

Original paper

## BUREAUCRATIC SUPPORT-RELATED FACTORS AND THEIR RELATIONSHIPS TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF A DECENTRALISED FISHERIES EXTENSION IN JAVA, INDONESIA

By: Waridin \*)

Faculty of Economics, Diponegoro University  
Jalan Erlangga Tengah 17, Semarang 50241, Indonesia

Received: September 5, 2002 ; Accepted: September 30, 2002

### ABSTRACT

*This study is aimed to assess the relationships between bureaucratic support-related factors and the implementation of decentralisation policy in fisheries extension. Population of this study comprised fisheries extension officers (FEOs) at the Rural Extension Centres (RECs) in Java, Indonesia. A multi-stage random sampling method was used for selecting the subjects of the study. A total of 50 FEOs at 10 districts in three provinces were covered. Data were collected from January to March 1998 by using interview and self-administered techniques. Descriptive statistics and correlation analyses were applied.*

*Decentralisation policy in fisheries extension was not effectively implemented at the local level. Effectiveness in programme planning, decision-making, resources utilisation, and provision of benefits were not implemented as expected by the policy objectives. As beneficiaries of services, fishers received little from the implementation of decentralised fisheries extension. The effectiveness of the policy implementation was positively and significantly correlated to the bureaucratic support-related factors, which comprised of support from district government bureaucracy and supervision as well as guidance from related agencies.*

**Key words:** decentralisation policy, fisheries extension, bureaucratic support factors, effectiveness, implementation.

\*) **Correspondence:** Phone. 024-8417004, Fax. 024-8442273 – E-mail: waridin@hotmail.com

### INTRODUCTION

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 (see, for instance 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 development programmes. Finally, as societies became more complex and the 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 fisheries extension. Rivera (1996) mentioned that cost sharing and participation of stakeholders in development initiatives and decision-making are several elements in fisheries extension's transition. Public sector service was intensely attacked in the 1980s for not being relevant, effective, and efficient in activities and for having little impact on its clientele.

One of the most fundamental changes in introducing the concept of decentralisation to the fisheries extension function in Indonesia was that of setting the objectives (GOI, 1995). Previously, the setting of fisheries extension objectives was characterised by system-driven processes. This implies that the objectives of the programme were determined at the central level institution, and the lower levels were expected to implement the predetermined objectives. However, the decentralisation policy when applied to the fisheries extension meant that it should begin from the bottom level and moves up to the top level. The basic issue in the objective setting of fisheries extension 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).

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 et al., 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 development resources.

Consistent to other countries in implementing decentralisation policies there are problems associated with the process and implementation of the decentralisation policy in fisheries 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. Why was the implementation of decentralisation policy in fisheries 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? In relation to these problems, this study is intended to: (1) describe the existing conditions related to

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

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 fisheries 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 fisheries extension. This has resulted in slower growth than might have been achieved with available resources.

Currently, three decentralisation policy directions dominate the fisheries 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 (Crowder, 1997). The third current policy direction is to decentralise management programmes through farmer participatory involvement in decision-making and securing responsibility for the programmes (Rivera, 1996). Governments are beginning to move institutionally and technically towards putting responsibility into the hands of farmers to manage the extension programmes. Participatory involvement in developmental programmes is considered to make services more responsive to local conditions and needs, more accountable, effective and sustainable.

Two major approaches to analysing decentralisation policies are based on neo-classical economic theory of public choice (Russel and Nicholson, 1981) and public administration and finance approach (Cheema and Rondinelli, 1983; Conyers, 1983; Rondinelli, 1987). The public choice has been developed largely on the basis of economic reasoning and usually concerned with macro economic issues based on equilibrium model. While policy analysts using public administration and finance approach take a different perspective on decentralisation policy than the public choice theory. This approach is concerned with specific decision usually, even not always, which focuses on micro analytical issues. According to Rondinelli et al. (1989), the analysis strive to place in a broader context and take into account the political, behavioural, administrative and other related factors that influence the policy implementation.

