SP., M.Si), Office agriculture, fisheries and livestock (Ir. Agus Lamakarate, MM), BP4K Kab. Sigi (Tugimin, Spt, MM), the Department of Forestry and Plantation (Ir. Andi Aco), Perindagkop, and Legislator Sigi (Rival).

Besides the results of the in-depth interview, this study was also supported with the record of focus group discussion (FGD) with purposive sample of community in the village of Jono Oge, disctrict of Biromaru which is a surplus agricultural village and dominated by plural immigrant farmers and the Bulu Bete village, Dolo Selatan District which is minus agricultural village and consists of homogenous local farmer of Kaili ethnic. This study involved the district government and village officials (village head and village secretary, village representative body/BPD, youth organization, farmer joint groups/Gapoktan, farmer groups/Poktan, agricultural educators, religious leaders, traditional leaders, women leaders). The data was also supported by secondary data from the above agencies and the media (newspapers, websites, etc.). This data was recorded and then made transcripts for easy verification and meaning.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Sigi Regency officially became autonomous regency since July 21, 2008 with the approval of Act No. 27 of 2008 on the establishment of Sigi Regency. This new region has an area of 5196.02 square kilometers consisting of 15 districts with Kulawi District as the largest district (1053.56 km²) and Dolo district as the smallest district with an area of 36.05 km² (CBS, 2012).

Population growth in the period 2010-2012 (two) years ranges from 1.59%, in which this period there were 3.93% of the population suffered from malnutrition. And there were 15.62% of the population that are categorized as below prosperous and prosperous I.

The situation becomes a challenge for a stable development considering the strong farmer in Sigi Regency. The condition is very clear as compared to the number of food

Table 1. The number of poor citizen in Sigi Regency

No.	Districts	Population (people)	Number of family	Below prosperous family	Prosperous I family	Malnutrition and insufficient
1	Pipikoro	7,962	2195	644	531	665
2	Kulawi Selatan	8,630	2281	786	780	773
3	Kulawi	14,434	4127	1326	1059	221
4	Lindu	4,777	1291	524	234	399
5	Nokilalaki	5,730	1467	238	636	410
6	Palolo	27,385	7756	2127	2336	409
7	Gumbasa	11,898	3207	609	872	661
8	Dolo Selatan	14,715	3944	2475	823	537
9	Dolo Barat	12,808	3623	1512	1470	664
10	Tanambulava	8,011	2252	657	428	536
11	Dolo	20,972	5255	1081	1427	932
12	Sigi Biromaru	43,649	10779	2151	3255	790
13	Marawola	21,379	7814	728	1276	482
14	Marawola Barat	6,500	1809	1247	538	179
15	Kinovaro	9,649	2779	1587	768	932
Sigi Regency 2013		218,499	60579	17692	16433	8590

Source: the Data of SKPG, Food Security Department of Sigi Regency, 2013

Table 2. Number of food production in Sigi Regency in 2012

No.	District	Paddy Production (Ton)	Corn Production (Ton) Gross	Cassava Production (Ton) Gross	Sweet Potatoes Production (Ton) Gross
1	Pipikoro	4003	545	186	162
2	Kulawi Selatan	6387	880	246	120
3	Kulawi	12205	447	288	117
4	Lindu	3123	11064	738	469
5	Nokilalaki	3089	429	266	106
6	Palolo	34060	1100	267	106
7	Gumbasa	4022	537	577	0
8	Dolo Selatan	12727	7640	1478	1353
9	Dolo Barat	10760	4775	658	553
10	Tanambulava	11877	440	185	96
11	Dolo	24353	545	6799	4095
12	Sigi Biromaru	38891	1108	430	0
13	Marawola	2577	448	847	297
14	Marawola Barat	0	1418	861	437
15	Kinovaro	1907	925	981	530
Gross Production		169981	32301	14807	8441

Source: The Data of SKPG, Badan Ketahanan Pangan of Sigi Regency, 2013

production in each area of Sigi Regency, namely:

The portrayal of both data shows that the development of community food production is not associated with the changes in the quality of life in Sigi Regency. The situation is characterized by the existence of poor nutrition in the regency although they have a surplus of food in terms of quantity. In this context, there is a big problem regarding on how malnutrition can happen where the welfare figures are still high. The use of data instruments in policy making will be visible in the form of regional policies program in the form of funding and programs in each SKPD and cross-SKPD so it will be able to create a better situation of society.

