BUREAUCRATIC SUPPORT FACTORS IN A DECENTRALISED AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION IN JAVA, INDONESIA: AN INITIAL ASSESSMENT

Waridin

Diponegoro University, Semarang

ABSTRAK

Studi ini dimaksudkan untuk menelaah hubungan antara variabel faktor dukungan birokrasi dengan efektivitas pelaksanaan kebijakan desentralisasi penyuluhan pertanian. Populasi dalam kajian ini meliputi penyuluh pertanian yang bekerja di Balai Penyuluhan Pertanian di Jawa. Persampelan dengan tahapan berganda digunakan untuk menentukan 107 kelompok penyuluh pertanian dan 107 ketua Balai Penyuluhan Pertanian. Data dari kontak tani juga digunakan dalam kajian ini.

Kebijakan desentralisasi penyuluhan pertanian tidak dapat terlaksana dengan baik di tingkat lokal. Efektivitas perencanaan program, pengambilan keputusan, penggunaan sumberdaya, dan pemberian manfaat tidak dapat terlaksana seperti yang diharapkan. Sebagai sasaran pelayanan, petani hanya menerima sedikit manfaat dari pelayanan penyuluhan. Terdapat kecenderungan semakin rendah derajat pegawai semakin rendah pemahamannya terhadap implementasi kebijakan desentralisasi. Efektivitas pelaksanaan kebijakan berhubungan positif dan signifikan dengan faktor dukungan birokrasi, yaitu dukungan pemerintah daerah, pengawasan dan pemantauan dari institusi bidang pertanian.

Kata kunci: *efektivitas, kebijakan desentralisasi, penyuluhan pertanian, dukungan dari birokrasi*

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Many developing countries have attempted to restructure their administrative organisations to ensure the effective planning and implementation of development programmes. The nature and purposes of these reforms vary considerably depending on the emphasis and priority. Some countries placed coordination and teamwork, and the encouragement of people's participation on development activities (Adamolekun, 1991; Malo, 1995; Devas, 1997). The increasing attention in decentralising authority for development planning arose from several reasons (Ingham and Kalam, 1992). Firstly, it emerged from dissatisfaction with the results of highly centralised planning and control of development activities. Secondly, it arose from the requirements in growth-with-equity policies as a new strategy in operating development programmes. Finally, as societies became more complex and government activities became larger and expanding, it was increasingly difficult to plan and administer the development programmes effectively and efficiently from the central level.

Currently, several governments and international development agencies are promoting structural, financial, and managerial strategies to improve the public sector

activities and services, including agricultural extension. Agricultural extension service is in transition. Rivera (1996) mentions that cost sharing and participation of stakeholders in development initiatives and decision-making are several elements in agricultural extension's transition. Public sector services such as agricultural extension was intensely attacked in the 1980s for not being relevant, effective, and efficient in activities and for having little impact on its clienteles.

One of the most fundamental changes in introducing the concept of decentralisation to the agricultural extension function in Indonesia was that of setting the objectives (GOI, 1995). Previously, the setting of agricultural extension objectives was characterised by system-driven processes. This implies that the objectives of the agricultural extension programme were determined at the central level institution, and the lower levels were expected to implement and accomplish the predetermined objectives. However, the decentralisation policy when applied to the agricultural extension services meant that it should begin from the bottom level and moves up to the top level. The basic issue in the objective setting of agricultural extension services is how to reconcile the centralised mindset and its system-driven practices with the decentralised feature of participatory approach to make farmers' aspirations the basis of objective setting (Rivera and Gustafson, 1991; Crowder, 1997).

RESEARCH PROBLEM

Decentralisation policy has been recognised as an important element in building a good government with greater accountability. It promotes greater participation in decision-making and makes the government structure become more flexible. It also encourages greater sensitivity and responsiveness to the needs of the people. In many developing countries, nevertheless, factors that influence policy implementation were not given

sufficient attentions because many of those who formulated the policies hold the compliance view of administration (Rondinelli, McCullough, and Johnson, 1989). They assumed that once the policy is announced, it would be implemented and the results might be achieved. It is assumed that the policy would achieve its intended goals without due consideration to the political set up and the competency of resources.

