Solid waste management in thailand pdf

SectorContracted ServicesIndustryDiversified Outsourcing ServicesCurrent All-Star Rank-Previous All-Star Rank-Industry Rank6Previous Industry Rank5Overall Score5.61Website Note-Page 2SectorComputers and CommunicationIndustryInternet Services and RetailingCurrent All-Star Rank-Previous All-Star Rank-Industry Rank3Previous Industry Rank4Overall Score6.73Website Note- Do you prefer: A) Sort By Your Daily Email or B) To Design a Strategic Plan? A) Combating shop fires or B) Creating an innovative production planning system? Many managers would answer A to both questions. This is because real leadership with its indeterminacy, ambiguous accountability, and muddy causal connections creates intense anxiety. To allay this fear, we escape into the hustle and bustle – we handle routine tasks that we already know how to do, and avoid our main tasks: improving performance under intense pressure More direct reports that streamline daily activities. Most managers spend only 47% of their time in leadership. Your companies are paying the price: too many people in a job, too complicated structures, over-analysis, too little action. Learn how to replace fearless with the trust that is essential to meeting your toughest challenges. The idea in practice Apply these steps continuously: 1. Take one step at a time. Break large, amorphous projects into manageable pieces. Carve several short-term tasks from poorly defined, long-term giants. Select projects that focus on the results of the result. e.g. output 10% compared to installing a new inventory system. Commit to perform these tasks in weeks, not months. For example, a bank's executives were overwhelmed by 50,000 unresolved transactions due to interest rate fluctuations. To address this challenge more effectively, they set out two modest initial projects: the four-day coverage of 85% of overdraft accounts within 60 days, and the collection of fees from other banks whose errors had further delayed processing. They achieved good results. 2. Stick to a narrow path. For each sub-goal, write steps and schedules. Explain how to measure, report, and review progress. Add just enough detail to stay focused. These steps reduce the appeal of time-wasting activities, give you a sense of control and relieve anxiety. Early success inspires you to apply these disciplines more widely. 3. Expand your Capture other aspects of your work by further transforming poorly defined projects into achievable steps. Apply steps 1 and 2 to these new parts. Example: After the bank's first two projects had progressed, the business unit managers identified opportunities in their own areas. They then selected one or two projects to achieve tangible results as quickly as possible and drew up written plans to achieve the new objectives. 4. Full steam ahead. Expand the busy destruction disciplines with traditional time management techniques: Document your actual time usage—for example, log time segments in your timebook. Ask questions about your three major leadership responsibilities: Which daily activities are least productive? How much time do I spend on innovation? What am I least confident about when I ask subordinates questions? Combine your insights with other managers to identify more effective work habits. An engineering group that discovered that it spent 50% of its time responding to routine service problems decided to help customers on the phone before resorting to more time-consuming field visits. The news has recently been filled with reports of the need to improve worker productivity if the United States is to compete successfully with the Japanese and the West Germans. Rarely, however, is the productivity of managers mentioned, even though the problem of wasting time was recognized as enormous long before anyone thought of quality circles. This problem remains unresolved, the authors of this article say, because most cures focus on the symptoms – long meetings, unnecessary phone calls, and tasks that could be handed over to subordinates or secretaries. Among these symptoms lies the disease: the fear of managers, which goes along with the fight against innovative activities. These authors have found that three requirements for executive work – organizing day-to-day activities, improving performance under pressure, and increasing subordinates – cause so much anxiety that many managers retreat to performing routine tasks they already know how to do. The authors show how organizational environments allow executives to be unproductive, and describe a strategy that can help them escape these time traps. You will receive a call from the president of your company. He asks if you would be interested in taking on a special task for which you have some unique qualifications. In this task, you would report directly to him, and you would participate in some of the company's important strategic decisions. The job would also include some interesting trips. This task would enable you to make a valuable contribution to the company and also to give you great growth opportunities. There is only one catch to the offer: since it is a part-time job that requires about one day a week, you will have to do your current work in the remaining four days. Would you accept the order? In recent years, we have asked this hypothetical question to hundreds of managers, most of whom believed that they were already missing the time, lacking, Jobs right. Ninety-nine percent of them accept the order. In this way, these managers actually admit that if the motivation were strong enough, they could eliminate activities worth eight to ten hours a week without negative consequences, or perform them in much less time. Since most of these people could improve the