CHAPTER 9

STAFFING AND HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

9.1 INTRODUCTION

According to Donnelly, Gibson & Ivancevich (1995), people are an organization's most precious internal resource, because they provide the knowledge, skills, and drive that create, maintain, and advance it. They are the organization's lifeblood. If an organization does not take its human resource management responsibilities seriously, work performance and goal achievement may suffer (Lindner, 2001). This is due to the fact that the common thread in high-performance work practices seems to be a commitment to improving the knowledge, skills and abilities of an organization's current and potential employees, increasing their motivation, reducing loafing on the job, and enhancing the retention of quality employees, while encouraging non-performers to leave the organization (Robbins & Coulter, 1999). This process involves working with and through people and seeing them as partners, not just as costs to be minimized or avoided (Donnelly *et al*., 1995).

The human resource management activities in extension that are shared by top, middle, and first level managers, involve selecting, developing, appraising and rewarding employees (Lindner, 2001:21).

9.2 SELECTING, AND HIRING EMPLOYEES

Recruiting, selecting and hiring are closely related parts and, when combined, make up the staffing process of human resource management (Lindner, 2001:23). Recruitment seeks to develop a pool of potential job candidates and is the process of locating, identifying, and attracting capable applicants, while selection is the process of screening job applicants to ensure that the most appropriate candidates are hired (Robbins & Coulter, 1999). Selection is an exercise to predict which applicants will be successful if hired. Successful in this case means performing well on the criteria the organization uses

to evaluate employees (Hooi, 2008). Against this background, the respondents' perceptions of the current and recommended level of entry qualification requirement for various extension work positions in Oromia Bureau of Agriculture and Rural Development (OBARD) is presented in Table 9.1.

Table 9.1 Respondents' perceptions of the current and recommended entry qualification requirement for extension staff in OBARD (N=339), as reflected in mean assessments on a 6-point scale *

Entry requirement for:	Current	Recommended
Development Agents (DA)	2	3
Extensionists	3	4
Subject matter specialists (SMS)	3	5

Qualification categories (1-6): 1=Secondary school graduate; 2= Certificate 3=Diploma 4=Bachelor's degree 5=MSc and 6=PhD

Table 9.1 indicates that the current entry requirement for the frontline development agents (DAs) is the appropriate certificate, and for extensionists and subject matter specialists the diploma from agricultural colleges.

For the recruitment of DA there are traditionally two sources, namely high schools and agricultural colleges. Those recruited from high school graduates are sent to agricultural vocational training centres for 6-12 months' training and, after being awarded a certificate, are employed and are assigned to Rural Development Centres (RDCs) as DAs. Those who are recruited from agricultural colleges, are employed directly, and they also assigned to RDCs for one to three days' orientation at their respective districts. The respondents expressed the view that the minimum qualification should be a college diploma.

The positions of extensionists and SMSs are currently filled by internal promotion, from DAs or transfers from other departments or institutions or new recruitments (graduates from colleges or universities). Therefore, the current entry qualification can be the appropriate certificate or diploma. No clearly outlined qualification level exists so far,

although the mean average respondents perceive it to be the diploma. The respondents recommended that BSc and MSc should be a requirement for qualification as extensionists and SMSs, respectively.

9.3 TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT

Training and development help to improve employee performance by developing and enhancing worker competence (Lindner, 2001:23). As job demands change, employee skills have to be altered and updated. According to Robbins & Coulter (1999), managers are responsible for deciding when subordinates need training and what form that training should take, because human errors could be significantly reduced, if not prevented, by better employee training. Respondents' perceptions of the current and the recommended situation of in-service training in OBARD are presented in Table 9.2.

Table 9.2 Respondents' perceptions of the current and the recommended training expressed in terms of the number of weeks per year (N=340)

Staff category	Current	Recommended
Extension	1.26	6.49
SMS	1.14	6.30
Management	.96	6.07

Overall, the respondents regard the current situation of in-service training for extension staff as inadequate, which is about a week per year. According to Table 9.2, the current in-service training for extensionist (1.26 weeks per year) is slightly higher than that of SMS (1.14 weeks per year) and management (0.96 week). The recommendation is a dramatic increase of in-service training: 6.49 weeks per year for extensionist and not much less for SMSs and managers. However, significant differences occur between the different zones (Table 9.3).

Table 9.3 The current and the recommended in-service training per year, expressed in terms of the number of weeks per year by respondents in various managerial positions and zones (N=340)

		In-service training per year (mean number of weeks)					
		Extensionist		SMS		Management	
Respondents categories		Current	Recommended	Current	Recommended	Current	Recommended
Managerial positions							
Non-managers		1.29	6.57	1.19	6.29	.95	6.03
First level managers		1.22	6.15	1.22	6.16	.82	6.22
Middle level managers		1.27	6.97	.92	6.68	1.20	6.08
Top level managers		1.29	5.00	.71	5.14	1.14	4.86
Total		**1.26**	**6.49**	**1.14**	**6.30**	**.96**	**6.07**
Analysis of variance (ANOVA)	F-value	.042	.888	.803	.502	.705	1.004
	df	3,338	3,338	3,338	3,338	3,338	3,338
	Sig.	.989	.447	.493	.681	.549	.391
Zones							
Jimma		1.75	6.07	1.54	6.35	1.22	6.40
Arsi		.94	6.29	.72	6.18	1.16	5.87
South West Shewa		1.16	9.32	1.03	7.41	.78	5.24
Borena		1.40	6.37	1.65	6.30	.49	6.86
East Shewa		.39	6.18	.70	5.37	.11	5.86
Analysis of variance (ANOVA)	F-value	7.134	5.530	6.377	1.334	4.184	4.190
	df	4,323	4,323	4,323	4,323	4,323	4,323
	Sig.	.000	.000	.000	.257	.003	.003

According to Table 9.3, the current situation of in-service training offered by Jima (coffee dominated) and Borena (pastoral area) appeared almost four times compared to the ratings by the respondents from East Shewa and double Arsi zones. These findings could imply that those zones well focused on a single enterprise have conducted more in-service training per year than those zones with more diversification.

As far as managerial positions are concerned, no significant variations between them are observed. However, for top level managers the demand for in-service training of extensionists, SMSs and managers appear to be less than for the other management categories.

9.4 MANPOWER APPRAISAL

The process of manpower performance appraisal is often emotional, as it brings into play ideas and perceptions of fairness and equal treatment. It involves individuals judging the quality and quantity of job performance of other individuals (Donnelly, *et al*., 1995). The effectiveness of the appraisal system depends on the quality of the three elements of all control techniques: standards, information, and corrective action (Chapter 11).

Managers must decide on three issues regarding performance information: the source, the schedule, and the method. Concerning the sources of information five possible parties can provide appraisal information: the supervisors of the appraisee, the peers, the appraisee, subordinates of the appraisee, and individuals outside the work environment (Donnelly, *et al*., 1995). In Ethiopia, prior to the decentralisation in 2002, the sources of information for manpower appraisal had been based only on the appraisee's immediate supervisor and the appraisal had been conducted every three months.

However, the current system involves a combination of peers, subordinates and even individuals outside the work environment and is conducted irregularly. Respondents' perception of the effectiveness of the current appraisal systems are assessed using a 10-point scale. These results are summarized in Table 9.4.

Table 9.4 The current efficiency level of the staff appraisal system (expressed as mean scale point percentage) as perceived by respondents in different managerial positions and from different zones (N=353)

Respondent categories	Mean scale point percentage
(a) Managerial	
Non-managers	38.0
First level managers	35.6
Middle level managers	39.7
Top level managers	35.0
Total	**37.6**
Analysis of variance (ANOVA)	
Degree of freedom (df)	*3,339*
F-value	*.558*
Significance (p-value)	*.64*
(b) Zones	
Jimma	34.8
Arsi	43.7
South West Shewa	28.9
Borena	45.1
East Shewa	26.9
Analysis of variance (ANOVA)	
Degree of freedom (df)	*6,336*
F-value	*5.897*
Significance (p-value)	*.00*

The general impression is that OBARD's current system of human power appraisal is perceived to be lacking. This is reflected in the current average efficiency score of 37.6 percent (Table 9.4). However, significant differences occur between the zones (F=5.897; p=0.00).

The assessments of the appraisal systems for East Shewa (26.9 percent) and South West Shewa (28.9%) fall significantly below the mean assessment (37.6%). This could be attributed to their proximity to the capital city and the subsequent bigger exposure to political influences.

The situation in the Arsi (43.7 percent) and Borena (45.1 percent) zones, comparatively, appears much better. One of the contributing reasons could be the presence and strong support (financially as well as technically) of agricultural projects over longer periods of time. For example, the Arsi zone has been under extension projects from 1967 onwards (such as CADU, supported SIDA, the Swedish Government, the Arsi-Bale project

financed by the Italian Government). In Borena, also, the GTZ project (financed by the German Government) has been providing strong support to the area for extension activities over the past two decades. The presence of these projects together with the close supervision of expatriate consultants might have contributed towards a more fair and equitable way of dealing with people.

9.5 REWARD SYSTEM

An organization must attract, hire, and retain a work force with the necessary competencies. In order to retain a competent work force, organizations should have a reward system that ensures that employees are fairly compensated in exchange for their efforts in achieving organizational goals (Lindner, 2001:23). According to Otley (1999) the links that should exist between the systems of designs of payment and performance measurement, should be documented and, in view of their motivational impact, assessed and evaluated. In this connection, respondents' were requested to indicate how important the following four criteria are for promotions or appointments, namely: qualification, proven performance, personality and political affiliation. A 10 point scale (where 0 represents 'unimportant' and 10 is decisive or extremely important) was used to assess the importance level of each criteria. The findings are summarized in Table 9.5.

