PN-AAM-978

ISN = 29547

9365300/62

Addressing Problems of Middle-Level Management

A Workshop held at the LOFA County Agricultural Development Project.

A field report prepared under AID contract DSAN-C-0065 for USAID/Liberia

Thomas H. Armor

October 1979

DAI
Development Alternatives, Inc. 624 Ninth Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20001

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE iii

BACKGROUND. 1

METHODOLOGY 1

WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES 3

Skills 4
Support. 4
Training 5

CHRONOLOGY OF ACTIVITIES. 5

Pre-Workshop 6
Workshop 7
Post-Workshop. 10

OBSERVATIONS. 10

Skills 11
Support. 13
Training 14

ANNEX A: PROJECT DESCRIPTION A-1

ANNEX B: MANAGEMENT FUNCTIONS RANK ORDER QUESTIONNAIRE B-1

ANNEX C: MANAGERIAL FUNCTIONS CHECKLIST. C-1

ANNEX D: PROBLEMS IDENTIFIED FOR USE IN FORCE FIELD ANALYSIS EXERCISE D-1

ANNEX E: CHARACTERISTICS OF GOOD AND POOR MANAGERS . . .E-1

ANNEX F: ISSUES DISCUSSED IN MEETING BETWEEN PARTICIPANTS AND DIVISION MANAGERS AND DEPUTIES. . . .F-1

ANNEX G: WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS G-1

PREFACE

This report describes the process used to plan and conduct a middle-level management workshop at the Lofa County Agricultural Development Project (LCADP) in Liberia. The description is a response to a project request for documentation of the activities that were undertaken and the process used.

The activities outlined herein were carried out during August 1979. At that time a three-person team consisting of Dr. Thomas Armor, Dr. Peter Weisel and Mr. David Miller, all of Development Alternatives, Inc. (DAI), provided eight person-weeks of management assistance to LCADP. This report focuses on the staff development activities undertaken by Dr. Armor.[1]

The groundwork for the August visit was laid in February 1979, when a four-person team from DAI/RTI and AID/Washington, accompanied by the USAID/Liberia project officer, visited LCADP. At this time the team discussed areas in which IRD Project consulting resources might be productively utilized by LCADP.[2] This visit resulted in a request for an IRD Project team to address two areas of need: (a) middle-level management development; and (b) difficulties confronting LCADP vehicle support and maintenance. The scope of work, team staffing, and scheduling were subsequently agreed upon through correspondence and personal contact during LCADP staff visits to Washington, D.C.

Complete cooperation and support were forthcoming from USAID/Liberia, AID/Washington, and the World Bank Staff in Washington, D.C. While this effort occurred with the collaboration of all institutional actors, it focused primarily on the needs of the field implementation staff.

---

[1] Dr. Weisel assisted with the workshop by examining implementation issues of LCADP and providing this information for use in the workshop. Mr. Miller analyzed LCADP vehicle support operations. His findings and recommendations appear in a separate report.

[2] The IRD Project refers to a contract between DAI/Research Triangle Institute and AID/Washington to provide services in the organization and administration of Integrated Rural Development. See Annex A for a project description.

Previous Page Blank

ADDRESSING PROBLEMS OF MIDDLE-LEVEL MANAGEMENT: A WORKSHOP HELD AT THE LOFA COUNTY AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

BACKGROUND

Good management and organization are largely responsible for LCADP's success to date. Division Managers and Deputy Managers at LCADP were selected for both their substantive expertise and their demonstrated managerial skills. At the next organizational level,[3] however, rapid project growth has not allowed for comparable skill levels across all divisions. Many middle managers have not had opportunities to formally or systematically study and develop their management skills; yet their span of control and general responsibilities have increased in size and complexity as the project has steadily grown.

The senior LCADP staff recognize the need to devote time and resources to the continuing development of middle management capability. This viewpoint was evident in the February discussions and was highlighted by project involvement in a subsequent World Bank sponsored survey of management development needs in West African projects, as well as in discussions with the consulting team about potential future management training activities.

METHODOLOGY

The technical assistance methodology used with LCADP is referred to as an organization development approach. The

---

[3] Comprised of middle management personnel, it is referred to as the Officer Level.

essence of this approach is to help a client project to better understand its own organizational behavior processes, and to undertake collaboratively planned changes when indicated. Thus, any intervention such as training or workshops must be both collaboratively planned and soundly based on real current data about the organization.

