

Training Rural Development Managers

MERVYN J. MISAJON*

Poor program administration and poor condition of services are two major reasons for the failures of rural development programs. These shortcomings point to the need for an improved administrative capability through trained manpower adept in planning, managing, and operating rural development efforts particularly at the field level. Although training is one approach for improving administrative capability, proper identification of training needs is vital to come up with an appropriate training design suited to the peculiarities of the areas and the traditional as well as actual tasks performed by rural development managers. Only by identifying these needs can training programs imbibe the knowledge, skills, and values required by today's and tomorrow's rural development managers.

Introduction

This paper focuses on the training needs of rural development managers. Specifically, it looks into the traditional as well as the actual tasks and roles performed by today's managers and identifies concepts, skills, and attitudes, necessary for successful project implementation. It then suggests the appropriate approach to training and its subsequent evaluation.

The Lack of Rural Development Managers

Scholars and practitioners of rural development today are concerned about the failure of programs to bring about significant improvements in rural life (McCallum 1982; FAO 1975; Lele 1975). Rural poverty, for instance, has persisted both in absolute and relative terms. Furthermore, some studies indicate that, given the tremendous financial investments in such programs by national governments and external donors, the impact on absolute poverty has been unexpectedly marginal and in some cases, have actually increased the inequalities and reinforced the preexisting inegalitarian rural social structures (Inayatullah 1973).

Many reasons have been raised for the failure of these rural development programs. They can be broadly categorized into those pertaining to the program itself, its clients, the implementing organization(s), and the environment. The

*Dean, College of Management, University of the Philippines in the Visayas, and Commission on Audit (COA) Professorial Chair holder, 1989-1990.

various reasons advanced in these categories have a common thread running through, namely: the management factor.

The poor administration of government-sponsored programs has been largely responsible for the failure of such programs to achieve their objectives (McCalum 1982). Avasthi and Maheswari (1966) have called it an *administrative lag* — the imbalance that exists between aspirations and performance and, consequently, constitutes a major obstacle to national development.

One requisite of management or administrative capability is the presence of trained manpower to plan and implement projects. However, in most developing countries today, there is an acute shortage of trained manpower. This has been viewed as a critical deficiency by the World Bank, Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), and other organizations and foundations that are committed to, and involved in, rural development efforts.

There are various reasons for the absence of trained manpower in developing countries. First, the tremendous expansion of investments in agriculture and rural development in many countries has exacerbated the manpower scarcities for planning and implementing projects (Israel 1978). The World Bank in 1975 described the supply of indigenous supervisory and managerial staff as chronically short in most developing countries. It also viewed the shortage as perhaps the most serious obstacle to large-scale rural development efforts.

Another reason is the poor conditions of service. Salaries for government employees are generally low (Jiggins 1977; Maddick 1963). The low salaries often affect the quality of personnel recruited. Most talented managers are either pirated away by private businesses (who offer better pay) or make a conscious effort to join such corporations. Related to salaries are poor promotion prospects and the lack of job security. It is generally accepted that promotion in government service is slow and that the systems of rewards are poor. In some countries, employees are still arbitrarily dismissed (Maddick 1963). All of these circumstances lead to a rapid turn-over of personnel and a generally low level of commitment to rural development.

Another reason is that technical personnel have been promoted through the inexorable process of seniority into positions of management for which they are often ill-prepared or ill-equipped to handle. This is the usual case of an agricultural technician being promoted into a supervisory position.

The need for trained manpower to staff agricultural and rural development efforts cannot be overlooked. For example, the Rockefeller Foundation noted that, in the development sectors where it has been involved, i.e., agriculture, health, and education, technology transfer impediments have not been the major problem affecting program effectiveness. Rather, a pervasive managerial

deficiency has been in evidence at all levels. This situation also demonstrates that the growth of foreign assistance availabilities has added substantial burdens to the managerial requirements of existing national programs.

Uma Lele (1975) and Emezi (1979) also point out that low-level persons are frequently entrusted with the major task of effecting rural development. Available manpower in local areas is often low in quality, limited in experience, and lacking in the requisite training demanded by rural development. Furthermore, professionals in charge of projects are often technicians who lack training and experience in administration and management. Hence, they carry an incomplete picture of the overall objectives, requirements, complexities, and possibilities of rural development programs.

The existing shortage of skilled manpower to plan, manage, and operate rural development projects, especially at the field level, has been a major reason for slow progress in implementing much needed decentralization of project administration (Rondinelli and Ruddle 1978; FAO 1975; McCallum 1982).

Who Is the Rural Development Manager?