Consistent to other countries in implementing decentralisation policies there are problems associated with the process and implementation of the decentralisation policy in agricultural extension in Indonesia. Initial studies conducted in a number of districts indicated some problems in implementing the policy at the district level (GOI, 1995). Some have shown gradual progress in the policy execution, while others experienced weak or declining roles in the implementing agencies as well as a decline in quality of management and operations of services. Some of the problems identified were related to the lack of capacity in financial as well as personnel management. There were also ambiguities in policy directions and guidance to agencies at the implementation level. Recognising conditions and problems in the policy implementation, some pertinent questions were posed. Why was the implementation of decentralisation policy in agricultural extension did not achieve its intended objectives? What bureaucratic support factors related to effective implementation of the policy at the local level as perceived by the extension officers?

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The general objective of this study was to determine the effectiveness of implementation of a decentralisation policy in agricultural extension in Java, Indonesia. The specific objectives of the study were to: (1) describe the existing conditions related to bureaucratic

support factor in implementing a decentralised agricultural extension; (2) determine the effectiveness of the current implementation strategy of decentralisation policy in agricultural extension; and (3) determine relationships between effectiveness of implementation of the decentralisation policy in agricultural extension and variables related to bureaucratic support factor.

LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Direction of Decentralisation Policy in Agricultural Extension

In recent years, the difficulties of maintaining public sector extension and the importance of farmers' participation have led to a wider scope for extension works through non-governmental intermediaries (Rivera, 1996). Financial pressures have influenced the exploration of ways to reduce the governments' expenses by decentralisation, privatising extension services and cost-sharing arrangements with non-government and farmer organisations (Crowder, 1997). Recent efforts take place in a context of extension re-conceptualising and restructuring which generally acknowledges that supply-side agricultural extension should be abandoned for demand-driven approaches that are more responsive to farmers needs (GOI, 1995). According to World Bank (1991), the over extendedness of public sector extension, the scarcities of financial resources for services and, in some cases, a lack of skilled manpower and dearth of organisational capacity have led to major changes in ideological, economic, and technical perspectives of agricultural extension. This has resulted in slower growth than might have been achieved with available resources.

Currently, three decentralisation policy directions dominate the agricultural extension development. According to Rivera (1996), the first is to decentralise the burden of extension costs to consider as the focus to more efficient

and equitable provision of public services. It is also aimed for achieving greater participation of local government in managing and financing the public services. Secondly, is to decentralise central government responsibility for extension through structural reform, which is intended to shift extension programmes and activities from the central to sub-government institutions at the local level with the idea of improving institutional responsiveness and accountability to the local needs and conditions (Antholt, 1991; Crowder, 1997). The third current policy direction is to decentralise management programmes through farmer participatory involvement in decision-making and securing responsibility for agricultural extension programmes (Rivera, 1996). Governments are beginning to move institutionally and technically towards putting responsibility into the hands of farmers to manage the agricultural extension programmes. Participatory involvement in developmental programmes is considered to make services more responsive to local conditions and needs, more accountable, effective and sustainable.

2. Bureaucratic Support-related Factors

The components in bureaucratic support-related factors include among others, the level to which national and political leaders are committed to decentralisation policy, and ability and willingness of the national bureaucracy to facilitate and support the policy implementation (Rondinelli, McCullough, and Johnson, 1989). Powerful political commitment and other supports from national leaders must emerge to enhance the transfer of planning, decision-making and managerial authority. The importance of securing the highest level of political authority to management reform programmes were identified consistently as major influences on implementing management policy innovations for the governments in African and Asian

developing countries (Ingham and Kalam, 1992; Juma and Clark, 1995; Kaul, 1997). Political circumstances that are favourable to development can be an important factor contributing to success, since it is likely to provide both material supports and a supportive ideological environment.