Table 9.5 Respondents' assessment (expressed as mean percentage scale point) of the current and recommended importance of different criteria for appointment and promotion purposes in OBARD (N=314)

	Current importance		Recommended importance	
Lists of criteria	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Qualification	68.4	17.6	85	14.6
Proven performance	65.4	17.8	84	15.6
Personality	64.4	18.0	79	19.7
Political affiliation	76.1	20.4	49	24.0

The outstanding feature in Table 9.5 is that political affiliation currently counts as the most important criterion (76.1%) in the appointment and promotion of personnel, whilst it should be the least important (49%). More emphasis should be placed on the other

criteria, namely, qualification (85%) and proven performance (84%) and, to a slightly lesser degree, personality (79%).

Nevertheless, significant variations between respondents' perceptions are observed, Table 9.6.

Table 9.6 Perceived mean percentage use of various promotion criteria by respondents in different zones and managerial positions in OBARD (N=340)

Respondents' categories	Statistical parameter	Qualification	Proven performance	Personality	Political affiliation
Managerial positions					
Non-managers	Mean	69.8	66.3	66.6	76.9
First level managers	Mean	68.0	64.7	60.0	77.0
Middle level managers	Mean	66.5	65.2	65.3	72.2
Top level managers	Mean	51.4	51.8	53.7	74.7
Total	Mean	68.4	65.4	64.4	76.1
ANOVA	F-value	2.773	1.544	3.501	.781
	P-value	.04	.20	.02	.51
Zones					
Jimma	Mean	71.8	68.6	58.5	82.8
Arsi	Mean	70.1	66.0	68.4	69.5
South West Shewa	Mean	67.0	65.3	70.9	75.4
Borena	Mean	61.5	60.8	66.8	80.5
East Shewa	Mean	72.2	67.1	63.4	66.8
ANOVA	F-value	5.174	3.488	4.728	5.282
	P-value	.00	.00	.00	.00

According to Table 9.6, significant differences between managerial positions are observed concerning the assessments of qualification (F=2.773; p=0.04) and personality (F=3.501; p=0.02) criteria. According to the top level managers' perceptions, personality is regarded as the second extensively applied criterion next to political affiliation, while the current application of qualification criterion is the least. But according to all lower position managers, qualification is given the second place in order of importance.

Finally, the extent of contribution of each promotion criterion to the various aspects of organizational efficiency is examined and the findings are summarized in Table 9.7.

Table 9.7 Relationship between the current application of promotion criteria and different aspects of organizational efficiency (N=340)

		Organizational efficiency aspects				
Criteria for promotion	Statistical parameter	Extension delivery	Job satisfaction	Functional efficiency	Return on investment	Total
Qualification	r	.35**	.27**	.07	-.07	.21**
	p	.00	.00	.19	.24	.00
Proven	r	.33**	.26**	.05	-.05	.20**
performance	p	.00	.00	.42	.43	.00
Personality	r	.30**	.11*	.04	.08	.19**
	p	.00	.05	.48	.15	.00
Political	r	-.05	-.01	.08	.11	.04
affiliation	p	.43	.81	.17	.05	.45

According to the findings in Table 9.7, qualification and proven performance criteria for promotion appear strongly associated with organizational performance. This is reflected in the stronger correlation between these two criteria and variables of organizational effectiveness, suggesting that they are the most important contributors towards organizational effectiveness. These results are in line with the respondents' recommendations, indicated in Table 9.5.

The implication of these findings is that there is a need to revisit the promotion system, specifically regarding the level of focus on political affiliation. This is due to the fact that although political affiliation is currently the most extensively used criterion for promotions and appointments of managers; it is unfortunately negatively or not at all associated with organizational efficiency.

CHAPTER 10
LEADERSHIP AND INFLUENCE

10.1 INTRODUCTION

Regardless of their respective organization's size or structure, most leaders strive to maximize the performance of their subordinates, in order to achieve organizational goals (Yukl, 1998). Of all the management functions, leading is the most human-oriented (Robbins & Coulter, 1999). Though the functions of planning, organizing, and staffing provide guidelines and directives in the form of plans, job descriptions, organization charts, and policies, it is people who do the work. But people have different needs, ambitions, personalities, and attitudes. Each person perceives the workplace and his job uniquely (Donnelly *et al*., 1995). Agricultural extension managers must take into account these unique perceptions and behaviours, and somehow direct them towards common purposes. This is the essence of leading or leadership.

According to Chemers (2002), leadership has been described as the process of social influence in which one person is able to enlist the aid and support of others in the accomplishment of a common task. In the context of management theory, Donnelly *et al.,* (1995) define leadership as the ability of a person to influence the activities of followers in an organizational setting

Leading involves day-to-day interactions between managers and their subordinates in influencing and motivating them to complete tasks; and in this sense leaders are individuals who positively influence the behaviour of followers. This exercise of influence by leaders in solving problems of an organization is a key to its successful operation or its effectiveness in overcoming constraints in its internal and external work environment (Robbins & Coulter, 1999).

In this regard, the extension managers' leading and influencing efficiency level, leadership behaviour and competency level of Oromia Bureau of Agricultural and Rural Development (OBARD) are examined.

10.2 CURRENT EFFICIENCY

Operationally, the leading and influencing ability of managers is defined as the level of inducing individuals or groups to assist willingly and harmoniously in accomplishing organizational objectives. The respondents were asked to assess the leading and influencing ability of Oromia Bureau of Agricultural and Rural Development (OBARD) managers in their situation, using a 10 point scale (0 = extremely low; 10 = extremely high). The respondents were also advised to make their judgements in terms of what they expected of them, according to their positions in the organizational managerial levels (top, middle and first level managers) that they occupy. The results are summarized in Table 10.1.

The results indicate that the overall leading and influencing abilities of OBARD managers is mediocre, about 52 percent. These findings are consistent with previous results in Chapter 5 where it was found that there were low employee motivations, communication and work climate that could be associated with poor leadership. However, there are significant variations in the assessments of respondents from different categories of management and locality.

Table 10.1 Extension managers' leading and influencing effectiveness, as perceived by respondents in categories of management and locality, and expressed in mean scale percentages) (N=353)

Categories of respondents	Statistical parameter	Leadership efficiency level of:		
		First level managers	Middle level managers	Top level managers
(a) Managerial positions				
Non-managers	Mean	49.9	49.3	50.5
First level managers	Mean	55.4	53.1	53.6
Middle level managers	Mean	56.6	59.2	55.3
Top level managers	Mean	42.5	52.5	58.8
Total	**Mean**	**52.4**	**52.1**	**52.4**
Analysis of variances (ANOVA)	F	2.906	4.058	1.090
	Sig.	.035	.007	.353
(b) Zones				
Jimma	Mean	51.4	50.5	53.8
Arsi	Mean	50.7	52.2	53.0
South West Shewa	Mean	56.3	54.7	52.9
Borena	Mean	57.4	56.7	55.1
East Shewa	Mean	49.7	47.7	37.7
Analysis of variances (ANOVA)	F	1.293	1.352	3.660
	Sig.	.27	.25	.01

According to Table 10.1, it appears that all managers tend to overrate their leadership ability. This conclusion is based on the fact that in every case a management category assesses itself higher that it is assessed by any of the other categories. Taking the non-managers ratings as a reference, the first, middle and top level managers have over-rated their leadership by about six, ten and eight percent respectively. Differences in assessment are significant in the case of first level managers (F=2.906; p=0.035) and middle level managers (F=4.058; p=0.007) The general low level of leadership effectiveness is a concern, which is exacerbated by the fact that managers tend to overrate themselves, and are thus less inclined to understand the scope of the problem.

As far as the zones are concerned, the only significant differences in leadership assessment occur with regard to top level managers (F=3.66; p=0.01). Here it is especially the staff from East Shewa that gave low assessment, also decreasing with higher levels of management. The possibility that these assessments were made out of

ignorance is unlikely, because, due to proximity to the head quarters, they were more likely to observe or experience the performance of senior management.

The tendency to award lower assessment to the more senior management levels does not necessarily imply that they have less leadership skills, but rather that subordinates have higher expectations of them, and it is against these expectations that they are evaluated, In general, the findings indicate a tremendous scope for improvement regarding leadership in all levels of management.

10.3 LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOUR

Leadership is one of the most salient aspects of any organization. Theorists began to research leadership as a set of behaviours, evaluating the behaviour of successful leaders, determining behaviour taxonomy and identifying broad leadership styles (Fiedler, 1967). Various aspects of the theories of leadership are discussed in Chapter 2: leadership in different contexts, how it may differ from related concepts (i.e., management), and some criticisms that have been raised about leadership and theories of leadership. The following sections provide a description of only the most popular styles of leadership, consistently associated with leadership effectiveness and organizational performance.

Whether managers are managing a team at work, captaining the sports team or leading a major corporation, the leadership style is crucial to an organizations' success. Consciously, or subconsciously, managers use some of the leadership styles featured, at least some of the time. By understanding these leadership styles and their impact, the managers can become more flexible and better leaders. So, different models provide an excellent guide to help managers choose the most appropriate leadership style in different situations.

This section presents the most common leadership styles emanating from different models and having found to be positively associated with organizational performance or the performance of subordinates. The styles referred to are: task- and/ or people- oriented,

participative/ democratic and visionary leadership styles. Against these four leadership styles, the OBARD managers' efficiency levels are assessed.

10.3.1 Task-Oriented and People-Oriented Leadership style

Research consistently demonstrates the benefits of task- and people-oriented leadership styles over the traits theories, in terms of achieving organizational goals (Awamleh, 1999). A highly task-oriented leader focuses only on getting the job done, and can be quite autocratic. He or she will actively define the work and the roles required, put structures in place, plan, organize and monitor. These leaders spare little thought for the well-being of their teams, and in this regard suffer from many of the flaws of autocratic leadership, like difficulties in motivating and retaining staff.