The term "manager" has been used to mean anyone who is responsible for subordinates and other organizational resources (Stoner 1982). Managers can be classified by their level in the organization, i.e., first line, middle, and top — and by the range of organizational activities for which they are responsible, i.e., functional and general managers. The lowest level in an organization at which individuals are responsible for the work of others is called first line or first-level management. First-line managers direct operating employees only; they do not supervise other managers. Middle-level managers, on the other hand, direct the activities of other managers and sometimes also those of operating employees. A principal responsibility of middle managers is to depict the activities that implement the policies of the organization. Top management, composed of a comparatively small group of executives, establishes operating policies and guides the organization's interactions with its environment. The functional manager is responsible for only one organizational activity, while a general manager oversees a complex unit and is responsible for all the activities of that unit.

Earlier, most development literature called for the training of the agricultural manager. In 1980, for example, the FAO observed that little has been done to provide training for those who administer agricultural development programs in developing countries and, if there were some, the orientation of such training was highly technical. Thus, the EDI (1979), summarized the job requirements and training needs of project managers in agriculture as comprising:

Public Relations	Coordination
Financial Control	Dealing with the Bureaucracy
Budgeting Procedures	Recruitment
Organization	Procurement Control
Administration	Work Planning

The concern for an agricultural manager is quite obvious since most, if not all, of the developing countries' economies are agriculturally based. This sectoral view was later modified to include a necessary understanding of the development process in agricultural development. Such modification laid the foundation for a rural development view which has agricultural development as a necessary component. It is now recognized, for example, that a mere increase in agricultural productivity does not necessarily translate into overall rural development.

So, who is the rural development manager? One obvious answer is: people who are managing programs and projects in the rural areas. The fact that they work in rural areas is a necessary prerequisite, but it is more than just physical location that determines this description. The connotations are numerous and they relate to the following:

- (1) Different tasks, skills and roles that have emerged as a result of adopting development strategies, e.g., integrated rural development which is a combination of the welfare and responsive strategies mentioned by Ickis (1979);
- (2) Different view towards organizations and management functions, i.e., development-oriented organizations in lieu of enterprise management or maintenance management. A cognizance of differing managerial contexts and driving towards more indigenous management systems; and
- (3) Different view towards citizen involvement i.e., towards more citizen participation through well organized community organizations.

Ickis (1979) describes four categories of rural development managers based on research in Latin America. These are: (1) Program Managers; (2) Regional Directors of government agencies; (3) Project Managers; and (4) Community Managers. He described Program Managers as usually national ministers performing meta-management functions and belonging to the top-level management group. Regional Directors would also fall into the upper level management category. He described the middle-level as composed of project managers, i.e., people who interface between the community and the bureaucracy. Community Managers would be the elected officials of the municipality. Ickis (1979) basically took, as a point of departure, the policy

framework of enterprise management and applied it to rural development. The focus of our concern is the middle-level manager or the project manager.

The Training Of Managers

Lessons in rural development show that the design and implementation of rural development efforts should be the responsibility of the government and the people of developing countries. A prerequisite of any strategy is the development of the organizations and human resources required to perform the tasks involved. Training is one approach for improving administrative capability.

Training may be defined as, "the conscious effort by the management to bring about change in an individual, a group, or an organization" (de Guzman 1976). A distinction is usually made between training that takes place in an institution or formal setting, such as a university, and that which takes place in the job situation and, consequently, is less structured or nonformal. Another distinction is whether the completion of training leads to the conferment of a degree—the former being usually called as formal degree training as compared to nonformal degree training.

To address the problem of trained manpower shortage, developing countries have embarked upon management education and training programs. These programs were usually offered through: (1) departments, colleges, or institutes within a university; (2) public management training institutions attached to a government agency; (3) autonomous private or semi-private management institutes; (4) administrative staff colleges on the model of Henlyon-Thames; and (5) ILO productivity centers and other training units established by international organizations (Stifel, *et al.* 1977).

However, these training programs have not been entirely successful in producing a "breed of managers" capable of handling the demands and tasks of rural development. The United Nations, as early as 1969, cited several reasons for the inadequacy of past training programs (De Guzman 1986):

- (1) Training programs are seldom based on a proper diagnosis, analysis and quantification of the kind and amount of training still needed for civil servants;
- (2) Training is often given haphazardly without establishing essential priorities according to the needs of development plans, programs, and projects;

- (3) Since there is no research into, or analysis of the training, very general courses are given to persons who often have no opportunity of applying the knowledge they acquire;
- (4) Almost nothing is known about the type of training that should be given to the different levels of public administration;
- (5) There is often complete ignorance of the difference between academic training in the science of public administration and in-service training. Although both are essential and complementary, it frequently happens that only the second type of training is used to make good the shortage of human resources in administrative development;
- (6) In-service training also leaves much to be desired. Programs are often organized without considering priorities, and without allocating the resource to the sectors and levels where the best results could be obtained; and
- (7) In-service training has been conducted more on the lines of courses for staff in subordinate positions. The countries have had little or no experience in training executive and supervisory staff, who are so important for national development.

