European Journal of Business and Management
ISSN 2222-1905 (Paper) ISSN 2222-2839 (Online)
Vol.10, No.34, 2018

Work Motivation Among Agricultural Development Agents in Jaldu Woreda, Ethiopia

Girma Ajama
Assistance Researcher at Oromia Agricultural Research Institute (IQQO),
Bako Agricultural Engineering Research Center, P.O Box 07 Bako, West Shoa, Ethiopia

Abstract
The study was conducted with an objective of assessing the level of DAs' work motivation and factors which have possible relation to, and effects upon it. The statistical population for this study was comprised of 120 DAs engaged in delivery of extension services. Given the diminutive population size, a decision was made to administer the survey to the entire population. The research was conducted based on both primary and secondary data. Primary data were collected through discussions, interview and a questionnaire survey where as secondary data were also gathered from office manuals and files to provide additional information. In accordance with the research objectives, and data characteristic, the study used descriptive and inferential statistics to analysis data. The study found that more than half (53%) of the DAs had a low level of work motivation, 26% of them had a medium level of motivation and 20% had a high level of motivation to work. The result also showed that out of the 15 factors included in analysis, 10 of them were found statistically significant and related to work motivation of DAs at different levels. The factors such as work itself, quality of supervision, recognition, promotion, and perception about salary, were positively and significantly related with job motivation at less than 1% level. While work place distance and unrealistic work load were negatively correlated at less than 1% level. Work condition and feeling of being involved also showed a positive and significant relationship with the dependent variable at less than 5% level. Therefore, it was recommended that both the higher policy makers and the management of office of agricultural and natural resources in the study area should focus on the extracted significant factors for better development agents' motivation strategy. Nonetheless as work motivation influences by different factors and subject to change overtime, administrators should periodically assess the factors of motivation and plan accordingly.
Keywords: AES, DAs, work motivation

Statement of the Problem

Ethiopia ministry of agriculture has a great prophecy to realize the agricultural extension and development. With this regard the organization was investing massive efforts and resources lead to effective performance. However, the issue of agricultural extension service (AES) delivery remains to be of concern to the extent that it hardly hits the target (Kinfe *et al*., 2012). As of the country at large, there is a general outcry on the ineffectiveness of AES in Jaldu woreda. The most possible explanations which have been offered for this trend are resource allocation, better management, and changes in the role of government, inter alia (*ibid*). Indeed financial and technological resources can be the barriers to improve the extension services. But it is poor implementation of human resource management system that tremendously to blame (*ibid*), and DAs motivation level is most likely a key component in this functional failure.

Haile and Abebew (2012) stressed that motivation governs work effectiveness. The same authors also asserted that level of motivation has the potential to shed a light on major collective accomplishments and the bottom line is that without an adequate level of motivated behavior, peoples' goals of actions cannot be set up, their fulfillment and sufficient performance cannot be achieved (Mboya, 2010). Nonetheless, much as the importance of workers' motivation is often mentioned and exists as a policy, it is normally easier said than done in study area. Little is known about the level of motivation among agents. The prevailing perception about DAs is that poor performance is a big problem and most of the time the blame for observed decline in effectiveness of AES was imposing on the performance of DAs without questioning their level of motivation which could be the real cause of failure.

Strength of motivation level can be situation, time and issue specific (Miner, 2013). A motivated person at one time can become de-motivated another time. On the other hand an unmotivated person can become motivated. The opportunity to motivate employees is never completely lost nor is the accomplishment of motivated employees ever guaranteed to continue indefinitely (Rutherford, 2010). These call for extension managers having an understanding of current position of development agents in terms of their level of motivation. Therefore a practical, fast, flexible and periodic assessment of motivational level and looking for solutions to associated problems accordingly is more critical.

A related problem with DAs is low morale, commitment and lack of motivation toward duties in the delivery of AES. It is empirically tested that the morale and commitment of DAs in Ethiopia are at its lowest ebb (Gebrehiwot *et al*., 2012). If one also refers appraisal files and different unpublished reports of work evaluation

of DAs in the study area, symptoms of the above scenarios are remarkably common and are manifested in lack of courtesy to farmers; intension to quit; failure to meet deadlines; looking for new jobs; indifferent performance; and other anti-work behaviors such as apathy, absenteeism, and awaiting order from higher echelon. In such situation, it is hard to farmers to get the required AES which in turn has profound negative consequence on the national extension program

The big question needed to be asked therefore is what account for these undesirable situations in AES. Managers seem to be not enough aware of what really motivates DAs and to strategically utilize those motivational factors so as to elevate agents' level of motivation, commitment and morale. A wide variety of factors account for such situations as revealed through various literatures include issues of recognition, meager promotional opportunities, unattractive work condition, and lack of supervisory support (Debebe *et al*., 2016). Others also hold the view that work itself, unrealistic work load, salary structure and distance of residing area, are what perhaps responsible for this situation (Tizazu, 2015). Step to improve agents' level of motivation, by means of appropriate strategy application, can only be taken once the factors are known and properly utilized. Unfortunately, there is no single research conducted in the study area so far on such prominent issues expect very few studies in other locations of the country. Therefore, this research was set out with the prime objective of investigating the current level DAs' work motivation and factors associated with it in the study area.

Research Methodology

This study was carried out between 1st January 2015 and 31st July 2012 in Jaldu woreda of oromia national regional state, Ethiopia. The woreda was selected purposively because of the existence of higher rate of DAs' turnover and the sponsor's interest. Astronomically, the woreda lies between 9^0 05' to 9^0 25' N latitude and 37^0 04' to $38^0$11' E longitudes with 139,389 hectare area coverage. The area experiences annual mean temperature of 17°C with biannual type of rainfall classified as short and long rainy seasons. The short rainy season usually occurs from end of February to mid May and the long rainy seasons occur from July to end of September (District Agriculture office, 2009). Its altitude ranges from 1600 to 2100 m above sea level. The area is topographically undulating and rugged

According to the Population and Housing census (CSA, 2007), a population of Jaldu woreda is estimated to be 202,716 of which 82.9% reside in rural setups and the remaining 7.1 % dwells in Gojo, Shukute and Chobi towns. As elsewhere in the country mixed agriculture is the mainstay of livelihood. Among the different types of crops grown in the woreda, wheat, teff, sorghum and maize are the dominant cereals. In addition, beans, potato, linseed and field pea are cultivated on a wider scale (WoAD,2014 unpublished data). Another important feature of the woreda is its mix of crop production with livestock. Whilst crop production makes up the bulk of farmers' livelihood at 70%, livestock production is also an integral means of livelihood both as subsistence as well as a source of income generation. Cattle are the most prominent livestock in the area, predominately used as draught power, with most households possessing 8 cattle on average (Birhanu, 2011). As 15% of the land is grazing land, farmers prefer open grazing but in recent years have encountered numerous challenges by shrinking grazing land. Various crops as described above are grown on the remaining arable land which makes up 43% of the total land in the woreda. Family members are typically used as labor and the land prepared using oxen-drawn traditional ploughs.