The continuity of the data was shown in the plus minus crops report of Sigi Regency in 2012 for January to August. For the types of plants –paddy- (Rice), there are some surplus district namely Palolo, Tanambulava and Nokilalaki districts while in districts Sigi Biromaru, the minus result occurred in June 2012, the District Dolo had surplus result in April, June, July and the remaining were minus, South Dolo District experienced a surplus in April, June, July, August; Dolo West districts experienced a surplus in April, June, July; Marawola district surplus in February, June; while the West Marawola district had minus throughout the months; Gumbasa district was minus in January, June, July August, Kinovaro district was minus in April, July, August (Sigi Food Security Office, 2013). During the period, there was no effect of *puso*/failed harvest (DP3 Sigi, 2013).

Some national policies are made to encourage the institutionalization of food security as an intervention attempt from the governments toward condition specificity faced by Indonesia, especially the Sigi Regency. Among them are:

1. The Regulation of the Minister of Agriculture No. 29 / Permentan / OT.140 / 3/2010 on Guidelines for Rural Agribusiness Development (PUAP)
2. The Decree of the Minister of Agriculture Number: 3045 / kpts / OT.140 / 9/2010 on Stipulation of Village and Farmers

Group Association (Gapoktan) Recipients Community Direct Assistance Fund (BLM) Rural Agribusiness Development (PUAP) The second phase of Fiscal Year 2010.

3. Decree of the Regent of Sigi No. 520/0202 / B-SIGI / 2010 on the Establishment of the Technical Committee of Rural Agribusiness Development (PUAP) Sigi.
4. Sigi District Regulation No. 10 of 2010, on the Executive Agency of Agricultural Extension, Fisheries and Forestry Sigi.
5. The Regent of Sigi decree No. 6 of 2011, the description of the main tasks and functions of the agricultural, fisheries and forestry implementation agencies of Sigi.

All rules of mutual synergy become the main foundation of applying and delivering the realization of food security that are expected to encourage a better lifestyle and mindset of farmers in Sigi Regency to be more modern.

The pillar of development in Sigi Regency is in the field of Agriculture, Tourism and Small-Medium Enterprises SMEs. This can be seen in the Government's vision of Sigi in 2010-2015, namely "The Realization of Sigi Regency which is Cultured, Civilized, and Excellent in Using the Potential Resources toward An Advanced Regency". The general policies of food security in Sigi Regency includes (a) Improving food security for the community; (b) Improving the welfare of farmers.

Those general policies will be pursued through these development programs:

1. Improvement of food security aimed at increasing the sustainability of food security with the target of declining the ratio of the districts' food insecurity in Sigi Regency.
2. Improvement Program of Farmers' welfare aimed at improving the welfare of farmers with the target of increasing the Value of Farmers' Sales Index or the Value of Agricultural Production Selling Index.

For the government and all elements of society in Sigi Regency, agriculture sector has multi-functions from the function of culture to the function of politics, which

until now has not received adequate attention from the public related to the quality of its management. Agriculture sector is the identity and source of life for most people in Sigi Regency. The sector is a supplier of clothing, food, and housing for the population, as well as the preserver or conservation of sustainable nature in Sigi Regency.

Agricultural Sector in reality becomes a dominant sector in the establishment and economic activity in Sigi Regency. But in addition to agriculture, food security is also obtained by SKPD. This explanation can be seen from the Sigi Regent who states that:

“... Coordination between some relevant agencies related to food security issues in Sigi Regency is conducted almost every day, including in every Monday, we hold a meeting to discuss all the sectors in which food security is part of it. The food security issue is for example how sometime it is hampered by the industrial sector and so on. We do all those things in order to be inter-connected with each other. We hope SKPD in Sigi Regency does not display any sectorial ego. Because I always convey to SKPD that we work for the public, meaning that Sigi regency government exists because of the public. Therefore, the level of social welfare is our priorities, which among them is also about food security ... “(ARL, in Sayuti, Sultan, M. Nur Alam, 2013)

There are several important points in the above statement, especially the need for an official forum, institutionalization of food security, as well as the necessity for a change of mindset of government bureaucracy to go out from the old “tradition” that sees the success from their only point of view. Sigi Regency empirical condition of food security depends on the paddy rice accompanied by the condition of commodity production which in 2012 had 38.174 hectares of production area (DP3 Sigi, 2013).

The main severe problem in Sigi Regency is the problem of poverty, which includes:

1. high number of poor people.
2. non-optimal planning and implementation of poverty reduction programs.

3. uneven and uncoordinated implementation of various policies and programs to reduce poverty.
4. non-optimal institutions that deal with the problem of poverty.

