
The impact of the decentralization and Pluralism policy on agricultural extension services

Jadallah, A. E. Omar^{1*}, Abu Hassan Abu Bakar¹ and Hasnah Mohd, Jais²

¹School of Housing, Building & Planning, Universiti Sains Malaysia (USM), ²School of Biological Sciences, Universiti Sains Malaysia (USM)

Jadallah, A.E. Omar, Abu Hassan Abu Bakar and Hasnah Mohd, Jais (2011) The impact of the decentralization and Pluralism policy on agricultural extension services. *Journal of Agricultural Technology* 7(4):895-901.

Agricultural extension systems in world are struggling to prove their importance and relevance to sustainable agricultural development. In order to solve of Problems of rural development, Agricultural extension systems need to encourage the active participation of Farmers in planning, implementing, and monitoring Agricultural extension programs. To achieve this participation, extension organizations would need to formally of decentralization and Pluralism or transfer the control of specific program planning and management functions to the system levels of local Agricultural extension, Private sector organizations, Farmers organizations and Education organizations where extension programs are actually implemented. This paper are reviewed the recently studies of Decentralization of agricultural Extension and Pluralism of agricultural Extension.

Key words: Decentralization, pluralism, agricultural extension services

Introduction

Agricultural extension services is the bedrock of Agricultural development, however, the development of the sector cannot be achieved without an efficient and effective extension system. Thus, there is the need for a well articulated and comprehensive Agricultural Extension Policy, Which depends on Decentralization and Pluralism to development of Agricultural extension system (Koyenikan, 2008).

Agricultural extension policy is a part of national development policy in general and of agricultural and rural development policy in particular. Hence, the problems of establishing or maintaining an effective agricultural extension service can be traced back to the lack of a realistic policy or an unstable policy framework for charting of the extension system (Swanson *et al.*, 1997). In developing national agricultural extension policies, representatives of all major groups of farmers should be directly involved and other relevant agricultural

*Corresponding author: Jadallah.A.E.Omar; e-mail: Alakf73@yahoo.com

organizations, should have a comprehensive agricultural extension policy which provides for coordination with research and education. The most difficult and challenging policy issue facing extension today is to secure a stable source of funding (Swanson *et al.*, 1997). With the widespread trend to cut government budgets, therefore Policy makers should examine this issue carefully in deciding what level of public funding is necessary to support extension in relation to the needs of farmers in the country Policies are predetermined guides to decision making; they establish boundaries or limits within which action may be taken. Managers are related to policy formation in two ways. First, they play a crucial role in implementing organizational policies that have been established by higher management. Second, they create policies within their departments as guides for their own work groups (Swanson *et al.*, 1997). To achieve these linkages need to restructure with new expertise and skills and with a new set of decentralization procedures, which are less hierarchical and more flexible, to respond to the emerging needs of farmers at the local level and to improve the cooperation of cross of Pluralism extension approach among different government departments and other development agencies.

Decentralization of agricultural extension

Deconcentration is defined as the transfer of effective control by central Managements to regional and provincial Managements or other field level offices. In addition, this strategy may include the participatory involvement of farmers in the managerial processes for agricultural development (Rivera *et al.* 1997) . District extension director received and followed instructions from the senior management of the agricultural extension with limited involvement of subordinate staff. The staff is involved in the development of the case organization's annual extension plan and each staff member is responsible in consultation with his supervisor, for the development of his own annual work plan and training program. Two field staff representatives are also included in a management team comprising the director and assistant, the supervisors and a support staff representative (Okorley *et al.*, 2009). Prior to decentralization, the management of the case organization was top-down - the Decentralization is an example of promoting the participation of lower-levels of agricultural extension management in decision-making and budgeting. And extension, participatory and demand-led services are examples of the effort to integrate producers into agricultural processes (Niamh Dennehy *et al.*, 2000), as this allows much greater transparency of decision making because the field staff representatives are involved in the actual decision making (Okorley *et al.*, 2009). Decentralization also encourages more contact and open communication to build respect and trust among the staff, gives a level of flexibility to field staff

