



**UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA**

**EFFECTIVENESS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF  
DECENTRALISATION POLICY IN AGRICULTURAL  
EXTENSION: A COMPARATIVE PERCEPTION OF  
EXTENSION OFFICERS IN JAVA, INDONESIA**

**WARIDIN**

**FPP 1999 10**

**EFFECTIVENESS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF  
DECENTRALISATION POLICY IN AGRICULTURAL  
EXTENSION: A COMPARATIVE PERCEPTION OF  
EXTENSION OFFICERS IN JAVA, INDONESIA**

**WARIDIN**

**DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY  
UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA  
1999**



**EFFECTIVENESS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF  
DECENTRALISATION POLICY IN AGRICULTURAL  
EXTENSION: A COMPARATIVE PERCEPTION OF  
EXTENSION OFFICERS IN JAVA, INDONESIA**

**By  
WARIDIN**

**Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of  
the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy  
in the Faculty of Educational Studies  
Universiti Putra Malaysia**

**January 1999**



**This dissertation is dedicated to:**

My lovely  
Dinda Saraswati Ratnaningsih  
and Dimas Susilo Waridiarto

My

My

Ibu Hjh. Soewarti Darminto

Brothers and sisters

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I express my great thanks to my dissertation's Supervisory Committee:

Bahaman Abu Samah,

Suandi for their guidance and supervisions throughout the preparation of this dissertation. Despite their tight work schedules,

and deliberations on time

and sincere appreciation to Professor Dr. Rahim Md. Sail for his advantageous comments and suggestions.

I am grateful to the external examiner, Professor Dr. Sharan B. Merriam of University of Georgia, the

comments,

appreciation goes to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Azimi Hj. Hamzah,

Committee and representative of the Dean of Graduate School,

Malaysia (UPM)

I wish to extend my sincere thanks to the entire members of the Department of Extension Education,

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Saidin Teh,

their encouragement and assistance during the duration of my study. My thanks also

go to Assoc. Prof. Dr. K. Kuperan Viswanathan,

Abdullah,

Faculty of Economics and Management,



My sincere gratitude is extended to Public Service Department, Malaysia, especially to Training Division for providing me a scholarship under Malaysian Technical Co-operation Programme (MTCP) my study. I acknowledge with sincere the encouragement of the Rector of Diponegoro University, Economics at the same university for me to pursue a Ph.D. programme. I am so grateful with “bajak laut” Dr. Ir. Rochajat Harun and Dr. Ir. Soedradjat Martaamidjaja at the Centre for Agricultural Extension of the Ministry of Agriculture, Indonesia, both deserve my acknowledgements and thanks for their helps and co-operations.

My special thanks are due to the Provincial Agricultural Offices, Social Political Offices and Agency for Regional Planning and Development at West Java, Central Java and East Java for the permission accorded me to conduct the study. I am especially indebted to the Heads and staffs of the BIPPs and RECs at the study locations. All of them helped me in the data collection. The enumerators deserve a special mention for their assistance during the data collection.

My regards are due to Mrs. Arbaiyah Md. Isa, Mrs. Farida Shamsuddin, Mr. Roslan Mohd. Shariff, Graduate School Office, Mohd. Kassim at the Student Health Centre of UPM for their cordial helps. I am also grateful to my colleagues:  
Yazid Ithnin,



friendships. My Indonesian friends; especially to (in alphabetic) Pak Edi, Edwin, Pak Enisar and family, Harfiandri, Pak I'ing and family, Pak Lalang and family, Linda, Pak Muhrizal and family, Pak Mulyadi and Bu Suhatmini Hardyastuti, Pak Sugeng, Sumber, Pak Tonny and family, Pak Wihandoyo and others; all these people would always be remembered for their helps and friendships during my stay in Malaysia. To the many individuals both in Indonesia and Malaysia, who in one way or another have contributed directly and indirectly to the successful completion of my study, I affirm my indebtedness.

Finally, my sincere appreciation goes to my perpetual wife, Dr. Indah Susilowati. Though she was also busy with her own research works she found time to extend her helping hand and mind in preparing this dissertation. Without her wholehearted support, attention and love, I could not have accomplished this degree. I owe great thanks to the entire members of my family in Pematang and Semarang; especially to Mbah Kung, Mbah Ti and Ibu for their overwhelming prayers, supports, forbearance, inspirations and understandings during my absence from them. My lovely daughter and son, Dinda Saraswati Ratnaningsih and Dimas Susilo Waridiarto, whom I left at home with Mak Nah during part of the period of my study, deserve appreciation. I always love for their understanding to me, and it is their perpetual love and encouragement that inspired me to complete my study.