Institutionally, the main institution which becomes the foundation of food security policy is in the hand of institutional food security department of Sigi Regency as stated in the regional regulations of Sigi Regency No. 09 2010 on July 19, 2010 concerning the organizations and functions of the Inspectorate, Bappeda and technical institutes of Sigi Regency. Therefore, it becomes the basis for the sustainability of food security in Sigi Regency. It is also seen in Sigi Regent decree No. 521/106 / B.SIGI / 2012 on 24 April 2012 about the establishment of food security council of Sigi Regency where the chairman is regent and operational chairman is the Secretary of the District Chief Executive (Sekkab) and the secretary is the Head of Food Security of Sigi Regency, this model makes this institutionalization stagnant and not dynamic.

The circumstance becomes a strategic indicator of food security office toward another institution. The phenomenon of bureaucratic life has structurally complicated the coordination considering all agency heads who become members of the working team working are the level of the leaders with the higher echelon classification as compared to the head of food security office who has just a IIIa echelon. The other policies that strengthen the functions of food security is the number of Sigi Regency government policies through the Regent, head of food security office and Sekkab as the operational chairman of food security of Sigi Regency and all related institutions which put food security office as the main leading sector.

The main functions of the food security office are as the technical policy makers in the field of food security, the provision of support on the regional administration areas of food security, the development and execution of tasks in the field of food security, and the implementation of other tasks given by the Regent (Lakip Food Security of

Sigi Regency, 2012). One of the other efforts to boost the food security in the Sigi Regency is by the stipulation of the existing industrial core competence in Sigi Regency, in this case is the cocoa processing industry (Food Security LAKIP Sigi, 2012). The existence of the action plan of the industrial development of core competence will be the operational guideline of the government officers of Sigi Regency in directing and supporting the implementation of core competence development program of cocoa processing industry complementarily and synergistically.

The existence of food security office budget with the support cost from the provincial budget, regency budget, and the APBN/De-concentration with a total budget of 3,877.750.000 even in the realization of performance measurement activities table (pengukuran kinerja kegiatan -PKK) of food security department in 2012 to finance the improvement of food security in the Sigi Regency for the realization of 98% with a target of 2.601.820.000 and the realization is 2,566,443,325 including office administration services for 430,222.500 and the rest for the improvement of resilience as much as 2,136,220,725 (LAKIP of Sigi Regency Food Security, 2012). This is obviously a very small figure in the estimation of potential stimulus for people in Sigi Regency.

According to the previous explanation, it is estimated that Sigi Regency is an area which relies on agriculture and food security to be one of the main sectors because the challenges and expectations of Sigi Regency does not merely prepare food for themselves but the wider community in their surrounding such as Palu and Donggala Regencies, including some areas in Kalimantan. The budget is smaller than the budget allocation for the agricultural development sector of Sigi Regency since the year 2009-2012 in the amount of 4,334,768,916.31 (DP3 Sigi, 2013). When we further compare to the 2012 budget, this figure is only 0.72% of the total budget including direct and indirect expenditure amounted to 537,245,541,000 (Bappeda Sigi, 2012).

Sigi local revenues in 2012, amounted to 4,900,950,000.00 or contributing 0.91%

to the budget of Sigi regency, therefore, it becomes a challenge for more innovative activities related to the policies that encourage farmers' perspectives in terms of their position as part of efforts to maintain the stability of food as well as the creation of a more balanced consumption patterns. The construction that has always emerged as a question is that where is the plus value of crop production which is carried out by society toward national mechanisms. Once again, the support to the farmers is appreciated by the development strategy which is measured materialistically on the urban development and not the society welfare potential.

In detail, Sigi government policies that include a direct security policy can be seen in some of the important points in RP-JMD Sigi Regency 2010-2015 (Bappeda Sigi, 2012) covering the policy orientation of local finance for:

1. Regency expenditure is prioritized for the improvement of the purchasing power on revitalization of agriculture, animal farming, fishery, plantation and forestry, strengthening rural based economic structure, empowerment of cooperatives and SMEs, Tourism, as well as support for rural infrastructure.
2. Regency expenditure is intended to support the reduction of unemployment through ready-to-work employment preparation, increased investment in several sectors, improvement of facilities and infrastructure for employment training.
3. Regency expenditure is intended to support the development of economic activities, maintenance, and development of infrastructure in the area of production centers in rural areas, and the accessibility of the raw water and electricity sources.
4. Regency expenditure is used to support the efforts to maintain the environmental capacity through programs and activities to reduce environmental pollution, achievement of the target of protected areas, disaster mitigation, and control of the land use and excessive exploitation of natural resources.

