INFORMATION TO USERS

This reproduction was made from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this document, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help clarify markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark, it is an indication of either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, duplicate copy, or copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed. For blurred pages, a good image of the page can be found in the adjacent frame. If copyrighted materials were deleted, a target note will appear listing the pages in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed, a definite method of "sectioning" the material has been followed. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. For illustrations that cannot be satisfactorily reproduced by xerographic means, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and inserted into your xerographic copy. These prints are available upon request from the Dissertations Customer Services Department.

5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases the best available copy has been filmed.

University Microfilms International
300 N. Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Downloaded from SHAREOK. Persistent Handle URL: https://hdl.handle.net/11244/5191

8404559

Rogers, Betty Sevier

A STUDY OF MANAGEMENT FUNCTIONS, ACTIVITIES AND ABILITIES NEEDED BY MIDDLE MANAGEMENT PERSONNEL IN LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

The University of Oklahoma PH.D. 1983

University Microfilms International 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Copyright 1983

by

Rogers, Betty Sevier

All Rights Reserved

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

A STUDY OF MANAGEMENT FUNCTIONS, ACTIVITIES AND ABILITIES NEEDED BY MIDDLE MANAGEMENT PERSONNEL IN LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

BETTY SEVIER ROGERS

Norman, Oklahoma

1983

A STUDY OF MANAGEMENT FUNCTIONS, ACTIVITIES AND ABILITIES NEEDED BY MIDDLE MANAGEMENT PERSONNEL IN LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

APPROVED BY:

Loy E. Prickett

Richard L. Simms

Bernard Reid

Daniel A. Wren

Charles S. Beetler

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

To the memory of

Lida Frances Sevier

—she always believed—

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to express her sincere appreciation to the chairman of her doctoral committee and director of this investigation, Dr. Loy E. Prickett, who so generously shared his time, experience, and knowledge. Appreciation is extended to committee members: Dr. Gerald D. Kidd, Dr. Daniel A. Wren, Dr. Charles S. Butler, and Dr. Richard L. Simms.

The writer also wishes to extend special thanks and gratitude to her family and friends for their encouragement, support and patience.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS iv

LIST OF TABLES vii

Chapter

I. THE PROBLEM 1

Introduction 1
Purpose of the Study 6
Statement of the Problem 7
Significance of the Study 9
Limitations 10
Definition of Terms 10
Research Design 10
Organization of the Report 11

II. REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE 12

Introduction 12
Managerial Functions 13
Information Processing 18
Environmental Parameters 21

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY 26

Introduction 26
Determining the Population 26
Designing the Survey 27
Collecting the Data 29
Analyzing the Data 30
Summary 31

IV. ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION 32

Introduction 32
Analysis of the Data 32
Summary 95

Page

V. SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 96

Introduction 96
Findings 98
Conclusions 99
Implications 100
Recommendations 100

REFERENCES 102

APPENDIX 107

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		Page
1.	Means & Percentages of Planning Responses	35
2.	Means & Percentages of Organizing Responses	36
3.	Means & Percentages of Directing Responses	38
4.	Means & Percentages of Controlling Responses	39
5.	Means & Percentages of Communicating Responses	40
6.	Means & Percentages of Motivating Responses	42
7.	Means & Percentages of Accounting/Finance Responses	43
8.	Means & Percentages of Data Processing Responses	44
9.	Means & Percentages of Government Agency Responses	46
10.	Means & Percentages of Personnel Responses	47
11.	Planning Responses by Management Levels	49
12.	Organizing Responses by Management Levels	50
13.	Directing Responses by Management Levels	52
14.	Controlling Responses by Management Levels	53
15.	Communicating Responses by Management Levels	54
16.	Motivating Responses by Management Levels	56
17.	Accounting/Finance Responses by Management Levels	57
18.	Data Processing Responses by Management Levels	59
19.	Government Agency Rsponses by Management Levels	60
20.	Personnel Responses by Management Levels	61
21.	Training Delivery Systems - On-the-Job Training	85

22. Training Delivery Systems - Formal Education 86
23. Training Delivery Systems - In House Development Programs. . 87
24. Training Delivery Systems - Workshops. 88
25. Training Delivery Systems - Seminars 89
26. Training Delivery Systems - Outside Consultant 90
27. Training Delivery Systems - Equipment Supplier Instruction . . 91
28. Means & Percentages of Subordinate Training 92
29. Forces Affecting Government Agency Performance 94

A STUDY OF MANAGEMENT FUNCTIONS, ACTIVITIES AND ABILITIES NEEDED BY MIDDLE MANAGEMENT PERSONNEL IN LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

CHAPTER I

Introduction

Service institutions are the fastest growing segment in the business world today (Personick, 1981, p. 28). Service employment in the United States has grown from about forty percent of the total labor force in 1929 to over fifty-five percent in 1967 (Fuchs, 1968, p. 18) and is predicted to reach seventy-five percent in the year 2000 (Lewis, 1973, p. 1). In 1974 service institutions employed 53.7 million workers. This employment is expected to increase to 71.5 million by 1985, an increase of thirty-three percent since 1974 (U.S. Government, 1976, p. 14). The Bureau of Labor Statistics (1976) identified five categories of service institutions: trade; government; service and miscellaneous; transportation and public utility; and finance, insurance and real estate (p. 14-15).

Since 1947 the government has been the most important growth area in employment (Bell, 1973, p. 128). Between 1960 and 1974, government employment has increased by 70 percent from 8.4 to 14.5 million. This employment growth has been faster than any other industry division (U.S. Government, 1976, p. 14). State and local government employment increased

rapidly from 1955 to 1975. This rate was faster than growth in private industry (Tucker, 1981, p. 19) and resulted in local government employment becoming larger than that in Federal and State governments combined (Lewis, 1973, p. 19). Local government employment increased from 7 percent in 1955 to 11.4 percent in 1975, an increase of 5.2 million jobs (Tucker, 1981, p. 20). State and local governments jobs were 6.81 million in 1980 and are expected to rise to at least 8.05 million by 1990 (p. 24).

The rapid growth of service institutions has caused problems within these organizations. For the once small establishments, growth creates more complex work, more numerous tasks, more difficult planning, and more demanding responsibilities (Samson, 1969, p. 1). Growth and diversity bring with them changes in organization structure, policy and procedure. The problems of efficiency and improved performance increase with expansion (p. 3).

As the organizations grow and become more complex, managers are unable to direct all phases of the businesses. They begin assigning responsibility for various functions to others. These assignments result in the emergence of middle mangement positions (Kay, 1974, p. 2).

An extension of top management, middle management is a group of junior executives and senior supervisors in the direct line of authority and communication between the top level of management and the first-line supervisor (Clark and Gottfried, 1957, p. 228). Top level management shares with and delegates a large part of its responsibilities to middle management (Niles, 1958, p. 111).

The function of middle management is translating the policies of top management into operating plans to be put into effect by supervisory management (Kelly, 1980, p. 9). Middle management is essentially concerned with

implementing these policies through development of intermediate plans (p. 6). Middle managers integrate the functions of the organization not only from top management to supervisors but also across department lines (Kay, 1974, p. 4).

The tremendous expansion of middle management jobs began in the early fifties. Middle management positions have grown three times as fast as the total employment in the past twenty years (Drucker, 1973, p. 331). No other group in the work force has been growing as rapidly (p. 443). Much of this growth has been in functions and industries which were hardly known a generation ago (p. 447). In 1974 there were about 8.9 million managers and administrators. Because organizations and agencies continue to depend on management specialists, the demand for salaried managers is expected to increase (U.S. Government, 1976, p. 17).

In a survey of the Fortune 500 companies in 1972, Kay (1974) found, "that two-third to three-fourths of the supervisory, managerial, and executive population could be identified as middle managers" (p. 6). Applying these statistics, Kay determined that approximately 5 to 5.2 percent of the total nonagrarian employed work force were middle management personnel (p. 7). Using Kay's percentages, the number of middle managers in service institutions would have been approximately 2.7 to 2.8 million in 1974 and could reach 3.6 to 3.7 million in 1985, an increase of 32 to 33 percent. Narrowing the service category to government services and applying Kay's percentages, 725,000 to 754,000 government employees would be classified as middle management personnel in 1974 with a possibility of 960,000 to 1,000,000 in the middle management classification by 1985.

In November, 1976, Carey (1976) reported in "Revised Projections to 1985," Monthly Labor Review, that:

> Educational upgrading in a wide range of managerial, administrative, and sales jobs also is anticipated. Increasing reliance by business and government on salaried management specialists and the historical decline in the number of self-employed managers both suggest continued educational upgrading in managerial occupations (p. 20).

Samson (1969), in his research on retail department stores, discovered that, "Businessmen are evidencing alarm at what appears to be a shrinking supply of appropriately trained potential middle managers in a situation of increasing demand" (p. 6).

After his research, Carey (1966) concluded:

> There should be an adequate supply of labor into the future for the distribution and services industries . . . . These people, however, will not be absorbed easily into the distribution and services sector unless necessary training and educational facilities are available to qualify them for such employment. There is a matter of great importance considering the fact that this sector has always required persons of greater skill and educational attainment than has the commodity producing sector (p. 252).

Fuchs (1968) pointed out the educational need in 1968. "The service industries make greater use of workers with higher education and relatively less use of those with only limited schooling" (p. 188).

Bell (1973) stipulated that, "the growth of technical requirements and professional skills makes education, and access to higher education, the condition of entry into the post-industrial society" (p. 128).

Greenfield (1966), in Manpower and the Growth of Producer Services, indicated, "that there is chronic shortage of highly trained personnel in many producer services and that these areas of activity are also vital to growth of American output and productivity" (p. 128).

Samson (1969) learned in his research that, "It was felt that employees need training before employment, and that most firms selected middle management personnel from among their present employees" (p. 10).

In April, 1974, Fletcher, President, National Training and Development Services for State and Local Governments, stressed Government's management problems:

> The greatest difficulty that most of our urban administrators are going through today is that our education and experience have often been inadequate for facing today's urban problems .... We are now seeking ways ... to learn about and use new methods of management and supervision (Powers, 1974, p. i).

Local government agencies' need for educated manpower has increased proportionally to the demands society has placed on these agencies for more efficient and responsible services (p. 161). In addition to its broad and complex responsibilities, local government exists in a state of continual change (Banovetz, 1971, p. 238). People, not machines, render public services, and these personal services usually account for 50 to 70 percent of the local government's total operating budget (p. 318). Training and retraining have become imperative as local governments begin to innovate and make advances in good practices in their continual search for solutions to their increasing problems (International City Manager's Association, 1974, p. 238).

Bromage (1957), in Introduction to Municipal Government and Administration, argues strongly:

> The training of employees is always a must if the public services is to be effective. Municipal adminstration has many specialists; individuals do not ordinarily enter public service prepared to be policemen or firemen without additional training. Through formal education or experience, this individual has developed abilities which result in his acceptance as an employee.
>
> In cities, training is necessary for various categories of public employees. These include administrative personnel, police and fire officers, professional and scientific employees, supervisors and clerical employees (p. 350).

Banovetz's (1957) analysis of local government management development resulted in the following conclusions:

> The growth of government, particularly at a time of labor market shortages, makes it essential to capitalize on every scrap of potential management talent. Local government's problem is compounded, in most medium sized cities, by the fact that the department and division heads who carry substantial administrative responsibility must also have strong technical skills in their chosen fields; local government departments are frequently not large enough to require the "pure" administrator over a strong technical staff. Therefore, the top officials, except the chief administrator, are likely to have progressed through the ranks by virtue of their technical background, and, upon arrival at the top, need all the help they can get in the art of management (p. 341-342).

The preceeding statements are indicative of an issue most aptly stated by Carey (1966):

> An important question then is whether those seeking employment will have the necessary education and skills to qualify for the types of jobs that are available (p. 254).

Purpose of the Study

From the preceeding discussion, two areas of rapid growth have been identified: local government employment and middle management personnel. Local government agencies have grown dramatically creating more levels of management resulting in the emergence of middle managers in these agencies. A need for training of local government middle managers has developed.

The increased need for trained middle management personnel in local government agencies indicates that an analysis of management skills is needed to determine what managerial functions, activities and abilities are required of current and prospective middle managers in the Las Vegas Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area.

Apparently there is a need to determine what managerial functions, activities and abilities are needed for developing middle management personnel in local government agencies throughout the United States; therefore there could exist a need for studying management skills needed in the Las Vegas SMSA. This

descriptive research project was conducted with local government agency leaders and middle managers who identified the skills needed.

Statement of the Problem

The general question to be answered by this research was: What managerial functions, activities and abilities are needed by middle management personnel employed by local government agencies in the Las Vegas Standard Metropolitian Statistical Area? Related specific questions to be answered were:

1. Is there a relationship between the levels of management responsibility in local government agencies and the perceived importance of managerial functions and/or activities including planning, organizing, directing, controlling, communicating and motivating?
2. Is there a relationship between the levels of management responsibility in local government agencies and the depth of understanding of managerial abilities including accounting/finance, data processing, government agency characteristics and personnel performance?
3. Is there a perceived importance by government departmental personnel regarding the managerial functions and/or activities including planning, organizing, directing, controlling, communicating and motivating?
4. Is there a perceived importance by government departmental personnel regarding the managerial abilities including accounting/finance, data processing, government agency characteristics and personnel performance?
5. Is there a perceived importance by government agency person-

nel regarding the managerial functions and/or activities including planning, organizing, directing, controlling, communicating and motivating?