performance of their current jobs, why don't they go ahead and give one day a week to focus on urgent employment problems? Because if the managers we've watched are typical, many of them don't have full control over the way they use the time. Even if they know that they should shift their time and deal with high-priority issues, the managers we have observed seem to be forced to deal with less consequential issues. So, while many executives rationally acknowledge that they are not using their time as well as they should, they cannot change how they spend it. Why? Our observation is that managers spend a considerable amount of time performing unproductive, time-wasting activities to avoid or escape job-related fears. Every manager has aspects that trigger anxiety, i.e. mental ailments that are so compelling that the manager has to seek a certain degree of relief. The most effective response of a manager to this fear is to make a direct attack on his source. For example, if he feels uncomfortable in an upcoming meeting, he or she might spend extra time getting additional information about the agenda or testing the agenda in advance with key attendees. However, almost all managers escape job-related anxiety through a variety of unproductive, often unconscious psychological mechanisms – such as rationalization, recrimination, denial, etc. One of the most common and costly of these escape mechanisms is what we call hustle and bustle: the flight into time-consuming activities that managers find less threatening (though much less productive) than the hard aspects of their work.1 Let's look at the job requirements that create much of the fear and discuss its impact. Then we'll explore how managers can identify and break out their time-wasting patterns. Sources of fear By observing managers in almost every type of industry, we have identified three workplace requirements that are common to almost all levels of management and often cause conditions. These fear-provoking tasks are among the most common sources of hustle and bustle we have observed: 1. work patterns and routines. 2. Respond to hard pressure from above to improve performance. 3. Get better results from subordinates. Planning & Organization of Daily Activities Most manager jobs are a mix of familiar routines and innovative activities. In general, people are more afraid when they start new activities than when they the work they have already mastered. We can rely on Gresham's Law of Time Management to describe how managers structure their daily activities: other factors that are equal, the desire to avoid fear, will lead a leader to repeat familiar patterns and avoid innovative activities. Because the impact of this law has been deeply rooted for many years, it is more difficult for managers than for outsiders to see these fear-avoidance patterns. Here are a few examples that can strike familiar chords: the head of department who reads and handles all her own emails, but doesn't get around to write the working paper on the strategic direction of the division. The production manager who spends half of the day fighting fires in the workshop, but does not have time to work with his employees on production planning and planning systems. The Quality Control Director, who will be able to pass through the detailed results of each quality inspection, but cannot find the time to organise much-needed quality improvement projects. According to a recent survey of more than 1,300 executives (including more than 500 presidents and vice presidents), such a poor priority attitude is common.2 The survey reports that, despite the long working hours of most executives, only 47% of their working hours are filled with managerial duties. They fill most of the remaining time with practical work, which the survey authors describe as doing rather than managing. Since many of these managers have worked their way up through the ranks of the Doers, their attention to non-executive duties can be a systematic retreat to more familiar and less threatening activities. Completing these activities becomes a measure of daily success, while more difficult and challenging tasks are squeezed out and remain unmastered. Improving performance under pressure Another common anxiety generator is a prerequisite for producing better results without additional resources. Faced with imperatives such as inventory reduction, increasing margins, lower costs, improving working relationships, speed of production or quality improvement, many managers are unsure what to do. In fact, most are sure that they are already doing the best they have, and that more gains will require more (or better) people, a larger budget, new equipment, or more support from other features. So when many leaders hear that they need to achieve better results without additional resources, they tend to initiate programs without a clear strategy. For example: Under pressure The company's management of a high-tech manufacturing company has brought its system employees to work to design a new inventory control system. Months later, they found that the new system, although well designed, had no impact on inventories (in fact, they were even higher). A large large companies face slow growth and dwindling profits. In order to achieve a turnaround, the top management started a major reorganization, which for two years brought enormous energy into a mixture. By the end of the two years, the new organization was in force – but the results remained essentially unchanged. As these examples show, action is now! often to the unintended way to more hustle and bustle. Demands of subordinates make The third pressure, which leads to hustle and bustle, is the need to negotiate with subordinates in order to improve