Sigi Regency financial expenditure

policy is a four out of 13 (thirteen) proclaimed policies which is intended as a regional policy to support the achievement of the Vision-Mission of Regent and Vice Regent 2010-2015, including also the target of Human Development Index (HDI) and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). The regency expenditure policy year 2010-2015 is done through regulation of regional spending which embraces the principles of proportionate, efficient and effective, economical and transparent (Bappeda Sigi, 2012). Other mechanism adopted by Sigi government to strengthen the basis of food security is to optimize the vertical presence of national and provincial institutions.

As an effort to institutionalize the binding between Sigi government agencies with the institutions, a joint agreement between the Regent Sigi Ir. H. Aswadin Randalambah, the Head of BPTP Central Sulawesi Province, and SKPD Chief of. Sigi Regency (sulteng.litbang.deptan.go.id, 2013) is done. The approved agreement is related to changes in the behavior of farmers as follows:

1. The improvement of agricultural productivity is inseparable from the application of technological innovation, but technological innovation will not provide the expected results without the support of other sectors, especially with regard to infrastructure, capital, marketing and others. For those reasons, in order to increase the productivity of the agricultural sector, Sigi Regency is required to make programs that can integrate various sectors, so that development activities can be more focused, efficient and effective.
2. The developmental model of Rural Agriculture through Innovation which is abbreviated as M-P₃MI is one of Agriculture Rural Development Model that integrates not only by involving sub-sectors in agriculture, but the sector outside of agriculture. M-P₃MI success is largely determined by the support of various sectors, both financially and program support.
3. Given the available organic material in Sigi Regency which is not used optimally, such as hay crops and cocoa wastes, it is

expected that the M-P₃MI program can maximize the utilization of the waste in promoting agricultural productivity while reducing environmental impact.

4. The institutional development can be done through a cultural approach so that the public will be regulated by customary law.

One of the priorities which is expected to trigger the farmers' work performance in the region is through the preparation of various institutions such as the Counseling Center for Agriculture, Fisheries, and Forestry (BP₃K) in Sigi Regency which have been formed in some places to support the assisting tasks for the community. The implementation of the tasks of this institution is conducted through the institutionalization of farmers professionally by the formation of farmers' combined group (gapoktan) in the village consisting of several farmer groups (Poktan) with one of serious obstacles is not working in synergy in each work unit (SKPD) to achieve the outcomes because of the sectoral ego on each agency (SKPD). The number of Farmer Group Association (union) is 146 Units, the number of farmer groups (Poktan) is 1,051 units, Pokdakan (fisheries) as many as 108 units, and KTH (Forest) 71 units, so there are 1376 units. Those are groups that have been formed from the total population in Sigi 214 700 people.

One of the disadvantages of these groups is that the Top Down characteristics so that it is not a pure public participation. The non-synchronization between institutions that creates a dilemma towards the issue of agriculture escort headed towards the realization of regional food security as one informant put forward as the following:

"... Indeed, it is sometimes a dilemma to be the educator in the field, for example, educator who is in the village had divided the territory, such as, a village that we have divided and formed groups. From BP₄K already sums up the whole potential of existing farmer groups in Sigi. The educator has already had the data group, for example in a village there are 10 groups. But on one hand, there are certain people

go into that village for the group. Well, it is usually chaotic. This includes the existing groups assisted by the department of agriculture but not yet entered in the SK of Regent that we manage and it will be put sort of revisers so the group can be assisted... (TUG, in Sayuti, Sultan, M. Nur Alam, 2013)

Further explained

"... educator is only volunteer in the village, while if there is a program officers who come to the region by bringing equipment, it will make the PPL workers unconfident. The solutions that exist today are in a form of decree on strengthening the group which explains that when there are groups outside of their group, it is not their responsibility, so that is the solution. For example, there are many cases where assistance from the province come into the area of Marawola districts by providing assistance directly to communities goat without coordination and involvement in village or district extension, when there is failure on the aid program, the PPL officers is questioned on why educator does not accompany them?. While initially, the program was not coordinated with BP4K or BP3 in each district. So that the educator is not responsible ... "(TUG, in Sayuti, Sultan, M. Nur Alam, 2013).