Another important aspect of this approach is the belief that true and lasting solutions to any organization's problems must be developed by the organization itself, with third parties acting only to facilitate problem-solving efforts. The workshop activities, therefore, emphasized management as a process of solving problems rather than as the specification of a pre-determined set of principles or rules for good management.

The DAI team's activities at LCADP clearly reflected the organization development approach to consultation. Most of the first week spent at the project was devoted to meetings with various LCADP staff to obtain timely and specific descriptions of management development issues that focused on the middle management level of the project. With the assistance of the Training Division, this information was then used to design a series of activities that would address these issues. The resulting preliminary model was then reviewed with the senior project management staff. Their concurrence, participation and commitment resulted in a common "ownership" of the workshop.

During the workshop, activities and exercises either directly or indirectly involved Division Managers and Deputies. This supported the effort to integrate workshop activities with ongoing project management actions.

Subsequent to the workshop, Dr. Armor met with all Division Managers and Deputies to review the activities of the workshop and discuss the next steps each Division might take to support the new learnings of that Division's workshop participants. Interest was expressed in further DAI involvement focused at the Division Manager and Deputy levels.

WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES

The staff development workshop was aimed at three major objectives: (1) to develop new managerial skills; (2) to develop the organizational understanding and capacity necessary to support the use of those skills; and (3) to increase the LCADP Training Division's capacity to conduct management training. Each objective is discussed below.

Skills

Interviews were conducted with Division Managers and their Deputies to identify appropriate managerial skills to focus upon during the workshop. The following skills were identified as important:

- Organizing and managing time;
- Setting objectives and determining priorities;
- Delegating authority;
- Expanding approaches to staff motivation;
- Increasing two-way communication;
- Planning and following-up staff activities;

- Diagnosing and identifying solutions to problems; and
- Identifying effective approaches to decisionmaking.

An explicit objective of the workshop was to relate these skills directly to the participants' own job experiences. Thus, even though these items were initially identified by a higher level of management, they were introduced and discussed during the workshop in terms and with examples developed by the participants themselves. Whenever possible, issues were explored in relation to current concerns and were used to define clear and workable options for making practical management decisions.

Support

Experience has shown that most management development efforts are severely diminished when treated as individually-focused training exercises apart from the organizational context where the new skills are to be used. With this in mind, a special effort was made to relate workshop activities to the organizational processes that would eventually support the new skills. Thus, in a sense, the organization was also a workshop participant.

An important factor in achieving this objective was the involvement of Division Managers and Deputies, as well as Senior Project Management, in the planning and, to some degree, the actual activities of the workshop itself.

In order to design workshop activities that would accurately reflect the organizational context in which the project operates, it was necessary to take into account the dif-

ferences between the seven divisions. The divisions vary in function, size, location of activities, interdependence with other divisions, and historical development, thus creating special needs for each division. Meetings were held with each Division Manager and Deputy to discuss the management issues facing their division and how Division Management could support and benefit from middle management participation in the workshop.

Training

Unless consultant efforts are integrated into a project's own training capacity they have very little long-term impact. The Training Division shared the team's view that management development efforts should be approached as an ongoing process and not simply as a single event. With this in mind, the DAI team encouraged the Training Division to collaboratively plan and help conduct the workshop. This effort focused on decisions about workshop content, modification of exercises and theory input, meetings with Senior Project Management to discuss workshop content and participants, and collection of questionniare data. At the conclusion of the workshop all resource materials used were left with the Training Division. This approach provides the Training Division with a better basis for conducting similar workshops in the future.

CHRONOLOGY OF ACTIVITIES

The use of organization development methods to address the three objectives occurred before, during, and after the

one-week workshop. The sequence and nature of activity during these three periods is briefly outlined below.

Pre-Workshop (August 13-18)

During this period, activities focused around interviews with Division Managers and their Deputies (as well as with the Deputy Project Manager).[4] From these interviews the specific objectives for the workshop were developed, and the role of the consultants was clarified. There was general concensus among interviewees on the areas of importance, though initially there were some differences of opinion concerning the most appropriate approach to pursue. Some Division Managers and Deputies were supportive of the concern for an organization development emphasis, while others preferred that they be presented with a list of management concerns from which they could select a training schedule.

Input from the subordinates to the workshop participants was also considered important. A meeting was arranged with several field Aides from the Agriculture and Commercial Divisions at the Kolahun Farmer Training Center. These Aides were representative of the project staff level that reported directly to the Officer Level.