According to the administration and finance approach, 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 bureaucracy to facilitate and support the policy implementation (Rondinelli et al., 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 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 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)

mentioned that frequent visits by the higher-level officers and the representative agencies to the implementation grounds created necessary compulsions for the national departments to demonstrate their commitment to the program.

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. Programme objectives would be achieved because of the special 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 programme. Similarly, intensities of supervision as well as guidance from the related institutions might have some influences on the implementation of decentralisation policy.

## **MATERIAL AND METHODS**

---

### **Sampling Method**

Population of this study comprised fisheries extension officers attached with the Rural Extension Centres (RECs) in Java, Indonesia. A multi-stage random sampling method was used to select the subjects for this study. At the first stage, three provinces in Java were randomly selected after observing the condition of fisheries extension and the duration of the policy implementation. This resulted the three provinces of West Java, Central Java and East Java. At the second stage, 10 districts were randomly selected, four in Central Java and three each in West and East Java. The third stage of the sampling procedure involved the selection of three to six fisheries extension officers (FEOs).

A total of 50 FEOs in 12 RECs in the study area were covered in this study.

### **Definitions and Measurements**

Effectiveness of the policy was operationalized as the degree to 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 REC officers pertaining to the RECs' functions in: setting-up programme planning, making decisions, utilising resources, and providing benefits to farmers. These were measured by a six-point Likert-like scales concerning the effectiveness level. A group-summed 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 fisheries extension, and vice versa. There were six items each being used to measure the effectiveness in the aspects of programme planning, decision-making, and resources utilisation. Meanwhile, the effectiveness in the provision of benefits utilised nine items. A total score for all items was used to measure the overall effectiveness of the policy implementation.

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 objectives of decentralisation policy in fisheries extension. 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 policy objectives. These were measured by five statements on a six-

point Likert-like scales. A high score revealed that bureaucracy at the district government had a high level of support to the RECs, and otherwise.

Supervision from fisheries agencies refers to the degree to which the implementation of decentralised fisheries 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 fisheries agencies during the policy implementation. There were six statements used to measure this variable. A low-level of supervision reflected by a low score. Guidance from fisheries 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 fisheries agencies in implementing the policy. There were six statements used to measure this variable. A low score reflected a low guidance from fisheries agencies, and vice versa.

### **Data Collection and Analysis**

Data collection procedure for this study utilised a cross-sectional survey design. Data were collected during the period of January to March 1998 by using an interview technique to fisheries extension officers (FEOs) in each RECs. Self-administered questionnaires were delivered to the head of RECs to be filled in. Contact fishers (fisher's leaders) in each selected REC were also interviewed using an interview schedule prepared especially for them. The statistical procedures used to analyse the data were descriptive and correlation analyses.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

### **Conditions Related to Bureaucratic Support Factors**

As shown in **Table 1**, only 4.7% of FEOs 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 FEOs 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 implementation of the policy. Similarly, financial as well as physical infrastructures were also granted to the RECs as they existed in some districts. Nevertheless, support from other institutions at the district level such as fisheries technical agencies and member of people representative board (DPRD) was low.

Results as summarised in **Table 1** reveal that 76.6% of FEOs and 35.5% of HRECs indicated that RECs received minimal supervision from higher-level fisheries agencies. Data for the three provinces showed identical tendencies where there were indications that the

RECs and BIPPs were lowly supervised by fisheries agencies. Most of the FEOs confirmed that supervision from higher agencies to the RECs was low. Intensive supervisions to RECs were provided by BIPPs, however, the RECs received minimal supervisions from fisheries agencies at provincial level as well as agency at the central level. The majority (82.2%) of FEOs and 41.1% of HRECs affirmed that the RECs were lowly guided by fisheries agencies. There was no FEO 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 the three provinces also showed identical trends where about one-half of FEOs stated that the RECs received minimal guidance. It implied that the policy implementation could not be executed as expected by the pre-determined objectives. Several studies indicated that political as well as economic supports from bureaucracy, supervision as well as guidance from related agencies to the implementing agencies at the local coverage had been known as the important elements in the success of policy implementation (see, for instance: Vengroff and Salem, 1992; Olowu and Smoke, 1992; Juma and Clark, 1995; and Kaul, 1997).