People-oriented style of leadership is the opposite of task-oriented leadership: the leader is totally focused on organizing, supporting and developing the people in the leader's team. It tends to lead to good teamwork and creative collaboration. However, taken to extremes, it can lead to failure in achieving the team's goals.

In practice, most leaders use combinations of both the task-oriented and people-oriented styles of leadership. This is in agreement with the managerial grid model developed by Blake & Mouton (1964). The managerial grid model identifies five main leadership styles based on the *concern for people* and the *concern for production*.

The model is represented as a grid with *concern for production* as the X-axis and *concern for people* as the Y-axis; each axis ranges from 1 (Low) to 9 (High). The five resulting leadership styles are as follows (Donnelly *et al*., 1995):

- The impoverished style (1, 1): in this style, managers have low concern for both people and production. Managers use this style to preserve job and job seniority, protecting themselves by avoiding getting into trouble.
- The country club style (1, 9): this style has a high concern for people and a low concern for production. Managers using this style pay much attention to the

security and comfort of the employees, in the hope that this will increase performance. The resulting atmosphere is usually friendly, but not necessarily that productive.

- The produce or perish style (9, 1): with a high concern for production, and a low concern for people. Managers using this style find employee needs unimportant; they provide their employees with money and expect performance in return. Managers using this style also pressure their employees through rules and punishments to achieve the company goals.

- The middle-of-the-road style (5, 5): Managers using this style try to balance between company goals and workers' needs. By giving some concern to both people and production, managers who use this style hope to achieve suitable performance, but neither production nor people needs are met.

- The team style *(9, 9)*: in this style, high concern is paid both to people and production. As suggested by the propositions of Theory Y, managers choosing to use this style encourage teamwork and commitment among employees. This method relies heavily on making employees feel as a constructive part of the company.

In accordance with the managerial grid, the respondents assessed the leaders in all the categories in terms of both the level of concern for task and concern for people, using a nine point, 1 to 9, scale (1=very low; 9=very high). Table 10.2 summarizes respondents' perceptions of the OBARD managers' leadership styles.

Table 10.2 The perceived level of extension managers' task and people orientation, as reflected in mean scale points by various categories of respondents (N=353)

Categories of respondents	Statistical parameter	Task orientation	People orientation
(a) Managerial Positions			
Non-managers	Mean	4.8	4.4
First level managers	Mean	4.5	4.0
Middle level managers	Mean	5.6	4.5
Top level managers	Mean	5.4	3.4
Total	**Mean**	**5.0**	**4.0**
Analysis of variance	F-value	3.255	1.365
	df	3,342	3,342
	Sig.	.02	.25
(b) Zones			
Jimma	Mean	4.8	4.1
Arsi	Mean	5.1	4.3
South West Shewa	Mean	4.2	4.0
Borena	Mean	5.2	5.5
East Shewa	Mean	4.7	3.2
Analysis of variance	F-value	1.909	6.472
	df	4,325	4,325
	Sig.	.11	.00

The mean assessments of 5.0 for task orientation and 4.0 for people orientation do not reflect very positively as far as the general level of management is concerned, but it does not allow any conclusions regarding the predominant leadership style. However, the findings clearly indicate that, in general, there is a greater focus on production than on people, and this tendency seems to be directly related to the level of management, meaning that with increase in level of management, there tends to be an increase in task orientation and a systematic decrease in people orientation. This discrepancy between a clearly higher task orientation (5.4) than people orientation (3.4) is particularly conspicuous among the senior managers.

Also as far as the zones are concerned, there are significant differences, particularly as far as people orientation is concerned (F=6.472; p=0.00). The extremes in this case are East Shewa with a mean people orientation assessment of 3.2, and Borena where the mean people orientation (5.5) is even higher than the task orientation.

The findings suggest that the leaders should improve both the concern for task and people orientation in order to increase organizational effectiveness and employee satisfaction. More specifically, people orientation is a concern.

10.3.2 Participative Leadership

The participative style of leadership can be most suitable where team work is essential, and quality is more important than speed to market or productivity (Robbins & Coulter, 1999). This style often leads to reduced tension, stress and conflict, more commitment to goal attainment, less resistance to change, effective two-way communication, high achievement drive, high employee morale, and high satisfaction (Verma & Saha, 1999).

A participative leader invites other members of the team to contribute to the decision-making process. This not only increases job satisfaction by involving employees or team members, but it also helps to develop people's skills. Employees and team members feel in control of their own destiny, and so are motivated to work hard for more than just a financial reward (Robbins & Coulter, 1999). According to Verma and Saha (1999), participative leadership is defined as a sharing process in which the leaders and their followers exchange information, delegate a good deal of authority to their subordinates and encourage them to play an active role in the performance of their jobs, motivate employees to feel more involved and create an environment of working together in a team.

In this context, the respondents were requested to evaluate the level of their leaders' emphasis on participation, using a 10 point scale (0 = extremely low; 10 = extremely high). Their perceptions are presented in Table 10.3.

Table 10.3 Perceived extension managers' level of participatory focus (mean scale points expressed in percentage) by various categories of respondents (N=353)

Respondents' categories	Statistical parameter	Mean
(a) Managerial positions		
Non-managers	Mean	55.4
First level managers	Mean	54.9
Middle level managers	Mean	59.1
Top level managers	Mean	56.4
Total	**Mean**	**55.9**
Analysis of variance (ANOVA)	F	.654
	Sig.	.58
(b) Zones		
Jimma	Mean	52.6
Arsi	Mean	60.1
South West Shewa	Mean	54.6
Borena	Mean	61.6
East Shewa	Mean	46.6
Analysis of variance (ANOVA)	F	5.242
	Sig.	.00

The results, as shown in Table 10.3, indicate that the overall level of extension managers' participatory focus is rather mediocre, almost half way of the expectation, about 56 percent. Significant differentials of perception are observed between respondents in the different zones. According to the respondents from East Shewa, the current level of managers' participatory focus is poor (46.6 percent), while the situation is comparatively better for respondents from Borena (61.6 percent) and Arsi (60.1 percent) zones. There are no significant differences between the different management categories regarding the perceived participatory focus (F=0.654; p=0.58), which implies that the need for more participatory leadership applies very generally.

10.3.3 VISIONARY LEADERSHIP

According to Donnelly *et al.*, (1995), the twenty-first century organization virtually demands visionary leadership. It cannot function without vision. For an organization

driven by accelerating technological change, staffed by a diverse, multicultural mix of highly intelligent, knowledgeable workers, facing global complexity, a vast variety of individual customer needs, and the incessant demands of multiple constituencies, not to have a common sense of direction, would mean self-destruction (Donnelly *et al*., 1995). Vision is the glue that binds individuals into a group with a common goal. When shared by employees, it can keep an entire organization moving forward in face of difficulties, enabling and inspiring leaders and employees equally (Robbins & Coulter, 1999).

Vision taps people's emotions and energy (Snyder & Graves, 1994). Properly articulated, a vision creates the enthusiasm that people have for sporting events and other leisure time activities, bringing the energy and commitment to the workplace (Nutt & Backoff, 1995).

Three qualities that, according to Collins & Porras (2004), are related to effective visionary leadership are the following:

(1) The first skill is the ability to identify and explain the vision to others. The leader needs to make the vision clear in terms of required goals and actions through clear oral and written communication.
(2) The second skill needed, is the ability to express the vision not just verbally but through behaviour. This skill requires behaving in ways that continually convey and reinforce the vision.
(3) The third skill is the ability to extend or apply the vision to different leadership contexts. For instance, the vision has to be as meaningful to the people in accounting as to those in production.

In evaluating the visual leadership found in OBARD, respondents were asked to evaluate the degree to which their leaders had demonstrated the visionary style of leadership in their work place, using a 10 point scale (0 = extremely low; 10 = extremely high). Table 10.4 summarizes the responses to a pre-coded question on visions of the future and its significance, in terms of awareness of vision's contribution to extension delivery effectiveness and employees job satisfaction.

Table 10.4 Perceived vision awareness level of OBARD and its potential influence on extension delivery and job satisfaction (mean scale point expressed in percentage) by respondents of various categories (N=353)

Categories of respondents	Statistical parameter	Level of vision Awareness	Influence on Extension Delivery	Influence on Job Satisfaction
(a) Managerial positions				
Non- managers	Mean	55.5	58.04	60.94
First level managers	Mean	51.1	59.05	63.84
Middle level managers	Mean	55.0	61.22	61.39
Top level managers	Mean	65.0	41.88	45.63
Total	Mean	54.4	58.49	61.44
Analysis of variances (ANOVA)	F	2.345	1.475	1.302
	df	3,349	3,346	3,345
	p	.07	.22	.27
(b) Zones				
Jimma	Mean	53.2	52.2	54.6
Arsi	Mean	53.8	55.7	58.5
South West Shewa	Mean	56.2	64.6	77.2
Borena	Mean	54.9	67.9	68.2
East Shewa	Mean	54.4	70.0	68.8
Total	Mean	54.1	58.6	61.8
Analysis of variances (ANOVA)	F	.233	7.219	9.001
	df	4,326	4,328	4,328
	p	.92	.00	.00

According to the findings in Table 10.4, the level of clarity of extension vision is 54.4 percent. The respondents feel that the increased awareness vision (in terms of what it does, what it will not do, and this clearly communicated to all concerned bodies or all stakeholders) will, in turn, increase extension delivery effectiveness and job satisfaction of employees by 58.5 and 61.4 percent, respectively. These results tend to imply that lack of clarity of extension vision statements in the current situation have negatively influenced extension delivery effectiveness and job satisfaction, in one way or another.

The vision awareness varies between the different management groups. Although the difference is only significant at a probability level of 7 percent (F=2.345; p=0.07), the top managers are more convinced of personnel's awareness of the vision. For example, the top-level managers have the opinion that currently there is already reasonable awareness (65 percent), which also explains why they expect less improvement (41.88 percent in the case of extension delivery improvement and 45.6 percent for improvement of job satisfaction) from future awareness campaigns.