Moreover, an effective implementation strategy needs to provide for necessary controls on staffing, costs and timing towards the policy or programmes (Khan, 1989). The role of the executing agency during the implementation phase needs to be clearly understood by officers, particularly where it involves the monitoring and evaluation of feedback and results. Khan (1989) affirmed that monitoring and demonstration were two techniques usually adopted to carry out and facilitate implementation of the policy and/ or programme. These can generate useful information, provide an exercise of management and political feasibility and work out operational bugs as well as to examine management practices and to provide guidelines and staff capability.

Implementation of the policy or programme needs to be dynamic, flexible and adaptable to changing situation. Consequently, supervision as well as guidance from related agencies plays important role in supporting the success of the policy implementation as it was experienced in some developing countries. Khan as quoted by Rondinelli (1987), for example, attributed some of the success of Pakistan's IRDP to the attention it received from higher-level officers. Accordingly, frequent visits by the higher-level officers and also the representative agencies to the implementation grounds created necessary compulsions for the national departments to demonstrate their commitment to the project.

Based on the foregone discussion, the following summarises some of important points related to bureaucratic support factor. The degree to which national and political leaders' supports on decentralised programmes would influence to their successful implementations, especially at the local level. Programme objectives would be achieved because of the attention they obtained from the related government bureaucracy. Their support and provision were needed for effective programme accomplishment because they have the political power as well as economic resources to support the development programme. Similarly, intensities of supervision as well as guidance from the related institutions might have some influences on the implementation of decentralisation policy.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

1. Population and Sampling Procedures

This study was conducted in three provinces in Java, Indonesia. Population of this study comprised agricultural extension officers attached with the Rural Extension Centres (RECs). A multi-stage random sampling method was used to select the subjects for this study. Firstly, three provinces in Java were randomly selected. The selection of these provinces was done based on the duration of the policy implementation that existed within the areas. At the second stage, 26 districts in West Java, Central Java, and East Java were randomly selected.

The third stage involved the selection of two to eight RECs in each district. A total of 107 RECs in 26 districts were covered in this study. All field extension workers (FEWs) in the selected RECs, comprising of groups of FEWs (GFEWs) and heads of the RECs (HRECs) became the respondents of the study. The selection and distinction of these two groups of extension officers at the RECs was done due to the assumption that they differ in their characteristics pertaining to knowledge and understanding towards the implementation of the policy. Apart from that, contact farmers or farmer leaders for each REC were also selected as respondents.

2. Operationalization and Measurements

Effectiveness of the policy implementation refers to the degree by which the objectives of decentralisation policy could be achieved by RECs as the implementing agencies. It was determined by the knowledge and understanding of the RECs officers pertaining to the RECs' functions in: setting-up programme planning, making decisions, utilising resources, and providing benefits to farmers. A group-summated score was computed by adding all scores for items included in the instrument. A high score on each aspect indicated that the REC had a high level of effective implementation of a decentralised agricultural extension, and vice versa.

Support from district government bureaucracy refers to the degree to which the bureaucracies at the district government provide supports to the RECs in accomplishing the policy objectives. This was determined by the knowledge and understanding of the officers with regards to the degree of willingness of districts authorities to provide extra efforts in terms of delivering necessary administrative, legal supports and other resources provision to RECs in achieving the objectives. A high score revealed that local bureaucracy had a high level of support to the RECs, and otherwise.

Supervision from higher-level agricultural agencies refers to the degree to which the implementation of decentralised agricultural extension and its progress at the REC level was supervised. It was determined by the knowledge and understanding of the officers on the degree of monitoring or on progress evaluation that existed and was provided to the RECs by the higher-level agricultural agencies during the policy implementation. A low-level of supervision reflected by a low score.