performance. For example, bosses too often allow their employees to delegate problems upwards. As the boss accumulates these delegated problems, he or she becomes increasingly busy.3 Our observation is that this phenomenon often occurs when managers are considering getting subordinates to achieve better results or new successes. Some managers fear that subordinates are arguing, pouting, quitting, or subtly refusing to achieve the necessary results. In order to avoid an unpleasant situation, the manager subconsciously assigns the work in such a way that the subordinate allows an escape: this is an important task; I want you to take care of it as soon as you have a chance. After a few weeks in which the subordinate has not yet had a chance to do the job, the manager will probably either do it himself or explain to his boss why this is not possible. Similarly, in cases where the subordinate tries to do the job, but the manager doubts the person's ability to remain fully involved in the process. In the end, two people do a person's work. Given these fears – which may arise from the real or imagined embarrassments of the claim – it is not surprising that many managers avoid framing sharp, specific, and hard performance expectations for their employees. It is also understandable that they send signals to subordinates that a good excuse will be almost as acceptable as achieving the result. But by setting expectations that give too much or have no follow-up, no timetable or no expectation of truly independent performance, managers are getting ripe for time problems. They create opportunities for subordinates to return problems to the boss and keep them there. The malicious hustle and bustle cycle The three work requirements just described are alone or combine sources of considerable discomfort and anxiety for many managers. To minimize this anxiety, executives often escape into time-wasting activities as we have described them. Unfortunately, when managers engage in unproductive activities, they neglect their main objectives and goals. This Time eventually creates more frustration, pressure, and fear – leading to greater temptations to escape into the hustle and bustle. The culture of a working group or management team often reinforces this work cycle. The Bebusyde can be It takes a number of people to work together in an unconscious conspiracy to perpetuate too many time-wasting meetings, too much paper and useless information, too many people in the workplace, too complicated organizational structure, too many studies and too little action. Once these activities become part of a culture, they can perpetuate themselves. For these reasons, managers who try to stop using time unproductively will often find after a heroic struggle that the system has beaten them and that they cannot change their patterns on their own. Breaking Away As evidence suggests that work-related anxiety causes most of the so-called time management problems, and that the organization's culture often reinforces these problems, it's no wonder that the rational, traditional approaches to time management (such as time graphs, time budgeting, and phone discipline techniques) rarely have lasting impact. Short courses and normative literature on time management produce a temporary relief of symptoms, but do little to cure the disease. No matter how fervently employed managers commit themselves to new patterns, work-related insecurities and fears still drive them to unknowingly slip into time-consuming activities. To reduce employment, managers need to address not only the symptoms, but also the root cause of the problem: the way managers plan, organize, and meet the most important anxiety requirements of their work. Suppose a person who is struggling with the hustle and bustle at work is on a weekend walk by the sea and sees someone drown. It is likely that managers – without study groups, meetings, training programs, memoranda, or restructuring – will shun the drowning as a lifekeeper. And it's not hard to figure out why. 1. The need is obvious, urgent and imperative. 2. Accountability is clear, especially when the person is alone at the scene of the crime. 3. The outcome of the proposed measure is foreseeable. 4. Feedback on the impact of the action will be provided immediately. The same four critical ingredients make work meaningful and exciting, and allow managers to focus on results and use time effectively. Unfortunately, management jobs often have an absolute minimum of these eager properties. Goals and goals are often vague or confusing. Accountability is ambiguous. The connections between management-technical actions today and measurable results later are difficult to perceive. And because of the cumbersome organizational procedures, managers rarely get immediate reinforcements for success. Since it is by definition, complex topics and long and short time frames, managers cannot, of course, become saviors of organizational drowning victims. Also, executives can't always get immediate feedback or see the results of their actions as a turner can do. But managers can do a lot to They respond to fear-provoking job requirements and at the same time introduce work planning and control disciplines that minimize the chances of their escape into the hustle and bustle. The strategy we recommend consists of four elements. 1. Break some long-term, amorphous, or complex management tasks into sequential short-term, clearly defined projects. 2. Block the hectic escape routes by gradually using work planning disciplines in these projects – such as sharp definition of goals, clear accountability, written work schedules, schedules, explicit measurements. 