As far as the zones are concerned, there are no significant differences observed, but certainly as far as the perceived influence of an awareness campaign on the improvement of extension delivery (F=7.2, p=0.00) and job satisfaction (F=9.0; p=0.00) are concerned. For example, Jimma Zone expects much less from an awareness campaign (52.2 and 54.6 percent improvement of extension and job satisfaction, respectively) than East Shewa and South West Shewa with percentages in the vicinity of 70 percent. The general conclusion is that there is scope for improving the awareness of extension staff regarding the organization's vision. Staff should, based on their overall understanding of the potential influence of such awareness on the improvement of extension and job satisfaction, welcome campaigns promoting such awareness.

CHAPTER 11
MANAGEMENT CONTROL

11.1 INTRODUCTION

Management is responsible for building an effective human organization and for motivating the people in that organization to work toward its goals (Anthony & Herzlinger, 1980:21). In order to fulfil this responsibility, management has five functions – planning, organizing, staffing and human resources management, leading and influencing, and controlling. Controlling completes the process of management by measuring accomplishments against plans (Buford, et. al; 1995:277). Controlling is necessary since things do not always go as planned, and, consequently, problems have to be anticipated, plans adjusted and corrective action taken, in order to enable organizations to survive and prosper (Buford, et. al., 1995:278). In extension, the term *control* is not used frequently, but it is not difficult to recognise the close association with the familiar monitoring *and evaluation* (Buford, et. al; 1995:278). This familiar process of monitoring and evaluation of programs in extension is fundamentally similar to the managerial function of control.

Controlling processes have been characterized in many different ways. According to Otley (1987), controlling has three basic building blocks or phases, namely: (a) identifying or establishing indicators of performance; (b) performance measurement and (c) corrective action. The current efficiency level of management control of the Oromia Bureau of Agriculture and Rural Development (OBARD) is assessed in terms of these three aspects of controlling.

11.2 INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE

Management control systems provide information that is intended to be useful to managers in performing their jobs and to assist organizations in developing and maintaining viable patterns of performance (Otley, 1999:364). Therefore, there is a need

for setting indicators against which the organizational or managerial performance can be gauged and can thus also be used as a management control. Indicators are simply measures or yardsticks of success that are concerned with the achievement of the organizational goals (Adams, 1990:76). Control is said to be effective if there is clear statement of measurement of success, and various indicators are applied to measure all aspects of goal achievement. For extension organizations, eight categories or levels of indicators were first identified by Bennett (1977), and can be used in measuring the extension organization's performance. They include the following: inputs (namely, the resources to be used), activities (implementation of decisions in terms of extension activities), clients' participation (in decision making that affects them), clients' reactions (opinions of clients about the performance), change in behaviour determinants (such as knowledge, attitude, skills, motivation and group norms), change in behaviour of clients (practice adoption), change in efficiency (as a consequences of practice adoption) and change in outcome (consequences for society). These performance indicators are frequently seen as representing a hierarchy, ranging from lowest level of inputs (level 1) to level 8 representing the outcome or impact as the highest level. These indicators are used in this study to test the extent of various aspects of organizational performances.

11.2.1 Current application status

Using a 10-point scale (where 0 = not at all, 5=sometimes/to a limited degree, and 10=always/very extensively) the extent of application of these 8 levels or indicators of control in the Oromia Bureau of Agriculture and Rural Development (OBARD) were evaluated. The respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which these indicators are used by extension organization in their area. Respondents' perceptions are summarized in Table 11.1.

Table 11.1 Degree to which the different indicators of performance are applied in OBARD, expressed as mean percentage and respondents' distributions

Performance indicators	Percentage distribution of respondents per efficiency categories				Summary statistics (Percentage)	
	Rarely	Sometimes	Intensively	Total	Mean	SD
Input resources	18.2	55.1	26.7	100	56.1	18.3
Activities implementation	24.6	45.0	30.4	100	55.9	20.0
Clients' participation	30.1	40.1	29.8	100	55.0	21.8
Clients' reaction	37.4	37.1	25.4	100	52.7	21.2
Change in behaviour determinants	49.4	34.5	16.1	100	46.3	20.3
Practice adoption	55.8	31.0	13.2	100	44.7	20.8
Change in efficiency	58.2	29.8	12.0	100	42.8	21.5
Change in outcome	68.7	26.0	5.3	100	36.6	24.3
Total indicators weighted average	46.3	49.8	3.9	100	47.4	12.3

Table 11.1 suggests that the current level of use of these indicators varies significantly between the different indicators, namely from as low as 36.6 percent in the case of outcome criteria and 56.1 percent for input indicators. This and a comparison of other mean percentages indicate that the input indicators are more frequently used, while the outcome indicators receive much less attention. This means that the lower level criteria, like input resources, activities and clients' assessment are used more intensively than the outcome focused indicators, such as behaviour determinants, behaviour (practice adoption) and behaviour results (efficiency and outcome). One of the reasons for this tendency could be that the input indicators are easily measurable, easily achievable and data becomes readily available.

Table 11.2 investigates whether there are differences between different localities (zones) and different managerial positions in terms of the application of the different control indicators.

Table 11.2 Mean percentage application of control indicators in OBARD by respondents in the different locations and managerial positions

Respondents' categories		Input resources	Activities implementation	Clients' participation	Clients' reaction	Behaviour determinants	Practice adoption	Change in efficiency	Change in outcome
(a) Managerial Positions									
Non - managers		68.8	67.5	58.8	57.5	35.0	31.3	26.2	32.5
First level managers		54.1	50.5	49.5	46.8	41.7	40.3	38.3	28.7
Middle level managers		55.2	54.4	54.0	49.7	46.1	42.7	39.8	32.9
Top level managers		57.5	59.1	56.6	53.1	45.9	42.9	41.4	34.0
Total		**56.6**	**56.6**	**54.7**	**51.2**	**45.0**	**42.1**	**40.1**	**32.8**
ANOVA:	df	3,340	3,341	3,341	3,341	3,341	3,341	3,341	3,341
	F-value	1.85	4.17	1.77	1.95	1.59	1.21	1.76	1.07
	Sig.	.14	.01	.15	.12	.19	.31	.15	.36
(b) Locations									
Jimma		57.2	55.9	53.8	50.2	46.1	42.7	41.0	32.4
Arsi		55.6	57.4	57.4	57.1	51.9	49.2	49.5	42.7
South West Shewa		59.7	58.9	49.7	47.0	41.6	41.6	37.8	30.3
Borena		54.0	55.8	55.4	47.9	39.3	35.8	33.5	24.0
East Shewa		52.0	50.7	54.8	46.3	33.0	30.0	22.6	15.6
Region		63.0	57.1	67.1	51.4	37.1	31.4	30.0	24.3
National		65.8	63.3	44.2	41.7	33.3	30.0	20.8	27.5
Total		56.6	56.6	54.7	51.2	45.0	42.1	40.1	32.8
ANOVA:	df	6,341	6,341	6,341	6,341	6,341	6,341	6,341	6,341
	F-value	1.33	.76	1.53	2.90	6.59	7.14	13.29	11.34
	Sig.	.24	.60	.17	.01	.00	.00	.00	.00

As far as management positions are concerned, it appears that the difference found in terms of the differential application of the input and outcome indicators, is more pronounced among the higher-level managers. This means that the input indicators are applied to an even higher degree, and the output criteria to an even lesser extent.

Greater differences occur between the various zones regarding the application of control indicators. The differences are more significant in regard to the farmers' opinions and the output indicators. The previously observed tendency of senior managers being more supportive of the input than output indicators, is further supported here in that the tendency is even more pronounced among the national level extension workers.

11.2.2 Influence of the use of indicators of performance on organizational efficiency

The purpose of this section is to examine the degree to which the uses of improved management practices can contribute to the organizational performance. The stronger the relationship between aspects of management practices and organizational performance, the more significant the contribution of those is towards performance improvement. In this way the importance of the control indicators can be identified and placed in importance rank order. The results of this procedure are summarized in Table 11.3.

Table 11.3 Relationship between perceived application of control indicators and organizational efficiency (N=332)

		Organization efficiency aspects				
Performance indicators	St	Extension delivery	Job satisfaction	Functional efficiency	return on investment	Total weighted
Input resources	r	.18**	.15**	.07	.01	.13*
	p	.00	.01	.22	.81	.03
Activities	r	.14*	.13*	.01	-.05	.04
	p	.01	.02	.85	.35	.45
Clients' participation	r	.06	.11*	.07	-.01	.06
	p	.25	.04	.23	.85	.32
Clients' reaction	r	.04	.09	.05	.01	.04
	p	.44	.12	.39	.91	.47
Behaviour determinants	r	.17**	.18**	.04	.03	.14*
	p	.00	.00	.43	.54	.01
Practice adoption	r	.09	.12*	.10	.08	.15**
	p	.10	.03	.07	.14	.01
Change in efficiency	r	.19**	.21**	.15**	.15**	.27**
	p	.00	.00	.00	.01	.00
Change in outcome	r	.10	.16**	.16**	.13*	.19**
	p	.06	.00	.00	.03	.00
Total indicators (weighted)	r	.19**	.23**	.13*	.07	.21**
	p	.00	.00	.02	.22	.00

Table 11.3 suggests that the findings are supportive of the hypothesis as the applications of all indicators show relationships with variables of organizational performance. This

applies more particularly to the output indicators, where the majority of correlations are highly significant. This means that the input indicators are useful and should be applied, as they contribute towards organisational performance, but the output indicators are more critical in this regard and deserve particular attention.

