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ABSTRACT
The complexity of policy implementation is an unavoidable phenomenon, because the policy implementation situation tends to be dynamic and influenced by climate/environmental factors where the policy is implemented and the behavior of actors in the organization. Therefore, the effective role of implementing actors is one of the keys in optimizing the performance of food policy implementation for the poor in Bone district, one of the features that can be utilized by street level bureaucracy is discretion, because flexibility is needed to deal with unclear boundaries, uncertain situations and conflicting demands in the daily interaction of actors with policy beneficiaries. This study will attempt to explore how street level bureaucracy utilizes discretion in the implementation of food policy towards the poor in Bone district. This research uses a qualitative approach with data analysis techniques (Miles, Huberman &; Saldana, 2014) including data condensation, data presentation and conclusions. The findings in this study conclude that effective use of discretion in the role of street level bureaucracy actors can improve the performance of food policy implementation for the poor in Bone district.
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INTRODUCTION
Public policy is basically oriented towards meeting public needs and solving problems, just like the working process of the brain, which always thinks about what actions will be done and not done (Keban, 2008). Therefore, policy is always related to action, the role of implementor actors is very important, this relates to how policy implementors have interpretations that are in accordance with policy expectations. In policy implementation, one of the actors that plays an important role is the Street Level Bureaucracy, because they are employees who interact directly with the community as beneficiaries (Michael Lipsky, 1980). Their massive interaction with the community certainly influences how policy implementation can be right on target, in fact, they are de facto policy makers who informally build and rearrange organizational policies that have been implemented.

The implementation of food policy is a policy that is currently in the spotlight, besides that the policy is a crucial issue because it relates to the basic needs of the community. Therefore, to ensure the availability and affordability of food to the community, the government is carried out through (Law No. 18, 2012) concerning food. As stated in the law that the government, local governments are obliged to realize food affordability for
the community, households and individuals, thus food affordability for poor categories has become the government’s obligation.

Bone Regency is one of the food granary areas in South Sulawesi and contributes 15% to food availability in South Sulawesi, of course, with abundant production, this area should be able to realize food affordability for the community, especially the poor. But in fact this still seems not optimal, this can be seen from food imports carried out even though food production is experiencing a surplus. This phenomenon leads to hypotheses on the still need for government intervention through food policy. Furthermore, poverty in Indonesia is still dominated by rural areas with a rate of 12.36% as of September 2022. To maximize this, efforts are still needed to improve the performance of food policy implementation in Bone district (Alwi, 2022). The agricultural sector is closely related to poverty as stated by the World Bank that 50% of the agricultural sector contributes to rural poverty alleviation efforts, therefore efforts to maximize the implementation of food policies for the poor are needed, where it is known that the poverty rate in Bone district is at 10.68% in 2020.

The implementation of food policies is often characterized by complexity, it is based on the implementation of food security and poverty alleviation policies involving multi-actor processes, in addition to the dynamic situation of society so that this requires adaptive and innovative actions in the role of implementing actors. One actor that plays an important role is the street level bureaucracy where the discretionary dimension of this actor receives widespread attention in the study of policy implementation studies (Huber &; Shipan, 2002; Tummers et al, 2009; Akosa &; Asare, 2016), this relates to a number of their discretions that can increase the level of policy interpretation of beneficiaries (Tummers L, 2014), thus, street level bureaucrats play an important role to influence policy implementation (Keiser, 2010; Akosa &; Asare, 2016). With the tendency of policies that often show an impression that is not in accordance with policy formulations and provisions, this requires street level bureaucrats to deal with the problem. This requires an altruistic attitude in utilizing existing flexibility.