The meeting was quite useful, though the most salient point was made indirectly: the Aides had difficulty discussing management issues apart from highly individual decisions that affected them. The team was unable to convince

---

[4] In this report the Deputy Project Manager refers to Mr. Jeremiah Tulay. Shortly after the visit of the DAI team Mr. Tulay was made Project Manager.

Aides that the object of the visit was not to solve their specific concerns (for example, more and better rainwear), but rather to help the project develop a more effective and responsive process for dealing with such concerns. This experience provided valuable insights into the potential difficulties of direct feedback between staff levels of the organization.[5]

During this week, advice and support from the Acting Training and Development Officer was constantly available. Additionally, the Deputy Project Manager was involved in discussing the objectives derived from the interviews, setting the agenda and schedule, and identifying workshop participants.

Workshop (August 20-24)

After making introductions and outlining the weeks's schedule, the team reviewed the philosophy and assumptions basic to the approach that would be followed to management development activities. It was emphasized that the team's role was to facilitate the participant's learning from their own experience, and that the workshop would draw upon that experience in developing a working definition of "management."

The first exercise illustrated various methods of decisionmaking, particularly the dynamics of group consensus decisions. In preparation for this exercise nine Division

---

5 This prepared the team for some things which happened later. For example, difficulties in de-personalizing issues and approaching them as common problems for joint solution were raised by workshop participants in reference to meeting with the Division Managers and Deputies.

Managers and Deputies had been asked to rank order seven management functions based on their importance to the project (see Annex B). The workshop participants were then asked to predict that rank order through a consensus decision. In addition to identifying the dynamics of group decisionmaking, the actual rank ordering of the functions by the Managers and Deputies provoked an animated discussion.

The second exercise helped participants to analyze how they used their time, with emphasis on planning and follow-up. The participants also reviewed a list of managerial and supervisory functions and indicated those they felt to be their own responsibility and those their immediate superiors carried out.

Day Two began with a planning exercise that illustrated some of the issues in planning and executing plans, particularly when the two efforts are approached separately. Officers from the Land Planning Division then described their Division's weekly planning and follow-up cycle. This initiated a discussion of coordination between Divisions and touched upon the participants' anxiety about a direct meeting with Division Managers and Deputies as part of the workshop.

Later, the participants compared checklists of managerial and supervisory functions (designed to indicate which functions they carried out, which their superiors carried out and which were not applicable to their Division, see Annex C) with the lists as prepared by their Managers and Deputies. They noted those functions that were not clearly in agreement. The remainder of the day was spent working with a problem-solving method (Force Field Analysis) using an example provided by the participants (selected problems

identified by participants as important are presented in Annex D; the exercise was designed to help analyze a problem and then develop action steps to be taken toward its solution).

During Day Three the Force Field Analysis exercise was continued, with each participant working on an issue from his own job. This exercise was then applied, with the entire workshop participating, to the general question of "how to change people's behavior." The latter part of the day was devoted to a case presentation and discussion led by Dr. Weisel. Based on his personal experience with an agricultural development project in East Africa, the presentation dealt with the need for farmer participation in decisionmaking.

On the fourth day, after discussions emphasizing the participants' own style, a list was developed of the characteristics of good and poor managers. At the request of the participants this list was reproduced so that they could ask their own subordinates to rate them according to the characteristics (see Annex E). Issues of communication were then discussed and illustrated by a short exercise. In the afternoon Mr. Milller met with workshop participants to discuss management principles.

During the final day of the workshop an exercise demonstrating a modified and simplified form of CPM/PERT was performed. Several Division Managers and Deputies then joined the workshop to discuss issues previously raised by the participants (see Annex F). For a brief period the Deputy Project Director sat in as an observer. The remainder of the day was used for general discussion and review of the week's activities. Unsigned written critiques of the most

and least useful activities were also completed and collected.

Post-Workshop (August 24-28)

Following completion of the workshop, DAI staff met with the senior project management to review the week's activities and discuss future activities. A similar workshop for the Manager/Deputy level was jointly discussed as an appropriate future activity. The details were to be worked out by correspondence following a more specific proposal.

On August 27, Dr. Armor reviewed the week's activities with the Managers and Deputies of each Division. Copies of the materials used were distributed and discussed, and future Division support for the new learnings was identified. In addition, the Division Managers and Deputies were presented with the possibility of a workshop with themselves as participants, an idea which received strong support.

Upon returning to Monrovia, Dr. Armor briefed USAID Mission staff on the work accomplished during the two-week period as well as proposed future activities.