Most of all, to the Almighty Allah SWT, for His guidance and blessing that made everything possible for me to complete my doctoral programme, I would like to express “alhamdulillah”.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	iii
LIST OF TABLES .....	x
LIST OF FIGURES .....	xiv
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS .....	xv
ABSTRACT .....	xvi
ABSTRAK .....	xix
<b>CHAPTER</b>	
<b>I INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
Decentralised Agricultural Extension Services in Indonesia .....	2
Background of the Study .....	5
Statement of the Problem .....	10
Objectives of the Study .....	12
Significance of the Study .....	13
Limitations of the Study .....	15
Definition of Terms .....	16
<b>II LITERATURE REVIEW .....</b>	<b>17</b>
Concept of Decentralisation .....	17
Direction of Decentralisation Policy in Agricultural Extension .....	22
Approaches in Implementation of Decentralisation Policy .....	26
Public Choice Theory .....	26
Public Administration and Finance Model .....	29
Factors Influencing the Implementation of Decentralisation Policy .....	30
Organisational-Related Factors .....	31





	Page
Bureaucratic Support-Related Factors .....	39
Financial and Personnel-Related Factors .....	46
Conceptual Framework of the Study .....	54
Hypotheses of the Study .....	59
<b>III RESEARCH METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>60</b>
Locations of the Study .....	6
Population of the Study .....	61
Sampling Procedure .....	62
Operationalisation of Variables .....	63
Dependent Variable .....	64
Independent Variables .....	65
Measurements of Variables .....	68
Dependent Variable .....	69
Independent Variables .....	70
Instrumentation and Reliability .....	74
Data Collection .....	77
Data Analysis .....	78
<b>IV FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS .....</b>	<b>82</b>
Characteristics of Rural Extension Centres .....	82
Number and Qualification of Officers .....	83
Extension Budget .....	85
Coverage of Services .....	86
Conditions Related to Organisational, Bureaucratic and Financial and Personnel Factors .....	87
Organisational-Related Factors .....	88
Bureaucratic Support-Related Factors .....	91
Financial and Personnel-Related Factors .....	94



	Page
Effectiveness in the Implementation of Decentralisation Policy ...	98
Effectiveness in Programme Planning .....	99
Effectiveness in Decision Making .....	10
Effectiveness in Resources Utilisation .....	10
Effectiveness in the Provision of Benefits .....	10
Overall Effectiveness of Policy Implementation .....	10
Differences in the Means of the Variables Between Groups .....	10
Relationships Between the Independent Variables and Effectiveness of Policy Implementation .....	111
Relationships Between Organisational-Related Factors and Effectiveness of Policy Implementation .....	112
Relationships Between Bureaucratic Support-Related Factors and Effectiveness of Policy Implementation .....	116
Relationships Between Financial and Personnel- Related Factors and Effectiveness of Policy Implementation	12
Influence of Selected Predictor Variables on Effectiveness of Decentralisation Policy Implementation .....	13
Influence of Predictor Variables on Effectiveness in Programme Planning .....	13
Influence of Predictor Variables on Effectiveness in Decision Making .....	13
Influence of Predictor Variables on Effectiveness in Resources Utilisation .....	13
Influence of Predictor Variables on Effectiveness in the Provision of Benefits .....	141
Influence of Predictor Variables on the Overall Effectiveness of Policy Implementation .....	14
<b>V SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>	<b>149</b>
The Research Problem .....	14
Objectives of the Study .....	15
Research Methodology .....	15



	Page
Summary of Findings .....	151
Conclusions .....	155
Recommendations .....	157
Practical Recommendations .....	157
Recommendations for Further Study .....	161
 BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	 163
 APPENDICES	
A. Additional Tables .....	172
B. Questionnaires for GFEWs and HRECs .....	193
C. Questionnaires for Heads of BIPPs .....	202
D. Questionnaires for Contact Farmers .....	211
E. Information on Locations of the Study .....	213
F. Organisations of Decentralised Extension .....	225
 BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH .....	 227