11.2.3 Factors influencing the use of performance indicators of control

Based on the conceptual model of this study (which is based on Düvel's (1991) model for the analysis of behaviour), managerial and organizational efficiencies are hypothesized as the function of independent and intervening variables (discussed in the literature review and previous chapters). Independent variables include individual respondents' demographic and personal characteristics (for more detail see chapter 4), organizational resources positions and external environment factors (as discussed in chapter 6); while intervening variables are related to needs, perceptions and knowledge (as discussed in chapter 5).

11.2.3.1 Influence of personal demographic and socio-economic characteristics on the use of performance indicators of control

This section provides the results of analysis, Table 11.4, regarding the test of hypothesis 3.1 which states that the uses of performance indicators are influenced by personal demographic and socio-economic characteristics of the respondents.

Table 11.4 Relationship between respondents' personal characteristics and perceived application of control indicators (N=340)

Personal characteristics	Statistical parameter	Input resources	Activities implementation	Clients' participation	Clients' reaction	Behaviour determinants	Practice adoption	Change in efficiency	Change in outcome
Job position	r	-.06	-.17**	-.12*	-.12*	-.12*	-.10	-.13*	-.10
	p	.28	.00	.03	.03	.02	.06	.02	.07
Age	r	.04	-.08	-.03	-.03	.06	.11*	.08	.04
	p	.46	.12	.57	.64	.27	.04	.15	.48
Gender	r	-.10	-.18**	-.15**	-.17**	-.10	-.12*	-.10	.00
	p	.06	.00	.01	.00	.08	.03	.07	.98
Marital status	r	-.06	-.14**	-.08	-.00	-.00	.04	.04	.01
	p	.32	.01	.17	.97	.96	.46	.49	.92
Formal education	r	-.08	-.14**	-.10	-.08	-.15**	-.10	-.04	-.07
	p	.14	.01	.07	.13	.01	.07	.48	.22
IST*in extension	r	.01	.03	.02	-.01	-.07	-.11*	-.10	-.04
	p	.80	.62	.68	.83	.17	.04	.08	.48
IST*in management	r	.02	.08	.12*	.03	.03	-.04	-.04	-.01
	p	.79	.12	.04	.58	.63	.51	.51	.87
Total service years	r	.08	-.06	-.01	-.02	.05	.12*	.07	.05
	p	.13	.30	.81	.75	.39	.03	.20	.36
NSY** in management	r	.01	-.12*	-.04	-.09	-.08	-.03	-.05	-.08
	p	.92	.04	.51	.10	.13	.59	.38	.14
NSY** in current position	r	.14*	.14**	.06	.07	.18**	.18**	.09	.05
	p	.01	.01	.24	.20	.00	.00	.10	.40
Salary	r	-.05	-.16**	-.11*	-.16**	-.20**	-.13*	-.14*	-.17**
	p	.34	.00	.04	.00	.00	.01	.01	.00

IST*= in-service training; NSY** = Number of service years

In general, the correlations between independent variables of individual respondents and perceived level of uses of various performance indicators vary from low positive to low negative. The size of the absolute value (ignoring the sign) of correlation coefficients (r) provides an indication of the strengths of the relationships (which in this case range from negligible (r = 0.00 – 0.09) to small (r = 0.10 – 0.20) suggesting that the overall strengths of relationships are low.

The factor having the greatest positive influence on the perceived application of performance indicators is experience (years of service) in the current position. The correlations are significant or highly significant with more than 50 percent of the indicators. This means that the more experience in the current position, the higher the perceived application of performance indicators.

Factors that tend to have a more critical influence on the perceptions regarding the degree of implementation of performance indicators are position, education (qualification), and even more so gender and salary level. This is indicated by statistically significant negative correlations in the case of several indicators, and implies that males and respondents of higher managerial position, education, and salary level and who have attended in-service training in extension, tend to be more critical or reserved regarding the implementation of performance indicators for control purposes.

An explanation for this could be the understanding of the concepts of performance indicators, or the ability to distinguish more accurately the degree to which they are currently in use in their areas. Consequently, the higher the managerial position, and level of education level and the more in-services training in extension the respondents have attended, the more likely they are to understand the concepts of performance indicators and their uses. As a result, they are more critical in their assessment. The gender influence can be attributed to the fact that male respondents are more educated than female respondents (Chapter 4) and, consequently, they are more critical in their assessment of the current application of control indicators.

11.2.3.2 Influence of organizational resources strength on the use of performance indicators of control

The variables relating to the adequacy of organizational resources are: extension teaching aids, office and accommodation facilities, transportation, finance, and skilled manpower availability (see chapter 6 for details).

The correlation analysis between the respondents' perception of the adequacy level of resources and the use of indicators of control are summarised in Table 11.5.

Table 11.5 Relationship between perceived organizational resources adequacy and the use of control indicators (N=336)

Organizational resource strength variables	Statistical parameter	Input resources	Activities implementation	Clients' participation	Clients' reaction	Behaviour determinants	Practice adoption	Change in efficiency	Change in outcome
Extension aids	r	.20**	.22**	.20**	.03	.24**	.18**	.10	.11*
	p	.00	.00	.00	.53	.00	.00	.07	.04
Office & accommodation	r	.15**	.21**	.27**	.16**	.18**	.12*	.10	.11*
	p	.01	.00	.00	.00	.00	.03	.07	.04
Transportation	r	.19**	.13*	.20**	.05	.16**	.13*	.09	.08
	p	.00	.02	.00	.41	.00	.02	.11	.15
Finance	r	.14**	.14*	.26**	.07	.20**	.15**	.13*	.11*
	p	.01	.01	.00	.20	.00	.01	.02	.04
Skilled manpower	r	.28**	.29**	.25**	.19**	.29**	.20**	.19**	.18**
	p	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00

In contrast with personal characteristics, the perceived adequacies of resources are significantly higher correlated with the perceived application of performance indicators (Table 11.5). Skilled manpower appears to have the highest correlation and is highly significantly correlated with the use of all performance indicators of control.

The directions of relationships between variables of organizational resources factors and performance indicators of control are all positive. These findings suggest that the higher use of performance indicators of control is associated with the perceived adequacy of organizational resources.

11.2.3.3 Influence of the external environmental factors on the use of performance indicators of control

The use of improved management practices (performance indicators in this case) was hypothesized to be influenced by external environmental factors such as the task and the general environment related factors that were discussed in detail in chapter 6. The same variables are used in Table 11.6.

Table 11.6 Relationship between perceived favourableness of external environmental factors and application of indicators of control

Environmental factors	Statistical parameter	Input resources	Activities implementation	Clients' participation	Clients' reaction	Behaviour determinants	Practice adoption	Change in efficiency	Change in outcome
Task environment									
Collaboration between institutions	r	.15**	.12*	.08	.10	.26**	.21**	.27**	.31**
	p	.01	.03	.15	.07	.00	.00	.00	.00
Availability of new agricultural technologies and information	r	.24**	.21**	.34**	.20**	.20**	.12*	.13*	.09
	p	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.03	.02	.11
Accessibility of small scale farmers to agric inputs and credit	r	.12*	.15**	.10	.11	.19**	.17**	.19**	.17**
	p	.02	.01	.06	.05	.00	.00	.00	.00
Farmers' willingness	r	.20**	.26**	.26**	.24**	.25**	.18**	.20**	.23**
	p	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
General environment									
Government policy & regulations	r	.18**	.13*	.15**	.17**	.21**	.18**	.21**	.18**
	p	.00	.02	.01	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
Land tenure policy	r	.07	.05	.14*	.14*	.05	.01	.09	.06
	p	.19	.37	.01	.01	.35	.84	.11	.28
Political	r	.02	.03	.03	.04	.15**	.15**	.11*	.14*
	p	.67	.54	.58	.43	.01	.01	.04	.01
Agro-ecological	r	.09	.10	.05	.11*	.06	.02	.05	.02
	p	.10	.06	.40	.04	.31	.77	.40	.73

The overall impression gained from Table 11.6 is that perceived environmental factors are, judged by the number of significant correlations, closely associated with the perceived application of control indicators. It is particularly the task environment (availability of new technology and information, farmers' willingness, collaboration between institutes) and government policy and regulations under the general environmental factors that are prominent.

As far as the task environmental factors are concerned, the biggest correlation coefficient occurs between perceived farmers' willingness and collaborations between institutions and the use of performance indicators.

Similarly, concerning the general environment, the factors that appear to have stronger association with the application of control indicators are government policy & regulations and political factors (reflected by significant correlation with all indicators).

All these above factors, although not a direct cause, are seen by respondents to be associated with the application of control indicators. This implies that top level managers and office heads at different levels should communicate or negotiate effectively as well as tactfully (to convince and defend systematically at least not to compromise basic extension/organizational principles) with government and political officials so that they will be able to create a favourable working environment for their subordinates.

11.3 PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT

Performance tracking and measurement is vital for a manager's decision making, as it tells him/her what has happened regarding implementation of activities, and serves as the basis for any action needed to improve the performance of an organization in moving towards predetermined objectives. Besides, adequate immediate managers' control over subordinates is very crucial, as there are dangers to leaving employees to their own devices in meeting performance standards (Thompson & Strickland, 2001:393). Such immediate managers' supervision or directions over their subordinates helps to ensure that the actions of subordinates stay within acceptable bounds. Thus, every organization needs systems for gathering and storing data, tracking key performance indicators, identifying and diagnosing problems, and reporting strategy-critical information (Thompson & Strickland, 2001:393).

In the context of Oromia Bureau of Agricultural and Rural Development (OBARD), performance tracking and measurement systems efficiency status were evaluated using three variables. They are: (a) immediate managers' support and control over subordinates; (b) employee appraisal system (discussed in Chapter 9); and (c) monitoring and evaluation system of extension activities or programs.