6. Is there a perceived importance by government agency personnel regarding the managerial abilities including accounting/finance, data processing, government agency characteristics and personnel performance?
7. Is there a perceived importance of tenure in current position regarding the importance of managerial functions and/or activities including planning, organizing, directing, controlling, communicating and motivating?
8. Is there a perceived importance of tenure in current position regarding the importance of managerial abilities including accounting/finance, data processing, government agency characteristics and personnel performance?
9. Is there a perceived importance of span of control regarding the importance of managerial functions and/or activities including planning, organizing, directing, controlling, communicating and motivating?
10. Is there a perceived importance of span of control regarding the importance of managerial abilities including accounting/finance, data processing, government agency characteristics and personnel performance?
11. What training delivery systems are perceived to be significant to local government agency middle management personnel as a self-development tool?

12. What training delivery systems are perceived to be significant to local government agency middle management personnel as an employee development tool?
13. What forces affecting local government agency performance are perceived to be significant by middle management personnel in these agencies?

Significance of the Study

A variety of delivery systems are available to provide the training and/or education required for middle management personnel in local government agencies. In order to provide effective training and/or education for these middle managers, an analysis should be made of the managerial functions, activities and abilities utilized on the job. The information obtained from this study allows those providing the delivery systems to develop and evaluate programs which best meet the needs of middle management personnel in local government agencies. The information from this study makes it possible for those in local government agencies to evaluate middle management development programs and determine which programs provide the best training and/or education to meet the needs of their middle managers.

Limitations

Limiting factors were restrictions to the population used in this study. The limitations were:

1. The study was limited to middle management personnel in local government agencies.
2. The study was limited to incorporated local (city and county) government agencies in the Las Vegas Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area.

Definition of Terms

The following is a list of operationally defined terms:

Government Agencies - the incorporated governing bodies in the Las Vegas Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area. City and county agencies were included but federal and state agencies were not included.

Government Department - the first level of division within the government agency in the Las Vegas SMSA.

Government Division - A subdivision of the government department in the Las Vegas SMSA.

Middle Management - The levels of authority in the organization found between the executive level and the first-line supervisor. Middle management was used as representing persons other than department heads and first-line supervisors in the Las Vegas SMSA government agencies.

Managerial Skills - The managerial functions, activities and abilities which are required of middle management personnel in performing their jobs in the Las Vegas SMSA.

Research Design

The first step was a comprehensive study of the related literature.

The second step was to develop a list of local government agencies in the Las Vegas Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area. This initial list was obtained from the Las Vegas City Manager and the Clark County Manager. A list of middle management personnel was developed from the above information.

The third step was to seek the cooperation of the managers of the local government agencies in the Las Vegas SMSA.

The fourth step was to design a questionnaire based on the review of the literature.

The fifth step was to design a coding system for the standardization and interpretation of the collected data.

The sixth step was getting a group of professionals to review the questionnaire for comments, criticism and correction.

The seventh step was to revise the questionnaire based on the results obtained from the professionals.

Next the data collection instrument was administrated to a sample of the population for a pilot study of the questionnaire. Based on the results of the pilot study, revisions were again made to the data collection instrument.

The data collection instrument was printed out and administered to the middle management personnel in local government agencies. Administration involved making appointments and delivering questionnaires to department heads or division chiefs and collecting the completed questionnaires.

The tenth step was to tabulate and analyze the data using non-parametric statistics.

The final step was to formulate a report of all findings, analyses and conclusions resulting from this descriptive study.

Organization of the Report

Chapter I of the formal report includes the introduction, statement of the problem, significance of the study, limitations, definition of the terms, research design and the organization of the report.

Chapter II contains the review of related literature.

Chapter III includes an explanation of the research design and the procedures followed.

Chapter IV presents the analyses and discussions of the data collected.

Chapter V contains a summary of the findings and suggestions for future study.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

During the twentieth century, a search has been undertaken to:

> . . . identify management as a distinct intellectual activity which was universal in nature. The search was for a generally agreed upon body of knowledge which could be distilled into principles and hence lead to a general philosophy or theory of management (Wren, 1972, p. 415).

By 1958, four basic management functions had been identified and agreed upon: planning, organizing, directing and controlling (p. 414-415). Terminology may differ but the activities involved in the four managerial functions remain basically the same.

Koontz and O'Donnell (1968) included under directing the activities of motivating and communicating (p. 535). A move for better understanding of the human resource began following World War II. The search for ways to get better quality from the human resource has identified motivation and communication as essential elements at all levels in the work place.

"Decision making is what managers do" (Flippo and Musinger, 1975, p. 56). All management functions and activities evolve around decisions (Hampton, 1977, p. 165). Decision making requires the ability to obtain "the right information in the right form and at the right time" (Koontz and

O'Donnell, 1968, p. 796). Two of the major areas of information for managers are accounting/finance and data processing.

No organization exists in a vacuum. According to Duncan (1975), knowledge about the organization — an understanding of management and its history, an understanding of human behavior and groups, and an understanding of organizations and their environment — are essential "tools of management" (p. 497-449).

Banovetz (1971) firmly stated, ". . . anyone in management — chief administrator, department head, or foreman — is concerned with the human resources of the agency and therefore is engaged in personnel adminstration" (p. 318).

This descriptive study was to determine what managerial functions, activities and abilities are needed by middle management personnel in local government agencies. To provide a thorough background and need for the study, this chapter has been divided into three sections: managerial functions, information processing and environmental parameters.

Managerial Functions

Fayol (1949) described five functions for managers: planning, organizing, commanding, coordinating and controlling (p. 5-6). His writing identified managerial skills and abilities and defined the principles of management. Fayol worked for a unity of management theory (p. xv). His concepts are commonly found in management literature and research today.

In 1937, Davis (1975) identified three "organic functions" of management: planning, organizing and controlling (p. 20). These functions were viewed as being universally applicable to any organization (p. 139).

Gulick (1937) developed his functions of the executive and labeled it POSDCORB (planning, organizing, staffing, directing, co-ordinating, reporting and budgeting) (p. 13). He also saw his functions as universal although they were applied to government administration.

In 1951, Newman, (1951) listed planning, organizing, assembling resources, directing and controlling as management processes (p. 4).

The first Principles of Management was written by Terry and proposed that the management processes were planning, organizing, directing, co-ordinating and controlling (Wren, 1972, p. 410). Later Terry (1964) included co-ordinating as a part of all functions (p. 161-163) and changed some of his terminology. These changes resulted in planning, organizing, actuating and controlling as the management functions (p. 50).

Koontz and O'Donnell (1955) established their managerial functions as organizing, staffing, directing, planning and controlling (p. 34). They also furthered the concept of the universality of management and a set of principles of management (p. 42).

In more recent writings and research, the previously identified managerial functions and/or activities of planning, organizing, directing, controlling, communicating and motivating are studied further to determine their need and usefulness to managerial personnel.

Horne and Lupton (1965), after surveying middle managers in British industrial firms, decided that managerial activities could be divided into four elements: Formulating, Organizing, Unifying and Regulating. They called these elements the F.O.U.R. classifications. The elements were defined for their study as follows:

> Formulating activities are concerned with assessing the long and short term future, with defining objectives, and specifying the human and material means necessary to their attainment.

> Organizing activities take account of the outcome of formulating activities, and attempt to create and maintain the means and conditions necessary to the effective implementation of plans and policies. They include all operations which deploy and re-deploy the means and facilities through which persons make their individual and collective contributions to defined aims and objectives.
>
> Unifying activities are those acts, procedures, and practices which serve to co-ordinate, focus, and harmonize, thus facilitating smoother working and adaptation and overall efficiency.
>
> Regulating activities are the detailed means by which a manager, from hour to hour, as it were, achieves his task of manipulating and shaping human and material resources (p. 21-22).

Carmichael (1968), in his research on middle managers in retailing, identified five managerial functions: planning, directing, coordinating, controlling and innovating (p. 146-148). One of his findings indicated that managerial competency is the most crucial of all competency areas (p. 180).

In researching the continuing educational needs of middle managers, Richards (1971) concluded that collegiate schools of business must, ". . . aid those middle managers in becoming more skillful in supervision and human relations by emphasizing current managerial concepts and techniques" (p. 208).

Pearse (1974), in a survey report for the American Management Association, found, "A significant percentage of managers spend 10 to 25 percent of their time each week in such managerial functions as planning, organizing, controlling, coordinating and motivating" (p. 2). The survey further determined that the relative importance of the managerial functions was: (1) planning, (2) motivating and (3) coordinating. Managerial activities that were identified and ranked by importance were: (1) interpersonal, (2) administrative, (3) personal and (4) technical (p. 2).

Studying future needed skills for mid-level managers, Guglielmino (1978) discovered that mid-level managers ranked the following skills as most important: anticipating and planning for future needs, leadership and motivation skills, and oral and written communication skills (p. 44).

In a study to determine pre-training needs of middle managers, McQueen (1978) developed a curriculum which included courses in, "business communications, both oral and written; basic managerial functions of planning, organizing and controlling; human-related-oriented management courses; and cost analysis and control" (p. 136).

In another study of middle managers, Clark (1979) identified 14 competency categories: communication, motivation, electronic data processing, quantitative methods, organization, planning, organizing, leading, control, budget control, accounting, personnel and staffing, labor relations, and affirmative action. Each of these categories was reported in the study to be important to middle managers in industrial firms (p. 49-55).

Middle management development was the topic of a study by Middlebrook (1980) in which the results identified the top 6 program areas as: communication, leadership, motivation, planning, organizing and control (p. 77).

The five topics most frequently mentioned by managers in a study by Chaney (1980) were in ranking order: communication process, developing motivational skills, leadership process, financial management, and organizational rules and regulations (p. 38).

Piccone (1980) did a study comparing the perceptions of the NASPAA (National Association of Schools of Public Affairs/Public Administration) and selected public administrators. The results of his study determined 30 areas of managerial skills which were important in public administration. The managerial skill areas identified by the participants were as follows:

The ability to:
84% Communicate effectively
71% Anticipate problems
Delegate appropriately
Motivate subordinates
67% Establish priorities

67% Understand agency goals and operations
66% Coordinate
Make decisions
65% Persuade
63% Negotiate
62% Focus on key aspects of problem
61% Monitor and control program activities
60% Respond and understand the view of others
58% Understand personnel strengths and weaknesses
Be flexible and to change one's views
Research and plan projects
57% Relate to everyone within the organization
56% Understand and recognize resources needed and available
53% Adjust to changes
49% Work effectively with manager's peers
47% Insure staff development
45% Understand government organizations and their policies
44% Understand personnel systems
41% Evaluate effect of agency on clients and personnel
37% Understand the political, social and economical forces affecting agency
35% Handle public relations
26% Apply data processing techniques
23% Understand the impact of agency policies
18% Understand American social and political values
Understand the budgeting system (p. 202-211).

Most studies found by this researcher were done for organizations in the private sector which may lead one to ask if the same managerial skills would apply to the public sector. Gulick and Piccone both identified and studied the same basic managerial functions and/or activities for public administration that are commonly found in research on the private sector.

Perhaps Barrett (1977) has stated it more appropriately:

> The function of management — decision-making, organizing, staffing, planning, controlling, communicating and directing — are common to both (public and private). Each seeks organizational purposes through people. The insights of the behaviorial sciences, quantitative analysis, communications theory, systems analysis and many other disciplines are relevant to management across the board. Finances are crucial to both public and private management. Consumer satisfaction is essential. (p. 7-8)

Information Processing

Ramo (1974), in discussing computer usage by managers at the 1974 meeting of The Conference Board, stated:

> Good management involves a combination of hunch and analysis; the qualitative and quantitative; the imponderable, vague and incomplete, on the one hand, and the deliberate, clear and thorough, on the other. It is not one set of considerations, one kind of thinking, to the exclusion of the other (p. 2).

But Sord and Welsch (1962) pointed out, after their research into using information planning and control for the Financial Executives Research Foundation, that:

> Basically, the role of management in business operations is to plan the proper combinations of materials, facilities, labor, and capital; to decide how much of these resources to use and allocate them to the major functions, such as production and sales; to time the allocations for optimum results; and to institute controls necessary to insure performance in accordance with the plans and hense attain satisfactory results (p. 44).

Pearse (1974), after his American Management Association survey, reported that, "Both top and middle managers spend a considerable amount of their time in decision making and in solving shortrun problems" (p. 2).

Additionally, Hodge and Hodgson (1969) stressed that decision making is found at every level of an organization (p. 25).