## LIST OF TABLES

<b>Table</b>	<b>Page</b>
1. Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficients for Independent and Dependent Variables of the Study .....	76
2. Distribution of Extension Officers .....	83
3. Extension Officers by Ranks, Specialisation .....	84
4. Annual Budget of RECs .....	85
5. RECs by Number of Villages and Farmer Groups Serviced .....	86
6. Organisational-Related Factors as Perceived by Extension Officers .....	89
7. Bureaucratic Support-Related Factors as Perceived by Extension Officers .....	93
8. Financial and Personnel-Related Factors as Perceived by Extension Officers .....	95
9. Effectiveness in Programme Planning by RECs as Perceived by Extension Officers .....	99
10. Effectiveness in Decision Making by RECs as Perceived by Extension Officers .....	102
11. Effectiveness in Resources Utilisation by RECs as Perceived by Extension Officers .....	103
12. Effectiveness in Provision of Benefits by RECs as Perceived by Extension Officers and Contact Farmers .....	105
13. Overall Effectiveness of Policy Implementation .....	107
14. Summary of the T-test for Differences in Means of the Variables Between Group of Respondents .....	108



15.	Summary of the T-test for Differences in Means of the Variable Between Group of Respondents .....	110
16.	Relationships Between Organisational-Related Factors and Effectiveness of Policy Implementation .....	113
17.	Relationships Between Organisational Factor and Effectiveness of Policy Implementation .....	116
18.	Relationships Between Bureaucratic Support-Related Factors and Effectiveness of Policy Implementation .....	118
19.	Relationships Between Bureaucratic Support Factor and Effectiveness of Policy Implementation .....	122
20.	Relationships Between Financial and Personnel-Related Factors and Effectiveness of Policy Implementation .....	124
21.	Relationships Between Financial and Personnel Factor and Effectiveness of Policy Implementation .....	129
22.	Summary of Stepwise Multiple Regression of Predictor Variables on Effectiveness in Programme Planning .....	134
23.	Summary of Stepwise Multiple Regression of Predictor Variables on Effectiveness in Decision Making .....	136
24.	Summary of Stepwise Multiple Regression of Predictor Variables on Effectiveness in Resources Utilisation .....	139
25.	Summary of Stepwise Multiple Regression of Predictor Variables on Effectiveness in the Provision of Benefits .....	142
26.	Summary of Stepwise Multiple Regression of Predictor Variables on Overall Effectiveness of Decentralisation Policy Implementation .....	145
27.	Organisational-Related Factors as Perceived by Extension Officers at the RECs .....	172
28.	Organisational-Related Factors as Perceived by Heads of the BIPPs .....	173
29.	Bureaucratic Support-Related Factors as Perceived by Extension Officers at the RECs .....	174



30.	Bureaucratic Support-Related Factors as Perceived by Heads of the BIPPs .....	175
31.	Financial and Personnel-Related Factors as Perceived by Extension Officers at the RECs .....	176
32.	Financial and Personnel-Related Factors as Perceived by Heads of the BIPPs .....	177
33.	Effectiveness of Policy Implementation as Perceived by Extension Officers at the RECs .....	178
34.	Effectiveness of Policy Implementation as Perceived by Heads of the BIPPs .....	180
35.	Results of Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances Between Groups of Respondents .....	182
36.	Results of Test for Homogeneity of Variances Among Groups of Respondents in the Three Provinces .....	183
37.	Results of Tukey-HSD Coefficients for Multiple Comparisons for Selected Independent Variables .....	184
38.	Results of Tukey-HSD Coefficients for Multiple Comparisons of the Dependent Variable .....	185
39.	Relationships Between Organisational-Related Factors and Effectiveness of Policy Implementation .....	186
40.	Relationships Between Bureaucratic Support-Related Factors and Effectiveness of Policy Implementation .....	187
41.	Relationships Between Financial and Personnel-Related Factors and Effectiveness of Policy Implementation .....	188
42.	Relationships Between Organisational, and Financial and Personnel Factors and Effectiveness of Policy Implementation .....	189
43.	Summary of Stepwise Multiple Regression of Independent Variables Related to Organisational Factor on Overall Effectiveness of Policy Implementation .....	190



## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AAET	Agency for Agricultural Education and Training
AARD	Agency for Agricultural Research and Development
<i>Bappeda</i>	<i>Badan Perencanaan Pembangunan Daerah</i> Agency for Regional Planning and Development
<i>Bimas</i>	<i>Bimbingan Massal</i> Mass Guidance
BIPP	<i>Balai Informasi dan Penyuluhan Pertanian</i> Agency for Agricultural Extension and Information
BLPP	<i>Balai Latihan Penyuluhan Pertanian</i> Agency for Agricultural Extension and Training
BPP	<i>Balai Penyuluhan Pertanian</i> Rural Extension Centre
BPTP	<i>Balai Pengkajian Teknologi Pertanian</i> Agency for Agricultural Technology Assessment
CAE	Centre for Agricultural Extension
FEWs	Field Extension Workers
GFEWs	Group of FEWs
GOI	Government of Indonesia
HBIPPs	Head of BIPPs
HRECs	Head of RECs
<i>Kanwil</i>	<i>Kantor Wilayah</i> Provincial Office (Representative of the Ministry)
MHA	Ministry of Home Affairs
MOA	Ministry of Agriculture
RECs	Rural Extension Centres



Abstract of dissertation submitted to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia  
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

**EFFECTIVENESS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF DECENTRALISATION  
POLICY IN AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION: A COMPARATIVE  
PERCEPTION OF EXTENSION OFFICERS IN JAVA, INDONESIA**

**By**  
**WARIDIN**  
**January 1999**

Chairman: Bahaman Abu Samah, Ph.D.

Faculty: Educational Studies

Decentralisation policy in agricultural extension services was introduced in Indonesia since the issuance of joint-ministerial agreement between the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Home Affairs in 1991, and was later modified in 1996. Consequently, several tasks and responsibilities concerning the agricultural extension services were transferred from the central government to the management of the district governments.

The purpose of this study was to determine factors influencing the effectiveness of implementation of decentralisation policy in agricultural extension services by utilising a model adapted from the public administration and finance of Rondinelli and Cheema (1983) and Rondinelli et al. (1984; 1989).

A correlational research design was used in the study. The population of this study comprised the extension officers at the Rural Extension Centres (RECs) in





island of Java. A multi-stage random sampling method was employed to select 107 groups of field extension workers (GFEWs) and 107 the heads of RECs (HRECs) in West Java, Central Java and East Java Provinces, Indonesia. In addition, data from the heads of the BIPPs (HBIPPs) and contact farmers were also solicited. Personal and group interviews as well as self-administered questionnaires were used in the data collection.

Decentralisation policy in agricultural extension services was not effectively accomplished at the implementation level. Effectiveness in programme planning, decision making, resources utilisation and provision of benefits were not executed as expected by the policy objectives. As beneficiaries of the services, the farmers received little or no benefits from the implementation of decentralised agricultural extension services.

The perception of GFEWs and HRECs were significantly different on almost all variables of the study. There was a tendency that the GFEWs indicated lower responses compared to the HRECs pertaining to the effectiveness of implementation of decentralised agricultural extension services. The same was true for contact farmers compared to the GFEWs and HRECs. There was a tendency that lower level officers have lower understanding and knowledge pertaining to the current implementation of the decentralisation policy.

The effectiveness of decentralisation policy implementation was positively and significantly correlated to the independent variables utilised in the study, except for officers' clarity towards policy objectives. Co-ordination among

agencies involved in policy implementation, bureaucracy, trained personnel were correlated significantly to the effectiveness of implementation of decentralisation policy. These four variables contributed significantly to the effectiveness of the policy implementation.

With the use of a framework adapted from the public administration and finance, predictors of effectiveness of implementation of decentralisation policy in agricultural extension services. In general, effectiveness of policy implementation was jointly explained by a set of independent variables, implementation”, and authority over financial resources” and “adequacy of trained personnel”.

The study found that the conceptual framework adapted from the public administration and finance model could serve as a useful model in predicting the effectiveness of decentralisation policy implementation in agricultural extension services in Indonesia.

Abstrak disertasi yang dikemukakan kepada Senat Universiti Putra Malaysia sebagai memenuhi sebahagian daripada syarat untuk mendapatkan ijazah Doktor Falsafah

**KEBERKESANAN PERLAKSANAAN POLISI DESENTRALISASI  
PERKHIDMATAN PENGEMBANGAN PERTANIAN: SATU  
PERBANDINGAN PERSEPSI DI ANTARA PEGAWAI  
PENGEMBANGAN DI JAWA, INDONESIA**

Oleh

**WARIDIN**

**Januari 1999**

Pengerusi: Bahaman Abu Samah, Ph.D.

Fakulti : Pengajian Pendidikan

Polisi desentralisasi dalam perkhidmatan pengembangan pertanian di Indonesia bermula sejak keluarnya persetujuan bersama antara Menteri Pertanian dan Menteri Dalam Negeri dalam tahun 1991, dan diubahsuai dalam tahun 1996. Berikutan dengan itu, tugas-tugas dan tanggungjawab berkaitan dengan perkhidmatan pengembangan pertanian diserahkan kepada pihak pengurusan pemerintah daerah daripada pihak pemerintah pusat.