Guidance from higher-level agricultural agencies refers to the degree to which the implementation of decentralisation policy and its progress at the RECs level was guided. This was determined by the knowledge and understanding of the officers with regards to the degree of interaction for work improvement that existed and was provided to the RECs by the higher-level agricultural agencies in implementing the policy. A low score reflected a low guidance from higher-level agricultural agencies, and vice versa.

3. Data Collection

Data collection procedure for this study employed a cross-sectional survey design. Data were collected during the period of November 1997 to March 1998 by using a group interview technique on GFEWs at the RECs. Their knowledge, understandings and opinions towards questions and statements posed to them represented as the group's responses. The self-administered question-naires were used to gather data from the heads of the RECs. Contact farmers or farmer leaders in each selected REC were also interviewed. Data collected were analysed using the statistical procedures of descriptive statistics and correlation analysis.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

1. Characteristics of Rural Extension Centres

About three-fourths (74.8%) of the RECs in the study area had 6 to 10 extension officers. The average number of officers in each REC was 10.8 (West Java), 6.8 (Central Java) and 6.4 (East Java) with a maximum of 27. More than one-half (57.7%) of the REC staffs were adjunct extension officers and only 7.6% were senior officers. The majority (83.9%) of officers had Senior High School's education (12 years schooling). The number of officers who had diploma and bachelor degrees was small, comprising 12.3% and 3.8% respectively. Most of them (77.6%) were trained in food-crops and the rests were

specialised in fisheries, plantation, and livestock.

Nearly two-thirds (64.5%) of the RECs have provided services to 11-20 villages. The other 31.8% of the RECs were responsible to more than 20 villages each. On the average, the number of villages serviced by each REC was 17.5 with the minimum and maximum of 8 and 44, respectively. In addition, more than one half (57.9%) of he RECs provided services to about 80 farmer groups. The average number of farmer groups in each REC was 82.1 with the minimum and maximum of 25 and 208 respectively.

2. Conditions Related to Bureaucratic Support Factors

As shown in Table 1, only 4.7% of GFEWs indicated that in implementing the policy, the RECs were highly supported by bureaucracy at the district government. However, the percentage for HRECs who expressed the same thing was higher (43.9%). The majority of officers (72.9% of GFEWs and 51.4% of HRECs) noted that support from district government bureaucracy was moderate. The RECs were provided with a number of administrative and legal supports and arrangements in achieving effective

Table 1. Bureaucratic Support-Related Factors as Perceived by Extension Officers

Variables	GFEWs %	HRECs %
1. Support from district government bureaucracy:		
Low (≤ 12.50)	22.4	4.7
Moderate (12.51 – 17.50)	72.9	51.4
High (≥ 17.51)	4.7	43.9
Total	100.0	100.0
Mean	13.8	16.9
Std. Deviasion	2.2	2.6
Minimum	8.0	10.0
Maximum	18.0	23.0
2. Supervision from higher-level agricultural agencies:		
Low (≤ 15.00)	76.6	35.5
Moderate (15.01 – 21.00)	23.4	56.1
High (≥ 21.01)	-	8.4
Total	100.0	100.0
Mean	12.7	16.4
Std. Deviation	3.4	4.1
Minimum	6.0	7.0
Maximum	20.0	25.0
3. Guidance from higher-level agricultural agencies:		
Low (≤ 15.00)	82.2	41.1
Moderate (15.01 – 21.00)	17.8	50.5
High (≥ 21.01)	-	8.4
Total	100.0	100.0
Mean	12.5	16.4
Std. Deviation	2.8	3.5
Minimum	7.0	9.0
Maximum	18.0	24.0

implementation of the policy. In addition, financial as well as physical infrastructures were also granted to the RECs as they existed in some districts. Nevertheless, support from other responsible institutions to the RECs was low.