to design their location-specific extension activities with farmers. It encourages team work amongst the staff, and has opened itself up to increased scrutiny and input from farmers and other stakeholders through greater interaction with them (Okorley *et al.*, 2009). This is undertaken to improve the field staff's knowledge of farmer practices and the reasons behind these practices to foster this learning culture. The case organization provides a range of mechanisms through which staff can learn informally, such provides learning materials that the staff can access for self-directed learning (Okorley *et al.*, 2009). It creates an open environment in which staff feel comfortable in sharing information, as such this provides support to the field staff in decision-making, and encourages teamwork among the staff; and ensures that the staff are informed in a timely fashion about policies and other relevant issues (Okorley *et al.*, 2009). The needed reforms include decentralization of responsibility, delegation of authority to district managers and teams, autonomy in routine decision making, and a separate budget for operational expenditure. To adopt new technologies, solve problems, and increase income from agriculture, must have to reorganize its structure and functions by embracing wider expertise, decentralizing management, and nurturing a culture of organizational learning (van den Ban and Wageningen, 2003). It should take into consideration the diversity of organizations that are providing different extension services and the potential for improving the relationships among them. While extension managers and policy makers need to explore these options for providing better extension services to farmers to meet the emerging challenges (van den Ban and Wageningen, 2003). The technologies developed were often inappropriate for small-scale farmers, as the conditions on-farm, including the farmers' own management type and priorities, were not adequately considered (Davis, 2008). Understanding of human resource capacity building is a key factor of success for decentralized public agricultural extension and other institutions such as research institutes, universities and other government organizations to facilitate training. This proximity to major research institutions provides it with an advantage in relation to accessing expertise for training (Okorley *et al.*, 2009). The critical feature of field staff training at the case organization is the involvement of farmers in the training process, a practice they call "joint-training" exercise (Okorley *et al.*, 2009). Institutional reform has resulted in a variety of institutions being engaged in the transfer and exchange of agricultural information; as well as institutional reform through privatizing schemes such as contracting with the private sector and the establishment of partnerships in the provision of agricultural extension services (Kim *et al.*, 2009). There is no way the private sector organizations can effectively provide extension services

without the assistance of the state and also from Agricultural development organizations, because they already have well-trained personnel and infrastructure in place. (Kristin Davis and Place, 2003). Extension and research staff will be accountable to farmer clients through the participation of farmer organizations and emerging agricultural structures in decision-making processes, and supported to ensure that they have a say in formulating policies that affect them (Al-Rimawi and Al-Karablieh, 2002). Other intervention measures include providing effective information dissemination to farmers, improvement in technology delivery mechanisms and increasing outreach such as making technology component farmer specific. Others are decentralization of agricultural technology delivery institutions, enhancing farmer's managerial ability especially through farmers' organizations and educational institutions and reforming agricultural markets to stabilize income of farmers (Chukwuone *et al.*, 2006). Consequently, an increase in the quality and quantity of adult and continuing education programme is a priority and educational institutions are charged with the task of designing programme curricula to achieve these policy aims. Higher education today operates in a new era, an era that is much more conscious of the market place (Angstreich and Zinnah, 2007). Towards this end, it is necessary to review the potential of developing measures for the greater organizations when it comes to the agricultural extension organizations, design agricultural extension organizations in the regions centered on the key products, and various alternatives (Kim *et al.*, 2009).