OBSERVATIONS

This concluding section highlights some observations of the workshop activities exercise with LCADP and the significance of the workshop for improving project implementation. The observations are clustered under three headings corre-

sponding to the workshop objectives. Those objectives were: (1) developing new managerial skills; (2) developing the organizational understanding and capacity necessary to support the use of those skills; and (3) increasing the LCADP Training Division's capacity to conduct management training.

Skills

The issues which arose in relation to six of the skill areas comprising this objective are presented below.

- Time Management: The senior project management was concerned that their staff too often perceived time as an unlimited resource. Common results of such an attitude are the failure to meet critical deadlines and the inability to coordinate activities with others in a timely manner. Thus, efforts were made to increase awareness of the need to think of time as a limited good which must be managed in an economical manner. Follow-up by senior staff -- through continued attention to the scheduling of and appropriate use of time -- is needed in this area.

- Setting Priorities: Force Field Analysis presented participants with a step-by-step procedure for identifying clear operational objectives and defining action steps arranged by priority. In their evaluation of workshop activities, the participants cited this exercise as one of the most useful.

  During a discussion of objectives and priorities, the participants noted that their pursuit of agreed-upon objectivs and priorities was sometimes limited by their superiors' attempts to redirect their efforts. They expressed a desire for more autonomy with superiors providing guidance and advice rather than giving direct orders. A better clarification of these issues -- focusing on the identification of those areas over which middle level management has control as well as those areas over which senior management properly exercises authority -- would help alleviate frustrations resulting from these concerns.

- Delegation: For many participants, the prospect of managing or supervising the activities of others had far less appeal than carrying out the work themselves. The perception seemed common that to not physically do a task was an indicator of poor performance. An important question for the project is to ask if such an attitude might implicitly permeate higher management levels and thus reward activity per se over the effective management of the activities of others.

- Motivation: This issue was first approached in discussions arising out of the "Characteristics of Good and Poor Managers" exercise. These discussions highlighted what motivated the participants and led them to explore how they were or were not providing positive motivation to their own subordinates.

  A second approach to this issue was touched upon in the discussion that included Managers and Deputies on the last day of the workshop. At this time the use of positive incentives was explored, with emphasis on how the Officers could directly employ such incentives with their own subordinates.

- Communication: The importance that the participants placed on developing two-way communication between themselves and their subordinates was evidenced by their desire to be rated by their subordinates using the "Characteristics of Good and Poor Managers" list. Additionally the meeting between the participants and the Managers and Deputies illustrated the usefulness of and need for two-way communication flows.

  Important follow-up work can be done by the senior staff in: (a) monitoring the extent to which incomplete communication between divisions is a bottleneck to project activities being undertaken in a timely manner; (b) determining where inadequate vertical communication between levels of staff is causing implementation breakdowns; and (c) analyzing the extent to which inaccurate (as opposed to incomplete) communiction is a problem. Approaches (presented at the workshop) to these problems need to be pursued and can be reviewed during the visit of the consulting team tentatively scheduled for early 1979.

- Decisionmaking: To identify effective approaches to decisionmaking, the Officers compared individual and group decisionmaking. It has been demonstrated elsewhere -- and exemplified by the workshop participants -- that decisions made through groups are frequently more acceptable and more appropriate than those made individually. The most important point resulting from the discussion of this issue was the clear desire for increased involvement of project staff at all levels. The effectivenes of centralized project decisionmaking was questioned; participants felt many decisions routinely referred to higher organizational levels could be resolved more satisfactorily at a lower level.

The major observation regarding skills is that the workshop did not transfer skills so much as it allowed recognition of existing skills and the reorientation required to more fully utilize them.

Support

The workshop participants seemed somewhat uneasy about meeting with their superiors. They supported a meeting which would develop better communication and improve overall relations, but were concerned that the meeting would instead be confined to specific and individual problems rather than broader management issues.

In contrast, the Division Managers and Deputies felt confident that a meeting could prove useful and effective. They felt that any anxiety on the part of the participants was unfounded, and assured the team that the participants would not be taken to task for any statements they might make. With this assurance, a meeting was endorsed by both the participants and the Divisions Managers and Deputies.

The reliance on authority relationships for motivating people was a critical issue raised in several forms during

the workshop and was a central issue discussed in the meeting with Managers and Deputies. There was some confusion about the use of authority and the use of discipline and perhaps the misuse of both for motivation.[6] Such a misunderstanding about the purpose of disciplinary action perhaps contributed to a statement often expressed by the participants -- that motivation as a management skills was often simply reduced to the use of authority.