In much broader terms, there is a tendency in the developing world to adopt training programs that are malsuited to the kind of administration needed. Likewise, there is an apparent overemphasis in terms of applying western management models to developing nations. There is also inadequate assessment of actual training needs. Finally, trainers are typically foreign consultants or local experts trained abroad—persons who are mostly familiar with western management models.

Assessing Training Needs of Rural Development Managers

To be able to come up with a viable training design for middle-level rural development managers, the identification of training needs as a first step is vital. In this regard, an analysis of the operating environment or constraints found therein, currently performed tasks and perceived roles are important. These will determine to a large extent the knowledge, skills, and attitudes a rural development manager should have.

Research on project management in the Philippines, such as Ocampo's (1980) study on the Bicol River Basin (as well as other observations on

IAD projects), reveal constraints impinging on project performance which serve as determinants of a project manager's tasks and roles. Project organization requires a project manager with a considerable role adaptability. He must balance technical solutions with time, resource, and human factors. He is, in short, an integrator and a generalist rather than a technical specialist.

There are seven constraints impinging on project performance that has been commonly identified by different agencies involved in IAD projects. These are:

- (1) Organizational structure and authority relationships — the matrix type of organization does not facilitate coordination and pin-point specific responsibility for project success. Authority relationships are therefore ill-defined leading to individualistic outlooks and performances among agencies.
- (2) Management support — weak political will or wavering support of top program and political leaders.
- (3) Leadership traits and technical competence of project managers — there is often a lack of technical-project managers and, if there are available, they are often lacking in leadership or management skills.
- (4) Competence of project staff assistance — there is an equal need for staff trained in rural development as well as project development.
- (5) The environment of project management — often the location of projects are in very depressed areas with almost no amenities.
- (6) The temporal nature of project life — since projects by nature are time constrained, issues of promotions and job stability, as well as loyalties, come to the fore.
- (7) The discrepancy of pay rates of personnel assigned to projects — often project staff members receive higher pay than those assigned by agencies to aid program development. Both staff may perform the same job, thus leading to jealousies and other organizational pathologies.
- (8) A fast rising issue is the meddling of foreign consultants in project implementation. Although documentation is insufficient, it is not too uncommon to hear local project leaders gripe about discrepancies in pay, approaches to the problem or tasks at hand, and the foreign consultant's penchant for utilizing western-oriented models to solve problems which have indigenous systems for their solution.

Some of the most common problems encountered by project managers in the Philippines are those that pertain to communications, policies, attitudes of farmers, conflicting interests of parties, minimum budget and delayed releases or arrival of funds, and cumbersome administrative and procedural matters (based on an unpublished selected random sampling survey conducted in 1975 by MARD personnel).

Given these numerous constraints, we look into the tasks and roles of present day rural development managers.

The Tasks of Rural Development Managers

Morris (1977) observes that project management in the Less Developed Countries (LDCs) requires a large input of energy expended on essentially manipulative and political tasks. In the humid tropics, such as in the Philippines, the energy required for successful management is itself a major constraint. Managers probably work longer hours in temperate zone systems, as Mintzberg (1975) would seem to suggest, but one feels that energy drains more acutely in the tropics. Much of an LDC manager's time is usually spent on trivial, but essential, tasks, e.g., rushing to town to buy tubes of mimeograph ink. This is in contrast to Mintzberg's findings that chief executives average 36 pieces of mail, 5 telephone calls, and 8 meetings per day. Morris (1981) further observes that a commitment to both achievement and power seems necessary.

Research on actual tasks performed by project managers is lacking. Efforts to acquire data were undertaken only recently. For example, studies are being conducted in Latin America, Asia, and Africa by the different management organizations in those areas focusing on project management and training. It is assumed, at present, that project managers perform the traditional functions of administration, such as: planning, organizing, staffing, directing, controlling, coordinating, and budgeting. In reality, though, other critical functions are performed such as:

- (1) Matching people to assignments to make use of their special strengths;
- (2) Safeguarding performance specifications while negotiating the design and implementation of field programs;
- (3) Remaining alert to the issues under considerations at a particular moment within the larger administrative system;
- (4) Insuring that all parties to a key decision have advance personal knowledge of the issues at stake;

- (5) Identifying and securing commitment for all important components that depend on outside support;
- (6) Providing contingency arrangements to back up all key components if their supply is at all problematic;
- (7) Identifying those items requiring long start-up times so that preliminary actions will be taken in time;
- (8) Exploring unofficially the political feasibility of all required measures for project implementation;
- (9) Learning and acknowledging the constraints which each party involved in a negotiation feels to be binding; and
- (10) Establishing realistic decision rules and deciding when general regulations must be ignored or overridden (Morris 1981).