Tujuan utama kajian ini adalah untuk menentukan faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi keberkesanan pelaksanaan polisi desentralisasi dalam perkhidmatan pengembangan pertanian dengan menggunakan model pentadbiran awam dan kewangan dari Rondinelli dan Cheema (1983) dan Rondinelli et al. (1984; 1989) yang telah diubahsuai untuk kajian ini.

Kaedah penyelidikan korelasi telah digunakan dalam kajian ini. Populasi kajian ini terdiri daripada pegawai-pegawai Pusat Pengembangan Pertanian (RECs) di pulau Jawa. Kaedah pengambilan sampel rawak tahapan-berganda digunakan untuk memilih 107 kumpulan pegawai pengembangan (GFEWs) dan 107 ketua RECs (HRECs) di Jawa Barat, Jawa Tengah dan Jawa Timur, Indonesia. Sebagai tambahan, data dari ketua-ketua BIPP dan petani maju juga diperolehi. Temuduga secara kumpulan dan perseorangan serta soalselidik isian-sendiri digunakan dalam pengumpulan data.

Polisi desentralisasi perkhidmatan pengembangan pertanian tidak dapat dilaksanakan secara berkesan di peringkat tempatan. Keberkesanan dalam rencana program, pembuatan keputusan, penggunaan sumber dan pemberian manfaat tidak sesuai dengan matlamat yang diingini. Petani-petani hanya menerima sedikit manfaat dari adanya pelaksanaan polisi desentralisasi dalam perkhidmatan pengembangan pertanian.

Persepsi kumpulan pegawai pengembangan dan ketua-ketua RECs dalam hampir semua angkuh-angkuh dalam kajian ini berbeza secara signifikan. Ditemui bahawa kumpulan pegawai pengembangan memberi jawapan yang lebih rendah berbanding dengan ketua-ketua RECs, berkaitan dengan keberkesanan pelaksanaan polisi desentralisasi dalam bidang pengembangan pertanian. Jawapan yang lebih rendah juga didapati pada petani-petani. Semakin rendah peringkat pegawai, akan semakin rendah pula pemahaman dan pengetahuan mengenai pelaksanaan polisi desentralisasi pengembangan pertanian.

Keberkesanan pelaksanaan polisi desentralisasi berkait secara positif dan signifikan kepada angkubah-angkubah bebas dalam kajian ini, “kejelasan pegawai terhadap tujuan polisi”. Penyelarasan di kalangan agensi yang terbabit dalam pelaksanaan polisi, kecukupan sumber kewangan dan kecukupan pegawai terlatih merupakan angkubah-angkubah yang mempunyai perkaitan yang signifikan terhadap keberkesanan pelaksanaan polisi desentralisasi memberi sumbangan secara signifikan kepada keberkesanan pelaksanaan polisi desentralisasi dalam bidang pengembangan pertanian.

Dengan menggunakan kerangka konseptual yang diubahsuai daripada model pentadbiran awam dan kewangan, angkubah yang berkait rapat bagi menentukan keberkesanan pelaksanaan polisi desentralisasi dalam bidang pengembangan pertanian. Secara 55.0% daripada varians keberkesanan pelaksanaan polisi desentralisasi dapat dijelaskan oleh satu set angkubah bebas yang digunakan dalam model regresi berganda. Angkubah-angkubah itu adalah “penyelarasan di kalangan agensi yang terbabit dalam pelaksanaan polisi”, daerah”,

Kajian ini mendapati bahawa rangka konseptual yang diambil daripada pendekatan pentadbiran awam dan kewangan dapat memberi petunjuk yang baik untuk meramalkan keberkesanan pelaksanaan polisi desentralisasi dalam perkhidmatan pengembangan pertanian di Indonesia.

# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

Indonesia disperses over an area of 2,027,000 km<sup>2</sup> and stretches over 5,150 km. It comprises approximately 17,000 islands with the five main islands of Java, Sumatera, Kalimantan, Sulawesi and Irian Jaya. With a total population of 205 million in 1998, Indonesia constituted the fourth most populous country in the world. About 70.0% percent of the country's population live in Java Island. Administratively, Indonesia is divided into 27 provinces and each province consists of a number of districts and municipalities for certain urban areas. Under the district or municipality, there are sub-districts and each sub-district comprises a number of villages. In total, there are 243 districts, 60 municipalities, 3,836 sub-districts and 65,554 villages within the country (GOI, 1995a).