Some of the above circumstances are part of food security problems especially in the field of food security that emphasizes the implemented activities and are method and pilot project involving the community directly and the implementation is not understood by the public such as; utilization of the yard for the development of food that is contested, accelerating diversification of food and nutrition community conducted simultaneously between socialization and competition, socialization of local food love in a form of competition reserved menu 3 B (LAKIP Sigi Food Security, 2013). While in the counseling sector, they provide guidance to the achievement of the program where the agricultural sector is an intervention program that is escorted by PPL although sometimes the phenomenon of sectoral ego that is still visible there.

The main reliance of gross domestic

income (GDP) of Sigi Regency lies in the agricultural sector, with the contribution of 52.85% (BPS Sigi, 2011) which is the highest achievement earned although it is still far below the target given in RPJMD for the agricultural sector which is 54.73 % in the third year (Bappeda Sigi, 2012). This achievement can be considered that there are still many things that have not been on the right track so that the optimum achievement of the farm has not been reached. This can be just a natural reality that Sigi is a natural area of agricultural management, and has not been optimized through the appropriate program.

The Future of Farmers

Sigi community character appears on the slogan which is used as a branding for local government that is *Mareso Masagena* which means Mareso (Reso) or hard work, tenacious, unflinching courage, enterprising, resilient, patient, trustworthy, then Masagena (Sagena) which means complete, convenience, shared and prosperous. In other words, the meaning and significance of the both words is to work hard to achieve success together for the welfare (Bappeda Sigi, 2012).

Until 2010, the Government of Sigi claims that there is about 38.2 percent of the 217 874 inhabitants of Sigi who are still relatively poor. The factors causing a high rate of poverty is, in addition to the influence of education, the limited employment with a far below average salary, the isolation factor of some areas also affects poverty in the region.

There is an error in the process of agricultural production in creating a behavioral pattern of with modern agriculture orientation. Mostly, the local farming communities still maintain traditional farming patterns on rice commodity which is managed monotonously, although it is empirically not so strategic view of production but is very important for the food security. Various mistakes on the traditional agricultural production patterns are seen in the use and utilization of rice seeds to post-harvest processing, farmers in this region often make small

mistakes that subconsciously will bring big economic losses.

The success in Sigi agriculture occurs because of the productive labor migration patterns (urbanization) that creates an imitation pattern of production. The interaction of Sigi local farmers who are culturally manage their agriculture with the outside farmers (bugis or Java) who are used to make innovation in agricultural business creates a great desire for local communities to also be able to perform the same production mechanism for the better result.

The existence of a very traditional way of thinking for the nature dependence is a cultural problem which still exists in the public mindset with assumption that nature has presented everything to the community. This condition creates apathetic society like the one in the research object namely *petani angina* (wind farmers-ARL, in Sayuti, Sultan, M. Nur Alam, 2013). The transfer of knowledge to a peer system is another example as expressed by the below farmers:

“... people in Bulu Bete, since 70s-80s until 90s, just knew it all, Corn ..corn ..failed harvest, that's it '. Later, I studied the emergence of this event through Javanese migrants, Bugis migrants, and modern farmers because we are just unprofessional farmers. They plant some crops, for example tomatoes, apples, watermelon, and cucumbers. From some hectares, if only corn for example, say 1 hectare will result in only about 2 million. If it's Javanese or Bugis people use that 1 hectare, the harvest can worth until 12-15 million, so they have an evolved way of thinking. Eventually, that's what I see today evolving in People of Bulu Bete because almost everyone here works as farmers. It means not only that. After that, there are alternate planting such as tomatoes, cucumbers, sweet potatoes. Because sweet potato's price is Rp.350.000 / sack, so it means our gratitude. We can imitate the way our family from Java and South Sulawesi to do their farm who have already established an advanced ways of thinking because this is not just like images, this is a clear example in the field ... “(FGD, in Sayuti, Sultan, M. Nur Alam, 2013)

In this context, the general knowledge possessed by farmers is not enough to take a rational decision, so that the necessary intervention and government policies or best practice from outside knowledge is needed to trigger the action. The objectives will never be able to be achieved if the farmers do not have supporting instruments and perhaps this is also related to the strong culture of patron client/patronage in the community. But this sign must be read as an important marker for the government for creating a more creative and efficient program. It is further stated that the culture of Sigi people likes to imitate the success,

“... The rice paddies using Legowo row model shows good result. The PPL officers just provide information or story that if we plant rice with the Legowo row system until 6-7 tons / hectare will result in a good harvest. Obviously, people will not believe it, if we only we get the story. Surely, the government should have to give a real example. And after the result is successful and seen by the people, for instance, their production is usually only 2-3 tons and after the piloting project using Legowo row system, the result becomes 6-7 tons. And at this point, they will they follow us. So this is actually a thing to be started first, which is from the top levels ... “(FGD in Sayuti, Sultan, M. Nur Alam, 2013)

The above statement embodies the cultural construction of society that has not been grown in a culture of modern, creative, innovative and independent agriculture. Their culture is still coopted with the old model which always thinks about derivative farming or even forced by economic demands. Although there are government programs that have also imposed some piloting projects such as national program of school field, integrated land processing, and the management of agricultural, the programs are still limited.