11.3.1 Immediate managers' support and control over subordinates

In the measurement of the current efficiency level of immediate managers' support and control over subordinates more additional steps were employed. First, respondents were requested to indicate how efficient they were in their current work position using a 10-point scale. In a follow up question, they were asked what the level of their efficiency in their current work position would have been without immediate managers' support or control over them. Finally, immediate managers' support and control over subordinates' efficiency was obtained by subtracting the respondents' current efficiency from what would have been without immediate managers from their total perceived efficiency in current work position. These results are summarized in Table 11.7.

Table 11.7 The perceived mean percentage efficiency level of immediate managers' support and control over subordinates in OBARD by respondents (N=353)

Respondents' categories		Immediate managers' support and control
(a) Managerial Positions		
Non-managers		-1.7
First level managers		-3.1
Middle level managers		-3.0
Top level managers		0.0
Total		-2.3
	Analysis of variance (ANOVA)	
	df	3,326
	F-value	.265
	Sig.	.85
(b) Locations		
Jimma		-1.1
Arsi		-0.6
South West Shewa		-3.0
Borena		-3.1
East Shewa		-10.4
	Analysis of variance (ANOVA)	
	df	4,336
	F-value	1.783
	Sig.	.10

In general OBARD's current performance of managers' support and control over subordinates is perceived as poor (Table 11.7). This is indicated by the respondents assessments that the average mean percentage current efficiency scores for immediate managers' support/ control subordinates is -2.3 percent. There are no significant

differences between respondents of various categories observed implying that the problem is applicable to all, though there are slight variations.

One of the reasons for this poor performance of support and control over subordinates could be an inappropriate selection of managers based on political affiliation rather than competence (see Chapter 9).

11.3.2 Monitoring and Evaluation of extension activities/ programs

In Chapter 7 types of extension activities or programmes and their mode of implementations of OBARD were discussed. Here the focus is on the monitoring and evaluation systems effectiveness in assessing the implementation and achievement of the organizational goals. Respondents' perception of the current efficiency level of monitoring and evaluation systems is assessed using a 10-point scale. The results are summarized in Table 11.8.

Table 11.8 The perceived efficiency level of current monitoring and evaluation systems of extension programmes mean scale point expressed in percentage by respondents (N=353)

Respondents' categories		Mean percentage
(a) Managerial		
Non-managers		41.6
First level managers		39.8
Middle level managers		39.8
Top level managers		35.0
Total		40.7
ANOVA:	df	3,339
	F-value	.401
	Sig.	.75
(b) Locations		
Jimma		39.8
Arsi		48.2
South West Shewa		32.4
Borena		45.6
East Shewa		24.1
ANOVA:	df	4,336
	F-value	7.865
	Sig.	.00

In general OBARD's current efficiency of extension programmes monitoring and evaluation system is perceived as poor. This finds expression in a mean total of 40.7 percent, (Table 11.8). The perceived efficiency levels of all the three measures appear below respondents' minimum expectations. This is indicated by the respondents' assessments that the average mean percentage current efficiency scores for extension evaluation is 40.7 percent. The results show that there are no significant differences between respondents of various managerial positions, though there are slight variations ($F=0.401$, $p=0.75$).

Unlike managerial positions, the differences between respondents of various zones were significant at one percent significance level ($F=7.865$, $p=0.00$). The current efficiency level of extension programmes evaluation by Arsi and Borena zones seem better than others as reflected by comparatively higher mean percentage of 48.2 and 45.6 percent respectively although still below mid-way.

One of the contributing reasons for better performance of in these two zones could be related to the presence and strong support (financially as well as technically) of agricultural projects over longer periods. For example, Arsi zone has been the target area over the last three regimes (due to its high potential, especially for wheat and barley production) and has been under extension project from 1967 (CADU, supported SIDA, Swedish Government) to the present (Arsi-Bale project financed by Italian Government). In Borena, also, the GTZ project has been providing strong support to the area for extension activities over the past many years, financed by German Government).

11.3.3 Purposes of reporting

Considering the various report forms sent in by OBARD extension workers every month, the question arises as to what their current purpose of these various reports is and what it should be. Respondents were asked to prioritize the various alternative purposes in order of current and recommended preference (Table 11.9).

Table 11.9 Respondents' perceptions of the current (C) and recommended (R) purposes of reporting in OBARD as reflected by rank order nominations

Purposes of reports:	Nomination frequency per rank order								Total weighted nominations		Rank order	
	1st		2nd		3rd		4th					
	C	R	C	R	C	R	C	R	C	R	C	R
To provide information that serves as evidence for accountability	181	83	69	79	46	95	46	85	1069	844	1	3
To provide information that allows frontline extension personnel to improve their extension	70	135	121	101	82	80	69	26	876	1029	2	1
To provide information used to improve management	34	63	92	124	174	114	42	41	802	893	3	2
To provide information mainly for policy makers	57	61	60	38	40	53	185	190	673	654	4	4

According to the findings in Table 11.9, reporting in OBARD is primarily conducted for the purpose of accountability, which shows as evidence of success or progresses. This is evidenced by respondents' ranking for accountability that amounted to a total of 1069 weighted nominations, which is far higher than nominations for the others. The variation between the other three variables is very little. Relatively, the least nominations (673) were for policy makers.

These findings imply that little is expected, regarding critical review of reports and provision for feedback for the purpose of corrective actions in order to improve extension delivery or management efficiency, as the target receiver of the reporting system is government administrators (where reports are mainly used for statistical purpose).

Understandably the respondents (Table 11.9) suggested that the primary purposes of reporting should be to improve frontline extension service provision. This is clearly shown by the highest rank order and the total weighted nominations of 1029. The second and the third ranks, with relatively small differences of nominations, are offered for management and accountability purposes respectively.

CHAPTER 12

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

12.1 INTRODUCTION

Against the background of frequent organisational changes and restructuring, often based on impulsive decisions rather than structured feasibility studies or evaluations, this study examines the nature and influence of management on the performance of the Ethiopian public extension service. The specific objectives of the study were to examine: (1) the current situation of overall organizational and managerial functioning, (2) the impact or influence of the 2002 organizational interventions, and (3) determinants of organizational effectiveness.

In order to achieve these objectives, the study was guided by the following research questions:

1. How efficiently is the OBARD organization currently functioning?
2. What is the current situation of OBARD regarding managerial efficiency level and the application of improved management practices?
3. Are there any differences between before and after the 2002 organizational restructuring in terms of improvements in organizational performance?
4. What are the factors that currently influence, (enhance or restrain) the organizational and managerial functioning of OBARD?
5. Are there any variations regarding assessed organizational and managerial performance between various categories of respondents?

The study was undertaken in Oromia Region, which is one of the nine regions of Ethiopia. Using purposive sampling, the Oromia region was selected mainly for reasons of cost saving (proximity to Haramaya University) and because it is representative of most of the country's agro-ecological climate zones (such as high, middle and low altitudes) and all main types of agricultural enterprises.

Extension staff from five of the twelve zones (selected on the basis of their representation of the region) were selected, and from each zone all extension personnel as well as extension specialists working at region and national headquarters were invited to participate and received questionnaires. Of the total of 566 who were invited, 353 (162 managers and 191 non-managers) correctly completed and returned their questionnaires, which represents a response rate of 62.4 percent.

Using a pre-tested and validated semi-structured interview schedule, the interviews were conducted in group sessions at various venues at each district, zone, region and national offices levels. The data was coded, captured and analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) program.

Correlations and regressions were used to determine the relationship between variables, while analyses of variance (ANOVA) and Chi-square were used to compare the level of variations between variables.

12.2 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Using the research questions as framework, the following is an overview of the findings and conclusions of this study:

Question 1. How efficiently is the OBARD organization currently functioning?

Based on the three main dimensions of organizational efficiency (namely operating, organizational health and process efficiency aspects) the current efficiency level of Oromia Bureau of Agricultural and Rural Development is summarized below.

(a) Operating efficiency

In the context of non-profit organizations, organizational operating efficiency refers to tasks and activities related to the organization's operational goals. Four variables were identified and operationally defined to measure the operating efficiency level of OBARD. They are: (1) Extension delivery effectiveness in terms of both quantity (target farmers' reached by services) and quality (impact of extension messages on target farmers) of services; (2) Resource utilization efficiency - manpower, time, finance and materials - to achieve organizational goals at district level; (3) Return on investment in extension (input-output ratio of investment in extension, expressed as a return per 100 Birr invested in extension by OBARD); and (4) the degree of under-performance or under-efficiency (the percentage of their current work time that respondents would require to achieve what they are currently doing assuming that they were highly competent, productive and effective).

The current extension delivery and resource use efficiency are assessed to be 56.88 and 60.24 percent respectively. The return on investment in extension of OBARD is perceived as 93.10 percent, which means that for every 100 Birr invested in extension, the return is currently estimated as 93.10 Birr. This implies that the organization is working at a loss. Further evidence in support of the low efficiency is the high level of perceived under-performance, namely 36.8 percent. This means that on average, the respondents' were of the opinion that they could have accomplished the same work in 63.2 percent of their normal time under more favourable conditions.

(b) Process efficiency

Organizational process efficiency refers to the level of consensus regarding goals/procedures, cooperation and smooth flow of work, ideas and information. Three variables were selected to capture this concept, namely: coordination (coordination among departments and between stakeholder organizations in confronting common problems and finding synergistic solutions), communication (communication and

openness between workers/ managers and between organizations' managerial hierarchies), and participation (involvement of subordinates or workers in decisions that affect them). The results indicate that the process efficiency seems comparatively better than the other two aspects with assessed current efficiency levels of 54.46, 55.06, and 55.82 percent for coordination, communication and participation variables respectively.

(c) Organizational health efficiency

Organizational health refers to non-financial aspects of organizational performance, such as human outcomes and interpersonal relations. Three variables were selected, namely job satisfaction (the extent to which the job provides interesting tasks, opportunities for learning and accepting responsibilities), motivation (achievement recognition and justice in workers' placement, transfer and promotion) and work climate (trust and support among workers and between subordinates and managers). The results show that the current efficiency for work climate, job satisfaction, and motivation are 51.38, 49.73, and 46.28 percent respectively.