These tasks require the employment of what Morris (1981) calls "compensatory management tactics" to overcome weaknesses in the system. These are:

- (1) Paying tremendous attention to detail, since almost any item can go wrong;
- (2) Following-up all important matters personally ("birdogging");
- (3) Building a large redundancy factor into all aspects of operation (also mentioned by Caiden and Wildavsky 1974);
- (4) Establishing direct personal contact with authorities before initiating any formal requests ("personalismo");
- (5) Adjusting day to day activities to fit immediate opportunities, instead of arranging schedules far in advance; and
- (6) Using simple but effective control devices to insure that organizational resources do not melt away.

The Roles of Rural Development Managers

There are four criteria which define the role of a rural development manager. These are, according to Korten (1979):

- (1) Job responsibilities are centered on results rather than procedures;
- (2) These results depend on voluntary support from individuals and independent organizations which are beyond the manager's direct control;
- (3) The programs being managed contribute toward strengthening the capacity of organizations which are beyond the manager's direct control;
- (4) The manager's decisions are subject to the guidance of some broadly representative body.

In essence, the ability to recognize the appropriate role to be played and to change roles readily is a mark of an effective manager (Stoner 1982).

Some of the roles of rural development managers are similar to those performed by the enterprise manager although in a different context and substance. Ickis (1979) sums the following as a result of research undertaken in Latin America:

- (1) Strategist — this role according to Ickis is often excluded from the more conventional definitions of the public administrator's role, where planning is regarded as more mechanistic than creative.
- (2) Infuser of values — this means developing and transmitting an organizational doctrine, i.e., a set of values and ideas which guide the organization's actions... a critical role in organizations seeking to introduce reforms.
- (3) Decisionmaker — problem solver; a very basic management concept.
- (4) Negotiator — engaging in continual negotiations with a much broader range of groups and interests than other type of managers.
- (5) Organization Architect — a meta-management function performed at the very highest levels where decisions are made regarding the design of the systems which will shape the policymaking processes.
- (6) Implementor — obtaining action through people, motivating others in such a way that they will implement the strategy.

- (7) Ambassador — establishing linkages between institutions, visualizing the total system, identifying key points of interdependence, gaining acceptance by appropriate individuals, and introducing the necessary linking mechanisms.
- (8) Public Spokesman — the advocacy role, i.e., representing and defending his program and its objectives, often controversial by nature, to the outside world.
- (9) Interpreter of community aspirations — managerial actions aimed at mobilizing the community to play a more active, self-directed role in using its own resources, setting priorities, and obtaining needed inputs from the government; as well as actions to make programs and bureaucratic structures more responsive to these community inputs.

In the Philippines, Cuyno and Lumanta (1979) add to the list the following:

- (1) Rural Educator — providing farmers learning experiences in order for them to acquire modern farming practices leading to higher productivity. Also helping the community grow through the introduction of innovations and, if needed, reorienting their values which may impinge upon the development of the community as a whole.
- (2) Technical Adviser — providing direct advice on the technical aspects of agricultural and rural development, also research data, technical experience and advice on methods and techniques.
- (3) Community Organizer — helping the community establish its local institutions and strengthen existing organizations. Helping the people verbalize their need for local organization, urging them to organize, and emphasize the advantages of cooperative undertakings through organization.
- (4) Information Disseminator — transmitting knowledge and information through a variety of channels. Explaining methods to the farmers who are generally cut off from such information, informing and providing them with learning resource materials on farming, homemaking, and anything to improve rural life.
- (5) Resource Linker — bringing to the clientele packages of technical services, such as marketing, credit assistance, and infrastructure

projects. Serving as middle-man between the farmers and resource agencies to ensure that the necessary resources will reach intended clientele.

In conclusion, the environment, tasks, and roles of the rural development manager at the middle-level pertain to three major areas of equal concern: the community, his organization, and the program.

The tasks and roles he fulfills at the community level are primarily directed towards strengthening the community as a political/social decisionmaking unit. As a member of an organization, specifically a public one, his tasks and roles are directed towards ensuring efficiency and effectiveness in the management of organizational resources. As program leader or member, his tasks and roles pertain to the creation of organizational and institutional arrangements conducive to effective program planning, implementation, and evaluation (which are typically multi-agency and often multisectoral).

His concerns can be said to be equally focused on the management of all three important, and often conflicting, components with a frequent view towards concurrent maintenance and development.

It follows, therefore, that the tasks, roles, and concerns necessary to manage rural development require the acquisition, through training, of the appropriate concepts, skills, and attitudes.

Concepts, Skills, Attitudes in O & M CD-CO Project/Program

Given the tasks and roles a middle-level rural development manager in LDCs must perform, be it in his office, community, or project, the following concepts, skills, and attitudes become necessary for him to have.

The concepts, skills and attitudes that will be identified here are the product of theoreticians and observations of rural development practitioners. However, two constraints must be noted: (1) there is no specific position description, "rural development manager," in most organizations and bureaucracies involved in rural development; and (2) development writers have used different labels [e.g., development systems manager [Korten 1979], agricultural manager [ILO 1974], development-oriented administrators [De Guzman 1976]] to refer to approximately the same set of role responsibilities. It will help to keep in mind, however, that the concepts, skills, and attitudes described in this chapter should be applicable to the tasks of middle-level managers in the public sector.