Results reveal that 76.6% of GFEWs and 35.5% of HRECs indicated that RECs received minimal supervision from higher-level agricultural agencies. Data for the three provinces showed identical tendencies where there were indications that the RECs and BIPPs were lowly or moderately supervised by higher-level agricultural agencies. With a mean score of 12.7, most of the GFEWs confirmed that supervision from higher agencies to the RECs was low. Intensive supervisions to RECs were provided by BIPPs, nevertheless, the RECs received minimal supervisions from agricultural agencies at provincial level as well as agency at the central level.

The majority (82.2%) of GFEWs and 41.1% of HRECs affirmed that the RECs were lowly guided by higher-level agricultural agencies. There was no GFEWs who indicated that the RECs were highly guided and only a small part (8.4%) of HRECs who stated a similar answer. About one-half (50.5%) of HRECs expressed that the guidance provided to the RECs was moderate. The findings for West Java, Central Java and East Java provinces also showed identical trends where about one-half of extension officers stated that the RECs received minimal guidance.

3. Effectiveness in the Implementation of Decentralisation Policy

The aggregate scores obtained from GFEWs and HRECs were used to measure effectiveness of the policy implementation in programme planning. More than one-half (58.9%) of GFEWs verified that effectiveness in terms of programme planning at the RECs were low. In contrast, however, only 3.7% of

HRECs provided similar responses. There was a difference in determining the effectiveness level existed at the RECs as reflected in average score. Most of GFEWs noted that effectiveness of decentralised agricultural extension at RECs in the aspect of programme planning was low whereas the HRECs indicated in the opposite manner.

Programme planning at the REC level usually could not be completed on time. This was because the RECs waited for guidelines from the higher-level agencies to harmonise and accommodate a national and regional-wide extension policy. However, the receipts of guidelines were usually late at the implementation level. Apart from that, there was insufficient knowledge of extension officers at the RECs in planning extension programmes at the respective areas due to limited exposure and training among them. Another problem was related to the lack of farmers' involvement in arranging extension programmes to ensure the programmes were suitable to local conditions and needs.

Nearly one-half (47.7%) of the HRECs indicated that effectiveness of policy implementation in relation to the aspect of decision-making was high. Nevertheless, only 6.5% of the GFEWs gave a similar response. Almost two-thirds (61.7%) of GFEWs stated that effectiveness in decision-making was low. The trend for the three provinces was similar. There were some problems in achieving effective decision-making at the implementation level. Directives were late and minimal guidance from the higher-level agencies hampered officers at the lower level to make decisions faster and more accurate. Slow co-ordination among agencies and organisations involved at the implementation level had also made accomplishment of decisions not based on local conditions, problems and needs. As in planning the extension programmes, another hindrance in making decision at the REC level was the low level of officers' education and experience. Most of them had no formal

training pertaining to making decision and other management issues. They depended mostly on guidelines from top officers within the ministry, either at the central or provincial levels. Decision making at the REC level, therefore, could not be accomplished on time due in part to these obstacles.

About one half (50.5%) of GFEWs verified that effectiveness of decentralisation policy implementation in the aspect of resources utilisation at the RECs was low, while only 4.7% of HRECs provided the same response. From the means' scores of groups, it can be shown that implementation of the policy in the aspect of resources utilisation was moderately effective. However, the score for GFEWs tended to show that effectiveness of policy implementation was closer to low level. Again, there was a difference between GFEWs and HRECs in determining the conditions of policy effectiveness implemented by their agencies. More than one-half (54.2%) of farmers confirmed that effectiveness of policy implementation in the provision of benefits

considerations to increase effectiveness. Thus, one would expect that the number of innovation adopted by local farmers would increase since they originate locally. Programme planning and decision-making were also intends to be carried out at the local level. From the contact farmers' viewpoint, the policy implementation was not effectively conducted in terms of provision of benefits. Officers' visits to farmers also could not be conducted regularly due to resource limitations at the RECs, such as transport costs and vehicles. It was found that local farmers were not involved extensively in extension activities. This was found to be against the basic tenets of a decentralisation system that should provide better benefits to the entire farming community at the respective RECs.