The woreda has 38 rural kebeles called peasant associations. In each rural kebele, FTCs in which farmers undergo modular training in all relevant modules with credible and accredited service providers was established. Under current conditions, 3 DAs with a range of technical skills in animal science, plant science, natural resource conservation and development, were posted. Information from the woreda agricultural development office indicates that there are about 36,361 farming households currently getting services from 80 male and 19 female altogether 99 trained DAs. Administratively these agents are responsible to Woreda's agricultural development office or supervisors. But, in practice, the DAs were accountable to the political chiefs of the Kebeles. The political chiefs command the agricultural experts to exercise political activities out of their profession

Sampling Size and Procedure

The population for the current study was all agricultural development agents working in Jaldu woreda. During the survey, there were one hundred twenty development agents in the study area and thus employing universal sampling known as census technique, all DAs were taken as a respondent for the survey purposively.

Type and Source of Data

Both primary and secondary data were collected from the primary and secondary sources. The quantitative primary data source was surveyed agricultural development agents whereas the qualitative data source was attendees of interview and FGD. Qualitative data was used to triangulate and augment the collected quantitative data and gain a more complete picture of what factors motivate DAs. On the other hand, Secondary data, which

was collected for the purpose of gathering some background information were sourced mainly from different available documents of zonal and woreda agricultural development and human resources management offices.

Method of Data Collection and analysis

As the research is descriptive in nature the study mainly relies on primary data. Primary data were gathered from DAs and key informants through personal interviews, focus group discussions and survey techniques whereas the secondary data collection was accomplished through reviewing of annual report, human resource policy and procedures. The data collected from the DAs were analyzed using frequencies, percentages, mean, standard deviation t-test chi-square, and one-way ANOVA. Correlation coefficients were also computed to detect the relationship between the variables of the study. In parallel, narrative type of analysis was used to analyzing qualitative type of data and to enrich and illustrate a qualitative conclusion**.**

Result and discussion

Level of work motivation among Development agents

The study examined the level of work motivation among DAs focusing on aspects include DAs' intensity, direction and persistence of efforts towards better performance. To uncover overall level of motivation to work, ten self reported items anchored of a five point likert scale was used. The items were given weighted score as per the response given by agents themselves and summed up, that obtained scores were then converted to mean levels of motivation. As presented in Table 1, the obtained mean score of work motivation ranges between 1.00 and 4.90 with the overall mean and standard deviation of 2.89 and 0.97 respectively. The work motivation categories were calculated on the bases of overall score mean and Standard Deviation $(2.89 \pm \frac{1}{2} 0.97)$ (Gangadharapappa *et al*., 2007). For the purpose of this study, mean ranges of 1.00-2.49 were considered to be low; 2.50-3.39 as medium and 3.40-4.90 as High.

Table 1. Level of work motivation among DAs

Work Motivation Level	Score mean	Frequency	Overall	
			Mean	
Low	1.00-2.49	57		
Medium	2.50-3.39	39	2.89	0.97
High	3.40-4.90	24		
Total		120		

χ^2 = 36.727, p-value= 000, Significant at 1% level

Source: Own computation from survey data (2016)

The study revealed that 54.74% of DAs do have lower level of motivation to function at the required level in delivering the necessary agricultural extension services to farmers. In a situation where a single de-motivated core employee in an organization can lead to low productivity (Gandhi, 2010), it was unexpected to find such a high proportion of extension workers in view of the fact that a major cause of ineffectiveness of agricultural extension in the study area. Other similar studies across Ethiopia also indicate that the frequency of farmers' contact with agricultural extension workers is very low (Gutu *et al*., 2012). This is partly attributed to lack of motivation and commitment from the side of the extension workers in spending much time supporting smallholder farmers. On the other hand 26.32% and 18.94% have indicated of medium and highly motivated to do their work respectively. The chi square test showed that the differences in the motivational level of these three groups of DAs were statistically significant at less than 1% probability level. It is apparent that only small proportion of them has high level of motivation to play their facilitative role as extension agents. This can shade light on how the current agricultural extension system would improve the agricultural production and productivity (Marx, 2006). Therefore, it is important to identify the factors that contribute to the current undesirable level of work motivation of the DAs in the study area.

Comparative ranking of motivational factors

This is to test if motivational factors indicated by different researchers as the most important, play also a crucial role for the present study. The participants were provided with a list of ten motivational factors and were asked to rank up all factors based on their perceived importance in motivating them to perform best at work. The rank order of the importance of motivation factors was determined by calculating the mean score for each factor. The factor with the lowest mean was ranked in the first position as being the most motivating while the factor with highest mean was ranked in the last position as being the least motivating. Table 3 presents the collective rank order of the ten motivational factors according to how important each is in influencing the agents' motivation

Table 2. Comparative ranking between DAs & managers on the important factor for motivation

DAs'			Factors	Mangers & Supervisor (n=10)		
Sum	Average	Rank		Sum	Average	Rank
120	1.212	1	Praise and appreciation	40	2.667	4
233	2.354	2	Promotion opportunities	52	3.467	5
544	5.495	7	Involvement	61	4.067	7
820	8.283	10	Achievement	37	2.467	9
476	4.808	5	Proximity of work location	15	1.000	3
337	3.404	3	Competitive salary	58	3.867	1
507	5.121	6	Interesting work	31	2.067	6
429	4.333	4	Good work condition	72	4.800	2
725	7.323	8	Quality of supervision	65	4.333	8
755	7.626	9	Realistic workload	68	4.533	10

Source: Own survey, 2016

Table 2 showed the ranked order of the motivating factors according to the development agents opinion were: [1] recognition, [2] promotional opportunities, [3] competitive salary, [4] good work condition, [5] proximity, [6] interesting work, [7] involvement, [8] quality of supervision, [9] realistic workload, and [10] achievement. In parallel by taking themselves as a reference point managers and supervisors ranked factors as the most important in order: [1] competitive salary, [2] good work condition, [3] proximity, [4] recognition, [5] promotion, [6] interesting work [7] involvement, [8] supervision, [9] achievement and [10] realistic workload. Having understand agents' economic problems, and lack of welfare facilities managers and supervisors thought salary and work condition were the most important to their DAs work motivation.

From the study respondents' perspective, praise and appreciation scored 120 and considered as the top priory variable contributes to the work motivation of DAs. Supervisor and managers placed it on the fourth position and they ranked good salary first followed by good work condition which was ranked third and fourth respectively by DAs. The comparison showed the dissonance in the rank order of factors of work motivations between what the supervisors and managers thought their employee's response would be and the actual employee responses. This elaborated that the managers do not fully comprehend of what motivated their staff especially development agents.