In general, the findings indicate that the organizational efficiency can be described as mediocre, thereby meeting only the minimum expectations in relation to the three aspects of the overall organizational functioning. Variation between management groups and different zones indicate that some are more critical of the situation and give an assessment well below 50 percent. This applies in particular to return on investment in extension and job satisfaction and motivation..

Question 2 What is the current situation of OBARD regarding managerial efficiency level and/ or the application of improved management practices?

All of the five management functions were considered in the evaluation of the current nature of management functioning and the findings are summarized under the various functions as follows.

(a) Planning function

Extension Activities

Currently much attention is given to non-extension education and non-agricultural tasks (such as government administrative, regulatory and other ad hoc activities) next to crop related extension activities. Relatively less emphasis has been on activities such as home economics, forest and wildlife and soil and land utilization. The findings imply that there is a need for reconsideration of the extension programme focuses by extension management and administrative bodies.

Priority consideration: Voluntary versus priority extension

In general, the current level of priority consideration in extension program planning and implementation is assessed as low, namely 47.5 percent. This implies that only to a limited degree departmental directive or priority problems based on improvement potentials (unfelt needs) are considered. The clear preference expressed by respondents (mean assessment of 93.6 percent) is that the priority approach should be the primary if not exclusive consideration when deciding on development projects. This represents a mean shift of 46.1 percent away from the current.

Planning: Centralization versus decentralization

The findings indicate that the current level of decentralization of decision making power in program planning is perceived as insufficient (4.9). The respondents are of the opinion that more authority and power should be given to lower level structures in the organization (7.3) with support (i.e. technically, financially and materially) and guidance (i.e. general picture such as national/ regional goals/ strategies) coming from the top. The overall demand for change is a 2.4 scale point shift.

Pro-active versus reactive approaches

The findings indicate that the extension workers are currently spending more than two-thirds of their time, in terms of number of days per week, in reactive extension work ("fighting fires"). The time spent on purposeful initiatives of development changes and their implementations is only about 27 and 42 percent for extensionists and subject matter specialists respectively.

The time spent by subject matter specialists on purposeful development activities is slightly better than that of frontline extension workers. But the general recommendation is an increase of 37 and 45 percent over the current for extensionists and SMSs respectively.

The disadvantage of a strong focus on the reactive type of extension approach is that the service invests little time in planning extension programmes with the result that new problems or unfelt needs will be identified too late. With such a reactive extension work approach the workers have to divide their attention between many different problems, so they are unable to pursue any one problem in depth and are also challenged as far as competence in a variety of fields is concerned.

Reporting

Four alternatives of evaluation reporting are compared, namely to: provide information that serves as evidence for accountability, provide information that allows frontline extension personnel to improve their extension, provide information used to improve management, and provide information mainly for policy makers

The findings indicate that reporting in OBARD is primarily conducted for the purpose of accountability, which shows as evidence of success or progresses. This is evidenced by respondents' ranking for accountability that offered a total of 1069 weighted

nominations, which is far higher than nominations offered for others. The variation between the other three variables is very little. Evaluation for the purpose of policy makers received the least nominations (673).

These findings imply that the value of evaluation results for general accountability is appreciated, but that its role in improvement of extension is not yet fully realised and may still be overshadowed by evaluation being perceived primarily as a control measure and/or for mere statistical purposes of extension inputs.

(b) Organizing function

Departmentalization

The current nature of grouping of extension organizational activities is based on specialities of agricultural enterprises (commodity based), while about one third of the respondents regard the departmentalization as functionally based. The respondents are almost equally divided between those who support further reinforcement of functionally based (42.9%) and those who are in favour of the introduction of a matrix based (41.7%) type of departmentalization in their recommendation.

Span of management

The span of management in this study refers to the number of frontline development agents (DAs) assigned at village level that report to one supervisor and the number of supervisory levels in the organizational structure. The general viewpoint is that the current numbers of DAs supervised by a supervisor are too many (10 and above) and should be reduced to five DAs per supervisor if supervision is to be effective.

Regarding the number of supervisory levels in the organizational structure, the recommendation is that the zone level department of agricultural and rural development offices in the organizational structure of OBARD should be expanded to coordinate and

manage all issues relating to the districts. This is reflected by the mean rank order percentage of 85.5, which is far in excess of the other alternatives, namely maintaining as it is (56.1%) and complete disbanding (8.3%).

Chain of command

The unity of command is investigated in terms of district heads accountability. All categories of respondents (both zones and management) are in favour of an increased accountability to the Bureau of Agriculture and significantly less to the district administration. Especially the top level managers with an assessment of 76% are most outspoken in this regard, with a similar tendency in the East Shewa zone. A safe and appropriate compromise is accountability to both District Administration and Bureau of Agriculture, but the former should never replace the latter.

Coordination

The respondents were asked to indicate the seriousness of coordination as a problem in their work area, using a 10 point scale (1=no problem whatsoever; 10=very serious problem). The results show that the coordination problem is very severe (7.5 scale points, especially for top managers (8.75). This concern is shared by most categories, with the exception of South West Shewa, who are somewhat less concerned (6.75 scale points). In comparison with other organizational related problems, the findings indicate that coordination is one of the three most important organizational issues that need to be addressed and resolved if the organization is to be effective in its extension service provision; the others being political factors and frequent organizational restructuring.

Organizational change

The organisation (OBARD) is characterized by extremely frequent changes. These changes have been inadequately supported by diagnostic and feasibility studies and by a

lack of involvement of key stakeholders in decision making. It appears as if many of these changes can be attributed to the intervention of political forces.

Current level of formal education of staff

The formal education levels of extension workers are very low. 63.2% of respondents are diploma holders, 27.2% have no training of extension at all, and more than 50 percent of managers don't have any knowledge about the general principles of management.

Selecting and hiring of employees

The current entry requirements for the frontline development agents (DAs) is a certificate and for extensionists and subject matter specialists a diploma from an agricultural college.

As to the desired situation, the top level managers recommended that the minimum level of entry qualification for the job position of development agents (DAs) should continue to be the certificate level while all the rest of the respondents should have the recommended diploma level of education. On the other hand, the top level managers unanimously agreed that for the position of Subject Matter Specialists (SMS) the minimum entry qualification should be a BSc degree.

These findings imply that the current situation of filling the vacancies of SMS positions by experienced diploma holders through internal employee promotion should be abandoned.

Training and development

In general the respondents consider the current situation of in-service training of extension staff, which amounts to about one week per year, as inadequate. In-service training for extensionists is slightly more than that of SMSs and management. The

respondents have recommended that the in-service training be increased significantly namely to up to 6.5 weeks per year for extensionists. The recommendation for managers is slightly less, namely a mean of 6.1 weeks per year.

Manpower Appraisal and Reward System

The current system of appraisal is perceived as not fair enough, as is evident from the mean efficiency assessment score of 38 percent. Although the zones vary significantly from as low as 27 percent (East Shewa) to 44 percent (Arsi) and 45 percent (Borena), the mean efficiency ratings are very low and leave much scope for improvement.

The results also indicate that all the identified criteria (qualification, proven performance, personality and political affiliation) of the reward system in the organization contribute reasonably but political affiliation is with a mean assessment of 76 percent judged to be the most important criterion for appointments and promotions. Personality, on the other hand, was assessed to be the least important criterion with an importance rating of 64.4 percent.

The respondents recommended that proven performance and qualification should be given more weight, as is reflected in mean assessed emphasis level of about 85 and 84 percent respectively.

(d) Leadership and influence

The results indicate that the overall leadership and influencing abilities of OBARD managers is mediocre, namely 52 percent. It appears that all managers tend to overrate their leadership ability. Taking the non-managers ratings as a reference, the first, middle and top level managers have over-rated their leadership by about six, ten and eight percent respectively. The general low level of leadership effectiveness is a concern, which is exacerbated by the fact that managers tend to overrate themselves and are thus less inclined to understand the scope of the problem.

Task-Oriented and People-Oriented Leadership style

In accordance with the managerial grid, the respondents were asked to evaluate their managers' leadership style in terms of both the level of concern for task and concern for people using a nine point, 1 to 9, scale (1=very low; 9=very high). The findings indicate that with increase in level of management there tends to be an increase in task orientation and a systematic decrease in people orientation. This discrepancy between a clearly higher task orientation (5.4) than people orientation (3.4) is particularly conspicuous among the senior managers.

The findings suggest that the leaders should improve both the concern for task and people orientation in order to increase organizational effectiveness and employee satisfaction. More specifically, people orientation is a concern.

Leader participation

The results indicate that the overall level to which extension leaders allow or encourage participation by subordinates in decision making is 56 percent. These assessments by respondents imply a considerable scope of improvement above which they currently assess to be mediocre.

Visionary leadership

The clarity of the extension vision received a mean assessment of 54.4 percent. Respondents feel that increased clarity accomplished through increased awareness (in terms of what it does, what it will not do, and this clearly communicated to all concerned bodies or all stakeholders) will, in turn, increase extension delivery effectiveness and job satisfaction of employees by 58.5 and 61.4 percent respectively. These results tend to imply that the current lack of clarity of the extension vision statement has negatively influenced extension delivery effectiveness and job satisfaction. The findings leave a clear impression of the big improvement potential, and staff should, based on the

potential influence of such awareness on the improvement of extension and job satisfaction, welcome campaigns promoting such awareness

(e) Control function

The evaluation results of the extent of application of the 8 indicators of control efficiency indicate that the current level of use of these indicators ranges from as low as 36.6 percent in the case of outcome criteria to 56.1 percent for input indicators. This means that the lower level criteria, like input resources, activities and clients' assessment are used more intensively than the outcome focused indicators such as behaviour determinants, behaviour (practice adoption) and behaviour results (efficiency and outcome).