Overall effectiveness of policy implementation was calculated by summing up all scores from effectiveness in the aspects of programme planning, decision-making, resources utilisation and the provision of benefits. As presented in Table 2, more than

Table 2. Overall Effectiveness of Policy Implementation

Scores	GFEWs (%)	HRECs (%)
Low (≤ 76.50)	58.9	2.8
Moderate (76.51 – 94.50)	33.6	39.3
High (94.51)	7.5	57.9
Total	**100.0**	**100.0**
Mean	74.9	93.4
Std. Deviation	11.2	9.4
Minimum	55.0	72.0
Maximum	100.0	113.0

aspect was low. However, only 10.3% of GFEWs and 1.9% of HRECs responded similar answers.

Decentralised agricultural extension policy is aimed at providing agricultural extension to the clients based on local conditions, problems and needs. Therefore, utilisation of local resources and technology would be taken into

one half (58.9%) of the GFEWs expressed that the overall effectiveness of policy implementation at the RECs was low. However, only 2.8% of the HRECs noted that the overall effectiveness was low and 57.9% of them stated that the effectiveness of policy implementation at the RECs was high. Slightly more than one-third (33.6% of GFEWs and

39.3% of HRECs) confirmed that overall effectiveness of the policy implementation at the RECs was moderate. The low level of effectiveness of the policy implementation was confirmed by the contact farmers. However, for the HRECs, overall effectiveness of the policy implementation at the REC level was moderate.

4. Relationships between Bureaucratic Support Factors and Effectiveness of Policy Implementation

As summarised in Table 3, the three variables under the bureaucratic support-related factors were correlated significantly to the four aspects of effectiveness of decentralisation policy implementation. This means that support from district government bureaucracy, supervision from higher-level agricultural agencies and guidance from higher-level agricultural agencies were important factors to be considered in ensuring effectiveness of implementation of decentralisation in agricultural extension.

Specifically, the correlation coefficients for "support from district government bureaucracy" were highest under effectiveness in programme planning. This means that support from district government bureaucracy is essential to ensure the effectiveness in programme planning with regard to decentralised agricultural extension. With regard to effectiveness in decision-making, "supervision from higher level agricultural

Table 3. Relationships Between Bureaucratic Support-Related Factors and
Effectiveness of Policy Implementation

Variable	Correlation coefficient (r)	
	GFEWs	HRECs
Effectiveness in programme planning and:		
(1) Support from district government bureaucracy	.465*	.416*
(2) Supervision from higher-level agricultural agencies	.397*	.313*
(3) Guidance from higher-level agricultural agencies	.261*	.327*
Effectiveness in decision making and:		
(1) Support from district government bureaucracy	.437*	.376*
(2) Supervision from higher-level agricultural agencies	.483*	.311*
(3) Guidance from higher-level agricultural agencies	.332*	.325*
Effectiveness in resources utilisation and:		
(1) Support from district government bureaucracy	.428*	.324*
(2) Supervision from higher-level agricultural agencies	.471*	.204*
(3) Guidance from higher-level agricultural agencies	.310*	.327*
Effectiveness in provision of benefits and:		
(1) Support from district government bureaucracy .	.518*	.424*
(2) Supervision from higher-level agricultural agencies	.504*	.334*
(3) Guidance from higher-level agricultural agencies	.356*	.407*
Overall effectiveness and:		
(1) Support from district government bureaucracy	.527*	.449*
(2) Supervision from higher-level agricultural agencies	.528*	.340*
(3) Guidance from higher-level agricultural agencies	.360*	.408*

* Significant at the .05 level

agencies" was regarded as important by the GFEWs while the HRECs identified "support from district government bureaucracy" as being important. This is reflected with the values of .483 and .376. In resources utilisation, GFEWs identified "supervision from higher level agricultural agencies" while HRECs identified "guidance from higher level agricultural agencies" as important considerations to ensure effectiveness of implementation of decentralisation policy. Both groups indicated that "support from district government bureaucracy" as being critical to ensure effectiveness in the provision of benefits.