Therefore what managers, supervisors, team leaders and other concerned bodies in office level perceive as the ignition of the work motivation of DAs and what DAs themselves feel as a work motivator should coincide with each other otherwise the gap may contribute to the low level of work motivation among the DAs in the study area.

Description and association of demographic variables with work motivation

Demographic explanatory variables were included in this study, because they were proxies of human capital and may influence motivational status and personal perception on organizational climate (Swala,2015).The demographic data presented in this section were collected in order to obtain firstly some understanding on common issues such as their work experience within the organization, their gender distribution, their marital status, the family background information as well as knowing their age structure. Secondly, it enables to make comparison among different groups of DAs to age, gender, job experience, marital status, and family background. This section examines participants' specific demographic information whose results are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Association between dummy demographic variables & work motivation of the DAs

Personal factors		Motivation level						Total		χ^2
		Low		Medium		High				
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	
Sex	Female	11	11.0	2	2.0	6	6.1	19	19.1	3.8069
	Male	42	42.4	24	24.1	14	14.4	80	80.9	(p=.149)
	Total	53	53.4	26	26.1	20	20.5	99	100	
Marital status	Married	49	49.4	17	17.2	14	14.2	80	80.8	10.129
	Single	4	4.0	9	9.1	6	6.1	19	19.2	(P=0.73)
	Total	53	53.4	26	26.3	20	20.3	99	100	
Background of DAs	Urban	8	8.2	8	8.1	4	4.1	20	20.4	2.6592
	Rural	45	45.2	18	18.2	16	16.2	79	69.6	(P=0.9)
	Total	53	53.4	26	26.3	20	20.3	99	100	

Source: Own computation from field Data (2016)

Sex: Respondents of the study composed of both male and female individuals. However, the findings

presented in the Table 4 revealed that male agricultural DAs were five times more in number than female DAs (19.1%) in Jaldu woreda. The male development agents predominates the population of the study (80.9 % of the total respondents). This confirms the trend that extension profession is male dominated. Yet, it has been consistently argued that there is a need to have a balance between male and female extension staff. Although there has been a significant increase in the number of female DAs in Ethiopia in general , further investigation as to why female DAs tend not to remain in the agricultural extension service as long as their male counterparts, is warranted.

It was hypothesized that male development agents motivated more than female. However, when the chi-square test was applied to analyze, the result did not support the hypothesis ($\chi^2 = 3.8069$, $p = 0.149$). This implies that there is no statistically justified evidence to generalize that, female agents are as not motivated as their male colleagues. This could be as a result of DAs of both sexes being treated alike and the same rules guide them on the job. The result obtained agrees with the findings of Yohannes (2009) but disagrees with the study by Debebe, Eric and Jemal (2016) whose study concluded that being male is strongly associated with work motivation.

Marital status: Marriage confers some level of responsibilities. For example, during early parenting years, role overload from having simply too much to do on and off the job is likely to create motivational challenges (Abzari, 2011). Therefore, single agents were expected to have high motivation level in the work place than married co-workers as they are relatively free from different burden of family responsibilities at home.

As can be observed in Table 4, over three-quarters (80.8%) of respondents have reported being married while less than a quarter (19.2%) of respondents are still single. According to the findings, married DAs reported the highest percentage of respondents (49.4%) who were lowly motivated and also represented the lowest percentage of respondents (14.2%) reporting that they were highly motivated. The result from the chi-square test in the same table ($\chi^2 =10.1289$, $p=0.73$) indicated that the difference in the marital status of DAs showed no effect on their motivation level. The similar results were found in the study by Debebe, Eric and Jemal (2016) and Yohannes (2009). They found no significant difference in the motivation level of married and unmarried DAs.

Family background: The respondents were asked to indicate their backgrounds in terms of where they grew up. They were to choose the background most indicative of their growing-up area ranging from a rural to urban. It turned out that 79.80% of DAs involved in this study was from rural background and that 20.20% of them were from towns or cities (Table 4). As per the findings almost all the respondents have a strong farm background. The result from Pearson's chi-square test revealed no significant difference ($\chi^2=2.6592$; $p=0.9$) in the levels of work motivation among agents on the basis of their childhood background. This corroborate Tesfaye (2012) but in contrast with Bennett, Gottesman, Rock & Cerullo (1993) and The International Rescue Committee (2009) whose studies draw the inference that backgrounds of employees have significant difference with motivational orientations.

Service year: The survey result in Table 5 showed that the respondents had worked on an average of 10.899 years as development agents with the shortest being three years and the longest nineteen years. But a considerable observation is that, nearly 62 % of the respondents of this research have worked for less than ten years as an extensionist. Given the length of time the development agents served, it is reasonable to assume that a high level of development agents' turnover.

Table 4. Association between service year and work motivation of DAs

		Motivation level						Total	
		Low		Medium		High			
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Service year	=<5	8	8.08	10	10.10	11	11.11	29	29.30
	6-10	12	12.12	12	12.12	9	9.09	33	33.33
	11-15	20	20.21	4	4.04	0	0.0	24	24.24
	>15	13	13.13	0	0.0	0	0.0	13	13.13
	total	53	53.54	26	26.26	20	20.20	99	100
Min/Max								3/19	
Mean		13.57		8.19		6.75		10.89	
SD		5.51		3.63		3.09		4.079	
F-value								2.5	
P-value								0.109	

Source: Own computation from field Data (2016)

It can be inferred from the same table that sixty two percent of DAs in low motivation category were in the group of more than eleven years experience and all of highly motivated were found in the group of less than ten. It was assumed that the longer time the agents worked with extension organization, the more likely they exhibited a lower level of motivation**.** To test this hypothesis statistically a one way analysis of variance was

used. The test revealed no significant mean difference in the level of work motivation depending on the variable of service year (p>0.10). Similar results were also obtained in the study conducted by Yohannes (2009). However, in the research conducted by Toker (2007), it was determined that there was difference in the levels of work motivation of the extension agents according to the variable service years.

AGE: Results in Table 6 conclude that respondents were on average 36.43 years old with the minimum and maximum age of twenty five and forty nine years respectively, and a standard deviation of 6.165. Similarly the mean age of DAs categorized in to low, medium and high in level of their work motivation was 39.94, 33.38, and 31.45 years respectively. The mode (N=30) was in the class of the age 30 to 35 years. This is an indication that agricultural extension agents in the study area were still agile and economically active to perform their extension work. Williams (2013) affirmed that extension work needs people that are agile and active as the work involves a lot of energy demanding activities like traveling, and carrying out a lot of demonstrations to farmers.