Pluralism of agricultural extension

Agricultural extension Managements can establish different collaborative working relationships with Agricultural Development organizations based on trust and mutual respect, to obtain access to resources for extension delivery Farmers and staff training.(Ernest *et al.*, 2010). The main challenge in installing a proper pluralistic agricultural extension mechanism is the effective coordination among various organizations, especially in matters of development when competent nonpublic institutions are present in the country (Rivera and Alex, 2004). The modality of using more than one organization, whether public or private, for delivering extension services is to help in achieving the desired goals (Rivera and Alex, 2004). In addition, agricultural research institutes, agricultural universities and farmers' associations, participate in the delivery of extension services. Here, agricultural extension refers to the cultivation of farmers' organizations that aim to increase agricultural productivity and to improve the everyday life of farmers. (Ban and Hawkins, 1988). The agricultural technology distribution is a model which shows the relationship among agricultural research, agricultural extension and

farmers (Ban and Hawkins, 1988). Based on the agricultural technology distribution, agricultural extension process is a scientific knowledge the results of agricultural research to the techniques and transmits the techniques to the farmers to help them adopt the techniques and increase production by using those (Kim *et al.*, 2009). Agricultural research and technology identification are often relevant to all public and private extension service providers. Here, most extension services oversight is an inherent aspect of the public sector's responsibilities for policy formulation, and design of reforms to promote pluralistic extension institutional arrangements (Rivera and Alex, 2004). The obvious rationale is the pooling of all available resources in order to alleviate pressure from low budgets and staff in the ministries of agriculture, as well as to let the farmers benefit from a variety of sources (Rivera and Alex, 2004). But pluralistic extension also requires of emphasizing multiple and diverse partnership between public and private sectors including partnership with farmer organizations and private venture companies to facilitate the common concepts, language, methods and skills needed to integrate the diversity that arises from institutional pluralism (Rivera and Alex, 2004). As farmer organizations mature, they may become increasingly oriented toward providing specific services for their members (Burton E. Swanson and Rajalahti, 2010). For example, farmers' associations have long played an important role in providing advice on production technologies, and putting pressure on research and extension organizations to work in a more demand-driven and client-oriented way (Van den Ban, 2000). The involvement of public organizations in institutional research and extension activities can lead these institutions to establish complementary relationships with such organizations as the Agricultural Research Institutes, the Ministry of Agriculture, and similar agricultural development organizations (Teffera Betru and Hamdar, 1997). As the cost of research is high, the public system is more technically and logistically equipped to undertake research activities, and the firms have direct interest to cooperate with the public research in undertaking experimental works (Al-Rimawi and Al-Karablieh, 2002). The provision of extension assistance to farmers previously supported by participating organizations and the development of seed supply networks that are accessible and affordable to subsistence farmers represent two tangible areas where linkages between public and private extension activities could provide important benefits (Rodney Reynar *et al.*, 1996). Development programs worldwide have recognized that local participation is the key to sustainable transfer and long-term adoption of new technologies and approaches. Interactive participation is the approach that facilitates this kind of learning environment. Teaching has long been the normal

mode of educational programs and institutions where agricultural extension skills work (Toness, 2001). The capacity building component was designed around three objectives: To develop competency-based curricula in participating universities that better match agricultural sector workforce needs. To develop new and updated courses, and improve instruction; and to develop internship programs to provide real-life experiences working with farmers, exporters and other agribusiness firms for college graduates (Barrick et al., 2009). In order to move from a teaching paradigm towards a learning paradigm, highly participatory interactions and knowledge sharing among all sectors is critical for extension institutions both in applied extension programs and at teaching institutions. Emphasizing the strengths of both public and private extension initiatives may begin to fully address the needs of subsistence farmers (Toness, 2001). A case is made for the organizations involved to continue to cross the institutional divides so that the long-term sustainability and development of small-scale farming communities is ensured. Conventional station-based approaches to agricultural research, technology development, and extension have failed to achieve the expected results in the small-scale farming sector of the developing world (Davis, 2008).