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

Variables	FEOs %	HRECs %
<b>1. Support from district government bureaucracy</b>		
Low ( $\leq 12.50$ )	22.4	4.7
Moderate (12.51 - 17.50)	72.9	51.4
High ( $\geq 17.51$ )	4.7	43.9
Total	100.0	100.0
Mean	13.8	16.9
Std. deviation	2.2	2.6
Minimum	8.0	10.0
Maximum	18.0	23.0
<b>2. Supervision from fisheries agencies</b>		
Low ( $\leq 15.00$ )	76.6	35.5
Moderate (15.01 - 21.00)	23.4	56.1
High ( $\geq 21.01$ )		-
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
<b>3. Guidance from fisheries agencies</b>		
Low ( $\leq 15.00$ )	82.2	41.1
Moderate (15.01 - 21.00)	17.8	50.5
High ( $\geq 21.01$ )	-	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

### Effectiveness in the Implementation of Decentralisation Policy

The aggregate scores obtained from FEOs and HRECs were used to measure effectiveness of the policy implementation in programme planning. More than one-half (58.9%) of FEOs 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 FEOs noted that effectiveness of decentralised fisheries 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 agencies to harmonise and accommodate a national and regional-wide policy. However, the receipts of guidelines were usually late at the implementation level. Apart from that, there was insufficient knowledge of officers at the RECs in programmes planning due to limited exposure and training. Another problem was related to the lack of farmers' involvement in arranging the suitable programmes.

Nearly one-half (47.7%) of the HRECs indicated that effectiveness of policy implementation in the aspect of decision-making was high. Nevertheless, only 6.5% of the FEOs gave a similar response. Almost two-thirds of FEOs 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 local level. Directives were late and minimal guidance from the higher 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. Another hindrance in making decision at the REC was the low level of officers' education and experience. Most of them had no formal training pertaining to making decision and management issues. 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 FEOs verified that effectiveness of decentralisation policy implementation in the aspect of resources utilisation was low, while only 4.7% of HRECs provided the same response. According to HRECs, 40.2% of the RECs was highly effective in resources utilisation compared to only 4.7% of FEOs' responses. 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 the FEOs tended to show that effectiveness of policy implementation at the RECs was closer to low level. More than 70.0% of the extension officers at the three provinces stated that resources utilisation at the RECs were moderately effective. In addition, more than one-half (54.2%) of contact fishers confirmed that effectiveness of the policy in the provision of benefits was low. However, only 10.3% of FEOs and 1.9% of HRECs responded similar answers.

Decentralised fisheries extension policy is aimed at providing fisheries extension to the clients based on local conditions, problems and needs. Therefore, utilisation of local resources and technology would be taken into 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. Nevertheless, it was not easy to achieve these expectations due to a complexity of barriers. 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.

**Table 2.** Overall Effectiveness of Policy Implementation

Scores	FEOs %	HRECs %
Low ( $\leq 76.50$ )	58.9	2.8
Moderate (76.51 - 94.50)	33.6	39.3
High ( $\geq 94.51$ )	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

As presented in **Table 2**, more than one half (58.9%) of the FEOs 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 was high. Slightly more than one-third (33.6% of FEOs and 39.3% of HRECs) confirmed that overall effectiveness of the policy implementation RECs was moderate. The low level of effectiveness of the policy implementation was confirmed by the contact fishers. However, for the HRECs, overall effectiveness of the policy implementation at the REC level was moderate. The findings for the three provinces also indicated a similar trend as confirmed by 70.0% of REC officers. Effectiveness of the policy implementation is influenced by several factors. A number of studies verified that decentralisation policy implementation would be effective in condition where, for example, there are supports from the government bureaucracy to the implementing agencies, agencies and organisation involved become more coordinated each other, and adequacy of financial as well as personnel resources

(Olowu and Smoke, 1992; Juma and Clark, 1995; and Kaul, 1997).