Similar findings were also found by scholars such as Asibuo (1992), Vengroff and Salem (1992) and Olowu and Smoke (1992). In several African and Asian developing countries, some scholars found that the importance of securing the highest level of political authorities to management reform programmes and the commitment of central ministries and senior officers to the programmes were identified consistently as major influences on the effectiveness of implementing management policy innovations for the governments (Ingham and Kalam, 1992; Juma and Clark, 1995; Kaul, 1997). This study found that support from the government bureaucracy would influence the success of the decentralised extension. Hence, the findings support the similar previous studies.

From the results, it might be discerned that the more effective supervision from higher level agricultural agencies or officers either at the provincial or central level to the implementing agencies such as RECs and BIPPs, the more effective would be the implementation of decentralisation policy in agricultural extension services conducted at the district level. Similarly, the more appropriate interaction for work improvements from higher agricultural agencies or officers to the implementing agencies, the more effective would be the implementation of decentralised

agricultural extension. Supervision and guidance from higher-level agencies to the implementing agencies at the local coverage had been known as an important element in the success of any policy implementation. Officers' guidance and supervision towards the programme would ensure that the programme could be carried out effectively. Regular visits of related officers had motivated officers and created a system of checks that maintained effective accomplishment of the policy or programme at the implementation level.

This study found that supervision as well as guidance from higher-level agricultural agencies was positively correlated to effectiveness of decentralisation policy implementation. As shown in Table 3, these relationships were statistically significant at .05 level. It could be concluded that the more supervision and guidance provided from higher-level agricultural agencies, the more effective would be the implementation of the policy. This is because through supervision and guidance effectively, there exist a system of checks or monitoring on the progress of the policy or programme at the implementation level. This would make early detection of misuse of available local resources and ultimately, technical as well as administrative revisions might be executed to track on the proper procedures.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

There was a tendency that lower level officers have lower understanding and knowledge pertaining to the current implementation of the decentralisation policy in agricultural extension. The policy was not effectively executed at the implementation level. Effectiveness in programme planning, decision-making, resources utilisation, and provision of benefits at the local level were not accomplished as expected by the objectives. As beneficiaries of the services, farmers

received little benefits from the implementation of decentralised agricultural extension. To ensure successful of policy implementation, support from district government bureaucracies was necessary. Without strong support from the power holders at the district level to the implementing agencies, the policy implementation would not achieve the desired results.

Implementing public policy is not an easy task. It takes time and hardworking to achieve the predetermined objectives of the policy. Nevertheless, from the findings of the study, some practical recommendations are put forward. As experienced in some developing countries, effective implementation of decentralisation policy requires strong support from the government bureaucracy, especially at the implementation level. From the findings, it might be recommended that authority holders at the district government needs to be more supportive to the implementing agencies. These supports might be provided in terms of legal-basis and financial capability as well as physical infrastructures that are needed by the implementing agencies.

It is also necessary that intensive supervision and guidance from the higher level agricultural agencies to be provided on the regular-schedule basis. The higher extension officers should visit or comedown to the field frequently. This is aimed to obtain a proper and real situation at the implementation grounds. On the other hand, the RECs should report to their higher officers pertaining to the problems existed. The two-ways communication would be important to make decision and solve the problems properly. Consequently, appropriate technical administrative supervision and guidance either from agencies at the central or provincial levels needs to be provided to the implementing agencies or officers. It may be fulfilled by increasing the budget for supervision and guidance as well as by spending properly the available costs. Overall, if the government is serious and committed towards the policy implementation then responsible ministries and their subordinate agencies should sit and discuss together the appropriate strategies to ensure the success of the decentralised agricultural extension.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adamolekun, L. (1991). "Decentralization Policies: Problems and Perspectives". *Asian Journal of Public Administration*, 13: 67-92.