Based on this review paper for several studies, the following conclusion was drawn and future work study are given, encourages more contact and open communication to build respect and trust among the staff, gives a level of flexibility to field staff to design their location-specific extension activities with farmers and effective coordination among various organizations. Further and concrete studies are needed because of complexity of the impact evaluation; it is necessary to combine studies using different perspectives in order to increase the scope and rigor of results. If studies are coordinated (e.g. Contribute of decentralization and the Pluralism of access to provides a framework for Agricultural extension staff to participate with farmers and other organizations in facilitating development planning and activity implementation For sustainable agricultural development).

References

- Al-Rimawi, A. & Al-Karablieh, E. (2002). Agricultural private firms' willingness to cooperate with public research and extension in Jordan. *Journal of International Agricultural and Extension Education* 9:5.
- Angstreich, M. & Zinnah, M. (2007). A meeting of the minds: farmer, extensionist, and researcher. *Journal of International Agricultural and Extension Education* 14: 85-95.
- Ban, A. & Hawkins, H. (1988) *Agricultural Extension*.
- Chukwuone, N., Agwu, A. and Ozor, N. (2006). Constraints and strategies toward effective cost-sharing of agricultural technology delivery in Nigeria: perception of farmers and agricultural extension personnel. *Journal of International Agricultural and Extension Education* 13.

- Davis, K. (2008). Extension in sub-Saharan Africa: Overview and assessment of past and current models, and future prospects. *Journal of International Agricultural and Extension Education* 15:15-28.
- Ernest, L. Okorley, David Gray and Janet Reid (2010). Towards a cross-sector pluralistic agricultural extension system in a decentralized policy context: A Ghanaian case study. *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa* 12: 4.
- Kim, J., Kong, M. and Ju, D. (2009) Challenges in public agricultural extension of Korea. *Journal of International Agricultural and Extension Education* 16.
- Koyenikan, M.J.(2008). Issues for agricultural extension policy in Nigeria. *Journal of Agricultural Extension* 12.
- Kristin Davis and Place, N.T. (2003). Non-governmental organizations as an important actor in agricultural extension in a semiarid East Africa. *Journal of International Agricultural and Extension Education* 10.
- Niamh Dennehy, Dermot J. Ruane and Phelan, J.F. (2000). Supports and funding for community development projects in the Republic of Ireland. *Journal of International Agricultural and Extension Education* 7: 83.
- Okorley, E., Gray, D. and Reid, J. (2009). Improving agricultural extension human resource capacity in a decentralized policy context: a Ghanaian case study. *Journal of International Agricultural and Extension Education*.
- Rivera, W.M., Elshafie, E.M. and Aboul - Seoud, K.H. (1997). The public sector agricultural extension system in Egypt: a pluralistic complex in transition. *Journal of International Agricultural and Extension Education* 4:3.
- Rivera, W. and Alex, G. (2004). The continuing role of government in pluralistic extension systems. *Journal of International Agricultural and Extension Education* 11: 41-52.
- Rodney Reynar, Fred Musser and Bruening, T. (1996). The potential for linking private and public extension services in Bangladesh., *Journal of International Agricultural and Extension Education* 3: 76.
- Swanson, B. E., Bentz, R. P. and Sofranko, A. J. (Eds.) (1997). *Improving agricultural extension: a reference manual*, food and agriculture organization of the United Nations, Rome.
- Teffera Betru and Hamdar, B. (1997). Strengthening the linkages between research and extension in agricultural higher education institutions in developing countries. *International Educational Development* (17): 303-311.
- Toness, A. (2001). The potential of participatory rural appraisal (Pra) approaches and methods for agricultural extension and development in 21st century. *Journal of International Agriculture and Extension Education* (8): 25-37.
- Van Den Ban, A. (2000). Different ways of financing agricultural extension. *Agren Network Paper* 106: 8-19.
- Van Den Ban, A. and Wageningen, N. (2003). Funding and delivering agricultural extension in India. *Journal of International Agricultural and Extension Education* 10: 21.

(Received 29 March 2011; accepted 30 May 2011)