Finally, the notion that the most effective managers "work for their subordinates" became a central management issue. As noted, approaches to increased two-way communication, improved support to subordinates, increased coaching and counseling, the provision of positive incentives, and increased participation in decisionmaking were all explored for the contribution they could make to improved management. A significant first step was the intent of the participants to have their subordinates rate their performance against a list of characteristics of good managers, and seek approaches to improve those areas where deficiencies are identified.

Training

As a result of the workshop activities, and in response to expressed desires by the workshop participants, the Training Division is planning a short two-day seminar for the supervisory level staff, (e.g., senior agricultural extension aides and senior commerical aides). This will be a

---

6 The Deputy Project Manager made an astute comment in this regard after the workshop, noting that the role of disciplinary action as a management control method was perhaps being misunderstood as a management motivation method. He hoped to clarify this issue in future meetings.

brief introduction to some of the relevant concepts discussed in the workshop as well as some use of the appropriate exercise material.

As noted, all the exercise materials as well as supplementary training/background materials were left with the Training Division for their future use. Opportunities for collaboration with other local training staffs in the area, most notably the Bong County Project's Training Division, were also discussed. There is a strong possibility that the two-day supervisory seminar will be conducted jointly with the Bong Project. It has been tentatively scheduled for late fall 1979.

The real test of improved planning capacity will be the execution of these planned activities. However, staff interest, new experiences and an inventory of new materials all suggest an improved capacity.

ANNEX A

IRD PROJECT DESCRIPTION

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF INTEGRATED RURAL DEVELOPMENT AID PROJECT 936-5300

Organizational arrangements and management practices are often major determinants of project success, yet they tend to be given low priority in implementation. This project is an attempt to raise that priority by selectively focusing on those projects most prone to organizational and administrative difficulties -- Integrated Rural Development Projects.

In September 1978, Development Alternatives, Inc., and Research Triangle Institute signed a four-year contract with USAID to assist donor agencies and host governments with the organization and administration of integrated rural development. The scope of this contract includes IRD projects of all sizes and types. Moreover, it provides for flexibility in staffing and timing.

The project supports rural development efforts by simultaneously addressing two objectives. The first objective is to provide field staff with technical assistance in the organization and administration of ongoing IRD projects. The second is to learn more about what organizational arrangements and

****

management actions have contributed to project success. Each objective is discussed below.

Assisting the Field

The technical assistance provided by this contract has two dimensions. The Development Administration facet emphasizes formal organizational structures and management procedures. This includes financial management, mechanisms for interagency coordination and beneficiary participation, incentives and disincentives that affect staff behavior, and other organization design concerns. The Organization Development facet emphasizes informal, interpersonal interaction. This includes leadership styles, multiple objectives and views held by different actors, conflict resolution processes, goal clarification and other behavioral and attitudinal concerns.

Short-term assistance teams have been fielded with members skilled in both approaches. The work of these teams has produced project-specific field workshops, written assessments of operational procedures, and a report of project experience to be used in a successor project. Each product is tailored to the specific needs of particular field situations, and visits have ranged from a few days to six weeks. Often two visits are used to diagnose and then deal with implementation needs. Ideally, this will lead to continuous long-term involvement with selected projects as this assistance becomes identified as an ongoing component of project implementation.

Advancing the Art

The second objective of this project is to learn more about what organizational mechanisms and management decisions improve the chances of project success in different situations. Such a contribution requires merging the lessons of the field with the literature of organization and management (O & M). This is being accomplished through a state-of-the-art paper which will be based on the literatures of both O & M and development, as well as on the lessons gained from direct project experience.

During field visits, an attempt is made to relate the general knowledge of the organization and administration of IRD to the particular situation encountered on site. This supports a two-way learning process that allows both the consultants and the field personnel to gain from the experience.

Project Outputs

The major outputs of this project will be: (1) direct assistance to project implementors; (2) a state-of-the-art paper; (3) a list of consultants skilled in the O & M of IRD; and (4) either a summary conference to be held during the final year of the contract or a series of workshops or conferences to present the findings of the Project.

ANNEX B

MANAGEMENT FUNCTIONS RANK ORDER QUESTIONNAIRE

ANNEX B

MANAGEMENT FUNCTIONS RANK ORDER QUESTIONNAIRE

The following list of seven management functions was presented to Managers and Deputies to rank order by importance to the project. The resulting composite ranking was then used as a task for workshop participants to predict in a decisionmaking exercise.