Meltzer (1967) identified information as:

> . . . just one of the many tools available to decision makers and problem solvers . . . the user needs temporary access to facts in order to solve problems and make decisions based on the best available data. Much of this material is ephermeral in nature and changes daily. Other factors are needed for reference only or as context within which hard-core information takes on a different meaning for each situtation. The administrator or manager cannot, indeed should not, deal with a deluge of detailed items, but they should be available to him when needed (p. 15).

For managers to be more effective in utilizing information, Hodges and Hodgson (1969) proposed:

> Information, its flow and use, is one of the most important factors in an organization. We are beginning to realize the componenets of an informational system, the communication of information, and techniques for gaining better intelligence from the facts. The integration of management information and its manipulation is becoming essential to proper administration and supervision (p. 272).

Ramo (1974), in explaining the assets of management computer usage for information processing, stressed:

> In today's complex management situations, planning without a computer is bound to be very superficial and to consider only a fraction of the available facts and useful assumptions. With the computer, the manager has a much better chance in the decade ahead than at any time in the past to make a huge step upward in management competence. He can cause more of the future to happen <u>because</u> of him rather than <u>to</u> him (p. 4).

At a conference sponsored by International Business Machines, Inc., Beckett (1967) predicted:

> In the operation end of business, it is clear that as systems advance, people — all people — will make fewer of the on-line, real time operations decisions than they have in the past. In nonoperations, decision-making will increase in volume and importance and the routine of day-to-day "management" will tend to disappear (p. 219).

Myers (1967), at the same conference, elaborated on the use of computers for information:

> As computers are taking over routine work from managers at all levels, there remain unstructured jobs that were not getting done before because these managers were too busy. The computer has reduced the manager's freedom to be wrong in handling routine, repetitive work, but there is still a big area of responsibility left in which a manager's skill, judgment, and ingenuity can be exercised (p. 11).

Change and automation both lead to fear and insecurity for those affected. Beckett (1967) explained the outcomes of supervisors working with automation as:

> . . . the systemation of operations activities for both workers and middle managers alike is not, in as many cases as is commonly supposed, frustrating man. In fact, man is finding himself capable of not only operating within the new system but also of being in fact

> far more creative because of it. For both the worker and the middle manager there appear to be ample opportunity to achieve "freedom through bondage" (p. 229).

From her research into quantitative goals for public agencies, Mendoza (1970) reported:

> Maximizing these traits desirable for an effective and efficient operation of public agencies can be attempted by the introduction of automation in the system . . . The primary contribution of cybernetic systems technology is the automaticity that speeds up relatively routine decision-making. Also, it makes possible the efficient handling of gross data, which allows decision-making to rest on more up-to-date, relevant and reliable information which would be either impossible or outrageously prohibitive in cost if done with only human effort. Presumably, automatic processing of information and routine decision-making on the intermediate levels can free some management or administrative level personnel to enable them to pursue the obviously more important policy decision-making tasks without having to maintain a crisis-orientation that is so common to American public agencies (p. 240).

Studying the use of quantitative tools of decision making for accounting, Kiani-Aslani (1975) determined:

> The types of specific business problems analyzed with quantitative tools of decision making by controllers who use these tools were ranked as follows: (1) production planning and control, (2) financial forecasting and budgeting, (3) analyzing capital investment projects, (4) facilities planning, (5) forecasting demand, supply, and price, (6) make-or-buy decisions and so forth (p. 142).

McQueen (1978) discovered that one of the top four areas for pre-employment training of middle managers was cost analysis and control but it had not been reported as important in previous studies.

In designing a curriculum for industrial middle managers, Clark (1979) included quantitative tools and industrial accounting as both areas had received significant ratings of importance in this survey.

Budgeting is one of the qualitative tools which has emerged as being not only useful but essential to effective management. Sord and Welsch (1962) discussed the importance of budgeting:

> It is worth repeating that budgeting is a management tool particularly useful in coordinating the planning and control activities of all functions of an enterprise. However, budgeting is more than this. Budgeting, effectively operated in conformity with the principles and broad patterns of practice revealed by this survey, makes possible the maximum delegation of resonsibility to successively lower levels of management, and at the same time makes provision for integrated and effective control (p. 40-41).

In their survey of management planning and control practices, Sord and Welsch (1962) also reported:

> . . . that budgeting is one of the best approaches for obtaining coordination of the various factors of production in the individual business enterprise. The study also shows that budgeting is a technique adaptable to the needs of practically all sizes and types of business. The widespread use of budgeting attests its value as a planning and control technique. There seems little doubt that the use and refinement of this technique will increase as the American economy continues to grow (p. 41).

Hodge and Hodgson (1969) summarized the importance of information processing in the following: "If management is the process of converting information into action, then it is clear that management success depends primarily on what information is chosen and how the conversion is executed" (p. 34).

Environmental Parameters

Local government agencies exist in a complex environment but most of the influence and pressure affecting agency performance and with which the middle manager must deal are the organization and its human resources.

The Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development (1979) symposium on areas of training needed by urban managers concluded:

> Although the urban management process contains several elements common to management in general, it does have certain unique characteristics which make the acquisition of knowledge about three things of critical importance . . . The three categories of knowledge are: knowledge about that which is governed; knowledge about organisations (sic) and processes involved in management; and, knowledge of techniques and procedures that help in the operations of management (p. 8).

Shafritz, et al. (1978) in covering the processes of government personnel management pointed out:

> Presumably new employees are hired with a modicum of skills so that they are capable of immediately performing work related to their assignment. The primary development needed here is to acquaint new employees with the organization structure that they have been placed in. As employees become full-fledged specialists, the developmental needs will be for even more knowledge of organizational structure (p. 263).

Janger (1977) explained the roles of middle managers as follows, "While top management enunciates policy, the primary responsibility for implementing company compliance . . . lies with operating managers, both individually and collectively" (p. 22).

In writing their guide for managers in the public sector, Crane and Jones (1982) stressed the importance of communication, "Rapid change in all aspects of government . . . demands constant effort to keep employees informed of new policies, techniques, and developments within the agency and the government service" (p. 118)

DeCarlo (1966), working with the Center for Applied Research in Education, developed programs for middle managers and determined a combination of the following areas should be included:

> History of the firm — its philosophy of management and the development of its policies and procedures.
> Human relations — the problems arising from work relattionships (sic) and managerial responsibility.
> Management policies and procedures:
> a) the problem of organizational forms and their use in managing a complex business structure;
> b) the importance of marketing strategy and policy in a changing industry;
> c) the role of financial management in the business enterprise;
> d) the role of business and its leaders in the society as a whole (p. 84).

Clark (1979) reported, as a result of his research, that middle managers perceived knowledge about the organization, personnel and staffing, labor relations, and affirmative action to be important in performing their daily duties (p. 51, 54-55).

Piccone (1980), in his study of public administration, found that, "understanding agency goals and operations" (p. 208) was ranked third in significance for middle managers.

Chaney (1980) determined as a result of her research in hospital services that one of the top four areas in management training needs was, "knowing and understanding organizational rules and regulations" (p. 59).

Organizations are structures created by people and operated by people. Organizational effectiveness is dependent on the people in the organization.

Shaeffer (1977), in a research report on human resources for The Conference Board, explained:

> Business executives . . . have long considered the human resources of our organizations to be the most valuable asset we have. But it has only been in the past fifteen years that we have come to see that such a viewpoint implies the need to plan for and implement the acquistion, development and effective utilization of highly talented personnel in close relationship to our basic business plans and objectives (p. 30).

Crane and Jones (1982) advised public managers in dealing with their human resources that:

> In order to have employees function effectively in the organization, public managers find they must insure that proper attitudes are instilled, appropriate skills are taught, and necessary information is provided. Enlightened managers emphasize the continuous development of all people within their jurisdiction (p. 117).

Jangen (1977), in writing about the changing personnel function, reminds us, ". . . it is perhaps worthwhile to remember that the core responsibilities of the lower level units . . . are to deal directly with employees" (p. 75).

Banovetz (1971), in Managing the Modern City for the International City Management Association, elaborated:

> Personnel administration is a major portion of the work of every administrator and supervisor. Unfortunately it cannot be routinized, as can many other tasks. Each employee is different. Each employee must therefore be considered as an individual and treated differently from all others. The knowledge of each employee's reactions to supervision's actions is essential if these actions are to be successful. Supervision is an art, not a science, but the principles . . . will generally apply in the management of people (p. 346).

As early as 1947, the International City Manager's Association (1947) had expressed concern for integration throughout the organization of the personnel functions:

> . . . it is easy to see that personnel administration must be a major concern of the whole adminstrative staff, from the chief administrator all the way down to the first line supervisor (p. 188).

Carlisle (1979), in discussing personnel functions and the manager, pointed out, "Managers should not drop their responsibilities for staffing by totally relying on the personnel department to handle these functions. The most important person . . . is the manager" (p. 367).

From 44% to 57% of the public administrators responding in Piccone's (1980) study identified four areas of personnel performance as being important in their daily activities (p. 206-208).

Pearse (1974), reporting for the American Management Association, summarized the attitudes previously expressed on human resources:

> The truly professionally managed firm is a people-building rather than a people-using organization. The truly professionally managed organization is people-conscious — people are central rather than merely peripheral to organizational planning and development (p. 50).

Summary

The review of the related literature has included explanations of the managerial functions, activities and abilities needed by middle management personnel in local government agencies in three sections: managerial functions, information processing and environmental parameters.

While related studies were found, no studies of managerial functions, activities and abilities needed by middle management personnel in local government agencies were found.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Introduction

To determine selected managerial functions, activities and abilities that local government middle managers should possess, the opinions of persons presently employed as middle management personnel in the Las Vegas Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA) local government agenices were obtained. Chapter III contains descriptions of the methods used in determining the population, the methods of designing the survey instrument, the methods of data collection and the statistical procedures used in analyzing the data.

Determining the Population

The population utilized in this study consisted of middle management personnel in local government agencies in the Las Vegas Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA) which encompasses the entire area of Clark County, Nevada. Six (6) local government agencies were identified as meeting the critieria which were: (1) governments must be located in the Las Vegas SMSA, and (2) governments must be incorporated. Several of the towns within this area are not incorporated but are part of the county's jurisdiction.

The six (6) identified local government agencies consisted of four cities: Boulder City, Henderson, Las Vegas and North Las Vegas; one county agency: Clark County; and one city-county agency: Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department. The administrators of the above agencies were contacted to

obtain the number of middle management personnel in each organization: Boulder City - sixteen (16); Henderson - ten (10); Las Vegas - twenty-nine (29); North Las Vegas - nineteen (19); Clark County - ninety eight (98); and Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department - sixty (60). This provided a population of two hundred thirty-two (232) middle management personnel. Because of the availability of middle management personnel, no sampling procedure was used. The entire population was surveyed.

Designing the Survey Instrument

Initially the chief executive officers of the local government agencies were interviewed to obtain permission to conduct the research within their respective organizations. The interviews covered a discussion of managerial functions and activities to be studied, why the study would be worthwhile and a definition of the population to be surveyed. The administrators for all six local government agencies agreed to participate in the study. Methods were approved for future contacts with appropriate personnel and the distribution of the questionnaire.

The first step in designing the questionnaire was to identify the areas of managerial functions, activities and abilities to be included. Ten major areas were identified: planning, organizing, directing, controlling, accounting/finance, data processing, government agency, communicating, motivating and personnel.

In the management literature, planning, organizing, directing and controlling were presented as the major areas of managerial activities. Although a variety of labels are used, these activities are consistently presented as the core of management.

The accounting/finance category was included to determine the extent middle managers are involved in these various functions. The inclusion of

data processing was likewise done to determine the extent of its use by middle management personnel.

The government agency section was to determine how much knowledge middle managers need to have concerning the organization, its history and its structure.

The categories on communicating and motivating were included to determine the behavioral aspects of managing. This is an area which has received much attention recently and is believed to have the greatest impact on organization productivity, efficiency and cost control.

Personnel are a part of every manager's job; therefore the personnel category was included to determine the scope of knowledge needed in this area.

After determining the areas to be covered in the questionnaire, questions were developed within each category.

Upon completion of the initial questionnaire, it was distributed to experts in the field of government management personnel. The local government experts assisted in reviewing all items developed and offered suggestions for additional questions and better clarity. Suggestions received from the experts were incorporated into the revised data collection instrument.

The third phase was a pilot study composed of one representative of upper management in each of the six local governments in the geographical area to be studied. These individuals were selected by the chief executive officers of the organization.

In March, 1983, a copy of the revised data collection instrument was sent to each of the six local government agencies with a letter explaining the study and a request for them to complete and return the instrument. Instructions within the data collection instrument directed them to respond to each

question on a scale of one (1) to five (5) with one (1) being very important and four (4) unimportant. A fifth category was available for a "no opinion" response and a sixth category for "not applicable." Five of the questionnaries were returned. Personal interviews were conducted with the respondents to determine responses to the effectiveness of each item on the questionnaire.

The averages were calculated on the pilot study returns for each item in the instrument. As no item was below the theoretical mean (3), no questions were eliminated. No changes were incorporated in the data collection instrument based on the results of the pilot study and the follow-up interviews. The final data collection instrument contained 341 questions including areas for comments by respondents.

Collecting the Data

The refined data collection instrument was printed and made available for distribution.