3. After achieving some modest, incremental sub-targets with disciplined attacks, expand and speed up the process. Attack more goals at once and capture a larger share of the total job with measured routings. 4. Then, with other managers, organize a structured effort to analyze the use of time and replace results producing work for business activities. While these more traditional time analysis steps cannot solve the time management problem, they can complement other work restructuring activities. Let's look at how managers can put this four-part strategy into practice. One step after another manager will strike the first blow to freedom if they carve one or two short-term tasks out of a poorly defined set of long-term, fear-producing things that need to be achieved and set about achieving their sub-goals in a few weeks instead of months. The manager should select a project that focuses on tangible results (e.g. reducing scrap X%, increasing production Y%, or reducing turnaround times by Q hours) rather than on process objectives (e.g. introducing a training program, installing a new inventory system, conducting a study, or defining a market direction). For example, the rapid fluctuation of interest rates led to a dramatic increase in the number of transactions that the business division of a major bank had to carry out, and performance collapsed. In less than a year, the division was forced to write off several million dollars in overdraft interest. Despite significant investments in new information systems and thousands of overtime hours, it had accumulated a backlog of 50,000 unresolved transactions. To keep the situation informed, Senior Division executives worked endless hours – but the problems piled up faster than the time to solve them. Finally, the managers decided to undertake two modest first-step projects. The original aim was to: a four-day coverage of at least 85% of overdraft accounts for 60 days. The second was the recovery of a certain amount of compensation from other banks, the errors of which led to delays in the processing of the division. Without neglecting other efforts, management focused on these two definable projects and Results. By moving from an amorphous, comprehensive view of goals to a narrower focus, managers could take a united, effective approach to their problems. Similarly, an electronics manufacturer struggling on many fronts to control a costly inventory problem decided to focus on one category (delivered but not accepted) and achieve a certain improvement in 60 days. And in a large teaching hospital, senior doctors and nurses formed a small team of doctors and nurses working together to generate more accurate methods for predicting the workload of an intensive care unit within two weeks. In none of these cases have managers given up or vilified the overall goal. Rather, as a first step, they fended off a definable bottom that had more of the eager ingredients we presented in our Drowning Person example. The specificity, focus and short-term nature of the projects made it easier for managers to direct energies directly to results, rather than dispersing them in a rush. Sticking to a narrow path The near-level of pilot projects allows managers who instruct them to introduce more work planning and control disciplines. Managers must clearly define and assign each pilot goal and ask those responsible for the projects to draw up written work plans (including sketchy), precise actions and planned progress reports and reviews. Unfortunately, many seniors believe that these disciplines make sense for the work of people at lower levels, but cannot be applied to difficult leadership tasks. And as long as leaders define their goals in far-reaching, long-term terms, there is truth to what they say. Most of the time, however, they avoid confronting the essence of their work with this rationalization – namely, dividing complex and abstract themes into discrete pieces. Ironically, when leaders apply these disciplines creatively and rigorously to the challenges of their jobs, not only block the unproductive escape routes, but also reduce the fear that is the source of this rationalization. Each of the pilot projects we have described has been launched with a written memorandum to those responsible. The note asked each manager to submit a written work plan outlining the steps and timetables. Methods for measuring, reporting and reviewing progress have also been developed. In the Banking Operations Department, the senior manager even organized a one-day working session in which his department heads reached a consensus on this which objectives, work planning and verification techniques they would use. These disciplines don't have to be cumbersome, just detailed enough to help managers avoid walking off the track. Without them, it's all too easy for managers to unknowingly slip into old time-wasting patterns when fear makes them with the task at hand. But if they commit themselves in writing to concrete steps towards a measurable goal, the possibility of drifting decreases. When managers gain a sense of control over their jobs and their fear fades, they will be able to apply these disciplines to broader areas of activity. Their first successes become springboards for other wins. Extension of the scope Once managers have successfully completed some focused projects, they can capture other aspects of management work by further dividing large, complex, poorly defined goals and projects into achievable, short-term increments – and organizing them with some disciplined approaches. So, when an inventory category is brought under control, managers can attack additional categories in a similar way. If one production line has made some progress in reducing scrap, others can use the same processes. If a branch office increases the number