* * * * * * * * *

Please rank order the following management functions as to their importance for people managing activities in the LCADP. Place a 1 in the space next to the most important, a 2 in the space next to the second most important and so on for all seven items.

_____	Decisionmaking	(1)*
_____	Coordinating with relevant others	(4)
_____	Directing subordinates	(5)
_____	Planning activities and use of time	(2)
_____	Following-up with subordinates	(6)
_____	Coaching and helping subordinates	(7)
_____	Setting clear and consistent priorities	(3)

---

* Composite rank order obtained from nine Division Managers and/or Deputies.

ANNEX C

MANAGERIAL FUNCTIONS CHECKLIST

ANNEX C

MANAGERIAL FUNCTIONS CHECKLIST

The following list of Managerial functions was given to Managers and Deputies who were asked to indicate which functions they carried out, which functions they expected their Officiers (or Officer level staff) to carry out and which were not applicable to their Division. The same task was then given to each of the workshop participants. Finally, the workshop participants were asked to compare their lists with those of their Division's Manager and/or Deputy. The columns to the right of each item indicate how many workshop participants felt that there was significant confusion about who should perform the function when making this comparison, as well as the percentage of the total number of participants.

* * * * * * * * * *

Managerial Function	Number
Conduct interviews in selecting new employees	3
Submit periodic reports on the performance of my employees	4
Contact employees who are excessively absent or tardy	5
Conduct exit intervies for employees who leave	0
Maintain records on employee output and/or production quotas	2
Determine and control the quality of work	4
Maintain group morale	0
Evaluate my own performance as a manager	1
Conduct group meetings with my subordinates	4
Conduct on-the-job training for new employees	4
Resolve conflicts among subordinates	6

Managerial Function	Number
Conduct performance appraisal interviews with subordinates	1
Determine who will be promoted and when	1
Set goals and assign work for each of my subordinates	2
Determine overtime schedules and decide who shall work	2
Give remedial training to employees whose work is below par	2
Dismiss or fire employees for poor performance	0
Give orientation to new employees on policy and procedures	1
Delegate responsibilities to others	4
Recommend salary increases (both amount and date effective	0
Organize and direct the work of subordinates	3
Develop job descriptions for my subordinates	3
Maintain personnel records for employees in my work unit	1
Counsel employees on personal and work-related problems	0
Help subordinates plan their work	3
Initiate transfers of my employees from my unit to another	2
Schedule vacations of my employees	1
Perform work of subordinates when quantity or quality of work lags	1
Conduct disciplinary interviews with subordinates	0
Communicate policies, methods and procedures to my subordinates	2

Managerial Function	Number
Decide when a new job position (employee) is needed in my work unit	0
Give warning notifications or suspensions to employees	2

ANNEX D

PROBLEMS IDENTIFIED FOR USE IN FORCE FIELD ANALYSIS EXERCISE

ANNEX D

PROBLEMS IDENTIFIED FOR USE IN FORCE FIELD ANALYSIS EXERCISE

The following items are representative of the problems identified by workshop participants for use in the Force Field Analysis exercise. This exercise was designed to help analyze and redefine a problem and then develop action steps to be taken toward its solution.

* * * * * * * * * *

Achieving targets

Control of my subordinates

Bosses not following procedure

Obtaining the influence of the local leaders and their full participation in our job so as to achieve our goal.

Management non-visitation to my area of assignment

Lack of transportation

Manager or Deputy giving direct instructions to my subordinates without my knowledge

What should be the relationship between a supervisor and his subordinates at work and at home as well

How to follow procedures

How to get rid of seedlings

Working relation in terms of having meetings with supervisor and subordinates

Better transportation conditions

How to make my aides write and submit accurate reports

Maintain group morale

Delegate responsibilities to others

Difficulty in getting farmers to attend farmer training programs

How to work with the farmers

ANNEX E

CHARACTERISTICS OF GOOD AND POOR MANAGERS

ANNEX E

CHARACTERISTICS OF GOOD AND POOR MANAGERS

The following list of characteristics of good and poor managers and supervisors was developed by workshop participants. Multiple copies of the list were prepared for participants' use in gaining feedback from their subordinates about their own style.