The role of street level bureaucracy in the implementation of food policy for the poor in Bone district is a strategic aspect, because street level bureaucracy actors can carry out the role of policy makers, this role is built on two important characteristics, namely the relatively high level of flexibility and relative autonomy of organizational authority (Michael Lipsky, 1980). Utilize the discretion possessed to influence the optimization of food policy implementation for the poor. Based on this description, this article seeks to explore the role of street level bureaucracy in utilizing discretion in the implementation of food policy for the poor in Bone district related to how their attitude utilizes discretion and how the implications of this role on the performance of food policy implementation for the poor in Bone district.
LITERATURE REVIEW

Street Level Bureaucracy & Public Policy Implementation

(Michael Lipsky, 1980; 3) defines street-level bureaucracy as public service workers who interact directly with citizens in carrying out their work and have considerable discretion in the performance of their work. He argues that when faced with dilemmas arising from policy inaccuracies, competing needs and lack of resources, the flexibility they have and the actions they take effectively become the public policies they run”. According to (Winter S. C., 2002) "Street-level bureaucracy is a field of work that interacts directly with citizens in implementing and implementing public policy. Therefore, these street-level bureaucrats are important actors in the policy implementation process. As Winter explains, a policy is only paper if it is not conveyed by the bureaucratic apparatus to the citizens".

As decision makers, street-level bureaucrats are often faced with discretion when facing a problem related to their job duties in providing services to the community. As stated (Michel Lipsky, 1980: 82) that "the role of street-level bureaucrats as policy makers is related to two things, namely related to their duty to serve the communities in which they interact, and related to policies taken by the institutions (agents) they represent. Discretion is basically a form of safety valve that can be used by street-level bureaucrats in overcoming policy gaps, especially those set by the Central Government with the real needs of people in more dynamic regions. Often there are policies or regulations that are operationalized in areas that turn out to be inappropriate and do not answer the needs of the community".

The fact that discretion is always embedded in the structure of rules, leaves room for distinctions made in public law between more structured and unstructured discretions (Hupe & Hill, 2007; Donnison 1977; Bull 1980). A public official has discretion when the effective limits of his power make him free to act (Hupe &; Hill, 2007; Davis 1969). Policy implementation is often faced with ambiguous and even contradictory situations and at the same time street level bureaucracy actors are required to act on their choices, this is referred to as policy policy. (Rigeling, 1978). This relates to the involvement of rules and regulations, namely the structure/division of labor of the implementing organization, the way democratic control is exercised and the work situation, especially their interaction with policy/service beneficiaries, these are sources of discretion. Street level bureaucrats can basically be policy makers, but they use their freedom to make policy specifically on the management of their work, as argued by (Hill &; Hupe; Maynard, Moody & Musheno, 2003: 20) who define the work of street level bureaucrats and are largely themselves more than just rules. The relationship between street level bureaucrats and policy/service beneficiaries is an exchange of resources, but not always symmetrical (Hasenfeld & Steinmentz, 1981) because they have a need for services that
are often not available, policy beneficiaries should be taught how to behave and street level bureaucrats are emphasized on ways of constructing the behavior of the community faced. Lipsky identifies this role as political, because street level bureaucrats de facto exercise a policy-making role or the policy itself is unable to guide their behavior.

**Discretion**

The discretionary dimension is decision making that is influenced by the actor's personal judgment, not bound by applicable law. This decision is often found in the dynamics of the *Street Level Bureaucracy* in providing services and implementing policies to beneficiaries/communities. In this case, they are required to be able to understand how the community responds and overcome the consequences of the decisions they make in service delivery/policy implementation. (Michael Lipsky, 1980: 13) suggests that "unlike lower-level workers in most organizations, street-level bureaucrats have considerable discretion in determining the nature, amount, and quality of benefits and sanctions provided by their agencies" from this understanding it can be explained that discretion is the discretion in using the authority of each individual in the decision-making process and the implementation of certain policies to the community. With this discretion, it can allow street level bureaucracy to use it to improve policy implementation performance in a positive direction and can also have the opposite impact where this flexibility directs policy implementation performance in a negative direction. *Street level bureaucrats* have to deal with the personal reactions of beneficiaries of a policy and public service to their decisions and how they address the implications. According to (Lipsky, 1980) the form of discretion is as follows

**Service access restrictions**

Utilizing discretion in the implementation of public policies and the delivery of public services, street level bureaucracy must verify how much resources are available with the number of service requests and then distribute services based on the type of service that has been verified so that in providing street level services bureaucracy makes decisions based on the need for public service requests.