Table 5. Association between age and work motivation of DAs

		Motivation level						Total	
		Low		Medium		High			
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Age	< 30	2	2.03	7	7.07	6	6.06	15	15.15
	30-35	9	9.09	10	10.10	11	11.11	30	30.30
	36-40	16	16.16	6	6.06	3	3.03	25	25.25
	>40	26	26.26	3	3.03	0	0.0	29	29.30
	total	53	53.54	26	26.26	20	20.20	99	100
Min/Max								25/49	
Mean		39.94		33.38		31.45		36.43	
SD		6.87		6.07		5.54		6.17	
F-value								2.47	
P-value								0.19	

Source: Own computation from field Data (2016)

As depicted in the same table, the majority of low motivated DAs are in over forty years whereas the majority of medium and highly motivated belonged to the 30-35 year's age category**.** This implies indirectly a negative correlation between work motivation and age as was presupposed in this study that work motivation has a negative correlation with age assuming that younger DAs were expected to report highest level of motivation than older. Nonetheless, when the one-way analysis of variance test was run statistically on the mean score, a significant difference was not noted (p>0.10). This result accords with the study by Yohannes Mare (2009).

Distance of work location: This study also determined the existence of association between work place distance from home and work motivation level. Respondents were asked to indicate the distance of work place from their home and it was recorded that the mean score for this variable is 9.56km. Given the poor facilities at rural areas, majority of development agents are not usually prepared to live at or near the work place. This can be proved where more than one third of respondents (37.4%) were found to live more than 15 km from their work place followed those who live in the range of 11-15km, and those who live in the range of less than ten km away from their work place. So, they end up having to commute long distances, which leaves them tired and lacking energy for working (Spies, 2006). Long distance poses a problem of travelling costs and extent of accessibility to farmers and thus impact negatively on extension service delivery.

Table 6. Association between work place distance & work motivation of DAs

		Motivation level						Total	
		Low		Medium		High			
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Work distance	=<5	1	1.02	10	10.10	12	12.12	23	23.24
	6-10	5	5.05	4	4.04	5	3.03	14	14.14
	11-15	20	20.20	2	2.02	3	0.0	25	25.25
	>15	27	25.25	10	10.10	0	0.0	37	37.37
	Total	53	53.54	26	26.26	20	20.20	99	100
Min/Max								2/18	
Mean		13.06		7.08		3.35		9.56	
F-value								4.06**	
P-value								0.002	

** Significant at the 0.01 level; Source: own computation from field Data (2016)

Results gained also revealed that the development agents categorized as low, medium and highly motivated were commuting on average 13.06, 7.08, 3.35km daily respectively. A one way analysis of variance was applied

to test for mean difference between three groups of DAs with three levels of motivation by distance commute. The result confirmed that there is statistically significant difference (F=4.069, P=0.002) at 99% of confidence level. As hypothesized, the distance of work place has a significant role to play in determination of work motivation level among DAs.

Results of organizational and work-related factors of motivation

There were fifteen independent variables scrutinized in the study. Five variables among demographic factors (sex, age, marital status, service years and family background) were analyzed separately. The results related to remaining nine independent variables are presented in Table 7 as follows

Table 7. Overall results of independent variables.

No	variables	Highly discouraging		Discouraging		Neutral		Motivating		Highly motivating		Mean
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	
1	Recognition	22	22.22	38	38.38	5	5.05	21	21.22	13	13.13	2.778
2	Promotion	20	20.20	35	35.35	4	4.04	26	26.26	14	14.14	2.889
3	Salary	27	27.27	25	25.25	8	8.08	23	23.23	16	16.16	2.350
4	Work condition	16	16.16	38	38.38	7	7.07	20	20.20	18	18.18	2.010
5	Work itself	23	23.24	31	31.31	8	8.08	24	24.24	14	14.14	2.350
6	Achievement	13	13.13	23	23.23	0	0.00	43	43.43	20	20.20	3.343
7	Involvement	22	22.23	32	32.32	8	8.08	23	23.23	16	16.16	2.747
8	Supervision	34	34.34	41	41.41	4	4.04	13	13.14	7	7.07	2.171
9	Workload	22	21.21	28	28.28	9	10.1	22	22.22	18	18.18	2.879

Source: Own survey, 2016

It is clear from the data included in Table 8 that achievement was important factors motivating to DAs towards the work. On the other hand promotion, work load, recognition and involvement were among the highly discouraging factors leading to de-motivation towards work. Surprisingly the application of work condition, supervision (M=2.171), perception about salary (M= 2.350) and the work itself (M=2.350) often weak in motivating DAs in the study area. The frequencies of DAs for different variables vary greatly across the five categories on the continuum.

Bivariate correlation analysis between Independent and Dependent Variables

This section discusses on the strength and direction of relationship between work motivation of DAs and selected independent variables through Spearman's rho and Pearson correlation analysis. The results are presented in Table 8.

Table 8. Strength & direction of relationship between independent and dependent variables

No	Variable	r/rho-value	p-value
1	Age	-.603	.215
2	Service year	-.696	.194
3	Sex	.024	.815
4	Marital status	.244	.135
5	Family background	-.066	.514
6	Distance of residing area,	-.858**	.000
7	Supervision quality	.541**	.000
8	Perception on Salary	.401**	.006
9	Promotion and growth opportunities	.594**	.000
10	Recognition for achievement	.672**	.000
11	Work itself	.648**	.000
12	Work condition	.218*	.030
13	Sense of achievement	.531**	.000
14	Feeling of being involved	.254*	.011
15	Unrealistic workload	-.227**	.000

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level; ** correlation is significant at the 0.01 level

Source: Own computation

Out of the fifteen factors included in analysis, ten of them were found to be statistically significant and related to work motivation of DAs at different levels. The factors such as work itself, quality of supervision, recognition, promotion opportunities, and perception about salary, were positively and significantly related with job motivation at less than 1% level. While work place distance and unrealistic work load were negatively

correlated at less than 1% level. Work condition and feeling of being involved also showed a positive and significant relationship with the dependent variable at less than 5% level.

These results imply that when interesting in the work itself, qualities of supervision, recognition, opportunities of promotion, sense of achievement, and salaries increase, high work motivation of DAs was obtained with shifting from highly discouraging and discouraging to possibly motivating and highly motivating, if not neutral. The same is true for the case of work condition and feeling of being involved in the work processes. But, the results further indicated that when the work expected of development agents and working place distance from family increase, the work motivation level might go down. The findings are in line with the earlier results reported by Debebe, *et al.,* (2016), Dessalegn (2014) and Tesfaye (2012).

Quality of supervision: According to Herzberg's theory, supervision is one of the hygiene or maintenance factors to either facilitate or impede work motivation. Therefore it was hypothesized to have a causal relationship with work motivation of DAs working in study area. Their relationship was statistically studied and analyzed by applying Chi-square and spearman-Brown correlation and the result of analysis is tabulated in Table 9.