* * * * * * * * * *

Characteristics of Good Managers/Supervisors

Friendly attitude toward subordinates

Concern for subordinates

Hard working himself

Listens to suggestions of subordinates

Makes good plans

Acknowledges/recognizes subordinates' good work

Gives guidance and counseling

Respects rules himself

Provides real incentives for good work

Responds to subordinates' requests

Must be honest and truthful with subordinates

Should be qualified and experienced

Trains subordinates, shares their knowledge

Delegates power and authority

Gives good and helpful examples

Is a good representative for his organization

Flexible, open to change

Characteristics of Poor Managers/Supervisors

Does not involve subordinates in making plans

Gives orders without asking for subordinates' ideas

Too impressed with his own position or power

Favoritism, nepotistic (tribalistic)

Lack of confidence in subordinates

Wrong skills for job (misplaced)

Fails to follow up

Mixes social life with job

Too much scolding in front of others

Has conflicts of interest

Not creative

Does not listen to subordinates

Gives wrong information to subordinates

Does not observe time

Does not easily accept new ideas

Quarrelsome

Good Job

Attractive salaries

Assistance is available

Safe working conditions

Adequate facilities

Free flow of communication

Adequate training available

Well planned and organized

Includes adequate authority and accountability

Proper division of labor

Makes good use of time

ANNEX F

ISSUES DISCUSSED IN MEETING

BETWEEN PARTICIPANTS AND DIVISION MANAGERS AND DEPUTIES

ANNEX F

ISSUES DISCUSSED IN MEETING

BETWEEN PARTICIPANTS AND DIVISION MANAGERS AND DEPUTIES

The following items were discussed during the "between levels" meeting on the fifth day of the workshop. Approximately 18 of the participants were able to attend and approximately six Divisional Managers and Deputies were able to attend.

A. Increasing two-way communication between project levels and divisions:

- More frequent and regularly scheduled contact;
- All officer level meetings (with Management level observer/reporter);
- Review the timing of "between Division" meetings (Are they timely for the increasing interdependence?);
- Is the occasional need for extraordinary interdivisional meetings recognized and considered;
- Consider publication of an all project newsletter on regular basis; and
- More follow-up on memo distribution.

B. Too much reliance on authority for motivation:

- Share more information on how and why targets are set;
- Recognize diverse problem solving methods necessary to achieve objectives;
- More information and education at all levels about divisional and project structure/organization;
- Development of more positive incentives for job performance; and
- Evaluation, feedback and counseling of subordinate staff.

ANNEX G

WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

ANNEX G

WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

Name	Title	Division
BANYOH, A. T.	L P Officer	Land Planning
BRYANT, Mulbah	CO/Zorzor	Commercial
DORBOR, Joe J.	Electrician (Chief)	Administration
GOE, Jacob J.		Administration
GOLAKAI, Sylvanus	Asst. Technician	SSU
HARRIS, D. Solo	AEO/Kolahun	Agriculture
KAMARA, Gbarwa M.	P/E Aide	Planning/Evaluation
KENNEDY, Jallah	AEO/Zorzor	Agriculture
KESSELE, James D.	Procurement Officer	Administration
KOIJEE, Fayia D.	CO/Foya	Commercial
KOINIG, Tom J.	AEO/Foya	Agriculture
KORTU, Stephen Kpaka	Training Officer	Training
KPAKOLA, J.	AEO/Voinjama	Agriculture
MERRIAM, Martin Sebe	CO/Kolahun	Commercial
RICHARDS, Daniel	Bookkeeper (Senior)	Finance
SAMOLU, Charles B.	Training Officer	Training
SIRLEAF, Mamadi B.	Road Supervisor	Land Planning
STUBBLEFIELD, J. M.	Assistant Chief Mechanic	Administration
TARNUE, James	Bookkeeper	Finance

Name	Title	Division
THOMAS, Alieuo	Chief Mechanic	Administration
TOLBERT, Thomas J.	Lab Technician	SSU
YENNEGO, D. Kolubah	CO/Voinjama	Commercial

OTHER DOCUMENTS AVAILABLE FROM THE IRD PROJECT

I. FIELD REPORTS

1. Rural Development Strategies in Thailand: A Review of the Organization and Administration of Rural Development for AID, by Donald R. Mickelwait, Charles A. Murray, and Alan Roth (June 1979).

2. Organizing and Managing Technical Assistance: Lessons from the Maasai Range Management Project, by George Honadle with Richard McGarr (October 1979).

3. Management Assistance to LCADP Transportation Logistics: Observations and Recommendations, by David W. Miller (October 1979).

4. Community Based Integrated Rural Development (CBIRD) in the Special Territory of Aceh, Indonesia, by Jerry VanSant with Peter F. Weisel (October 1979).