Antholt, C.H. (1991). "Agricultural extension in the 21st Century: Lessons from South Asian". In W.M. Rivera and D.J. Gustafson (Eds.), *Agricultural Extension: Worldwide Institutional Evolution and Forces for Change* (pp. 203-216). Amsterdam: Elsevier Science Publishers.

Conyers, D. and Kaul, M. (1990). "Strategic Issues in Development Management: Learning from Successful Experience: Part I". *Public Administration and Development*, 10: 127-140.

Crowder, L.V. (1997). *Decentralized Extension: Effect and Opportunities*. In Internet (retrieved via Microsoft Explorer, April 2, 1997). http:/www.fao.org/ WAIN-CENT/faoinfo/sustdev/Exdirect/ Exan0013.html.

Devas, N. (1997). "Indonesia: what do We Mean by Decentralization?". *Public Administration and Development*, 17: 351-367.

Government of Indonesia (1995). *Preparing Decentralized Agricultural Extension: A Preliminary Study*. Jakarta: Centre for Agricultural Extension of the Ministry of Agriculture.

Government of Indonesia (1997). *Decentralized Agricultural and Forestry Extension Pilot Project*. Book 1. Jakarta: Centre for Agricultural Extension of the Ministry of Agriculture and Centre for Forestry Extension of the Ministry of Forestry.

Ingham, B. and Kalam, A.K.M. (1992). "Decentralization and Development: theory and Evidence from Bangladesh". *Public Administration and Development,* 12: 373-385.

Juma, C. and Clark, N. (1995). "Policy Research in sub-Saharan Africa: an exploration". *Public Administration and Development,* 15: 121-137.

Kaul, M. (1997). "The New Public Administration: Management Innovations in Government". *Public Administration and Development,* 17: 13-26.

Khan, J. (1989). "The Implementation Process". *The Indian Journal of Public Administration,* XXXV: 851-868.

Malo, M. (1995). Social Sector Decentralization: The Case Study of Indonesia. Ottawa: *International Development Research Center.*

Olowu, D. and Smoke, P. (1992). "Determinants of Success in African local governments: an overview". *Public Administration and Development,* 12: 1-17.

Rivera, W.M. (1996). "Agricultural extension in Transition Worldwide: Structural, Financial and Managerial Strategies for Improving Agricultural Extension". *Public Administration and Development,* 16: 151-161.

Rivera, W.M. and Gustafson, D.J. (1991). "New Roles and Responsibilities for Public Sector Agricultural Extension". In W.M. Rivera and D.J. Gustafson (Eds.). *Agricultural Extension: Worldwide Institutional Evolution and Forces for Change* (pp. 257-266). Amsterdam: Elsevier Science Publishers.

Rondinelli, D.A. (1987). "Administrative Decentralization of Agricultural and Rural Development Programs in Asia: A Comparative Analysis". In W.M. Rivera and S.G. Schram (Eds.). *Agricultural Extension Worldwide: Issues, Practices and Emerging Priorities* (pp. 22-57). London: Croom Helm Ltd.

Rondinelli, D.A., McCullough, J.S. and Johnson, R.W. (1989). "Analyzing Decentralization Policies in Developing Countries: A Political-Economy Framework". *Development and Change,* 20: 57-87.

Vengroff, R. and Salem, H.B. (1992). "Assessing the Impact of Decentralization on Governance: A Comparative Methodological Approach and Application to Tunisia". *Public Administration and Development,* 12: 473-492.

Waridin (1999). *Effectiveness of the Implementation of Decentralisation Policy in Agricultural Extension Services: A Perception of Agricultural Extension Officers in Java, Indonesia.* Ph.D. Thesis, Universiti Putra Malaysia.

World Bank (1991). *Accelerating Development in Sub-Saharan Africa: An Agenda for Action.* Washington, D.C: The World Bank.