Correlation analyses indicate significant relationships between both the number of indicators applied and the output indicators with organizational performance. Especially the latter correlations, namely between output indicators and organizational performance are highly significant, suggesting that especially the output indicators are more critical and deserve special attention.

Question 3. Are there any differences between before and after 2002 organizational restructuring in terms of improvements in organizational performance?

Opinions regarding the influence of the 2002 decentralisation are mixed, varying from negative to positive, but also depending on the type of organisational performance which were analysed in terms of three main performance dimensions.

(a) Operating efficiency

The influence of decentralization on the operating efficiency of OBARD is, in general, limited but more significant at the district level than at regional level. The biggest positive change is in resource use (manpower, time, finance and materials) at district

level (Mean difference =5.6 percent; t=3.92; p=0.00). But noteworthy is also the increased extension delivery of 3.5 percent (t=2.55; p=0.01) which was achieved in spite of a reduction in the financing of 4.2 and 11.6 percent at district and region level respectively.

(b) Process efficiency

All variables of organizational process efficiency show an improvement after decentralization (coordination 3.3%, communication 3.1%, and participation at district level 8.14%), except participation of staff/workers at Region level. The biggest improvement is recorded in the area of extension workers' participation (involvement in decision making) at the district level (mean difference of 8.14 percent; t-value = 5.30; p=0.00). It appears as if the improved participation at district level might have happened at the expense of participation at regional level, which showed a decline, although not statistically significant (mean difference =-0.67 percent; t-value=0.43; p=0.67).

(c) Organizational health efficiency

The overall organizational health efficiency showed the least improvement with restructuring. In fact in all cases there has been a decrease in efficiency; highly significant in the case of motivation (mean difference = -8.3 percent, t-value = -4.83, p = 0.00) and job satisfaction (mean difference = -7.0 percent, t-value = -4.61, p = 0.00).

Question 4. What are the factors that currently influence, (enhance or restrain) the organizational and managerial functioning of OBOARD?

As far as the determinants of organizational factors are concerned, three sets of variables were considered, namely personal, organizational, and environmental factors. All three were found to have influence on organizational performance, with environmental factors being most dominant, explaining about 36 percent of the organizational efficiency variance (R^2 =0.356).

Various factors, which, according to the literature, can be expected to have an influence on organizational behaviour, were identified and categorised into personal, organizational and environmental variables. Their influence on organizational efficiency was investigated by means of correlation and regression analyses and is briefly as follows:

(a) Personal characteristics

Thirteen variables concerning respondents' socio-economic and demographic characteristics were identified (see chapter 5, Table 5.4). The emphasis is on the influence of these variables on the different aspects of organizational efficiency.

The overall impression is that personal variables have little influence on the way the organizational efficiency is perceived. An exception is the level of salary, showing significant relationships with most of the efficiency aspects. However, in all of these cases the correlations are negative, which implies that higher earning respondents tend to be more critical as far as the organizational efficiency is concerned.

The only other determinants having a limited but noteworthy influence are education and in-service training, but a more valid indication of the comparative influence of these variables is offered by regression analyses. They confirm salary and managerial positions as variables contributing most significantly to the perception variations of the current organizational efficiency situations. However the total contribution of personal characteristics towards explaining the variance is only six percent. This is reflected in the significant R^2 of 0.060.

(b) Organizational (internal) factors

According to Thompson and Strickland (2001), an *organization's strength* is something it is good at doing or a characteristic that gives it enhanced competitiveness (such as a skill/ important expertise, valuable physical assets, valuable human assets, valuable organizational assets, valuable intangible assets/brand name or reputation/, competitive

capabilities, alliances or cooperative ventures, and its market achievements determine the complement of resources at its command with which it competes). Five variables were selected (Skilled manpower, Offices & accommodation, Extension aids, Finance, and Transportation).

The overall picture is that there is an inadequacy of resources. The seriousness of the situation is reflected in the fact that all assessments fall well below the 50 percent level. Finance, extension teaching aids, and transportation facilities appear to be the most critical, with assessments of 21.4, 22.9, and 27.1 percent respectively.

All these variables were significantly correlated with most criteria of organizational efficiency. Based on correlation coefficients and level of significance, availability of the skilled manpower and offices/accommodations can be considered as more important, because of the stronger and more significant association with all organizational efficiency variables. Regression analyses support these findings namely that out of the five selected variables reflecting organisational strength, skilled manpower and offices & accommodation variables are found to be the variables contributing most significantly to the variations of the current organizational efficiency situation. The overall contribution of this set of variables (R^2 = 0.101 or 10%) is higher than that of the personal characteristics (R^2 = 0.060) in explaining variation in perceived organisational efficiency.

(c) Environmental (external) factors

External environments are related to the larger social, economic, administrative, political and diplomatic arena, and the two aspects distinguished here are the task and the general environment. While task related environment factors are referring to the organization's competitive conditions, factors of the general environment are related to what an organization is complying with. A total of eight variables (four for each aspect) were identified and their causal relationship with organisational efficiency analysed.

According to the findings in Table 6.7, most of the variables of the external environment (in terms of adequacy or favourableness) fall below average expectations of the respondents. Assessments of the general environment (mean = 52.2 percent) are somewhat better than those of the task environment (mean = 45.8 percent), which leads to the conclusion that especially the task environment constitutes a threat to organization's effectiveness and efficiency.

The association between perceived environmental situations and organizational effectiveness are strong. This is reflected by the fact that, except for the agro ecological variable, environmental factors are significantly correlated with all organizational efficiency measures. According to regression analyses their contribution towards explaining the variance of the current organisational efficiency is 35.6 percent (R^2 = 0.356)

These results suggest that all of the environmental variables included in this study were found to be relevant and important and need attention, especially government policy (dealing with development problems through pro-active and purposeful extension, and the collaboration between supplementary institutions. This implies that the organization's management and policy makers should focus on addressing issues related to extension policies, improving the communication and networking with supplementary rather than endless organisational restructuring.

Question 5. Are there any variations regarding assessed organizational and managerial performance between various categories of respondents?

There are significant variations observed between various groups of respondents. Specifically highly significant variations observed between respondents categories by zones than by managerial positions. The findings imply that there appears to be more mutual influence and sharing of information within zones than between different hierarchical management levels.

12.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

The current functioning of OBARD, the scope of its activities and the development challenges facing it, emphasise the necessity of an effectively functioning organisation, which is in essence the function of effective management. Based on the findings and on observations, the following recommendations are made.

1. Re-structuring should not be seen as the major means of achieving improved management, and, subsequently, improved extension delivery. This does not mean that restructuring cannot have a positive outcome, but invariably they are an excuse to start afresh. Whenever and wherever they are considered it should be preceded with the necessary feasibility studies and followed up with meaningful monitoring and evaluation for purposes of accountability and justification

2. Improve in-service training of extension workers and managers. This could be the biggest contributing factor towards improving extension delivery, but is a long term undertaking. In the training a good balance will have to be found between competence in agriculture and in extension, and even managers will, in addition to management skills, need to have a good understanding of extension. Added impetus could be given by the following:

    - A strengthened and adapted Knowledge Support System in the form of Subject Matter Specialists whose primary function would become the knowledge support of extension workers in the form of systematic and purposeful upgrading in those areas or commodities that are a priority in their specific areas.

    - Closer cooperation and mutual support with the local Universities as there is at least one in every ecological zone.

- The establishment of professional associations to enhance scholarship and professionalism among extension personnel.

3. Introduction of the priority approach principle. The reason for this is that the challenges and service demands are more that OBARD can cope with in terms of its resources. Against this background it is important that attention is focused where the biggest return in terms of input/output ratio can be expected. This will require a new approach regarding the reconciliation of "felt" and "unfelt" needs.

4. Bigger focus on pro-active rather than re-active approaches and this also implies a more purposefulness. The implementation of extension programs is seriously obstructed by involvement of extension workers in non-extension activities or by outside interference resulting in derailing from scheduled programmed activities. Steps need to be taken to minimise this derailment. Possibilities include the following:
    - Involvement of management in decisions regarding that time ratio of programmed versus ad hoc activities,
    - Allowing for more flexibility in programs,
    - Timely announcement of other dates and responsibilities so that planning can accommodate them, and
    - Protection by managers from "outside interference".

5. Introduction of a national monitoring and evaluation (M&E) programme. The choice of monitoring and evaluation criteria should be guided by the following considerations:
    - The objectives should be chosen and formulated to focus on or include the full spectrum of criteria ranging from resource and activity inputs to clients' responses and opinions, behaviour determinants, behaviour change (practice adoption), outcome or efficiency aspects and, where possible, the impact in terms of job creation, increase in living standard, etc.

- For monitoring purposes criteria need to be chosen that are focused on behaviour determinants (i.e. needs, perceptions and knowledge). They are the actual focus of extension and their positive change is a precondition for behaviour change (practice adoption) and the consequent change in efficiency and the resulting financial and other outcomes. Behaviour determinants are the focus of every encounter and thus lend themselves to monitoring after every extension delivery. In this way extension can continuously (on a monthly basis) come up with evaluation evidence.
- Revisit and adapt the current criteria for promotions and appointments of managers to ensure that it serves the purpose of: motivation, rewarding those that deserve it and ensuring that the best personnel are retained.

6. As far as future research is concerned, the following is recommended:

- That this study be extended to other regions to verify whether or to what degree the findings in Oromia Region also apply to other regions. In addition, if time and other resource constraints allow, it is advisable to include the views of other stakeholders (such as the farmers and the politicians or government administrators at various levels) of the organization.

- That efforts be made to find more objective scales and criteria for measuring management efficiency. These would not only serve the purpose of more accurate analyses of the data and interpretation of the findings, but could also be used for evaluation or performance assessments of managers.