The Cognitive Domain

"Cognitive" is used to include remembering and recalling knowledge, thinking, problem-solving, and creating. Bloom's taxonomy of this domain is organized into six major classes, but can be subsumed into two areas: (1) knowledge; and (2) abilities and skills. Knowledge involves the recall of specifics and universals, the recall of methods and processes, or the recall of a pattern, structure, or setting. Intellectual abilities, on the other hand, refer to organized modes of operation and generalized techniques for dealing with materials and problems.

The area of knowledge in rural development, for example, involves:

- (1) knowledge of specifics, i.e., knowledge of terminologies used in the field as well as of specific facts, i.e., dates, events, people, and places, etc.;
- (2) knowledge of ways and means of dealing with specifics, i.e., ways of organizing, studying, judging, and criticizing facts or information about rural development; and
- (3) knowledge of the universals and abstractions in a field, i.e., the theories and generalizations in rural development.

The area of intellectual abilities or skills, on the other hand, involves:

- (1) comprehension of the materials or ideas in rural development without necessarily relating it to other material or seeing its fullest implications. This involves translation of ideas, interpretation or explanation, and extrapolation;
- (2) application or the use of abstractions in the field or concrete situations;
- (3) analysis or the breaking down of ideas into elements to focus closely on their structure, organization and their relationships;
- (4) synthesis or the putting together of elements and parts so as to form a whole; and
- (5) evaluation or the judgments of ideas in terms of internal evidence and external criteria.

To fully explicate the above, it is necessary to identify the concepts that constitute the knowledge areas of the rural development manager.

Concepts may be defined as notions of our perceptions of reality whose meanings have become established and validated and have been assigned names.

In a report authored by the Extension Committee on Organization and Policy (ECOP) (1975) of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges entitled, "Community Development Concepts, Curriculum and Training Needs," concepts were described as useful:

- (1) as ways of thinking about (analyzing and describing) real life situations;
- (2) for organizing and structuring observations of reality, facts and knowledge;
- (3) for communicating with others;
- (4) as a basis for predicting and testing relationships;
- (5) as a means for becoming acquainted with a field of knowledge; and
- (6) as elements in developing theory.

Rural development managers must be prepared to think about, and make applications of, concepts. Studies of human learning suggest that the learner can deal with a limited number of abstract ideas. It is important, therefore, that key concepts be identified for clearer focus by the learner.

Rural development management can be categorized as an emerging sub-field of the study of Rural Development. The plethora of literature on rural development within the last five years attests not only to the interest in rural development but to its attainment of disciplinary or semi-disciplinary status. Morris (1977) asserts that there is ample foundation of materials and concepts to warrant the emergence of rural development as an applied profession in its own right. Yet, the interstitial nature of the profession is a limiting factor in itself.

Rural Development intersects about ten academic disciplines. Important subareas, according to Morris (1977), which overlap the jurisdictions of the conventional disciplines, include:

<i>Topical Area</i>	<i>Parent Disciplines</i>
(1) Development Economics	Economics
(2) Applied Anthropology	Anthropology
(3) Underdevelopment Theory	Marxian Sociology
(4) Rural Sociology	Sociology
(5) International Agriculture	Agricultural Economics
(6) Nonformal Education	Extension, Education, Communication
(7) Development Administration	Political Science, Management, Public Administration
(8) Urbanization & Modernization	Geography, Demography, Sociology
(9) Rural and Regional Planning	Economics, Geography
(10) Technology Transfer	Agriculture, Engineering

Worthy of inclusion in the above list is community development, which is eclectic, and has emerged as a discipline and as an applied profession.

Skills for Rural Development Management

In a quote from a report on the Gombe and Funtua Agricultural Development projects by Gordon and Duncan (1978), a distinction was made between technical skills and management skills:

- (1) technical, or task related skills mean, for example, road and dam construction, use of base and surfacing materials, book-keeping, store systems, and administrative procedures, engineering and vehicle maintenance skills, evaluation techniques, etc.; and
- (2) management skills mean those less tangible, but essential skills of being able to think and plan ahead; to foresee problems, set standards and monitor progress; to tackle tasks methodically and set objectives; to build effective teams; to motivate subordinates; to visualize and keep in mind the broader picture of the whole job; people using human resources effectively; communicating effectively, etc..

Katz (1974) has identified three basic types of skills needed by all managers: technical, human, and conceptual. Technical skill is the ability to use the tools, procedures, or techniques of a specialized field. Human skill is the ability to work with, understand, and motivate other people—either as individuals or as groups. Conceptual skill is the mental ability to coordinate and integrate all of the organization's interests and activities. Katz has

pointed out that, although all three of these skills are essential to effective management, their relative importance to a specific manager depends upon his or her rank in the organization.