#### **Relationships Between Bureaucratic Support-Related 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 for both FEOs and HRECs. This means that support from district government bureaucracy, supervision from fisheries agencies and guidance from fisheries agencies were important factors to be considered in ensuring effectiveness of implementation of decentralisation in fisheries extension.

Specifically, the correlation coefficients (r-values) for “support from district government bureaucracy” were highest among the FEOs as well as for the HRECs under effectiveness in programme planning with .465 and .416 respectively. This means that support from district government bureaucracy is essential to ensure the effectiveness in programme planning with regard to decentralised fisheries extension. With regard to effectiveness in decision-making,

“supervision from fisheries agencies” was regarded as important by the FEOs 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, FEOs identified “supervision from higher level fisheries agencies” while HRECs

identified “guidance from fisheries agencies” as important considerations to ensure effectiveness of implementation of decentralisation policy in fisheries extension. Both groups indicated “support from district government bureaucracy” as being critical to ensure effectiveness in the provision of benefits.

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

Variables	Correlation Coefficient (r)	
	FEOs	HRECs
Effectiveness in Programme Planning and:		
Support from district government bureaucracy	.465*	.416*
Supervision from fisheries agencies	.397*	.313*
Guidance from fisheries agencies	.261*	.327*
Effectiveness in Decision Making and:		
Support from district government bureaucracy	.437*	.376*
Supervision from fisheries agencies	.483*	.311*
Guidance from fisheries agencies	.332*	.325*
Effectiveness in Resources Utilisation and:		
Support from district government bureaucracy	.428*	.324*
Supervision from fisheries agencies	.471*	.204*
Guidance from fisheries agencies	.310*	.327*
Effectiveness in Provision of Benefits and:		
Support from district government bureaucracy	.518*	.424*
Supervision from fisheries agencies	.504*	.334*
Guidance from fisheries agencies	.356*	.407*
Overall Effectiveness and:		
Support from district government bureaucracy	.527*	.449*
Supervision from fisheries agencies	.528*	.340*
Guidance from fisheries agencies	.360*	.408*

\* Significant at the .05 level

Similar findings were also found by researches conducted by scholars such as 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 fisheries extension. Hence, the results of the study support the results of similar previous studies.

From the results, it might be discerned that the more effective supervision from higher fisheries 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 fisheries extension services conducted at the local level. Similarly, the more appropriate interaction for work improvements from fisheries agencies or officers to the implementing agencies, the more effective would be the implementation of decentralised fisheries extension. Supervision as well as guidance from higher 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 agencies and officers had motivated local 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 fisheries agencies was positively correlated to effectiveness of decentralisation policy implementation. As shown in **Table 3**, these relationships were statistically significant at .05 level. The more supervision and guidance provided from fisheries 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. This would help the policy or programme to achieve its goals and hence, create an effective mechanism of implementation.

## CONCLUSION

---

The decentralisation policy was not effectively executed at the local level. As beneficiaries of services, fishers received little benefits from the implementation of decentralised fisheries extension. The effectiveness of the policy implementation was positively and significantly correlated to the bureaucratic support-related factors, which comprised of support from district government bureaucracy and supervision as well as guidance from related agencies. To ensure successful implementation, support from district government bureaucracies was necessary. Implementing public policy is not an easy task. It takes time and hardworking to achieve the predetermined objectives. Effective implementation of decentralisation policy requires strong support from the government bureaucracy. Authority holders at the district government needs to be more supportive to the implementing agencies in terms of legal-basis, financial capability, and physical infrastructures.