Table 9. Relationship between quality of supervision & work motivation of DAs

Supervision quality	Motivation level								
	Low		Medium		High		Total		
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	Mean
Highly discouraging	22	22.22	8	8.08	4	4.04	34	34.34	
Discouraging	27	27.28	10	10.1	4	4.04	41	41.41	
Neutral	2	2.02	1	1.01	0	0	3	3.03	2.171
Motivation	1	1.01	5	5.05	7	7.07	13	13.14	
Highly motivation	1	1.01	2	2.02	5	5.05	8	8.08	
Total	53	53.54	26	26.26	20	20.20	99	100	

$\chi^2 = 183$, p=.000; rho=.401, p=.041

Source: Own survey, 2016

Development agents want their superiors at work to be intelligent, experienced, matured, and having a good personality (include trustworthiness, sympathy). In fact, the superior needs to have more knowledge and skills than that of his subordinates. The very presence of superiors can motivate the agents (Amend, 1970). If the workers' deem the supervisory leader unworthy and incompetent, it becomes frustrating to them, thus producing de-motivation

As can be seen from Table 9**,** however, agricultural development agents overwhelmingly described that the support they receive from their supervisors particularly from the upper administrator and subject matter specialists was insufficient (M=2.171). Seventy five percent of them expressed that the quality of their supervisor was the main source of their discouragement to perform the job well. The following excerpt was taken from FGD as illustrative of this:

"The hunger, thirst and long distance travelled can sometimes make us lose hope, but when it coupled with lack of support from supervisors, it is so discouraging. There were several times that I was about to give up the job. Sometimes they shout at us for wrong doings and never asked us our problems. They are not listening to us."

"If the woreda supervisors come and see our work, we will be happy. We need encouragement from them. We will be encouraged by the appreciation and support they give for us but what affects our moral and makes us not work hard is, when they leave our strong parts and take very minor things and discourage us due to those things."

Another participant said, "When we do something with the community, they (supervisors) don't support us. They want us to deal with everything on our own. They don't even want to go down and look at it. The usual reason for their lack of support is workload. But, when we fail to deliver, they are the one always pointing fingers on us and making us responsible for any failure."

Oppositely, although, about three percent of respondents are indecisive, twenty one percent of development agents reported that they were motivated by their respective supervisors and supervision services. Table 10 showed the existence of significant relationship at 5% probably level and positive association between quality of supervision and work motivation level of DAs. The finding is in tandem with earlier findings, for example, of Debebe, Eric, & Jemal's (2016) study which found significant correlation between supervision and work motivation of DAs working in Agarfa district of Oromia.

Perception about Salary: This is about the development agent's perception of their salary received from the current employer. Money is considered to be a panacea used to solve the most problems. Therefore, it enables DAs to develop motivation via their position. In this study, perception about salary was also seen in relation to work motivation of the DAs. The results of relationship between perception about salary and work motivation level of respondent DAs was analyzed using chi-square, and Spearman's correlation. Its results are summarized in Table 10.

Table 10. Relationship between perception about salary & DAs' level of motivation

Salary	Motivation level								
	Low		Medium		High		Total		
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	Mean
Highly discouraging	27	27.3	0	0	0	0	27	27.3	
Discouraging	22	22.2	3	3.03	0	0	25	25.2	
Neutral	4	4.04	3	3.03	1	1.01	8	8.10	2.35
Motivating	0	0	13	13.1	10	10.1	23	23.2	
Highly motivating	0	0	7	7.10	9	9.09	16	16.2	
Total	53	53.54	26	26.26	20	20.20	99	100	

$\chi^2 = 71$, p=.000; rho=.401, p=.006
Source: Own survey, 2016

According to the findings tabulated in Table 10, 23.2% (n=23) of DAs perceived the level of salary they earn to be good and motivating and 16.2% considered it to be highly motivating. In contrary, 27.2% of the DAs were highly discouraged by the present level of salary they get paid, while 25.25% of them were discouraged with it. This indicates that above 53% (n=52) of the DAs are not completely satisfied and feel that their salary not according to responsibilities they bear. One respondent during interview air out that:

"*The salary we are getting paid does not match the work we do. We are doing a great deal of work and it is hard. Sometimes you take your work home through thinking about [clients'] problems…. When you see it from that point of view, it is hard to say you are getting paid... You might say, 'what do I get after working this hard?' It will make you lose hope and make you look for other choices in order to meet up with the increasing cost of living."*

The result of statistical analysis depicts that as hypothesized, there is positive relationship (rho=401) between the perception toward pay package and work motivation of DAs in the study area. The relation is moderately significant at 1% probability level which aligns with the work of Alebachew and Temesge (2015), whereby perception toward pay (salary) is stated to be one of the major factors in determining the level (high ,medium or low) of DAs work motivation in organization under study.

Promotion opportunities: This study looked at the relationship between promotion avenues which exist in extension organization and the perception of DAs on promotion system and their motivation at work. Their correlation was ascertained using test of Chi-square and Spearman's rank ordered correlation. The results are presented in Table 11.

Table 11. Relationship between promotion opportunities & work motivation of DAs

Promotion	Motivation level								
	Low		Medium		High		Total		
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	Mean
Highly discouraging	19	19.2	1	1.01	0	0	20	20.2	
Discouraging	26	26.3	9	9.09	0	0	35	35.4	
Neutral	2	2.02	2	2.02	0	0	4	4.00	2.889
Motivating	5	5.00	10	10.1	11	11.1	26	26.3	
Highly motivating	1	1.01	4	4.04	9	9.10	14	14.1	
Total	53	53.53	26	26.26	20	20.20	99	100	

$\chi^2 = 151$; rho value = .594; p=.000
Source: Own survey, 2016

When DAs were asked about the availability of promotion opportunities and its regularity, the reactions were different. From the entire respondent, 26.3% (n=26) felt motivated with the way the promotions were carried out in relation to their potential and the timing of it. Whereas 14.1 % of the respondents expressed promotion opportunities are highly motivating to them (Table 12). In support of this, during FGD one DA said that

"*As part of motivation, the government has arranged a career structure where we can get benefits depending on our years of services. We are really happy about that".*

On the other hand, It also emerged from 35.4% (n=35) of the respondents that lack of promotion opportunities and the way it was done in their organizing made them discouraging to conduct their work. This is because, DAs do not enjoy for example, training and salary increments to go along with the changing economic times, and this coupled with other factors could have led to dwindling of morale and high turnover rates in the office of Agriculture. Belay (2004, cited in Dessalegn, 2014) showed that the situation of promotion in extension services was found to be a discouraging factor. These feelings were also corroborated by the focus group discussion held soon after the questionnaires were filled and collected. One study participants complained that:

Promotional side?....hardly any. From time to time, except what I'll see, 'let our dreams come true', there is

hardly any promotional effort; or even if there is anything, I almost always miss, nobody even knows….