of visits per day from sellers, other offices can apply the same approaches. In the banking business division, the head of the department asked his employees to identify the decisive areas for improvement in their own areas as soon as the first two projects made significant progress on schedule. Each manager has submitted an extensive list. The manager then asked them to focus on the one or two areas that would achieve tangible results in the shortest possible time and to submit written work plans to achieve their objectives. Full steam ahead The last element of our strategy is to directly analyze and experiment with time usage. Managers who complement the work disciplines just outlined with the more traditional types of analyses and experiments can speed up the process. We found two types of analysis to be particularly helpful. The first is an objective analysis of how managers actually use their time. For this analysis, managers can effectively use most traditional time management tools (for example, those listed in Appendix I). Each manager can ask a secretary to track her time for a week or two under a limited number of categories. Managers can make more cautious entries in their diaries, using them not only as reminders, but also as logs. Executives can rate meetings according to their effective time usage. At the end of each day, a manager can spend five or ten minutes (possibly with a secretary or assistant) reconstructing the day and noting the most important activities, time spent, and other important quantifiable factors. The intentionally planned compared to spontaneous or interrupted time is helpful. Managers can fill out short questionnaires at the time spent in an average week or month. The second area to be analysed is more personal. Here, executives ask themselves questions, as in Appendix II, in order to analyze themselves and gain insights into the impact of certain job requirements. Win. The extent to which a manager can discuss these questions with colleagues and supervisors will affect the type of help he or she can receive. Managers are probably uncomfortable sharing this data, and it may take some time for them to accept the fact that everyone shows some symptoms of anxiety and therefore feel free to discuss these issues more openly. Which activities of my days are the most productive? Which least? How much time is spent on everyone? How much of each day is simply lost – by worn-out hours away, interruptions, and so on? Do I have daily routines that haven't been tested for efficiency lately? Answers to challenges How much time do I spend on improvement or innovation? How much for maintenance and firefighting? How high should the proportions be? Do I have clearly defined and measurable improvement goals, or are they vague? When the pressure comes down for better results, do I ever press the action button or program button before analysing what is really needed? To ask subordinates to meet my expectations What do I feel most or least confident about asking my subordinates to do? How well do I teach my subordinates that they need to achieve better results? Or do they seem to have opportunities to negotiate my expectations down? Do I receive progress reports at short-term checkpoints to make sure things are moving in the right direction? With such analysis in hand, executives can shift their focus to action. You can answer questions like this: What activities that last more than 30 minutes per week can you safely eliminate? Select one to eliminate next week. What tasks that take an hour or more per week can you do in half the time or less? Select one to reduce next week. What activities that last 30 minutes or more per week can you delegate completely to a subordinate? Select one to delegate next week. After this kind of time analysis, engineers from a group working on a bespoke energy product found that they spent 50% of their time responding to routine service problems – much more time than they should have expected. This realization led them to shift their work patterns in several ways, such as trying to help customers on the phone before making time-consuming (but psychologically comfortable) field visits. Individual and group efforts to analyze and reduce time-wasting activities lead to a kind of awareness-raising that allows the grinding of incremental and facilitates the recording of time with appropriate management disciplines. Executives can, of course, complement these disciplines with administrative procedures such as simplifying forms, focusing and shortening meetings, streamlining communication, and reducing organizational levels. With diligence, managers can create a continuous process that is integrated into leadership positions and when it ages. But as long as people are devastated, jobs will have requirements that create fear and thus lead to time-wasting activities. Therefore, the strategy we have described here must be applied continuously. Then the old familiar business cycle can be reversed: success can build trust, which in turn can lead to large payouts in management productivity. 1. For more comprehensive treatment of managers' escape mechanisms, see Robert H. Schaffer's The Psychological Barriers to Management Effectiveness, Business Horizons, April 1971; and see Harry Levinson's HBR article What Killed Bob Lyons?, last published in March to April 1981, p. 144. 2. Phillip Marvin, Executive Time Management: An AMA Survey Report (New York: AMACOM, 1980). 3. For an insightful and amusing discussion about this phenomenon, see William Oncken, Jr. and Donald L. Wass, Management Time: Who's Got the Monkey? HBR November-December 1974, p. 75. A version of this article appeared in the May 1982 issue of Harvard Business Review. Review.