It is also necessary that intensive supervision and guidance from the fisheries agencies to be provided on the regular-schedule basis. 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. Appropriate technical administrative supervision and guidance either from agencies at the central or provincial levels needs to be provided. 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 the related ministries and their subordinate agencies should sit and discuss together the appropriate strategies to ensure the success of the decentralised fisheries extension.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This article is a part of the author's Ph.D. thesis entitled "Effectiveness of Implementation of Decentralisation Policy in Agricultural Extension: A Comparative Perception of Extension Officers in Java, Indonesia". Universiti Putra Malaysia (UPM), Serdang, Selangor: January, 1999. Special thanks go to the Supervisory Committee consisting of Prof. Dato' Dr. Rahim Md. Sail, Dr. Bahaman Abu Samah, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Turiman Suandi, and Prof. Dr. Sharan M. Merriem (University of Georgia, USA) for their valuable comments and suggestions.

## REFERENCES

- Adamolekun, L. 1991. "Decentralization policies: problems and perspectives". *Asian J. Public. Adm.*, 13: 67-92.
- Cheema, G.S. and Rondinelli, D.A. (Eds.) (1983). *Decentralization and Development: Policy Implementation in Developing Countries*. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications.
- Conyers, D. 1983. "Decentralization: the latest fashion in development administration?". *Public. Adm. Dev.* 3: 97-109.
- Crowder, L.V. 1997. *Decentralized Extension: Effect and Opportunities*. In Internet (retrieved via Microsoft Explorer, April 2, 1997). <http://www.fao.org/WAINCENT/faoinfo/sustdev/Exdirect/Exan0013.html>.
- Devas, N. 1997. "Indonesia: what do we mean by decentralization?". *Public Adm. Dev.* 17: 351-367.
- Government of Indonesia (GOI). 1995. *Preparing Decentralized Fisheries Extension: A Preliminary Study*. Jakarta: Centre for Fisheries Extension of the Ministry of Agriculture.
- Ingham, B. and Kalam, A.K.M. 1992. "Decentralization and Development: theory and evidence from Bangladesh". *Public. Adm. Dev.* 12: 373-385.
- Juma, C. and Clark, N. 1995. "Policy research in sub-Saharan Africa: an exploration". *Public. Adm. Dev.* 15: 121-137.
- Kaul, M. 1997. "The New Public Administration: management innovations in government". *Public. Adm. Dev.* 17: 13-26.

- Khan, J. 1989. "The implementation process". *The Indian J. Public. Adm.* 35: 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. Adm. Dev.* 12: 1-17.
- Rivera, W.M. 1996. "Fisheries extension in transition worldwide: structural, financial and managerial strategies for improving fisheries extension". *Public. Adm. Dev.* 16: 151-161.
- Rivera, W.M. and Gustafson, D.J. 1991. "New roles and responsibilities for public sector fisheries extension". In W.M. Rivera and D.J. Gustafson (Eds.). *Fisheries Extension: Worldwide Institutional Evolution and Forces for Change* (pp. 257-266). Amsterdam: Elsevier Science Publishers.
- Rondinelli, D.A. 1987. "Administrative decentralization of fisheries and rural development programs in Asia: a comparative analysis". In W.M. Rivera and S.G. Schram (Eds.). *Fisheries 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". *Dev. Change.* 20: 57-87.
- Russel, C.S. and Nicholson, N.K. (Eds.) 1981. *Public Choice and Rural Development*. Washington, DC.: Resources for the Future.
- Vengroff, R. and Salem, H.B. 1992. "Assessing the impact of decentralization on governance: a comparative methodological approach and application to Tunisia". *Public. Adm. Dev.* 12: 473-492.
- Waridin 1999. *Effectiveness of the Implementation of Decentralisation Policy in Fisheries Extension Services: A Perception of Fisheries 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.