Moreover, during the focus group discussion, there was a general feeling of disillusionment with the whole promotions process, with the majority of the respondents feeling that promotions were not based on merit, but rather on favoritism and the relationship between the extension officer and their supervisor. There are other additional criteria that you should fulfill. First and foremost, you should be a member of the existing political party [the government]. Only those individuals who are highly active in political activities get the chance for these positions.

The study's result further shows that promotion opportunities had a positive and significant association with work motivation level of DAs at 1% level of significance. This supports the hypothesis that there is a significant relationship between promotion opportunities and work motivation level of DAs. Consequently, an increase in promotion opportunity will result in enhanced job motivation and vice versa. The finding that promotion is significantly related to work motivation is consistent with the study of Yohannes (2009) who stated that providing employees with opportunity to advance in their organization through internal promotions as a motivator related to work.

Recognition: This measure describes how the work of development agent is evaluated and how much appreciation he or she receives in return from the organization. It also specifies the way an organization gives its extension workers the reward and status for their work and activities. The variable was presupposed to have a direct and positive association with developments' overall work motivation. In test of this, Chi-square and Spearman's rank correlation was employed and the result obtained has been presented below in Table 12

Table 12. Association of recognition with work motivation of DAs

Recognition	Motivation level								
	Low		Medium		High		Total		
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	Mean
Highly discouraging	19	19.2	3	3.03	0	0	22	22.2	
Discouraging	30	30.3	6	6.06	2	2.02	38	38.4	
Neutral	3	3.03	2	2.02	0	0	5	5.10	2.778
Motivation	1	1.00	8	8.08	12	12.1	21	21.2	
Highly motivation	0	0	7	7.07	6	6.10	13	13.1	
Total	53	53.53	26	26.26	20	20.2	99	100	

$\chi^2 = 159$; rho=.672, p = .000; significant at 1%

Source: Own survey, 2016

From The mean of recognition (2.778) it is understood that Agricultural DAs are not in good condition regarding the appreciation and praise aspects and approaches going on in their organization. Table 13 shows that whereas about one-third of DAs (n=34) considered recognition to be highly motivating, sixty percent of them were discouraging with the prevailing recognition system as it does not exist as a factor of motivation in their organization as they see. The following example of excerpt taken during interview and FGD, illustrates this view

"We are working very hard to meet the set goals of agricultural extension program. But looking at our acceptance by the community is really disastrous. And as long as the government pays me, I keep on doing what I am doing. There is no appreciation, neither by the community nor by the government. For your surprise, there is nobody who says thank you and God bless you. This is real pain for me".

According to DAs, the existing recognition practices do not make any difference among them based on their performance. Consequently, both hardworking and irresponsible agent awarded equally, which the participants claim unfair and seriously discouraging. One DA from discussants elaborated that:

…there is no any difference between those who are working hard and who are not. This affects the motivation and enthusiasm of agents who relatively perform better .The existing system does not encourage hard working. As to me, those who are working hard should be recognized and rewarded in a transparent way. What we are observing in our organization is obnoxious. For example, if we looked at the way DAs are assigned in a leadership position or the way DAs are selected for further training, it is disgraceful. It lacks transparency and scientific base. The only thing we are sure about the practice is that the procedures are not in favor of hardworking. This practice not only kills the motivation but also convey a message that extension service is not important.

These imply that employees will be more motivated to work hard if they know that they are recognized and appreciated for their superior contributions. The statistical result also depicts recognition has a positive and significant strong correlation with work motivation of DAs with rho value 0.672 at 99% confidence level ($p<0.01$). In support to this finding Debebe, Eric and Jemal (2016) found that motivation of DAs is based on reward and recognition.

Work condition: Working condition is crucial for the smooth service delivery process. A conducive and legally accepted environment can catalyze the nature and modality of services to the beneficiaries. Therefore it

was hypothesized to have a relationship with work motivation of DAs working in extension services delivery at the study area. The relationship between work conditions and work motivation of DAs was analyzed using Chi-square and spearman-Brown correlation and the result of analysis is presented in Table 13.

Table 13. Relationship between work condition and motivation of DAs

Work condition	Motivation level								
	Low		Medium		High		Total		
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	Mean
Highly discouraging	13	13.1	2	2.01	1	1.01	16	16.1	
Discouraging	34	34.3	3	3.03	1	1.01	38	38.4	
Neutral	4	4.04	3	3.03	0	0	7	7.10	2.010
Motivation	2	2.02	10	10.1	8	8.08	20	20.2	
Highly motivation	0	0	8	8.08	10	10.1	18	18.2	
Total	53	53.53	26	26.26	20	20.20	99	100	

χ^2 = 109, p=.000; rho value=.218, p=.030; Source: Own survey, 2016

As can be plainly seen from Table, work condition was found to be very important motivational factor for DAs. About 38% of the respondents perceived the work condition to be courageous and motivating; while 7.10 percent perceived atmosphere to be neutral. However, DAs close to 54% are discouraged with the conditions of work available in their organization. Its mean (2.010) illustrates that the physical working conditions of the DAs were not good as perceived by them. This observation is consistent with findings of previous studies by Desalegn (2014) and Yohannes (2009) concluded that Physical work environment and job prospects were the key areas many agricultural workers expressed discouraging.

Even if greater facilities were not expected, housing and travel facilities are the two critical issues affecting moral and motivation of development agents. Interestingly, during discussion one of the respondents was quite emphatic about this point:

"Frankly speaking, what is expected from us to do and the basic facility provided by the government do not match. We want a place to live. Since there is no house for us in rural area, for example I had to travel more than five hour everyday from Woreda town to my work place to perform my duty. That definitely affects my actual performance. We need houses to do our work properly either in rural or urban area. It's hard for a woman to go back and forth to work".

The result again illustrates that working condition of DAs was significant at 1% level of significance and has positive association with work motivation of DAs (rho=.218). This implied that when the work condition of the job is not comfortable and according to the needs of the DAs their motivation is affected by the bad work condition of the organization. in view of the results, it can be safely conclude that work conditions is a factor impacting work motivation level of development agents.

The Work itself: The relationship between the work itself and work motivation level of DAs was analyzed employing Chi-square and Spearman's rank correlation and according to the finding the following revealed as in Table 14.