The instrument was distributed in person to the pre-arranged contact personnel within each of the local government agencies. The questionnaires were delivered with a cover letter (See Appendix) and a self-addressed, stamped envelope. Each questionnaire was coded so that follow-up letters could be sent to those who failed to respond within two weeks and could be repeated for those who had still failed to respond after four weeks. Sixty-four (64) questionnaires were returned after the intital distribution; forty-five (45) additional responses were received after the first follow-up letter; and eighteen (18) responses were received after the second follow-up letter. A total of one hundred twenty-seven (127) questionnaires were returned. One hundred twenty-seven (127) questionnaires returned of the two hundred thirty-two (232) distributed represents a 54.7

percent response rate. A 54.7 percent return rate was considered to be acceptable. This acceptability was verified in the statement by Erdors (1970):

> While it is impossible to generalize about what constitutes an adequate return rate, it is also unwise to side step the question or to hedge on it. In this author's opinion, a minimum standard can be established, which sets at least a negative limit: no mail survey can be considered reliable unless it has a minimum of 50 percent response, or unless it demonstrates with some form of verification that the nonrespondents are similiar to the respondents (p. 144).

Four of the responses were not usable in this research as over 50 percent of the questions were left blank. This left one hundred twenty-three (123) usable responses for a return rate of usable responses of 53 percent.

Analyzing the Data

The completed data collection instruments obtained from the one hundred twenty-three (123) respondents were audited and the responses were extended to the card code column at the right side of the questionnaire page. Coded data responses were keypunched onto computer data cards. Data cards were proofread to verify accuracy of the keypunching. Using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (Nie, et al, 1975), programs for frequencies (p. 195), condescriptive (p.186) and cross-tabulation (p. 231-235) were run on the data.

According to Huck (1974), " . . . descriptive statistics are concerned only with characteristics of the set of data obtained by the researcher, inferential statistics are concerned with generalization to a population larger than the set of data obtained by the researcher" (p. 19).

As the present study was a collection of data from a select population and not a random sample, it was necessary to use methods of descriptive statistics. The mean and crosstabulation were determined to be the most relevant of the measurements.

With a possibility of selecting responses from one (1) to six (6), the theoretical mean was determined to be three (3). All responses that were three (3) or below were determined to be significant for this study.

The program crosstab was utilized to present a percent of responses under the response scale by the level of management responsibility. The level of management responsibility was determined by job title and organization charts. One group consisted of second-level managers; the second group was operations managers; the third group was assistant department heads; the fourth group was professionals. Chi square (x^2) was run but was not included in the formal part of the report since most of the cells did not have a minimum of 5 responses. All analyses were skewed in the direction of "most important" (1). This skewness was supported by the means and standard deviations as reported in the other descriptive statistics utilized.

Summary

The procedures used in designing and conducting the study have been presented in Chapter III. The development of the data collection instrument was explained. An explanation of the pilot study was discussed, and the data collection process presented. The statistical procedures used to analyze the data were identified.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to gather data from middle management personnel in local government agencies which would identify the managerial functions, activities and abilities essential in performing their duties. The purpose of this chapter is to present the data collected by a survey of local government middle managers. These middle managers represented the six (6) incorporated local government agencies in the Las Vegas Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA).

The data collection instrument contained three hundred thirteen (313) questions in ten (10) categories. Using a Likert scale of summated ratings, each respondent was asked to select one of the following options on each of the three hundred thirteen (313) questions: (1) very important; (2) moderately important; (3) slightly important; (4) unimportant; (5) no opinion; (NA) not applicable. Areas for comments were made available for respondents. Chapter IV contains the analysis of the data: respondents' demographics, and analyses as applied to the questions.

Analysis of the Data

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (Nie, et al, 1975) was used to determine frequencies, means and selected crosstabs. Crosstabulation included the option for the chi-square (x^2) test.

The data were analyzed to find the mean rating for each questionnaire item. Any questionnaire item which had a mean rating of three (3) or less was considered important for middle management personnel in local government agencies.

Respondents

The results of the survey determined the following statistics regarding the responding population. A total of 123 middle managers in local government agenices in the Las Vegas Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area responsed: Boulder City - 6; Henderson - 8; Las Vegas - 14; North Las Vegas - 16; Clark County - 49; Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department - 30. The levels of management responsibility represented in the responding population were: second-level managers - 49; operations managers - 46; assistant directors - 19; professionals - 9. Governmental departments represented by this study were as follows: police - 39; other services - 24; public works, building, surveryor, engineering - 15; fire - 13; courts - 11; parks and recreation - 8; other support - 8; financial - 4; legal, clerk offices - 2.

Educational characteristics of the respondents included: high school - 116; technical school - 17; specialized training - 36; associate degrees - 8; bachelor degrees - 73; advanced degrees - 21; no degrees - 23. Ages of the respondents ranged from 26 to 61 with 64.2% of the respondents being between 36 and 50 years of age.

Span of control ranged from 0 to more than 26 employees with 41.5% respondents indicating they supervised more than 26 employees. Seventy-six of the respondents (61.8%) indicated they had held their current position less than 6 years with one hundred five respondents (86.1%) indicating less than 11 years. In attaining their current positions, respondents indicated that 74.8% were

promoted from within the agencies; 5.7% were transferred within the agencies; 20.3% were hired from outside the agencies. Future career expectations of the respondents included: self-improvement - 69.1%; promotion - 60.2%; further training - 47.2%; transfer - 12.2%; none - 5.7%

Principle Question

The question to be answered was, "What managerial functions, activities and abilities are needed by middle management personnel employed by local government agencies in the Las Vegas Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area?"

The data shown in Tables 1 through 10 shows the percentage responses indicated as very important (1), important (2), slightly important (3), the mean response, the percentage responses of 1 and 2, the percentage responses of 1, 2 and 3 (all responses below the theoretical mean).

The managerial functions, activities and abilities needed by middle management personnel in local government agencies were determined from the data presented in Tables 1 through 10. The following ten (10) managerial areas provided an analysis of these categories by population mean scores and percentage responses. The areas of each of the ten (10) managerial areas were as follows: Planning, Organizing, Directing, Controlling, Communicating, Motivating, Accounting/Finance, Data Processing, Government Agency and Personnel.

Planning

The planning responses indicated that 76.4% or more of the participants perceived all items in this section to be important. The responses are found in the analysis of items 1 through 23 of the Data Collection Instrument as

shown in Table 1. Percentage responses ranged from 76.4% to 96.8% responses below the theoretical mean (3). Mean responses ranged from 1.122 to 2.154 responses.

Item 13 was indicated by 91.9% of the responses as being very important. Only 4 items of the 23 in this section had responses below 70.0% for responses 1 and 2 and none of these were below 61.8%. The responses to the 23 items clearly demonstrates the importance of the planning function and activities for middle management in local government agencies.

Table 1

MEANS & PERCENTAGES OF PLANNING RESPONSES

Item No.	%* 1	%* 2	%* 3	Means	%* 1+2	%* 1+2+3
1	43.1	22.0	17.9	2.073	65.0	82.9
2	49.6	30.9	10.6	1.675	80.5	91.1
3	56.9	26.0	4.1	1.691	82.9	87.0
4	60.2	13.8	6.5	1.756	74.0	87.8
5	44.7	17.1	16.3	2.154	61.8	78.0
6	45.5	26.8	13.8	1.862	72.4	86.2
7	46.3	26.0	13.8	1.967	72.4	86.2
8	41.5	21.1	13.8	2.016	62.6	76.4
9	41.5	22.8	13.8	2.106	64.2	78.1
10	52.8	23.6	10.6	1.740	76.4	87.0
11	56.1	22.0	5.7	1.797	78.0	83.8
12	54.5	15.4	8.1	1.699	69.9	78.0
13	91.9	4.1	0.0	1.122	96.0	96.0
14	63.4	22.8	10.6	1.488	86.2	96.8
15	47.2	37.4	11.4	1.675	84.6	96.0
16	74.8	20.3	0.0	1.358	95.1	95.1
17	56.1	33.3	5.7	1.488	89.4	95.1
18	71.5	14.6	2.4	1.154	86.2	88.5
19	58.5	29.3	7.3	1.537	87.8	95.1
20	56.9	33.3	5.7	1.480	90.2	96.0
21	68.3	23.6	4.9	1.374	91.9	96.8
22	68.3	23.6	4.1	1.350	91.9	96.0
23	53.7	33.3	8.1	1.569	87.0	95.2

* All percentages reported are those below the theoretical mean.

Organizing

The organizing responses indicated that 87.1% or more of the participants perceived all items in this section to be important. The responses are found in the analysis of items 33 through 55 of the Data Collection Instrument as shown in Table 2. Percentage responses ranged from 87.1% to 99.2% responses below the theoretical mean (3). Mean responses ranged from 1.154 to 1.992 responses.

Table 2

MEANS AND PERCENTAGES OF ORGANIZING RESPONSES

Item No.	%* 1	%* 2	%* 3	Means	%* 1+2	%* 1+2+3
33	40.7	32.5	15.4	1.951	73.2	88.6
34	48.8	30.9	13.8	1.764	79.7	93.5
35	65.0	19.5	7.3	1.659	84.6	91.9
36	54.5	22.0	10.6	1.805	76.4	87.1
37	69.1	14.6	5.7	1.228	83.7	89.4
38	87.0	11.4	0.8	1.163	98.4	99.2
39	60.2	29.3	8.9	1.537	89.4	98.4
40	51.2	40.7	6.5	1.593	91.9	98.4
41	51.2	39.0	8.1	1.610	90.2	98.4
42	88.6	8.1	0.8	1.154	96.7	97.6
43	78.0	17.1	0.8	1.285	95.1	95.9
44	71.5	23.6	2.4	1.333	95.1	97.6
45	61.0	29.3	7.3	1.455	90.2	97.6
46	48.0	34.1	11.4	1.683	82.1	93.5
47	32.5	44.7	13.0	1.992	77.2	90.3
48	69.9	22.8	4.1	1.390	92.7	96.8
49	70.7	22.0	4.9	1.415	92.7	97.6
50	46.3	38.2	10.6	1.805	84.6	95.1
51	64.2	28.5	4.9	1.439	92.7	97.6
52	62.6	24.4	8.1	1.593	87.0	95.1
53	60.2	26.8	9.8	1.553	87.0	96.8
54	55.3	35.8	4.9	1.537	91.1	96.0
55	48.8	42.3	4.1	1.650	91.1	95.1

* All percentages reported are those below the theoretical mean.

Item 38 was indicated by 87.0% of the responses as being very important. Item 42 was indicated by 88.6% of the responses as being very important. Only 4 items of the 23 in this section had responses below 80.0% for responses 1 and 2 and none of those were below 73.2%. Only 3 items of the 23 had responses below 90.0% for responses below the theoretical mean and none of those were below 87.1%. The responses to the 23 items clearly demonstrates the importance of the organizing function and activities for middle management in local government agencies.

Directing

The directing responses indicated that 88.7% or more of the participants perceived all items in this section to be important. The responses are found in the analysis of items 65 through 94 of the Data Collection Instrument as shown in Table 3. Percentage responses ranged from 88.7% to 99.2% responses below the theoretical mean (3). Mean responses ranged from 1.041 to 1.967 responses.

Item 80 was indicated by 99.2% of the responses as being important. Two items were indicated as being very important: Item 65 by 81.3% of the responses, and item 70 by 83.7% of the responses. Only 6 items of the 30 in this section had responses below 80.0% for responses 1 and 2 and none of those were below 69.9%. Only 2 items of the 30 had responses below 90.0% for responses below the theoretical mean and none of those were below 88.7%. The responses to the 30 items clearly demonstrates the importance of the directing function and activities for middle management in local government agencies.

Table 3

MEANS AND PERCENTAGES OF DIRECTING RESPONSES

Item No.	%* 1	%* 2	%* 3	Means	%* 1+2	%* 1+2+3
65	81.3	11.4	0.0	1.041	92.7	92.7
66	40.7	29.3	18.7	1.870	69.9	88.7
67	50.4	30.1	14.6	1.667	80.5	95.2
68	66.7	19.5	5.7	1.528	86.2	91.9
69	72.4	12.2	4.9	1.447	84.6	89.4
70	83.7	13.8	0.0	1.203	97.6	97.6
71	62.6	22.0	8.1	1.667	84.6	92.7
72	47.2	35.0	9.8	1.813	82.1	91.9
73	38.2	40.7	12.2	1.967	78.9	91.9
74	47.2	36.6	11.4	1.740	83.7	95.1
75	30.1	46.3	16.3	1.943	76.4	92.7
76	50.4	34.1	9.8	1.642	84.6	94.3
77	43.1	33.3	17.9	1.870	76.4	94.3
78	58.5	34.1	3.3	1.569	92.7	95.9
79	48.8	38.2	9.8	1.618	87.0	96.8
80	65.9	28.5	4.9	1.415	94.3	99.2
81	73.2	22.8	1.6	1.276	95.9	97.6
82	53.7	35.0	5.7	1.496	88.6	94.3
83	64.2	27.6	6.5	1.480	91.9	98.4
84	37.4	40.7	12.2	1.959	78.0	90.3
85	67.5	22.8	7.3	1.472	90.2	97.6
86	64.2	22.8	8.1	1.528	87.0	95.1
87	57.7	20.3	13.8	1.691	78.0	91.9
88	73.2	22.8	1.6	1.317	95.9	97.6
89	40.7	45.5	8.9	1.772	86.2	95.1
90	59.3	30.9	4.9	1.439	90.2	95.1
91	43.6	37.4	12.2	1.650	83.7	96.0
92	57.7	35.8	4.9	1.512	93.5	98.4
93	57.7	30.9	6.5	1.618	88.6	95.1
94	57.7	26.8	10.6	1.659	84.6	95.1

* All percentages reported are those below the theoretical mean.