5. Honduras Small Farmer Technologies: A Review of the Organization and Administration of Rural Development for USAID, by Richard L. Smith, Donald R. Jackson and John F. Hallen, with George Honadle and Robert af Klinteberg (October 1979). Also in Spanish.

6. Addressing Problems of Middle Level Management: A Workshop Held at the Lofa County Agricultural Development Project, by Thomas H. Armor (October 1979).

7. Coordination and Implementation at Bula-Minalabac: An Example of the Structure and Process of Integrated Rural Development, by James A. Carney, Jr., George H. Honadle and Thomas H. Armor (March 1980)

8. An Information System for the Rural Area Development - Rapti Zone Project, by David D. Gow (May 1980).

9. Implementing Capacity-Building In Jamaica: Field Experience in Human Resource Development, by George Honadle, Thomas H. Armor, Jerry VanSant and Paul Crawford (September 1980).

10. Supporting Field Management: Implementation Assistance to the LCADP in Liberia, by George Honadle and Thomas H. Armor (October 1980).

11. Institutional Options for the Mandara Area Development Project, by A.H. Barclay, Jr. and Gary Eilerts (October 1980).

12. Supporting Capacity Building in the Indonesia Provincial Development Program, by Jerry VanSant, Sofian Effendy, Mochtar Buchori, Gary Hansen, and George Honadle (February 1981).

13. Management Support to the Jamaica Ministry of Agriculture Second Integrated Rural Development Project, by Jerry VanSant, Thomas Armor, Robert Dodd, and Beth Jackson (April 1981).

14. The Abyei Rural Development Project: An Assessment of Action Research in Practice, by Gene M. Owens, A.H. Barclay, Jr., Edwin G. Charle, and Donald S. Humpal (May 1981).

15. The Botswana Rural Sector Grant: An Assessment After One Year, by Roger J. Poulin and others (November 1981).

16. Planning for the Communal First Development Areas in Botswana: A Framework, by A.H. Barclay, Jr. (November 1981).

17. Differing Agendas: The Politics of IRD Project Design in Panama, by David Gow, John Bishop, Edwin Charle, Robert Hudgens, Joseph Recinos, and Humberto Rojas (July 1981).

18. Institutional Analysis and Design for Ecuador's Rural Development Secretariat, by Donald R. Jackson with Alex Barril (October 1981).

II. STATE-OF-THE-ART PAPERS

Integrated Rural Development: Making It Work?, by George Honadle, Elliott R. Morss, Jerry VanSant and David D. Gow (July 1980). (a preliminary state-of-the-art paper.)

Integrated Rural Development: Making It Work?, executive summary, by George Honadle, Elliott R. Morss, Jerry VanSant, and David D. Gow (July 1980).

Executive summary available in French and Spanish:

Developpement Rural Integre: Le Faire Reussir?, Sommaire Executif (July 1980).

Desarrollo Rural Integrado: Puede Tener Exito?, Resumen Ejecutivo (July 1980).

III. RESEARCH NOTES

1. Integrated Rural Development: Nine Critical Implementation Problems, by Elliott R. Morss and David D. Gow (February 1981).

2. Implementation Problems in Integrated Rural Development: A Review of 21 USAID Projects, by Paul Crawford (June 1981).

IV. WORKING PAPERS

#1. Rapid Reconnaissance Approaches To Organizational Analysis for Development Administration, by George Honadle (December 1979).

#2. Integrated Rural Development in Botswana: The Village Area Development Programme, 1972-1978, by Hugh Snyder (December 1979)

#3. Technical Assistance for IRD: A Management Team Strategy, by Donald R. Mickelwait (September 1980).

#4. Technical Assistance for IRD: A Field Team Perspective, by Jerry Silverman (forthcoming)

#5. Technical Assistance for IRD: A Counterpart's Perspective, by Soesiladi (June 1981).

#6. Using Organization Development in Integrated Rural Development, by Thomas H. Armor (June 1981).

#7. IRD in Colombia: Making It Work, by Donald R. Jackson, Paul Crawford, Humberto Rojas, and David D. Gow (June 1981).

#8. Fishing for Sustainability: The role of Capacity Building in Development Administration, by George Honadle (June 1981).

#9. Beyond the Rhetoric of Rural Development Participation: How Can It Be Done?, by David D. Gow and Jerry VanSant (June 1981).

#10. Building Capacity for Decentralization in Egypt: Some Perspectives, edited by Tjip Walker (October 1981).

#11. Water User Associations: A Capacity Building Approach to Organization and Management Issues, by Gene Owens and George Honadle (forthcoming).