Table 14. Association of the work itself with work motivation of DAs

Work itself	Motivation level								
	Low		Medium		High		Total		
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	Mean
Highly discouraging	21	21.2	2	2.02	0	0	23	23.2	
Discouraging	27	27.3	3	3.03	1	1.01	31	31.3	
Neutral	5	5.05	2	2.02	1	1.01	8	8.08	2.778
Motivation	0	0	11	11.1	12	12.1	24	24.2	
Highly motivation	0	0	8	8.08	6	6.06	14	14.1	
Total	53	53.54	26	26.26	20	20.20	99	100	

χ^2 = 67.15; rho=.648, p=.000

Source: own survey, 2016

Table 14 portrays, the "work itself" has a positive strong relationship (rho=.648) with the work motivation of DAs at less than 1 % level of significance. The survey result further showed that more than half of DAs in the study area were both highly discouraged and discouraged with a cumulative percent of 54.5. They were bored with their jobs, lacked commitment and were looking for greener pastures. *an employee may decide to work effectively because he or she wants to avoid sanction from a boss or supervisor. In effect, the employee is doing the job not because it is interesting but rather because he or she is aware of the sanction that will come if the work is poorly done.*

However the cumulative percent of motivated and highly motivated agents with the content of their work was found to be 38.4. The rest DAs were those did not much motivated or discouraged by their work aspects as

far as the work motivation is concerned. But its relation with work motivation, the significant results indicate that it is among important factors which influence work motivation of DAs. This finding lend credence to the conclusion made by Hsiu-Fen (2007) that organizations should focus in designing of jobs on issues central to the motivation and satisfaction of their employees.

Sense of achievement: One of the important needs which exist to some level in all human beings is the need to attain excellence and higher level of performance. People in whom the need for achievement and the feeling of accomplishment is strong seek difficult work and improve their task performance. They are task oriented and prefer to work on tasks that are challenging and on which their performance can be evaluated in some way McClelland (1961as cited in Dessalegn, 2014). The causal link of achievement and work motivation of DAs was analyzed using Chi-square and Spearman's correlation.

Table 15. Relationship between sense of achievement and work motivation of DAs

Achievement	Motivation level						Total		
	Low		Medium		High				
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	Mean
Highly discouraging	13	13.13	0	0	0	0	13	13.13	
Discouraging	20	20.21	3	3.03	0	0	23	23.23	
Neutral	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3.34
Motivation	13	13.13	16	16.16	14	14.14	43	43.44	
Highly motivation	7	7.07	7	7.07	6	6.06	20	20.20	
Total	53	53.54	26	26.26	20	20.20	99	100	

$\chi^2 = 71$; rho value=.513, p=.000; Source: Own survey, 2016

The result indicates that about 43.44% of DAs were motivated to see their achievement in their work, while 20.2% of them even reported that the need of achievement in their work made them highly motivating. On the contrary, 36.4 % of DAs were discouraged by the achievements in their work. The statistical result also indicates a significant association between the two variables with the hypothesized sign (rho=513, p=.000), at 1% probability level.

From the result thus achievement is among the determinant factors of DAs' work motivation in the study area. In line with this, a study by Herzberg (1968 cited in Yohannes, 2009) pointed out that to improve motivation and thereby increase staff performance, attention should be given to motivating factors by increasing the individual's sense of achievement and to demonstrate recognition of that achievement. Furthermore, McClelland's (1975 cited in Tesfaye, 2012) motivation theory pointed out that individuals exhibiting the need for achievement have been variously described as possessing a universal positive motivation for competence and effectiveness, the desire to manipulate their environment in order to create something new or at the very least create change.

Feeling of being involved: The study sought to look at the relation feeling of being involved in work process and decision making has with the level of work motivation of DAs. In the current study this variable was hypothesized to have a positive relationship with the work motivation of development agents. The significant association between them was tested using chi-square and spearman's rank correlation and the results are tabulated below.

Table 16. Relationship between feeling of involvement & work motivation of DAs

Involvement	Motivation level						Total		
	Low		Medium		High				
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	Mean
Highly discouraging	21	21.2	1	1.01	0	0	22	22.2	
Discouraging	28	28.3	3	3.03	1	1.01	32	32.3	
Neutral	4	4.04	4	4.04	0	0	8	8,08	2.747
Motivating	0	0	11	11.1	12	12.1	23	23.2	
Highly motivating	0	0	7	7.07	7	7.07	14	14.1	
Total	53	53.54	26	26.26	20	20.2	99	100	

$\chi^2 = .74$, rho value=.254, p=.011

Source: own survey, 2016

Table 16 disclosed that little number of the DAs (14.14%) reported that they are highly motivated by their manager's willingness to let them take decisions and they said that they are usually involved in planning, implementing and evaluating programs and projects related to their job. They suggested that suggestion boxes, meetings and group discussions are a few ways in which DAs can contribute their ideas. However, the majority of participants (54.54%) did report it to be discouraging at all. It would not appear that this is a strong avenue for organization to motivate their employees to greater productivity. They added that they were not given opportunities to provide input with regard to the organization's objectives and standards.

The analysis further revealed there exist a positive association (rho=.254) between feeling of being involved in work process and motivation level of DAs. The p-value is 0.011 and thus, less than the probability level of 0.05 hence establishing a significant relationship between variables. This implies that involvement had a significant effect on motivation of agricultural development agents, that is an improvement in the degree of involvement led to an increase in the DAs' motivation.

Unrealistic work load: The relationship between motivation of DAs and unrealistic workload variable was tested using chi-square and spearman' rank ordered correlation and the results are provided in Table 17 as follows.

Table 17. Relationship between unrealistic workload and motivation of DAs

Work load	Motivation level								
	Low		Medium		High		Total		
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	Mean
Highly discouraging	21	21.22	0	0	0	0	21	21.22	
Discouraging	25	25.25	3	3.03	0	0	28	28.28	
Neutral	3	3.03	6	6.06	1	1.01	10	10.10	2.879
Motivation	4	4.04	12	12.12	6	6.06	22	22.22	
Highly motivation	0	0	5	5.05	13	13.13	18	18.18	
Total	53	53.54	26	26.26	20	20.20	99	100	

$\chi^2 = 49.313$, p=.000; rho value = -0.473, p=.000

Source: Own survey, 2016

Statistical data in Table 17 demonstrates "unrealistic work load" was an important cause discouraging 50% of the respondents to promote high motivation. During the interview session, one respondent stated "*We do a donkey's job and get a beggars pay, while they work like officers and get paid like princes……this is unfair*". Another said, "*We are bombarded by multiple tasks coming from, for example women affairs and education sector. We are also involved in political matters. These disturb our regular work, lead to high workload and in a certain cases to mistrust from the community toward the extension services. We are quarrelling many times with our managers on these things. If we are not involved in these activities, they hold our salary."*

Interestingly, however, a significant percent (40%) of DAs reported that their work load to be both realistic and motivating. The rest of the respondents numbering 10 individuals remained in the neutral position.

The above table further showed unrealistic work load was significant at 1% level and exhibited negative relationship (rho=-0.473) with DAs work motivation. As for the inverse relationship between workload and motivation, it can be stated that when DA begins to perceive both an excessive and sheer amount of work to be done in a given unit of time his or her adjustment to the work is distorted which results in low level of motivation. Concurring findings came from Hussein Shah (2011). Employees carrying unrealistic workloads are not likely to experience adequate levels of motivation for any amount of job.