Controlling

The controlling responses indicated that 88.6% or more of the participants perceived all item in this section to be important. The responses are found in the analysis of items 104 through 115 of the Data Collection Instrument as shown in Table 4. Percentage responses ranged from 88.6% to 97.6% responses below the theoretical mean (3). Mean responses ranged from 1.382 to 2.187 responses.

Only 1 item of the 12 in this section had responses below 70.0% for responses 1 and 2 and it was 68.3%. Only 1 item of the 12 had responses below 90.0% for responses below the theoretical mean and it was 88.6%. The responses to the 12 items clearly demonstrates the importance of the controlling function and activities for middle management in local government agencies.

Table 4

MEANS AND PERCENTAGES OF CONTROLLING RESPONSES

Item No.	%* 1	%* 2	%* 3	Means	%* 1+2	%* 1+2+3
104	45.5	34.1	17.1	1.772	79.7	96.8
105	50.4	33.3	12.2	1.699	83.7	95.9
106	64.2	26.0	5.7	1.553	90.2	95.9
107	56.1	38.2	2.4	1.528	94.3	96.8
108	53.7	35.0	8.9	1.634	88.6	97.6
109	51.2	39.0	5.7	1.626	90.2	95.9
110	52.0	37.4	4.9	1.642	89.4	94.3
111	61.0	27.6	8.9	1.520	88.6	97.6
112	69.1	25.2	3.3	1.382	94.3	97.6
113	55.3	35.8	5.7	1.561	91.1	96.8
114	28.5	39.8	20.3	2.187	68.3	88.6
115	43.9	39.8	12.2	1.780	83.7	95.9

* All percentages reported are those below the theoretical mean.

Communicating

The communicating responses indicated that 92.7% or more of the participants perceived all items in this section to be important. The responses are found in the analysis of items 217 through 241 of the Data Collection Instrument as shown in Table 5. Percentage responses ranged from 92.7% to 99.2% responses. Mean responses ranged from 1.073 to 1.927 responses.

Table 5

MEANS AND PERCENTAGES OF COMMUNICATING RESPONSES

Item No.	%* 1	%* 2	%* 3	Means	%* 1+2	%* 1+2+3
217	73.2	21.1	2.4	1.309	94.3	96.8
218	74.8	16.3	4.9	1.260	91.1	95.9
219	72.4	18.7	4.1	1.301	91.1	95.1
220	91.9	5.7	0.0	1.073	97.6	97.6
221	73.2	20.3	2.4	1.293	93.5	96.0
222	54.5	28.5	12.2	1.593	82.9	95.2
223	80.5	9.8	6.5	1.309	90.2	96.8
224	56.9	26.0	9.8	1.691	82.9	92.7
225	78.9	13.0	5.7	1.301	91.9	97.6
226	85.4	10.6	2.4	1.179	95.9	98.4
227	88.6	9.8	0.8	1.146	98.4	99.2
228	67.5	21.1	8.1	1.455	88.6	96.8
229	87.8	9.8	0.8	1.138	97.6	98.4
230	87.8	10.6	0.8	1.154	98.4	99.2
231	78.0	17.9	1.6	1.228	95.9	97.6
232	48.8	35.0	12.2	1.659	83.7	96.0
233	63.4	29.3	4.1	1.447	92.7	96.8
234	35.8	36.6	22.0	1.927	72.4	94.3
235	55.3	30.1	10.6	1.618	85.4	95.9
236	39.0	37.4	16.3	1.870	76.4	92.7
237	43.1	37.4	13.0	1.813	80.5	93.5
238	53.7	27.6	14.6	1.634	81.3	95.0
239	54.5	30.1	11.4	1.642	84.6	95.9
240	52.8	29.3	12.2	1.667	82.1	94.3
241	75.6	15.4	5.7	1.309	91.1	96.8

* All percentages reported are those below the theoretical mean.

Item 220 was indicated by 91.9% of the responses as being very important. Only 2 items of the 25 in this section had responses below 80.0% for responses 1 and 2 and neither of those were below 72.4%. No items were below 90.0% for responses below the theoretical mean. The responses to the 25 items clearly demonstrates the importance of the communicating function and activities for middle management in local government agencies.

Motivating

The motivating responses indicated that 87.4% or more of the participants perceived all items in this section to be important. The responses are found in the analysis of items 251 through 266 of the Data Collection Instrument as shown in Table 6. Percentage responses ranged from 87.4% to 97.6% responses below the theoretical mean (3). Mean responses ranged from 1.228 to 2.325 responses.

Only 4 items of the 16 in this section had responses below 90.0% for responses below the theoretical mean and none of those were below 87.4%. The responses to the 16 items clearly demonstrates the importance of the motivating function and activities for middle management in local government agencies.

Accounting/Finance

The accounting/finance responses indicated that 78.9% or more of the participants perceived all items in this section to be important. The responses are found in the analysis of items 125 through 152 of the Data Collection Instrument as shown in Table 7. Percentage responses ranged from 78.9% to 96.8% responses below the theoretical mean (3). Mean responses ranged from 1.504 to 2.577 responses.

Table 6

MEANS AND PERCENTAGES OF MOTIVATING RESPONSES

Item No.	%* 1	%* 2	%* 3	Means	%* 1+2	%* 1+2+3
251	76.4	21.1	0.0	1.228	97.6	97.6
252	54.5	35.0	6.5	1.520	89.4	96.0
253	27.6	43.1	22.0	2.041	70.7	92.7
254	70.7	22.8	3.3	1.382	93.5	96.8
255	39.0	37.4	17.1	1.919	76.4	93.5
256	22.0	39.8	26.0	2.325	61.8	87.8
257	45.5	39.0	8.1	1.715	84.6	92.7
258	43.9	38.2	10.6	1.756	82.1	92.7
259	58.5	33.3	3.3	1.512	91.9	95.1
260	55.3	36.6	3.3	1.545	91.9	95.1
261	39.8	41.5	8.1	1.813	81.3	89.4
262	43.9	35.0	8.9	1.837	78.9	87.8
263	68.3	25.2	3.3	1.407	93.5	96.8
264	42.3	39.8	13.8	1.805	82.1	95.9
265	69.9	22.0	4.9	1.447	91.9	96.7
266	58.5	22.0	6.5	1.293	80.5	87.4

* All percentages reported are those below the theoretical mean.

Accounting/Finance (Continued)

Only 10 items of the 28 in this section had responses below 66.0% for responses 1 and 2 and none of those were below 50.4%. Only 1 item of the 28 had responses below 80.0% for responses below the theoretical mean. The responses to the 28 items clearly demonstrates the importance of the accounting/finance abilities for middle management in local government agencies.

Table 7

MEANS AND PERCENTAGES OF ACCOUNTING/FINANCE RESPONSES

Item No.	%* 1	%* 2	%* 3	Means	%* 1+2	%* 1+2+3
125	38.2	25.2	25.2	1.707	63.4	88.6
126	59.3	30.1	7.3	1.520	89.4	96.8
127	53.7	31.7	8.9	1.618	85.4	94.3
128	52.8	30.1	9.8	1.675	82.9	92.7
129	40.7	30.9	17.1	1.984	71.5	89.6
130	36.6	33.3	19.5	2.024	69.9	89.5
131	38.2	32.5	21.1	1.984	70.7	91.9
132	51.2	27.6	14.6	1.764	78.9	93.5
133	42.3	34.1	14.6	1.911	76.4	91.1
134	39.0	26.0	22.8	2.065	65.0	87.8
135	37.4	26.0	25.2	2.122	63.4	88.6
136	46.3	28.5	15.4	1.902	74.8	90.3
137	65.9	22.8	6.5	1.504	88.6	95.1
138	33.3	30.9	22.0	2.187	64.2	86.2
139	44.7	22.8	21.1	2.033	67.5	88.6
140	48.8	26.0	14.6	1.919	74.8	89.4
141	18.7	31.7	31.7	2.577	50.4	82.1
142	33.3	29.3	22.0	2.358	62.6	84.6
143	31.7	32.5	19.5	2.366	64.2	83.8
144	27.6	30.9	23.6	2.423	58.5	82.1
145	39.0	35.8	14.6	2.024	74.8	89.4
146	32.5	24.4	22.0	2.423	56.9	78.9
147	43.1	29.3	17.1	2.049	72.4	89.4
148	43.9	28.5	16.3	2.024	72.4	88.6
149	37.4	30.1	17.1	2.195	67.5	84.6
150	36.6	25.2	22.8	2.203	61.8	84.6
151	38.2	30.1	16.3	2.138	68.3	84.6
152	43.9	29.3	13.0	2.024	73.2	86.2

* All percentages reported are those below the theoretical mean.

Data Processing

The data processing responses indicated that 41.5% of the participants perceived all items in this section to be important. The responses are found in the analysis of items 162 through 176 of the Data Collection Instrument as shown in Table 8. Percentage responses ranged from 41.5% to 81.3% responses below the theoretical mean (3). Mean responses ranged from 2.439 to 3.919 responses.

The patterns of responses which emerged were the differences among responses to the extent of data processing knowlege needed and the types of use of data processing information needed. Items 167 through 171 responses

Table 8

MEANS AND PERCENTAGES OF DATA PROCESSING RESPONSES

Item No.	%* 1	%* 2	%* 3	Means	%* 1+2	%* 1+2+3
162	8.9	29.3	22.0	3.317	38.2	60.2
163	4.9	11.4	25.2	3.919	16.3	41.5
164	13.0	17.1	26.8	3.439	30.1	56.9
165	17.1	27.1	21.1	3.276	38.2	59.4
166	15.4	16.3	25.2	3.407	31.7	56.9
167	29.3	36.6	15.4	2.439	65.9	81.3
168	11.4	17.1	30.9	3.390	28.5	59.4
169	28.5	24.4	22.8	2.732	52.8	75.6
170	30.1	27.6	17.9	2.642	57.7	75.6
171	29.3	24.4	22.0	2.724	53.7	75.6
172	27.6	32.5	16.3	2.528	60.2	76.4
173	11.4	20.3	28.5	3.325	31.7	60.2
174	27.6	26.0	22.8	2.691	53.7	76.4
175	28.5	30.1	17.9	2.593	58.5	76.4
176	26.0	23.6	23.6	2.748	49.6	73.2

* All percentages reported are those below the theoretical mean.

indicated higher group percentages to accessing information than basic usage of data processing equipment. Only 5 of the 15 items in this section had responses below 60.0% for responses below the theoretical mean and only one of those was below 50.0%. The responses to the 15 items in this section do not clearly demonstrate the importance of data processing for middle management in local government agencies.

Government Agency

The government agency responses indicated that 86.1% or more of the participants perceived all items in this section to be important. The responses are found in the analysis of items 186 through 207 of the Data Collection Instrument as shown in Table 9. Percentage responses ranged from 86.1% to 96.8% responses below the theoretical mean (3). Mean responses ranged from 1.309 to 2.317 responses.

Only 4 items of the 22 in this section had responses below 70.0% for responses 1 and 2 and none of those were below 53.7%. Only 2 items of the 22 had responses below 90.0% for responses below the theoretical mean and neither of those were below the 86.1%. The responses to the 22 items clearly demonstrates the importance of government agency knowledge for middle management in local government agencies.

Personnel

The personnel responses indicated that 79.7% or more of the participants perceived all items in this section to be important. The responses are found in the analysis of items 276 through 307 of the Data Collection Instrument as shown in Table 10. Percentage responses ranged from 79.7% to 97.6% responses below the theoretical mean (3). Mean responses ranged from 1.432 to 2.772 responses.