Samuel Paul (1978) mentions four types of skills that should be learned by today's public managers: planning skills, analytical skills, organizational skills and integrative skills. He arrived at these types based on what he describes as the functions performed by today's public manager, namely: planning and policy, environmental appraisal, service delivery and logistics, technology and production, budgeting, information, and control, and organization and personnel.

To the above list, Siffin (1977) would add what he calls "unstructured skills," which are regarded by some as central to creating effective managers. These skills are considered most essential for public managers in the developing world and include: interpersonal skills; synthetic and integrative skills; problem and opportunity finding skills and decisionmaking skills under conditions of instability, uncertainty and flux.

Attitudes and Values for Rural Development Management

If trainers want assurance that the knowledge and skills acquired in the training situations are transferred to the work situations, every effort must be undertaken so that the accompanying values and attitudes are developed in the managers being trained.

There are no generalized approaches to the development of desirable attitudes and values, but the first step involves determining the types of attitudes which should be promoted and developed. This brings us to the subject of the affective domain (De Guzman 1976). As a trainee moves from the lower levels in the affective domain, the behavior of the trainee changes from passive to active, involuntary to voluntary, transitory to stable, inconsistent to consistent, and from neutral (or negative) to positive.

Management training on attitudinal or behavioral change must consider the affective domain as a first step in developing attitudes, predispositions, values and beliefs that are supportive of acquired managerial capabilities and technocratic skills. For example, Krathwohl (1964) cites the following levels in the hierarchy of the affective domain:

- (1) Receiving the knowledge or information as part of the education process.

- (2) The trainee responds to the knowledge or information he has acquired.
- (3) Valuing is where the trainee begins to consider or decide which knowledge he wants to learn or retain.
- (4) Organization is where the trainee organizes his/her values into a cohesive form.
- (5) Characterization by a value complex is where the trainee begins to act out his values after internalizing them.

It is important to note that the Peace Corps (1973) has utilized the above model in training its overseas participants. But what are the values that are to be considered desirable in the training of Filipino administrators?

In a research conducted by De Guzman and Carbonnel in 1976 (De Guzman 1979) on the development orientedness of Filipino administrators, some value commitments were identified. These are values that should be instilled in every Filipino administrator: (1) change orientation; (2) action propensity; (3) commitment to economic development; (4) concern for economic equality; (5) concern for public participation; (6) concern for conflict avoidance; (7) concern for the nation; and (8) selflessness

The Management of Rural Development Program of UPLB in 1975 also identified several attitudes or attributes that a rural development manager should possess. The manager must possess character, be a risk taker, aggressive, innovative, creative, and competent. He must constantly be attuned to his environment or culture. As Samonte (1978) points out, personalism and particularistic orientation is a typical social value in a transitional society that can be used by the manager. It can help him win group support, prevent conflict with policy makers, and facilitate acceptance of plans.

The Andragogical (Process) Model of Adult Education

The Andragogical model of education is a process model — in contrast to the content models employed by most traditional educators. The difference is that, in traditional education, the teacher decides in advance what knowledge or skill needs to be transmitted, arranges this body of content into logical units, selects the most efficient means for transmitting this content and, then, develops a plan for presenting these content units in some sort of sequence. The andragogical model, on the other hand, prepares in advance a set of procedures for involving the learners (and other parties, e.g., the organization(s)) in a process involving the following elements:

- (1) establishing a climate conducive to learning;
- (2) creating mechanism for mutual planning;
- (3) diagnosing the needs for learning;
- (4) formulating program objectives that will satisfy these needs;
- (5) designing a pattern of learning experiences;
- (6) conducting these learning experiences with suitable techniques and materials; and
- (7) evaluating the learning outcomes and rediagnosing learning needs.

The Andragogical model is particularly applicable to Philippine conditions for several reasons. Traditional pedagogy promotes dependency whereas andragogy increases self-directiveness. Pedagogy also considers experience of little value whereas andragogy utilizes learners as a resource for learning. In terms of readiness to learn, pedagogy takes into consideration the biological development of the learner whereas andragogy focuses on developmental tasks of social roles. Knowledge learned in pedagogy has postponed application value whereas andragogy has immediate applicability. Lastly, pedagogy is topic-centered whereas andragogy is problem-centered.

Evaluating The Training Program

Evaluation is undertaken for a number of different reasons. Chelimsky (1978) and Rossi (1979), for example, point out that evaluation may be undertaken: for management and administrative purposes; to assess the appropriateness of program shifts; to identify ways to improve the delivery of interventions; and to meet the requirements of funding groups who have fiscal responsibility for the allocation of program monies. Furthermore, that evaluation can be undertaken for planning and policy purposes, i.e., to help decide on either program expansion or curtailment, and to reach decisions on whether to advocate one program or the other. Basically, evaluation measures the worth or value of an activity, decision, or course of action. It asks whether objectives were accomplished and whether they were the right objectives to begin with.