Generally, people move to do something if there is a concrete/empirical evidence that they can see and is not limited to just giving directions. Therefore, the existence

of the empowerment program fostering the food security in Sigi Regency is very important such as the program of *Kaji Terap* Rice and Corn and other agricultural activities (BP4K Sigi, 2013).

The same program is conducted by food security department (Food Security Strategic Plan of Sigi, 2012) through the improvement of food security programs as well as the acceleration of program diversification of food consumption and nutrition which is a stimulant effort to encourage people to care about food security mainly with the utilization of local food potential and not merely relying on rice but also corn, tubers, and various other nutritious food.

For the Small and Medium Enterprises sector, the government of Sigi Regency through Perindagkop Agency and SMEs, even during the visit of the minister of agriculture in the village of Jono Oge on the usage of Sustainable Food House Region (KRPL), have signed agreement related to the cooperation in the purchase and management of fried onions which until now does not show a clear cooperation, although institutionally, Perindagkop also has a program that is strongly associated with the security such as,:

1. The Creation Business a Conducive Climate for SMEs through SME Development Facilitation
2. The Program of Entrepreneurship Development and Small-Medium Enterprises Competitiveness, activities: Facilitation of promotion infrastructure development on production results and Cooperative Management Training.
3. The Program of business supporting development systems for small and medium micro enterprises that support the socialization of information on capital provision for small and medium enterprises.
4. The program of Cooperative Institutional Quality Improvement namely, Monitoring, Cooperative Achievement Award, evaluation monitoring, and reporting
5. The Development Program of Small and Medium enterprises related to the facilitation for SMEs toward Resource Utilization; Facilitation of Partnership of SMEs

with Private and production system technology.

6. The Improvement Program of Industrial Technology which is the mentoring of Industrial Technology ability.
7. The Arrangement of industrial structure including policy for top and down business and facilities and infrastructure provision for industrial clusters (Strategic Perindagkop & SMEs, 2010).

Therefore, Sigi Regency should be able to reorient the potential of that programs so they can be implemented effectively in each phases in order to produce quality outcomes for more prosperous and empowered society. However, it is unfortunate that there has been no region institution in general which specifically prioritizes the food security as one of the strategic programs that can encourage the achievement of the other sectors.

The main concern of development undertaken by Sigi government seems to be more oriented on the infrastructure development particularly office infrastructure while the food security program just receives a little concern and is generally limited to the formal program. This food security program does not encourage the change of mindset and attitudes for the farmers. The ceremonial activity with the presence of officials is certainly an effort to show the concern and achievement of food security in the society.

The coverage magnitude of achievement exposed by the government has addressed the people who have begun to understand food security presence in agricultural policies to be marginalized. This situation creates a reduction on their interest of farming. The farmers mistrust the system of government programs. Therefore, the agricultural program is merely a pragmatic program using hit-and-run system which means that the farmers only take the financial support from the program and do not give any serious innovation because they think that the farmers are just an object and not the subject of agricultural program by the government.

The infrastructure problem in Sigi Re-

gency to promote food security across the region is conducted by SKPD, as stated Regent of Sigi that:

“... as a new area with a wide infrastructure and geographical condition, the main priority is the improvement of infrastructure construction in Sigi Regency. But through the development of other programs, we expect the achievement of other areas, particularly food security which really needs support of infrastructure to reach out to the existing locations ...” (ARL in Sayuti, Sultan, M. Nur Alam, 2013)

In line with the Regent, there are other informants who stated that.