Table 9

MEANS AND PERCENTAGES OF GOVERNMENT AGENCY RESPONSES

Item No.	%* 1	%* 2	%* 3	Means	%* 1+2	%* 1+2+3
186	64.2	25.2	5.7	1.407	89.4	95.1
187	74.0	15.4	5.7	1.309	89.4	95.1
188	26.0	28.5	31.7	2.203	54.4	86.1
189	48.8	28.5	13.8	1.732	77.2	91.1
190	53.7	26.0	9.8	1.707	79.7	89.4
191	61.8	22.0	11.4	1.553	83.7	95.1
192	73.2	17.1	6.5	1.390	90.2	96.8
193	70.7	17.9	4.9	1.488	88.6	93.5
194	73.2	11.4	6.5	1.545	84.6	91.1
195	69.9	18.7	8.1	1.390	88.6	96.8
196	44.7	37.4	11.4	1.715	82.1	93.5
197	55.3	30.9	10.6	1.561	61.8	96.8
198	43.9	32.5	18.7	1.805	76.4	95.1
199	65.0	24.4	7.3	1.439	89.4	96.8
200	37.4	38.2	17.9	1.878	75.6	93.5
201	24.4	40.7	27.6	2.089	65.0	92.7
202	17.9	35.8	36.6	2.317	53.7	90.3
203	71.5	19.5	4.1	1.390	91.1	95.1
204	31.7	47.2	13.8	1.935	78.9	92.7
205	52.8	34.1	8.1	1.577	87.0	95.2
206	71.5	16.3	8.1	1.398	87.8	96.0
207	49.6	34.1	6.5	1.748	83.7	90.3

* All percentages reported are those below the theoretical mean.

Personnel (Continued)

Only 11 of the 32 items in this section had responses below 70.0% for responses 1 and 2 and none of those were below 56.9%. Only 1 item of the 32 had responses below 80.0% for responses below the theoretical mean and it was 79.7%. The responses to the 32 items clearly demonstrates the importance of the personnel abilities for middle management in local government agencies.

Table 10

MEANS AND PERCENTAGES OF PERSONNEL RESPONSES

Item No.	%* 1	%* 2	%* 3	Means	%* 1+2	%* 1+2+3
276	40.7	34.1	14.6	2.065	74.8	89.4
277	64.2	26.0	5.7	1.545	90.2	95.9
278	52.8	31.7	9.8	1.699	84.6	94.3
279	65.9	26.8	4.1	1.423	92.7	96.8
280	38.2	35.0	17.1	2.008	73.2	90.3
281	43.9	37.4	13.0	1.846	81.3	94.3
282	26.0	38.2	26.8	2.179	64.2	91.1
283	54.5	28.5	8.9	1.748	82.9	91.9
284	45.5	40.7	11.4	1.724	86.2	97.6
285	54.5	26.8	11.4	1.821	81.3	92.7
286	50.4	36.6	9.8	1.642	87.0	96.8
287	17.9	39.0	30.9	2.382	56.9	87.8
288	26.8	30.9	26.0	2.382	57.7	83.8
289	62.6	24.4	7.3	1.561	87.0	94.3
290	48.0	33.3	13.0	1.756	81.3	94.3
291	52.0	31.7	10.6	1.675	83.7	94.3
292	64.2	25.2	4.9	1.537	89.4	94.3
293	55.3	28.5	5.7	1.496	83.7	89.4
294	62.6	21.1	4.1	1.854	83.7	87.8
295	34.1	41.5	19.5	2.000	75.6	95.1
296	29.3	52.8	15.4	1.902	82.1	97.6
297	41.5	31.7	10.6	2.220	73.2	83.7
298	30.9	28.5	9.8	2.772	59.3	89.1
299	43.9	30.1	8.9	2.195	74.0	82.9
300	22.8	36.6	25.2	2.463	59.3	84.6
301	24.4	36.6	21.1	2.480	61.0	82.1
302	32.5	37.4	16.3	2.293	69.9	86.2
303	28.5	30.9	23.6	2.480	59.3	82.9
304	33.3	24.4	22.0	2.472	57.7	79.7
305	46.3	26.8	18.7	1.935	73.2	91.9
306	29.3	32.5	23.6	2.317	61.8	85.4
307	30.1	27.6	27.6	2.382	57.7	85.4

* All percentages reported are those below the theoretical mean.

Question 1

The question to be answered was, "Is there a relationship between the levels of management responsibility in local government agencies and the perceived importance of managerial functions and/or activities including planning, organizing, directing, controlling, communicating and motivating?"

In order to answer this question, it was necessary to analyze the response ratings by level of management responsibility and each of the functions and/or activities.

Planning

The planning responses indicated no significant differences among the four levels of management responsibility and managers' perceived importance of the various planning functions and/or activites. The mean responses are found in the analysis of items 1 through 23 of the Data Collection Instrument as shown in Table 11. Percentage responses ranged from 73.3% to 100.0% responses below the theoretical mean (3).

The pattern of responses which emerged was the differences among responses by organizational levels. In items 1 through 12, second-level managers and operation managers had their lowest group percentage responses to planning for the organization whereas assistant directors and professionals responded with higher percentages. Of the 23 items in this section, responses to 14 items (61.0%) indicated 90.0% or more of the participants rated these functions and/or activities as being important. No mean responses for items were below an 82.0% favorable response.

TABLE 11

PLANNING RESPONSES BY MANAGEMENT LEVELS*

ITEM NO.	SECOND LEVEL MANAGERS	OPERATIONS MANAGERS	ASSISTANT DIRECTORS	PRO-FESSIONALS	TOTAL AVERAGE
1	81.2	90.9	88.2	88.9	86.4
2	93.9	95.3	100.0	88.9	94.9
3	93.8	95.6	75.0	77.8	90.7
4	87.5	90.5	80.0	77.8	86.8
5	77.1	86.0	82.4	88.9	82.1
6	87.8	93.0	88.2	88.9	89.8
7	89.6	93.5	75.0	88.9	89.1
8	83.0	88.1	73.3	87.5	83.9
9	78.7	86.0	94.1	85.7	84.2
10	87.5	95.3	94.1	88.9	91.5
11	87.2	91.3	81.3	87.5	88.0
12	82.6	92.7	86.7	100.0	88.1
13	97.9	97.8	100.0	88.9	97.5
14	100.0	97.8	100.0	88.9	98.3
15	97.9	95.6	100.0	100.0	97.5
16	95.8	95.7	100.0	88.9	95.9
17	97.9	97.8	100.0	100.0	98.3
18	100.0	97.7	93.8	100.0	98.2
19	100.0	95.7	100.0	77.8	96.7
20	100.0	97.8	100.0	88.9	98.3
21	100.0	97.8	100.0	88.9	98.3
22	100.0	97.8	100.0	88.9	98.3
23	100.0	97.8	94.7	88.9	97.5

* Columns represent the percentage of responses below the theoretical mean.

Organizing

The organizing responses indicated no significant differences among the four levels of management responsibility and the managers' perceived importance of the various organizing functions and/or activities. The responses are found in the analysis of items 33 through 55 of the Data Collection

TABLE 12

ORGANIZING RESPONSES BY MANAGEMENT LEVELS*

ITEM NO.	SECOND LEVEL MANAGERS	OPERATIONS MANAGERS	ASSISTANT DIRECTORS	PRO-FESSIONALS	TOTAL AVERAGE
33	85.7	95.5	94.4	100.0	91.6
34	91.8	97.8	94.4	100.0	95.0
35	95.9	93.5	77.8	100.0	92.6
36	91.8	93.3	76.5	87.5	89.9
37	97.7	97.7	100.0	100.0	98.2
38	100.0	97.8	100.0	100.0	99.2
39	100.0	95.7	100.0	100.0	98.4
40	100.0	97.8	100.0	88.9	98.4
41	98.0	97.8	100.0	100.0	98.4
42	98.0	97.8	100.0	100.0	98.4
43	95.9	95.6	100.0	100.0	96.7
44	100.0	97.8	100.0	88.9	98.4
45	100.0	97.8	100.0	100.0	99.2
46	97.9	95.6	100.0	77.8	95.8
47	91.8	95.6	88.9	77.8	91.7
48	100.0	95.7	94.4	100.0	97.5
49	98.0	95.7	100.0	100.0	97.6
50	93.9	95.7	94.7	100.0	95.1
51	97.9	97.8	100.0	100.0	98.4
52	93.9	93.5	100.0	100.0	95.1
53	100.0	95.7	100.0	88.9	97.5
54	100.0	95.7	100.0	88.9	97.5
55	98.0	95.7	100.0	88.9	95.9

* Columns represent the percentage of responses below the theoretical mean.

Instrument as shown in Table 12. Percentage responses ranged from 76.5% to 100.0% responses below the theoretical mean (3). Only item 36 had an overall percentage responses of lower than 91.7%.

In items 33 through 36, second-level managers had their lowest group percentage responses to organizing for the organization whereas the other three managerial levels responded with higher percentages for the organization and department. Items 37, 38, 42 and 43 received percentage responses in excess of 75.0% in the very important rating alone. Of the 23 items in this section, responses to 19 (86.0%) indicated 95.0% or more of the participants rated these functions and/or activities as being important. No mean responses for items were below 89.9% favorable response.

Directing

The directing responses indicated no significant differences among the four levels of management responsibility and managers' perceived importance of the various directing functions and/or activities. The responses are found in the analysis of items 65 to 94 of the Data Collection Instrument as shown in Table 13. Percentage responses ranged from 91.0% to 100.0% responses below the theoretical mean (3).

Item 65 responses were 100.0% by the participants as very important and moderately important. Item 70 was indicated as very important and moderately important by 98.4% of the respondents. Of the 30 items in this section, responses to 22 items (73.0%) indicated 95.0% or more of the participants rated these functions and/or activities as being important. No mean responses for items were below a 91.0% favorable response.

TABLE 13

DIRECTING RESPONSES BY MANAGEMENT LEVELS*

ITEM NO.	SECOND LEVEL MANAGERS	OPERATIONS MANAGERS	ASSISTANT DIRECTORS	PRO-FESSIONALS	TOTAL AVERAGE
65	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
66	93.6	95.3	88.9	88.9	93.2
67	97.9	97.7	94.7	100.0	97.5
68	97.9	95.7	77.8	100.0	94.2
69	95.7	95.5	83.3	88.9	93.2
70	100.0	95.7	100.0	100.0	98.4
71	91.8	91.3	100.0	88.9	92.7
72	93.9	91.3	100.0	77.8	92.6
73	93.9	93.5	88.9	77.8	91.8
74	98.0	95.7	94.4	88.9	95.9
75	95.8	91.3	100.0	100.0	95.0
76	100.0	91.3	100.0	100.0	96.7
77	98.0	91.3	100.0	88.9	95.1
78	100.0	89.1	100.0	100.0	95.9
79	97.9	97.8	100.0	100.0	98.3
80	100.0	97.8	100.0	100.0	99.2
81	100.0	97.8	100.0	100.0	98.4
82	100.0	95.5	100.0	100.0	98.3
83	100.0	95.7	100.0	100.0	98.4
84	95.9	91.3	83.3	77.9	91.0
85	98.0	95.7	100.0	100.0	97.6
86	100.0	93.5	88.9	100.0	95.9
87	98.0	88.9	94.4	88.9	93.4
88	100.0	95.7	100.0	100.0	98.4
89	100.0	93.5	100.0	77.8	96.7
90	97.9	97.8	100.0	100.0	98.3
91	100.0	97.8	100.0	88.9	98.3
92	98.0	97.8	100.0	100.0	98.4
93	100.0	95.7	83.3	100.0	95.9
94	98.0	97.8	83.3	100.0	95.9

* Columns represent the pecentage of responses below the theoretical mean.

Controlling

The controlling responses indicated no significant differences among the four levels of management responsibility and managers' perceived importance of the various controlling functions and/or activities. The responses are found in the analysis of items 104 through 115 of the Data Collection Instrument as shown in Table 14. Percentage responses ranged from 77.8% to 100.0% responses below the theoretical mean (3).

Responses of 100.0% were indicated on 10 of the 12 items by assistant directors and 9 of the 12 items by the professionals. Of the 12 items in this section, responses to 11 items (92.0%) indicated 95.0% or more of the participants rated these functions and/or activites as being important. No mean responses for items were below an 89.3% favorable response.

TABLE 14

CONTROLLING RESPONSES BY MANAGEMENT LEVELS*

ITEM NO.	SECOND LEVEL MANAGERS	OPERATIONS MANAGERS	ASSISTANT DIRECTORS	PRO-FESSIONALS	TOTAL AVERAGE
104	100.0	95.7	94.4	100.0	97.5
105	98.0	93.5	100.0	100.0	96.7
106	95.9	93.5	100.0	100.0	95.9
107	97.9	95.7	100.0	100.0	97.5
108	98.0	95.7	100.0	100.0	97.6
109	98.0	93.5	100.0	100.0	96.7
110	98.0	93.5	94.4	88.9	95.1
111	100.0	95.7	100.0	100.0	98.4
112	100.0	95.7	100.0	100.0	98.4
113	100.0	93.5	100.0	100.0	97.5
114	87.8	89.1	100.0	77.8	89.3
115	95.9	95.7	100.0	88.9	95.9

* Columns represent the percentage of responses below the theoretical mean.

Communicating

The communicating responses indicated no significant differences among the four levels of management responsibility and managers' perceived importance of the various communicating functions and/or activities. The responses are found in the analysis of items 217 through 241 of the Data Collection Instrument as shown in Table 15. Percentage responses ranged from 88.9% to 100.0% responses below the theoretical mean (3).