**Administrative injustice**

In the dynamics of policy implementation in the role of street level bureaucrats, the community as beneficiaries of policies/services requires bureaucracy to be able to respond to the wishes of the community flexibly, in anticipating this, street level bureaucrats often have initiatives to improve services, but this shows a tendency of disappointment of beneficiaries if the services provided are not In accordance with his wishes Thus, bureaucratic interversion is necessary to ensure that the services provided to the community are appropriate. The allocation of public services is mostly in contact
with the lower-level bureaucracy. In some situations there are strong reasons that there are many differences in providing services to the public.

Organizing society and work situations

Street level bureaucrats organize society and regulate work situations in several ways, which are as follows:

a) Service providers interact with communities by strengthening their roles and limiting their interactions with communities
b) Interaction between service users is restricted. The service bureaucracy is structured in such a way that service users do not know the conditions of other service users. This treatment results in service users thinking that they are responsible for themselves
c) The services provided by the service provider are provided kindly to the service users. This they do to form the opinion of service users that the services they provide are of high quality
d) Service users play an active role in obtaining services
e) Interactions with service users are designed in tiers, so that service providers can control actions, timing, and steps taken
f) When controlling the community of service users is faced with a difficult situation, the interaction between the provider and recipient of the service is carried out by routine control mechanisms. Some service providers cannot rely entirely on the existing system in controlling the service user community, therefore they develop a routine agenda that aims to make service users take the initiative to prepare themselves before getting services
g) The service provider creates sanctions to provide penalties for actions that do not comply with the regulations compiled by the service provider. (Gatu Adie Pradana, 2020; Lipsky, 1980)

Influencing the mentality of beneficiaries

This relates to how street level bureaucracy changes their goals to better match their ability to perform their roles. In this case, mental adjustment to conditions that occur in the field is one way to reduce tension between policy implementers and policy beneficiaries. Thus, street level bureaucrats develop a conception of their work with beneficiaries, which reduces the tension between ability and purpose, thus making their work psychologically easier to organize. (Gatu Adie Pradana, 2020; Lipsky, 1980)

METHOD

This study uses a case study research design with a qualitative approach in describing and explaining how street level bureaucracy actors utilize aspects of discretion in efforts
to optimize the implementation of food policies for the poor in Bone district. By using data analysis techniques from (Miles, Huberman &; Saldana, 2014) which include data condensation, data unification and conclusion telling, so that the output of this study will illustrate the use of discretionary aspects on the role of street level bureaucracy in the implementation of food policy for the poor in Bone district.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The implementation of food policy for the poor in Bone district, carried out by the food security office as the leading sector in efforts to ensure food accessibility for the community, the form of action in achieving food policy objectives is carried out with three activity models, namely through the provision of government rice reserve assistance, monitoring food prices in the market and through the sustainable food yard program. The results of interviews and observations in the field identified street level bureaucracy as agricultural extension workers and village heads who were used as key informants in exploring how they played a role in utilizing discretion to realize food accessibility for the poor in Bone district. This exploration was carried out in three districts in Bone Regency, namely Barebbo District, Tellu Siatting District and Ulaweng District. The area is based on the food granary area.

Based on the three models of activities carried out by the government in order to realize food accessibility for the community, the first model aims to overcome food shortages that can have an impact on food and nutrition crises, control inflation and protect producers and consumers from the impact of price fluctuations on food aid recipients (National Food Agency Regulation, 2023), this activity is carried out in coordination with related agencies such as the Social Service as a facilitator of poverty data, Bulog as a distributor and the Food Security Office as a leading sector. Second, through monitoring food prices in the market, this aims to ensure food prices remain affordable by referring to predetermined prices, third, through the sustainable food yard (P2L) program which aims to empower the community through the use of yard land which is expected to bring food accessibility closer to the community. The following are the results of data reduction on the use of Street Level Bureaucracy discretion in implementation Food policy towards the poor in Bone district:

Table 1. Discretionary aspects at the street level bureaucracy in the implementation of food policies for the poor in Bone district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agricultural Extension Agency</th>
<th>Optimization of synergy between extension workers and between OPDs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Directing villages to form peasant women’s groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forming a Vegetable Bank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on the three sub-districts of the research locus, exploration related to discretion in the role of street level bureaucracy shows variations in street level bureaucracy decision-making actions in each region, can be seen in table 2.1, showing the actions of actors utilizing discretion in the implementation of food policy towards the poor in Bone district, in this case, indications of discretionary use were found in implementors who described as follows:

**Service access restrictions**

This aspect is related to how street level bureaucracy is limited in terms of service access, this requires the suitability of the resources owned with the services to be provided, so that before making a decision what to do, the actor pays attention to his ability first before implementing the decision. In handling this discretionary model, street level bureaucrats are carried out through verification of the types of services to be distributed to beneficiaries.

In the implementation of food policy for the poor in Bone district, restrictions on access to services were experienced by several street level bureaucrats, where actors found limitations to deal with a problem. This was experienced by the head of Jompie village, Ulaweng District, where as a street level bureaucracy realized the needs of the community, and how the situation of the poor category people in his village, actors thought that often people who were categorized as poor were actually still capable, but the village government did not have the capacity to manage the assistance received by the community because there were related agencies that tupoksinya handled the problem of poverty. then one of the factors causing poverty and low food affordability for the poor is the lack of employment, then the initiative carried out through verifying the needs of the village community and the suitability of the resources owned by the village government and limiting what the village government can do and what cannot be done, so that the results of community empowerment efforts through the peasant women's group become an implemented decision. This is based on the main commodity in the village is breadfruit, and can be a strategic industry to be managed by farmer women's groups,
initially the development of this industry cannot be done independently by the village government, this is due to limited budgets, but on the initiative of decision making taken, the village government took partnership steps with the provincial government to facilitate the creation of breadfruit chip industries that will Managed by the Women's Farmer Group, where the main target of this program is the involvement of poor people who are targeted to work in the industry, thus, it is hoped that the community can get a job so that they can get themselves out of poverty and accessibility to food needs will increase.

The same thing was also experienced by extension workers as one of the street level bureaucracy in Barebbo District, actors took the initiative to form a vegetable bank which aimed to collect the results of community yard utilization, this was based on the understanding of extension workers who considered that the use of yard land through farmer women's groups showed high productivity but experienced market problems that were not yet available where the community needed a market to distribute the results of its production. So that the decision to form a vegetable bank is what the community needs. This shows discretionary utilization activities on limited service access.

In the context of service restrictions, basically all street level bureaucrats actors experience this, it's just that the difference lies in how the actors respond to the discretionary model to be oriented towards improving the performance of food policy implementation for the poor in Bone District.

**Administrative injustice**

This aspect relates to the implications of discretionary use on policy or service beneficiaries, which often show negative impressions, such as disappointment with the services obtained. Therefore, bureaucratic interversion is necessary to ensure that the services provided to the community are appropriate. Especially in the role of street level bureaucrats which are the spearhead in the implementation of food policies for the poor, often the services provided give a dissatisfied impression to beneficiaries, this is due to variations in the relative satisfaction behavior of beneficiaries, so it tends to be difficult to fulfill the wishes of beneficiaries as a whole. This requires the active role of street level bureaucrats in realizing community satisfaction, in the context of food policy in Bone district a similar phenomenon was found, where there are people who are dissatisfied with the behavior of the services obtained, while in the perspective of street level bureaucrats this is related to the limited resources they have. Therefore, to deal with administrative injustice, street level bureaucrats are carried out by showing concrete evidence that the capacity of services provided is in accordance with the policy mandate. This is done by the village government, where as a street level bureaucrats is aware of the limited budget it has, so that the treatment of farmer groups in the village is different from the treatment carried out in the village, this is because the village government has a
special allocation of 20% for food security while the village government does not have this.