Evaluation is useful to a management training program in that it can be used, among others, to justify expenditures or the very existence of the program. It also seeks to improve training as well as the trainers.

It is important to realize that the matter of evaluation is viewed in different ways in developing countries. This observation is made in line with our knowledge on the impact of administrative cultures and the overall transferability of western concepts and values as postulated earlier in this

work. For example, the conduct of evaluation requires clearly specified goals and a time-frame against which rates of achievement can be plotted. Yet, in LDCs, vague goals are often politically necessary; official goals are either partial or badly chosen and the clarification of some goals may not occur until several years of effort have been invested. Thus, a program evaluator trained in western evaluation techniques will often find goals as difficult, if not impossible, to evaluate.

It has also been observed by Morris (1981) that where administrative systems are below the threshold for effective interaction, actual achievements will fall considerably below potential productivity—perhaps by as much as 50 percent. Furthermore, the discovery that some evaluation can be helpful has been rapidly extended to the much stronger assumption that definitive evaluation is always desirable. Actual field experiences also suggest that, in the LDCs, the demand for data is high but the storing and handling mechanisms are poor, if not inadequate. Such limitations must be borne in mind when conducting evaluation to assess the relative strength of a training program.

Summary

In the earlier part of this paper, a case for the training of current and future rural development managers was made. The basic assumption has been that the rate of success of rural development programs and projects have been low and that, among other factors, a managerial deficiency has been pin-pointed as largely responsible.

To effectively diagnose the needs for learning to overcome such a deficiency, two steps are necessary. First, it is necessary to construct a model of desired behavior, performance, or competencies of the rural development manager. Secondly, the discrepancies or gaps between the competencies specified in the model and their present level of development by the learners need to be assessed.

There are three sources of data for building a diagnostic model namely: the society, the organization, and the individual.

The Society. Developing countries have adopted complex strategies for rural development (e.g., the integrated approach) that require training of current and future implementors/managers of programs and projects. The matter of training is part of public policy designed to: (1) strengthen administrative systems; (2) provide the necessary impetus to rural development efforts, and; (3) sustain its gains.

The Organization. Organizations and governmental agencies view training as one way of strengthening administrative capability, i.e., to improve present managerial and, at the same time, develop a cadre of managers necessary for sustaining development efforts. Management training, as one among other solutions, is preferred because it is an integral part of public policy towards development and resources are often adequate for pursuing this type of solution.

It has also been pointed out that previous training programs have not been without problems. Some of these problems pertain to structural deficiencies in the conceptualization and execution of these programs; others relate to the more fundamental problem of what to teach and how to teach it (given the perceived absence of indigenous well-developed models for transferring management concepts and skills).

The Individual. Managers, in actuality, perform a variety of functions that are maintenance-oriented. However, we also expect them to perform more and more developmental functions. Note has also been made of the manager's areas of concern, i.e., the community, his organization, and the programs and projects. The accommodation of these often conflicting goals and competing areas of concern necessitates training in management that would include, for example, the development of integration and synthesis skills. Our model of the rural development in most developing countries, is generalist in orientation. It focuses on the person who has basic training in one of the development sectors (such as agriculture) and "tops" this degree with management training in the previously mentioned areas of concern. Thus, a graduate of the program can be expected to manage a development project irrespective of sector.

There is, therefore, a need to inculcate the concepts, skills, and attitudes required of today and tomorrow's rural development manager. Such concepts, skills and attitudes need to be taught in a manner that allows students to learn from the teacher and each other's experiences in the field. The andragogical model of training is best suited to our needs and this can be strengthened with periodic and relevant evaluation tools.

References

- Avasthi, Amreshwar and Shriran Maheswari
1966 *Public Administration*. Agra, Lakshmi Nacain Agarwal.
- Caiden, Naomi and A. Wildavsky
1974 *Planning and Budgeting in Poor Countries*. New York: John Wiley.