“..... To realize a good agricultural development, we must no longer create barriers between the educators and the community. We have the same vision including food security; even the agriculture department wants to realize agricultural development through Sigi Regency agricultural department has significantly needed the help from other agencies such as Public Works Department (PU). PU should help us in terms of irrigation because we need to take water from a big river which must pass through non-farming land. Our expertise does not go that far. We need engineer who can help us to build irrigation networks. And after our successful farmers have cultivated the production, then we urgently need the Department of Perindakop to pack their crops and then make our own industry to be sold. Managing such area belongs to Perindakop, our main task is to lead farmers to gain successful production ...” (ALK in Sayuti, Sultan, M. Nur Alam, 2013)

It is seen in a various programs to improve the road quality from and to the centers of agricultural production which is directed to increase the current distribution of agricultural products in each of the centers of production to markets of Sigi. The development of the agricultural center (farm roads) is mainly directed to some agricultural production centers in all regions of Sigi Regency. The expectation of the people from the method of focus group discussions (FGD)

that have been carried out shows that the reality is not intercepted with the idea of government toward their needs of production way.

Lack of infrastructure is one of the conditions that makes agriculture and farming products of the people difficult to be marketed outside the region. Several studies show that the frequency of access to agricultural information has the greatest influence on the behavior of farmers in addition to education, farming experience, agricultural management understanding, and the amount of family labor or the public interest to keep farming. As the complaint of some farmers in Jono oge, that:

“... The current obstacles are water channels which are much improved, but only the primary and secondary channels. Most of these tertiary channels is still much damaged. The problems that existed at that irrigation is the mechanism of P3A which should come from the Department of agriculture, but so far has not operated. Another thing is that there is limitation in the area of Jono Oge related to the transportation and roads in Food Barn which is still much less ...” (FGD in Sayuti, Sultan, M. Nur Alam, 2013)

So it can be concluded that the policy orientation is still partial and does not have the short or long term indicator. As part of the effort to encourage the farmers' behavior is conducted through Farmer Empowerment of Innovation and Information Technology (P3TIP / FEATI). One of the parts is to encourage this program is the researcher and educator. This strong point of Sigi government policy is also acting as the obstacle in managing the food security policy particularly related to finance, coordination, structure, and existing commitments.

The statement of farmer professional degradation is also sated b an informant:

“... If we want to see the condition in Sigi, most people who were once farmers now become only farm laborers due to the economic needs so they were the owner of the land but they sold to people who could afford. Then they became farmers again in

their own fields. The vast majority of land owners are no longer people from Sigi regency. Now, there are only few people who originally come from here, like in the Jono Oge village. Additionally, high level of conversion of agricultural land is potentially risky. The faring land with good irrigation has now become housing land. Such factor makes the change in the pattern of the former farm. The commission II of parliament is now preparing a local regulation on the maintenance of eternal agricultural land, for in the new Central Sulawesi in Sigi ... "(RIV in Sayuti, Sultan, M. Nur Alam, 2013)

The problem has emerged as the reality which is faced by society and therefore it becomes people's anxiety. And institutionally, the Regency Parliament as part of the public expression agency makes a good breakthrough. It is certainly expected to be a policy in favor of the community which can generate something that can keep community identity of Sigi to be better. Therefore, the involvement of professional guidance and educator is essential in order to focus on the agricultural production economy business mechanism and not only in the program.

CONCLUSION

The political climate of democracy in the era of decentralization complicates the success of food security programs. Institutionalization of agricultural policy which has been done is the first step to be able to trigger people to care about the farming profession which is regarded by young people as a "last alternative". This mindset puts agricultural employment with less respected position and it is only a matter of traditional legacy from a village. The process of institutionalization of government policy interests in a village tends to be used as a mere mobilization strategy to support popularity. Therefore, the deviation happens when too many political interests take part.

This dilemma becomes a challenge for the government, considering that this policy aims at increasing the local Sigi's welfare and food security in the context of the

country. The reality of local autonomy in a decentralized environment should emerge as spirit to encourage the local potential optimization in triggering more people to survive, and not vice versa, as a formality in potential, agricultural, and regional character and culture of the community which does not have a strong historical value.

The success in Sigi is a short-term effect is seen through vigorous programs scattered in various local work unit primarily on several related institutions, but there has been no effort to build synergy between agricultural potential, farming capacity, the culture of farmers and Sigi government policies. However, the regency parliament should be appreciated for its initiative efforts to present a draft regulation on the protection of agricultural areas.

The existing policy model which includes communication, resources, disposition or commitment and structure is still not working properly. It can be seen on the synergy between several departments to care about food security. The non-optimal food security council and the distance between each SKPD in practice can be a beginning or ending problems of the sustainability of food security policy that is the construction of the state in realizing the sovereignty of the people. It takes the support of various political will of the political leadership in the region to be able to create a model that is able to accelerate the context, the structure of state policy, and culture of local communities in generating food security policies which are more relevant to the local context and could be an example for the same area. This study of food security gets funding support from the directorate general of higher education, ministry of education and culture of Indonesia through Tadulako University for the advanced decentralization in 2013.