Organizing society and work situations

There are several ways of managing society and work situations, when the beneficiary community is faced with a difficult situation, the interaction between the implementor and the beneficiary is carried out with routine control mechanisms. Some service providers cannot rely entirely on the existing system to control the service user community, therefore they develop a routine agenda aimed at allowing service users to prepare themselves before getting services, such behavior is found in some street level bureaucrats actors in the implementation of food policies for the poor in Bone district which is carried out by absorbing their aspirations, recognizing the problems that occur and trying to overcome these problems. This behavior is applied by extension workers where the interaction of extension workers and communities in several research loci shows an attitude of altruism in empowering the poor, this is based on actor planning, namely mapping the potential of each area of the peasant women’s group and prioritizing the involvement of the poor, this mapping is carried out so that the commodities developed by the group are in accordance with the climate situation of the region and identify the poor to be empowered in yard land utilization programs. This shows how the role of street level bureaucrats in regulating the community and work situation in the implementation of food policy for the poor in Bone district.

Influencing the mentality of beneficiaries

Adjustment of the mentality of implementors with beneficiaries is needed to reduce tensions in the form of community pressure as beneficiaries that must be actively controlled by street level bureaucrats, this is also related to adjusting the mentality with bureaucratic actors involved in the implementation of food policies for the poor in Bone district. Based on observations and interviews in the field, this study found that the role of actors in influencing the mentality of beneficiaries is carried out by influencing villages to form groups of peasant women, this is done so that the performance of food policy implementation can be optimal and comprehensive, with community involvement through the P2L program expected to bring food accessibility closer to the community which of course requires the role of street level bureaucracy. In influencing the mindset of the community to be enthusiastic about being involved in the program. Furthermore, this aspect of influence is not only done to society, but is done with government actors involved.

In fact, the process of implementing food policy for the poor requires cross-sectoral collaboration, so this should be optimized street level bureaucrats through building harmonious relationships between extension workers, involved actors and local
communities. Thus, a harmonious cooperative relationship between stakeholders and beneficiaries is created.

The description of the actions taken by the street level bureaucracy illustrates how they use discretion in improving the performance of food policy implementation for the poor. However, such actions are only found in a few roles of street level bureaucracy actors so that optimization of the performance of food policy implementation as a whole has not been effective, this is due to the lack of extension resources that are not proportional to the number of villages/kelurahan in Bone district, and the activity budget is relatively small and actors have not received stimulus in the form of policy instruments who are able to change their behavior towards achieving policy performance (Alwi & Kasmad, 2018).

The identified actors using discretion to maximize policy implementation performance showed a significant impact on food affordability for the poor, based on interviews and observations with communities that showed the positive impact of decisions made by street level bureaucracy. Therefore, street level bureaucracy in the implementation of food policy strategically can be done by utilizing the resources owned and conducting activities and businesses such as giving birth to innovative actions, assistance and actions and interventions, resulting in management that shows a positive trend (Susanti & Sopia Rukmana, 2020). Street level bureaucracy in policy implementation often faces dilemmatic and uncertain situations so that in these situations decision making is expected to lead to policy optimization. Therefore, effective use of discretion is a strategic step in improving the performance of food policy implementation for the poor in Bone District.

CONCLUSION

Street level bureaucracy in the implementation of food policy towards the poor is one of the key actors because they are actors who interact directly with policy targets. The actions they take can directly affect the performance of policy implementation. One of the strategic steps in this case is the use of discretion in a positive direction, where actors act creatively to maximize policy implementation. This study concludes that effective use of discretion in the role of street level bureaucracy has a significant impact in efforts to increase food accessibility for the poor, but such behavior is only found in a few roles of street level bureaucracy actors in Bone district, so as to maximize the use of discretion in the role of street level bureaucracy it still requires development, training and tools as a driver of actors in achieving policy goals.
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