- Chelimsky, E.
1978 Differing Perspectives of Evaluation. In C. C. Rentz and R. R. Rentz, eds. *Evaluating Federally Sponsored Programs: New Directions for Program Evaluation*. 2 (Summer). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cuyno, Rogelio V. and Melinda F. Lumanta
1979 *Internalizing Rural Development Experience*. Los Baños: University of the Philippines.
- Cuyno, Rogelio V., Melinda F. Lumanta and Mardonía C. Ramos
1982 *Management of Rural Development in the 80s: Philippine Reflections*. Los Baños: MARD, University of the Philippines.
- De Guzman, Raul P.
1976 Management Training Needs and Goals in the ESCAP Region: Toward Collaborative Efforts. *Philippine Journal of Public Administration*. 22 (2):162-179.
- 1979 Towards a More Effective Coordination of Planning and Implementation of Development Programs/Projects: The Integrated Area Development (IAD) Approach. Paper prepared for the National Conference of Local Government Executives and the 24th World Congress of the International Union of Local Authorities. Manila, Philippines.
- De Guzman, Raul P. and Ma. Aurora A. Carbonell
1976 *Development-Orientedness of Filipino Administrators*. Quezon City: NSDB-UP Integrated Research Program.
- Economic Development Institute (EDI)
1979 Summary of Discussion of Meeting on Training Needs for Project Managers in Agriculture. Washington: EDI.Emezi, C.E.
- 1979 *Administration for Development in Africa*. New York: Conch Magazine Limited Publishers.
- Extension Committee on Organization and Policy (ECOP)
1975 Community Development Concepts, Curriculum Training Needs. Report of the ECOP, National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges.
- Food and Agriculture Organization
1975 *Key Issues: Integrated Rural Development*. Rome: UN-FAO.
- Gordon, R.H. and G.W. Duncan
1978 A Report on the Gombe and Funtua Agricultural Development Projects. Cited in Youker's memorandum to Price Gittinger on a New Course in Managing Rural Development Projects in 1979.
- Hunter, Guy (ed.)
1978 *Agricultural Development and the Rural Poor: Declaration of Policy and Guidelines for Action*. London, England: Overseas Development Institute/Book, Mag.
- Ickis, John
1979 Rural Development Managers. In D. Kortén, ed. *Population and Social Development Management*. Caracas: Instituto de Estudios Superiores de Administración.

- Inayatullah
1973 Political Context of Programmes of Rural Development and Rural Poverty. Revised version of the paper presented at the Conference on Effective Anti-Poverty Strategies. Bangkok, Thailand: 12-21 December.
- International Labor Organization (ILO)
1974 *Sharing in Development: A Program of Employment, Equity, and Growth for the Philippines*. Rome, Italy: ILO.
- Israel, Arturo
1978 Workshop on Institutional Issues in Agriculture and Rural Development. Cited in Youker's memorandum to Price Gittinger on a New Course in Managing Rural Development Projects in 1979.
- Jiggins, Janic
1977 Motivation and Performance of Extension Field Staff. In *Extenuation, Planning and the Poor*. London, England: Overseas Development Institute. pp. 1-19.
- Katz, Robert L.
1974 Skills of an Effective Administrator. *Harvard Business Review*. 52 (5).
- Korten, David C.
1979 Toward a Technology for Managing Social Development. In D.C. Korten, ed. *Population and Social Development Management*. Caracas. Instituto de Estudios Superiores de Administration. pp. 20-50.
- Krathwohl, David R. (ed.)
1964 Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, the Classification of Educational Goals Handbook II: Affective Domain. New York: David McKay Company, Inc.
- Lele, Uma
1975 *Design for Rural Development: Lessons from Africa*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Maddick, Henri
1963 *Democracy, Decentralization and Development*. New Delhi: Asia Publishing House.
- Management of Rural Development Programs (MARD)
1975 Highlights and Main Issues of the Interview Series with Project Managers. Los Baños: University of the Philippines.
- McCallum, Alec
1982 Devolution and Rural Development: Unsnarling the Bureaucracy. Pp. 36-40 in *Ceres*.
- Mintzberg, Henry
1975 The Managers Job: Folklore and Fact. *Harvard Business Review*. 53 (40).
- Morris, Jon R.
1977 The Transferability of Western Management Concepts and Programs: An East African Perspective. *Education and Training for Public Sector Management in Developing Countries*. The Rockefeller Foundation.
- 1981 *Managing Induced Rural Development*. Bloomington, Indiana: International Development Institute.

- Ocampo, Romeo
1980 A Case Study of IRD in the Philippines. Manila: College of Public Administration, University of the Philippines.
- Paul, Samuel
1978 A Framework for Curriculum Planning. *Education and Training for Public Sector Management in Developing Countries*. The Rockefeller Foundation.
- Peace Corps
1973 *Peace Corps Program and Training Journal*. 1(6).
- Rondinelli, Dennis A. and K. Ruddle
1978 *Urbanization and Rural Development: A Spatial Policy for Equitable Growth*. New York: Praeger.
- Rossi, Peter H., Howard E. Freeman and Sonia R. Wright
1979 *Evaluation: A Systematic Approach*. Beverly Hills-London: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Samonte, Abelardo G.
1978 Integrated Rural Development: Concept, Approach, and Objectives. In *Rural Development: The Philippine Experience*. The Philippine Training Center for Rural Development, University of the Philippines at Los Baños, Laguna, Philippines.
- Siffin, William J.
1977 Two Decades of Public Administration in Developing Countries. *Education and Training for Public Sector Management in Developing Countries*. The Rockefeller Foundation.
- Stifel, Lawrence, Joseph E. Black and James S. Coleman (eds.)
1977 *Education and Training for Public Sector Management in Developing Countries*. The Rockefeller Foundation.
- Stoner, James A.F.
1982 *Management*. 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, Inc.