REFERENCES

- Alamsyah, M.N. 2012. *Preliminary Report State Of Local Democracy (SoLD) Assesment In, Parigi Moutong Indonesia*. JPP UGM & IDEA International.
- Bappeda Sigi. 2011. *Dokumen Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah Daerah Kab. Sigi tahun 2010-2015*. Sigi: Bappeda.

- BP4K Sigi. 2013. *Data Profil Badan Penyuluh Pertanian, perikanan, Peternakan dan Kehutanan Kab. Sigi*. Biromaru: BP4K.
- BPS Sigi. 2012. *Kabupaten Sigi Dalam angka Tahun 2011*. Biromaru: Bappeda-BPS.
- Darwanto, D.H. 2005. Ketahanan Pangan Berbasis Produksi Dan Kesejahteraan Petani. *Jurnal Ilmu Pertanian*, 12 (2): 152 - 164.
- Dewan Ketahanan Pangan. 2006. *Revitalisasi Pertanian, Perikanan, dan Kehutanan*. Jakarta: Kementerian RI.
- Dinas Perindagkop dan UMKM Kab. Sigi. 2011. *Rencana Strategis Satuan Kerja Perangkat Daerah (Renstra SKPD) dinas perindagkop dan UMKM Kab. Sigi tahun 2010-2015*. Biromaru: Dinas perindagkop dan UMKM.
- Dinas Pertanian, Perikanan dan Peternakan (DP3K) Kab. Sigi. 2013. *Data Luas Tanam Menurut Kecamatan, Dinas Pertanian, Perikanan Dan Peternakan Kab. Sigi 2013*. Biromaru: Dinas Pertanian, Perikanan Dan Peternakan (DP3K) Kab. Sigi.
- Dinas Pertanian, Perikanan dan Peternakan (DP3K) Kab. Sigi., 2013. *Data Luas Tanam, Luas Puso, Luas Panen, Produktifitas Dan Produksi Tanaman Pangan Bulan Januari-Maret 2013*. Biromaru: Dinas Pertanian, Perikanan Dan Peternakan (DP3K) Kab. Sigi.
- <http://sulteng.litbang.deptan.go.id/ind/index.php/berita/4-info-aktual/339-pertemuanpembk-ab-sigi-dan-bptp-sulawesi-tengah-hasilkan-4-butir-kesepakatan> downloaded on 2 August 2013, 09.23 Wita
- Kantor Ketahanan Pangan Sigi. 2012. *Laporan Surplus Minus Tanaman Pangan Kabupaten Sigi*.
- Kantor Ketahanan Pangan Kab. Sigi. 2012. *Laporan Akuntabilitas Kinerja Kantor Ketahanan Pangan Kab. Sigi (LAKIP) Tahun 2012*. Biromaru.
- Kantor Ketahanan Pangan Kab. Sigi. 2011. *Data Renstra Kantor Ketahanan Pangan 2010-2015*. Kantor Ketahanan Pangan Kab. Sigi. Biromaru.
- Kementerian Negara Riset dan Teknologi Republik Indonesia. 2006. *Indonesia 2005 - 2025 Buku Putih Penelitian, Pengembangan dan Penerapan Ilmu Pengetahuan dan Teknologi Bidang Ketahanan Pangan*. Jakarta.
- Mangunwijaya, Y.B(ed). 1993. *Teknologi dan dampak kebudayaannya, (Teknologi, Pembangunan dan Kebudayaan)*. Jakarta: Yayasan Obor Indonesia.
- Parsons, W. 2006. *Public Policy: Pengantar Teori dan Praktik Analisis Kebijakan*, Cet. ke-2. Jakarta: Kencana.
- Sayuti, Sultan, & Alamsyah, M.N. 2013. Kebijakan Ketahanan Pangan Dalam Mendorong Perilaku Kerja Petani Di Kabupaten Sigi. *Laporan penelitian*. Program Hibah Penelitian Desentralisasi Unggulan Perguruan Tinggi, Lembaga Penelitian Untad.
- Syahyuti. 2006. *Konsep penting dalam pembangunan pedesaan dan pertanian*. Jakarta: BRP.
- Winarno, B. 2007. *Kebijakan Publik: Teori dan Proses* cet. ke-1. Yogyakarta: Media Pressindo.