TABLE 15

COMMUNICATING RESPONSES BY MANAGEMENT LEVELS*

ITEM NO.	SECOND LEVEL MANAGERS	OPERATIONS MANAGERS	ASSISTANT DIRECTORS	PRO-FESSIONALS	TOTAL AVERAGE
217	100.0	95.7	100.0	100.0	98.3
218	100.0	97.8	100.0	100.0	99.2
219	100.0	95.7	100.0	100.0	98.3
220	100.0	97.8	100.0	100.0	99.2
221	100.0	95.7	100.0	100.0	98.3
222	97.8	95.7	100.0	100.0	97.5
223	98.0	97.8	100.0	88.9	97.5
224	95.9	91.3	94.4	88.9	93.4
225	100.0	95.7	100.0	100.0	98.4
226	100.0	97.8	100.0	100.0	99.2
227	100.0	97.8	100.0	100.0	99.2
228	100.0	93.5	100.0	100.0	97.5
229	100.0	97.8	100.0	100.0	99.2
230	100.0	97.8	100.0	100.0	99.2
231	100.0	97.8	100.0	100.0	99.2
232	97.9	95.7	100.0	100.0	97.5
233	97.9	95.7	100.0	100.0	97.5
234	95.8	93.5	100.0	100.0	95.9
235	98.0	93.5	100.0	100.0	96.7
236	95.8	91.3	100.0	88.9	94.2
237	93.9	93.5	100.0	88.9	94.3
238	100.0	95.7	100.0	88.9	97.5
239	95.9	95.7	100.0	100.0	96.7
240	95.8	93.5	100.0	100.0	95.9
241	100.0	95.6	100.0	100.0	98.3

*Columns represent the percentage of responses below the theoretical mean.

Assistant directors indicated 100.0% responses on 24 of the 25 items and the professionals indicated 100.0% responses on 20 of the 25 items. Participants' responses of very important above 50.0% were 21 of the 25 items and 12 of the 25 items were above 75.0% Of the 25 items in this section, responses to 22 items (88.0%) indicated 95.0% or more of the participants rated these functions and/or activities as being important. No mean responses for items were below a 93.4% favorable response.

Motivating

The motivating responses indicated no significant differences among the four levels of management responsibility and managers' perceived importance of the various motivating functions and/or activities. The responses are found in the analysis of items 251 to 266 of the Data Collection Instrument as shown in Table 16. Percentage responses ranged from 84.8% to 100.0% responses above the theoretical mean (3).

Item 251 responses were 99.2% indicating very and moderately important. Assistant directors and professionals indicated 100.0% responses to 13 of the 16 items. Of the 16 items in this section, responses to 15 items (94.0%) indicated 90.0% or more of the participants rated these functions and/or activities as being important. No mean responses for items were below an 89.3% favorable response.

TABLE 16

MOTIVATING RESPONSES BY MANAGEMENT LEVELS*

ITEM NO.	SECOND LEVEL MANAGERS	OPERATIONS MANAGERS	ASSISTANT DIRECTORS	PRO-FESSIONALS	TOTAL AVERAGE
251	100.0	97.8	100.0	100.0	99.2
252	100.0	95.6	100.0	100.0	98.3
253	95.8	93.5	94.4	88.9	94.2
254	97.9	95.7	100.0	100.0	97.5
255	95.8	91.3	94.7	100.0	94.3
256	89.6	84.8	100.0	88.9	89.3
257	95.7	93.5	100.0	100.0	95.0
258	95.7	93.5	100.0	100.0	95.0
259	95.7	95.7	100.0	100.0	96.7
260	95.8	95.7	100.0	100.0	96.7
261	93.5	87.0	100.0	100.0	92.4
262	95.7	87.0	100.0	100.0	90.8
263	98.0	95.7	100.0	100.0	97.5
264	98.0	95.7	94.4	100.0	96.7
265	98.0	95.7	100.0	88.9	96.7
266	97.8	97.5	100.0	100.0	98.2

*Columns represent the percentage of responses below the theoretical mean.

Question 2

The question to be answered was, "Is there a relationship between levels of management responsibility in local government agencies and the depth of understanding of managerial abilities including accounting/finance, data processing, government agency characteristics and personnel performance?"

In order to answer this question, it was necessary to analyze the response ratings by level of management responsibility classifications and each of the managerial abilities.

TABLE 17

ACCOUNTING/FINANCE RESPONSES
BY MANAGEMENT LEVELS*

ITEM NO.	SECOND LEVEL MANAGERS	OPERATIONS MANAGERS	ASSISTANT DIRECTORS	PRO-FESSIONALS	TOTAL AVERAGE
125	97.8	97.5	100.0	100.0	98.2
126	97.9	97.8	100.0	88.9	97.5
127	95.8	95.7	100.0	88.9	95.9
128	95.8	91.3	100.0	88.9	94.2
129	91.7	89.1	94.4	77.8	90.1
130	89.6	89.1	100.0	88.9	90.9
131	93.8	89.1	100.0	100.0	93.4
132	95.8	91.3	100.0	88.9	94.3
133	91.7	91.3	100.0	88.9	92.6
134	87.2	89.1	100.0	88.9	90.0
135	87.5	89.1	100.0	88.9	90.1
136	89.6	91.3	100.0	88.9	91.7
137	95.8	95.7	100.0	88.9	95.9
138	83.3	87.0	100.0	88.9	87.6
139	83.3	91.3	100.0	88.9	89.3
140	89.6	87.0	100.0	88.9	90.2
141	85.4	76.1	100.0	77.8	83.5
142	79.2	84.8	100.0	88.9	85.2
143	79.2	82.6	100.0	88.9	84.4
144	77.1	84.8	94.4	88.9	83.5
145	87.5	89.1	100.0	88.9	90.2
146	83.3	78.3	83.3	66.7	80.2
147	85.4	91.3	100.0	88.9	90.2
148	85.4	91.3	100.0	88.9	90.1
149	81.3	91.3	88.9	77.8	86.0
150	77.1	91.3	100.0	88.9	86.7
151	75.0	93.5	100.0	88.9	86.7
152	85.4	89.1	94.4	77.8	87.6

*Columns represent the percentage of responses below the theoretical mean.

Accounting/Finance

The accounting/finance responses indicated no significant differences among the four levels of management responsibility and the managers' perceived importance of the various accounting/finance abilities. The responses are found

in the analysis of items 125 through 152 of the Data Collection Instrument as shown in Table 17. Percentage responses ranged from 66.7% to 100.0% responses below the theoretical mean (3).

In items 125 through 129, assistant directors indicated 66.7% or more responses were rated as very important. Of the 28 items, 23 items were indicated by 100.0% of the assistant directors as being important. Of the 28 items in this section, responses to 17 items (61.0%) indicated 90.0% or more of the participants rated these accounting/finance abilities as being important. No mean responses for items were below an 80.2% favorable response.

Data Processing

The data processing responses indicated no significant differences among the four levels of management responsibility and managers' perceived importance of the various data processing abilities. The responses are found in the analysis of items 162 through 176 of the Data Collection Instrument as shown in Table 18. Percentage responses ranged from 33.3% to 88.9% responses below the theoretical mean (3).

The lowest percentage responses were on items 163, 168 and 173 which dealt with models in data processing. Of the 15 items in this section, responses to 7 items (47.0%) indicated 75.0% or more of the participants rated these abilities as being important. Only one item (163) was below a 50.0% favorable response.

Government Agency

The government agency responses indicated no significant differences among the four levels of management responsibility and managers' perceived importance of the various government agency abilities. The responses are found

TABLE 18

DATA PROCESSING BY MANAGEMENT LEVELS*

ITEM NO.	SECOND LEVEL MANAGERS	OPERATIONS MANAGERS	ASSISTANT DIRECTORS	PRO-FESSIONALS	TOTAL AVERAGE
162	55.1	65.2	50.0	88.9	60.7
163	36.7	52.2	33.3	33.3	41.8
164	55.1	63.0	44.4	66.7	57.4
165	57.1	63.0	50.0	77.8	59.8
166	55.1	63.0	50.0	55.6	57.4
167	83.7	80.4	77.8	88.9	82.0
168	49.0	65.2	72.2	66.7	59.8
169	71.4	76.1	78.9	88.9	75.6
170	73.5	78.3	83.3	66.7	76.2
171	69.4	80.4	84.2	66.7	75.6
172	79.6	76.1	77.8	66.7	77.0
173	59.2	60.9	66.7	55.6	60.7
174	75.5	76.1	78.9	77.8	76.4
175	77.6	76.1	77.8	77.8	77.0
176	71.4	78.3	72.2	66.7	73.8

*Columns represent the percentage of responses below the theoretical mean.

Government Agency (Continued)

in the analysis of items 186 through 207 of the Data Collection Instrument as shown in Table 19. Percentage responses ranged from 50.0% to 100.0% responses below the theoretical mean (3).

Assistant directors and professionals indicated 100.0% responses as very important to 12 of the 22 items. Of the 22 items in this section, responses to 21 items (95.0%) indicated 91.0% or more of the participants rated these government agency abilities as being important. No mean responses for items were below 89.8% favorable responses.

TABLE 19

GOVERNMENT AGENCY RESPONSES BY MANAGEMENT LEVELS*

ITEM NO.	SECOND LEVEL MANAGERS	OPERATIONS MANAGERS	ASSISTANT DIRECTORS	PRO-FESSIONALS	TOTAL AVERAGE
186	97.8	97.8	100.0	100.0	98.3
187	97.8	97.8	100.0	100.0	98.3
188	93.5	91.3	94.4	50.0	89.8
189	93.5	91.3	100.0	100.0	94.1
190	91.3	91.3	100.0	87.5	92.4
191	95.8	97.8	100.0	88.9	96.7
192	95.8	97.8	100.0	100.0	97.5
193	100.0	93.5	83.3	100.0	95.0
194	100.0	93.5	77.8	77.8	92.6
195	100.0	97.8	100.0	88.9	98.3
196	95.7	97.8	100.0	77.8	95.8
197	100.0	95.7	100.0	100.0	98.3
198	95.8	95.6	100.0	100.0	96.7
199	100.0	95.7	100.0	100.0	98.3
200	93.6	97.8	94.7	88.9	95.0
201	93.6	95.7	100.0	88.9	95.0
202	95.7	89.1	100.0	77.8	92.5
203	100.0	95.7	89.5	100.0	96.7
204	95.7	95.7	84.2	100.0	94.2
205	100.0	95.7	94.4	100.0	97.5
206	100.0	95.7	94.7	100.0	97.5
207	97.9	89.1	89.5	77.8	91.7

*Columns represent the percentage of responses below the theoretical mean.

Personnel

The personnel responses indicated no significant differences among the four levels of management responsibility and managers' perceived importance of the various personnel abilities. The responses are found in the analysis of items 276 through 307 of the Data Collection Instrument as shown in Table 20. Percentage responses ranged from 70.2% to 98.4% responses below the theoretical mean (3).

TABLE 20

PERSONNEL RESPONSES BY MANAGEMENT LEVELS*

ITEM NO.	SECOND LEVEL MANAGERS	OPERATIONS MANAGERS	ASSISTANT DIRECTORS	PRO-FESSIONALS	TOTAL AVERAGE
276	85.7	89.1	100.0	88.9	89.4
277	95.9	93.5	100.0	100.0	95.9
278	93.8	93.5	100.0	100.0	95.1
279	100.0	95.7	100.0	88.9	97.5
280	89.6	91.3	100.0	88.9	91.7
281	89.8	97.8	100.0	100.0	95.1
282	89.6	91.3	100.0	100.0	92.6
283	87.8	95.7	100.0	88.9	92.6
284	95.9	97.8	100.0	100.0	97.6
285	89.8	93.5	100.0	88.9	92.7
286	98.0	95.7	100.0	100.0	97.5
287	89.8	89.1	94.4	66.7	88.5
288	85.4	82.6	94.4	77.8	85.1
289	93.8	95.7	100.0	100.0	95.9
290	93.8	95.7	100.0	100.0	95.8
291	93.8	95.7	100.0	100.0	95.9
292	93.8	93.5	100.0	100.0	95.1
293	93.0	95.5	100.0	100.0	95.7
294	77.6	91.3	100.0	100.0	87.8
295	95.9	91.3	100.0	100.0	95.1
296	95.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	98.4
297	77.6	87.0	94.7	77.8	83.7
298	63.3	80.0	83.3	33.3	70.2
299	75.5	88.9	89.5	88.9	83.6
300	75.5	91.3	100.0	77.8	85.2
301	77.6	82.6	44.4	88.9	82.8
302	75.5	91.3	100.0	88.9	86.2
303	71.4	87.0	100.0	88.9	82.9
304	72.3	87.0	94.4	77.8	81.7
305	85.4	97.8	100.0	88.9	92.6
306	83.3	91.3	100.0	55.6	86.8
307	81.3	91.3	100.0	55.6	86.1

*Columns represent the percentage of responses below the theoretical mean.

Items 297 through 303 which dealt with unions had the lowest group percentage responses in this section. Assistant directors indicated a 100.0% response to 25 of the 32 items. Of the 32 items in this section, responses to 18 items (56.0%) indicated 90.0% or more of the participants rated these abilities as being important. No mean responses for items were below a 70.2% favorable response.