Conclusion and Recommendation

The result of this research revealed that majority of agricultural development agents were belongs to low level of motivation to work. Though they are the key agents of change in the living standards of thousands of farmers, their level of motivation to work was affected by perceived work burden, extremely low salary, unfavorable work condition, and poor interpersonal and work atmosphere with supervisors. Other aspects include distance of work location; recognition, promotion opportunities, DAs' sense of achievement and inclusion into the decision making process were the factors that this research uncovered to have a vital role in DAs work motivation. Therefore, the study recommended that the management of Agricultural and Natural Resource Development Office in the study area should take note of the following areas: adequate salary, promotion opportunities, description and employees' participation in decision making, recognition and cordial supervision quality for Agricultural development agents. Other recommendation include: realistic work load, work itself, distance, work condition and encouragement for DAs to enhance sense of achievement to reinforce excellent performance that they would like to see more of. The factors in this research are studied based on the current situation of the organization. As the time and economic conditions changes the factors and situations are bound to change as well. Hence Agricultural and Natural Resource office managers, Extension Process Owners, Human Resource Administrators, and Supervisors should conduct periodic assessment to determine the level of DAs' motivation and factors associated with it in Jaldu woreda

References

Abzari, M. 2011. Factors Affecting Employee Motivation in Isfahan Electricity Distribution Company. *Proceedings*, 8 (19)..

Alebachew Dejene & Daniel Temesgen. 2015. Institutional Factors Affecting Work Motivation of Development

Agents: The Case of Wolaita zone, SNNPRS, Ethiopia.

Bennett, R. E., Gottesman, R. L., Rock, D. A., & Cerullo, F. 1993. Influence of behavior perceptions and gender on teachers' judgments of students' academic skill. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 85: 347–356.

Berhanu Gebremedin, Hoekstra, D. and Azage Tekegn. 2006. Commercialization of Ethiopian Agriculture: Extension Service from Input Supplier to Knowledge Broker and Facilitator, Improving Productivity and Market Success of Ethiopian Farmers Project Working Paper, International Livestock Research Institute, Nairobi. Kenya.

Birhanu Ayana Tola. 2011. Assessment of rainwater management practices for sustainable development and rural livelihood improvement in Andode/Maja Micro Watershed, Jaldu District, Oromiya Region, Ethiopia.

CSA (Central Statistical Agency). 2007. Central statistical authority population estimates, CSA, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

Debebe Cheber Bezu, Eric Ndemo Okoyo and Jemal Yousuf Hasen. 2016. Factors Influencing Work Motivation of DAs: The Case of Agarfa and Sinana Districts, Bale Zone Oromiya Regional State, Ethiopia. *International Journal of Agricultural Science Research*, 5 (1): 001-018.

Dessalegn Gachena. 2014. Analyzing Determinants of Development Agents' Motivation in Agricultural Extension Services Provision: A Case from South West Shoa Zone, Oromia Regional State, Ethiopia: An Ordered logit Regression Model approach. *International Journal of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development,* 1(3): 026-030.

Gandhi MK. 2010. Hind Swaraj and other writings. In: Parel AJ (ed) M.K Gandhi: Hind Swaraj and other writings. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Gangadharapppa, H., Pramod, K., and Shiva, K.H. 2007. Gastric floating drug delivery systems: A review. *Indian Journal of Pharmaceuticals Education and Research*, 41(4): 295-305.

Gebrehiwot Weldegebrial Gebru, knife Asayehegn, and Deribe Kaske. 2012. Challenges of Development Agents (DAs) Performance in Technology Dissemination: A Case from South Nation Nationalities and Peoples Regional State (SNNPRS).Ethiopia. *Scholarly Journal of Agricultural Science*, 2(9): 208-216.

Gutu Tesso, Bezabih Emana, and Mengistu Ketema. 2012. Analysis of vulnerability and resilience to climate change induce shocks in North Shewa, Ethiopia. *Journal of Agricultural Science*, 3(6): 871-888.

Haile Mekbib Gebretsadik., Abebaw Degnet. 2012. What Factors Determine the Time Allocation of Agricultural Extension Agents on Farmers, Agricultural Fields? Evidence from Rural Ethiopia". *Journal of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development* .4 (10): 318-329.

Hsiu-fen, L. 2007. Effects of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation on employee knowledge sharing intensions. *Journal of Information Science*, 33(2):135-149.

Kinfe Asayegn, Gebrehiwot Weldegebriel and Deribe, Kaske. 2012. Effectiveness of DAs' performance in agricultural technology dissemination: The case of SNNPR, Ethiopia. *Journal of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development*, 4(17):446-457.

Malhotra, N.K. 2010. Marketing Research, Prentice Hall, Boston.

Marx. 2006. Re-examining work motivation-performance relationship. *Journal human performance*, 2:112-130.http://www.ncbi. nlm. nih.gov/pubmed, Retrieved on September5, 2010.

Mboya, W. 2010. A Model for Determinants of Labour Mobility in the Banking Industry of Tanzania: Employees' Perspective. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Dar Es Salaam Business School, Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania.

Miner, J. 2013. The Rated Importance, Scientific Validity, and Practical usefulness of theories in Organizational Behavior: A Quantitative Review, Academy of Management Learning and Education.

Neuman, W. L. (2011). Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches, 7th Edition. Pearson, Boston, MA, United States.

Rutherford, M. 2010. Job Attitude and Employees Performance of Public Sector Organizations. *GITAM Journal of Management*, 6(2): 66-73.

Shah, H.S. 2011.Workload and Performance of Employees. *Journal of Contemporary Research in Business,* 3(5): 256-267.

Spies, M. 2006. Distance between home and workplace as a factor for job satisfaction in the North-West Russian oil industry. Fennia184 (2):133–149. Helsinki. ISSN 00150010.

Swala, M. 2015. Factors Influencing Employee Motivation in Catholic Church Owned Institutions in Nairobi City County. *Research Journal of Human Resource*, 3(2):11-23.

Tesfaye Getaneh. 2012. Work Motivation and Job Performance of Development Agents in Agro-Pastoral Areas: The Case of Bule Hora District, Ethiopia. MSc Thesis, Haramaya University, Haramaya, Ethiopia.

Tizazu Kassa. 2015. Employee Motivation and its Effects on Employee Retention in Ambo Mineral Water Factory. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Computer Science and Management Studies,* 3(3):123-157.

Toker, B. (2007). Demografik Değişkenlerin İş Tatminine Etkileri: İzmir'deki Beş ve Dört Yıldızlı Otellere

Yönelik Bir Uygulama. Doğuş Üniversitesi Dergisi, 8, 92-107.
Yohannes Mare. 2009. Factors Influencing Work Motivation of Development Agents in Burji and Konso Special Woredas. MSc Thesis, Haramaya University, Haramaya, Ethiopia.