Agriculture is still an important sector in the country's economy. This sector contributed 17.2% to the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) in 1995 and provided employment to 35.5 million people or more than 50.0% of the total labour force in 1990. The total land area of Indonesia is about 181 million hectares, of which 120 million hectares are still under forest. The crop area consists of 22 million hectares with 6 million hectares allotted to perennial crops, 7 million hectares to wetland crops and 9 million hectares to dry-land crops (GOI, 1997). The majority of farmers in Java Island operate small size farms with an average of less than 0.5 hectare, whereas farmers outside the island operate larger farm sizes.



## **Decentralised Agricultural Extension Services in Indonesia**

Since the release of the Law No. 5 of 1974 concerning Basic Principles of Regional Government, Indonesian administrative policy thrust has been to support the goal of greater regional autonomy. The law was also applied to the agricultural sector. Under the joint agreement of the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Home Affairs in July 1991, a major step was taken to decentralise the agricultural extension services and to extend the roles of district governments and agricultural line agencies to manage agricultural extension activities.

Based on the joint agreement, Rural Extension Centres (RECs) and field extension workers (FEWs) as well as the authority for placing the FEWs in working areas were transferred to and put under the administrative responsibility of the district governments. Moreover, responsibility for operational components of agricultural extension services was divided into four sub-sector agencies (food crops, estate crops, fisheries and livestock) based on the relative importance of the sub-sectors in the districts. In addition, an annual central subsidy for running the agricultural extension activities and for extension officers' salaries was transferred to the district governments to be administered by the sub-sector agencies for their respective RECs and FEWs (GOI, 1995b; 1997).

In practice, however, it was not an easy task to properly implement the agreement. There were controversies concerning the contents and objectives of the policy, due in part, to inadequate guidance for its implementation. Each executing agency had its own interpretation and perception about the policy. This resulted in short falls in the implementation strategies as well as the achievements of its goals

(Mutiarra, 1994). Furthermore, the quality of service in agricultural extension did not change very much and in some cases it was even decreased and rendered ineffective. To overcome the problems and doubts that existed, the government decided to upgrade and strengthen the RECs and their front-line extension offices in delivering agricultural extension services.

To ensure that the policy implementation was more successful, the Indonesian government established the Centre for Agricultural Extension (CAE) in February, 1994. The CAE of the Ministry of Agriculture (MOA) is a national agency which was created to provide, among other services, technical guidance to the districts' extension services on some aspects relating to the implementation of a decentralisation policy in agricultural extension services (GOI, 1995b). Specifically, in relation to the strategy of decentralised agricultural extension services, the role of the centre is to institutionalise the districts' capabilities to plan and carry out agricultural extension services effectively.

The key central agencies of the MOA and the Ministry of Home Affairs (MHA) are responsible for policy formulation, technical guidance and monitoring functions related to decentralised agricultural extension services. Within the MOA, in addition to the CAE, there exist the Agency for Agricultural Education and Training (AAET) and the Agency for Agricultural Research and Development (AARD). The AAET conducts training for agricultural staffs, whereas the AARD conducts research and supervises the new technology assessment centres.

In addition, some Directorate Generals within the ministry provide technical guidance by sub-sectors, while the Mass Guidance (*Bimas*) organisation supports



intensive guidance strategies for food crops sub-sector. The MOA is also supplemented by offices at the provincial level such as Provincial Agricultural Office (*Kanwil Pertanian*), Agency for Agricultural Extension and Training or BLPP and Agency for Agricultural Technology Assessment or BPTP.

An array of local entities at several levels participates in agricultural extension services. These include regional government (provincial, district) for Regional Planning and Development (*Bappeda*). Additional extension related entities include the RECs, implementation unit, village institutions such as village co-operative units and farmer organisations.

The government's commitment to decentralisation policy implementation was strengthened by the Presidential Decree No. 8 of 1995 which had selected 26 pilot-project districts in 26 provinces to receive intensive supports in developing districts' autonomies. Two important objectives are to: authority closer to local communities and resources in order to be more responsive to local needs and conditions, development activities (GOI, of agricultural extension, encourage higher level of local participation and self-reliance, transfer of agricultural technology to the farmers.

The joint-ministerial agreement in 1991 was further revised by the new ministerial agreement in April,