Question 3

The question to be answered was, "Is there a perceived importance by government departmental personnel regarding managerial functions and/or activities including planning, organizing, directing, controlling, communicating and motivating?"

In order to answer this question, it was necessary to analyze the response ratings by managerial functions and/or activities categories.

Planning

Under planning, items 1 through 23 of the Data Collection Instrument were analyzed and utilized in responding to this question. Table 1 contains the frequencies below the theoretical mean (3) and the means for each of the items. Therefore the reader is asked to turn to Table 1 (p. 35) to obtain details which support the following analyses.

Mean responses ranged from 1.122 to 2.154. Of the 23 items in this section, mean responses to 19 items were less than 2.000 and none of those above 2.000 were over 2.154. The average mean response for this section was 1.658. Mean responses in this section were skewed towards the "1" which indicated that departmental personnel in local government agencies perceived planning to be an important managerial function and/or activity.

Organizing

Under organizing, items 33 through 55 of the Data Collection Instrument were analyzed and utilized in responding to this question. Table 2 contains the frequencies below the theoretical mean (3) and the means for each of the items. Therefore the reader is asked to turn to Table 2 (p. 36) to obtain details which support the following analyses.

Mean responses ranged from 1.154 to 1.992. Of the 23 items in this section, mean responses to all 23 items were less than 2.000. The average mean response for this section was 1.548. Mean responses in this section were skewed towards the "1" which indicated that departmental personnel in local government agencies perceived organizing to be an important managerial function and/or activity.

Directing

Under directing, items 65 through 94 of the Data Collection Instrument were analyzed and utilized in responding to this question. Table 3 contains the frequencies below the theoretical mean (3) and the means for each of the items. Therefore the reader is asked to turn to Table 3 (p. 38) to obtain details which support the following analyses.

Mean responses ranged from 1.041 to 1.967. Of the 30 items in this section, mean responses to all items were less than 2.000. The average mean response for this section was 1.596. Mean responses in this section were skewed towards the "1" which indicated that departmental personnel in local government agencies perceived directing to be an important managerial function and/or activity.

Controlling

Under controlling, items 104 through 115 of the Data Collection Instrument were analyzed and utilized in responding to this question. Table 4 contains the frequencies below the theoretical mean (3) and the means for each of the items. Therefore the reader is asked to turn to Table 4 (p. 39) to obtain details which support the following analyses.

Mean responses ranged from 1.382 to 2.187. Of the 12 items in this section, mean responses to 11 items were less than 2.000 and the one over 2.000 was 2.187. The average mean response for this section was 1.657. Mean responses in this section were skewed towards the "1" which indicated that departmental personnel in local government agencies perceived controlling to be an important managerial function and/or activity.

Communicating

Under communicating, items 217 through 241 of the Data Collection Instrument were analyzed and utilized in responding to this question. Table 5 contains the frequencies below the theoretical mean (3) and the means for each of the items. Therefore the reader is asked to turn to Table 5 (p. 40) to obtain details which support the following analyses.

Mean responses ranged from 1.073 to 1.927. Of the 25 items in this section, mean responses to all items were less than 2.000. The average mean response for this section was 1.441. Mean responses in this section were skewed towards the "1" which indicated that departmental personnel in local government agencies perceived communicating to be an important managerial function and/or activity.

Motivating

Under motivating, items 251 through 266 of the Data Collection Instrument were analyzed and utilized in responding to this question. Table 6 contains the frequencies below the theoretical mean (3) and the means for each of the items. Therefore the reader is asked to turn to Table 6 (p. 42) to obtain details which support the following analyses.

Mean responses ranged from 1.228 to 2.325. Of the 16 items in this section, mean responses to 14 items were less than 2.000 and neither of those above 2.000 was over 2.325. The average mean response for this section was 1.831. Mean responses in this section were skewed towards the "1" which indicated that departmental personnel in local government agencies perceived motivating to be an important managerial function and/or activity.

Question 4

The question to be answered was, "Is there a perceived importance by government departmental personnel regarding the managerial abilities including accounting/finance, data processing, government agency characteristics and personnel performance?"

In order to answer this question, it was necessary to analyze the response rating by managerial abilities categories.

Accounting/Finance

Under accounting/finance, items 125 through 152 of the Data Collection Instrument were analyzed and utilized in responding to this question. Table 7 contains the frequencies below the theoretical mean (3) and the means for each of the items. Therefore the reader is asked to turn to Table 7 (p. 43) to obtain details which support the following analyses.

Mean responses ranged from 1.504 to 2.577. Of the 28 items in this section, mean responses to 11 items were less than 2.000 and all mean responses were below the theoretical mean (3). The average mean response for this section was 2.026. Mean responses in this section were skewed towards the "1" and "2" which indicated that departmental personnel in local government agencies perceived accounting/finance abilities to be an important managerial ability.

Data Processing

Under data processing, items 162 through 176 of the Data Collection Instrument were analyzed and utilized in responding to this question. Table 8 contains the frequencies below the theoretical mean (3) and the means for each of the items. Therefore the reader is asked to turn to Table 8 (p. 44) to obtain details which support the following analyses.

Mean responses ranged from 2.439 to 3.919. Of the 15 items in this section, mean responses to all 15 items were more than 2.000 and only 8 of the items had mean responses of less than the theoretical mean (3). The average mean response for this section was 3.011. Mean responses in this section did not indicate that departmental personnel in local government agencies perceived data processing abilities to be an important managerial ability.

Government Agency

Under government agency, items 186 through 207 of the Data Collection Instrument were analyzed and utilized in responding to this question. Table 9 contains the frequencies below the theoretical mean (3) and the means for each of the items. Therefore the reader is asked to turn to Table 9 (p. 46) to obtain details which support the following analyses.

Mean responses ranged from 1.309 to 2.317. Of the 22 items in this section, mean responses to 19 items were less than 2.000 and none of those above 2.000 were over 2.317. The average mean response for this section was 1.661. Mean responses in this section were skewed towards the "1" which indicated that departmental personnel in local government agencies perceived government agency abilities to be an important managerial ability.

Personnel

Under personnel, items 276 through 307 of the Data Collection Instrument were analyzed and utilized in responding to this question. Table 10 contains the frequencies below the theoretical mean (3) and the means for each of the items. Therefore the reader is asked to turn to Table 10 (p. 47) to obtain details which support the following analyses.

Mean responses ranged from 1.423 to 2.772. Of the 32 items in this section, mean responses to 16 items were less than 2.000 and no items had a mean response above the theoretical mean (3). The average mean response for this section was 2.008. Mean responses in this section were skewed towards the "1" and "2" which indicated that departmental personnel in local government agencies perceived personnel abilities to be an important managerial ability.

Question 5

The question to be answered was, "Is there a perceived importance by government agency personnel regarding the managerial functions and/or activities including planning, organizing, directing, controlling, communicating and motivating?"

In order to answer this question, it was necessary to analyze the response ratings by managerial funtions and/or activities categories.

Planning

Under planning, items 1 through 23 of the Data Collection Instrument were analyzed and utilized in responding to this question. Table 1 contains the frequencies below the theoretical mean (3) and the means for each of the items. Therefore the reader is asked to turn to Table 1 (p. 35) to obtain details which support the following analyses.

Mean responses ranged from 1.122 to 2.154. Of the 23 items in this section, mean responses to 19 items were less than 2.000 and none of those above 2.000 were over 2.154. The average mean response for this section was 1.658. Mean responses in this section were skewed towards the "1" which indicated that government agency personnel in local government agencies perceived planning to be an important managerial function and/or activity.

Organizing

Under organizing, items 33 through 55 of the Data Collection Instrument were analyzed and utilized in responding to this question. Table 2 contains the frequencies below the theoretical mean (3) and the means for each of the items. Therefore the reader is asked to turn to Table 2 (p. 36) to obtain details which support the following analyses.

Mean responses ranged from 1.154 to 1.992. Of the 23 items in this section, mean responses to all 23 items were less than 2.000. The average mean response for this section was 1.548. Mean responses in this section were skewed towards the "1" which indicated that government agency personnel in local government agencies perceived organizing to be an important managerial function and/or activity.

Directing

Under directing, items 65 through 94 of the Data Collection Instrument were analyzed and utilized in responding to this question. Table 3 contains the frequencies below the theoretical mean (3) and the means for each of the items. Therefore the reader is asked to turn to Table 3 (p. 38) to obtain details which support the following analyses.

Mean responses ranged from 1.041 to 1.967. Of the 30 items in this section, mean responses to all items were less than 2.000. The average mean response for this section was 1.596. Mean responses in this section were skewed towards the "1" which indicated that government agency personnel in local government agencies perceived directing to be an important managerial function and/or activity.

Controlling

Under controlling, items 104 through 115 of the Data Collection Instrument were analyzed and utilized in responding to this question. Table 4 contains the frequencies below the theoretical mean (3) and the means for each of the items. Therefore the reader is asked to turn to Table 4 (p. 39) to obtain details which support the following analyses.

Mean responses ranged from 1.382 to 2.187. Of the 12 items in this section, mean responses to 11 items were less than 2.000 and the one over 2.000 was 2.187. The average mean response for this section was 1.657. Mean responses in this section were skewed towards the "1" which indicated that goverment agency personnel in local government agencies perceived controlling to be an important managerial function and/or activity.

Communicating

Under communicating, items 217 through 241 of the Data Collection Instrument were analyzed and utilized in responding to this question. Table 5 contains the frequencies below the theoretical mean (3) and the means for each of the items. Therefore the reader is asked to turn to Table 5 (p. 40) to obtain details which suport the following analyses.

Mean responses ranged from 1.073 to 1.927. Of the 25 items in this section, mean responses to all items were less than 2.000. The average mean response for this section was 1.441. Mean responses in this section were skewed towards the "1" which indicated that government agency personnel in local government agencies perceived communicating to be an important managerial function and/or activity.

Motivating

Under motivating, items 251 through 266 of the Data Collection Instrument were analyzed and utilized in responding to this question. Table 6 contains the frequencies below the theoretical mean (3) and the means for each of the items. Therefore the reader is asked to turn to Table 6 (p. 42) to obtain details which support the following analyses.

Mean responses ranged from 1.228 to 2.325. Of the 16 items in this section, mean responses to 14 items were less than 2.000 and neither of those above 2.000 was over 2.325. The average mean response for this section was 1.831. Mean responses in this section were skewed towards the "1" which indicated that government agency personnel in local government agencies perceived motivating to be an important managerial function and/or activity.

Question 6

The question to be answered was, "Is there a perceived importance by government agency personnel regarding the managerial abilities including accounting/finance, data processing, government agency characteristics and personnel performance?"

In order to answer this question, it was necessary to analyze the responses ratings by managerial abilities categories.

Accounting/Finance

Under accounting/finance, items 125 through 152 of the Data Collection Instrument were analyzed and utilized in responding to this question. Table 7 contains the frequencies below the theoretical mean (3) and the means for each of the items. Therefore the reader is asked to turn to Table 7 (p. 43) to obtain details which support the following analyses.

Mean responses ranged from 1.504 to 2.577. Of the 28 items in this section, mean responses to 11 items were less than 2.000 and all mean responses were below the theoretical mean (3). The average mean response for this section was 2.026. Mean responses in this section were skewed towards the "1" and "2" which indicated that government agency personnel in local government agencies perceived accounting/finance abilities to be an important managerial ability.

Data Processing

Under data processing, items 162 through 176 of the Data Collection Instrument were analyzed and utilized in responding to this question. Table 8 contains the frequencies below the theoretical mean (3) and the means for each of the items. Therefore the reader is asked to turn to Table 8 (p. 44) to obtain details which support the following analyses.

Mean responses ranged from 2.439 to 3.919. Of the 15 items in this section, mean responses to all 15 items were more than 2.000 and only 8 of the items had mean responses of less than the theoretical mean (3). The average mean response for this section was 3.011. Mean responses in this section did not indicate that government agency personnel in local government agencies perceived data processing abilities to be an important managerial ability.

Government Agency

Under government agency, items 186 through 207 of the Data Collection Instrument were analyzed and utilized in responding to this question. Table 9 contains the frequencies below the theoretical mean (3) and the means for each of the items. Therefore the reader is asked to turn to Table 9 (p. 46) to obtain details which support the following analyses.

Mean responses ranged from 1.309 to 2.317. Of the 22 items in this section, mean responses to 19 items were less than 2.000 and none of those above 2.000 were over 2.317. The average mean response for this section was 1.661. Mean responses in this section were skewed towards the "1" which indicated that government agency personnel in local government agencies perceived government agency abilities to be an important managerial ability.

Personnel

Under personnel, items 276 through 307 of the Data Collection Instrument were analyzed and utilized in responding to this question. Table 10 contains the frequencies below the theoretical mean (3) and the means for each of the items. Therefore the reader is asked to turn to Table 10 (p. 47) to obtain details which support the following analyses.

Mean responses ranged from 1.423 to 2.772. Of the 32 items in this section, mean responses to 16 items were less than 2.000 and no items had a mean response above the theoretical mean (3). The average mean response for this section was 2.008. Mean responses in this section were skewed towards the "1" and "2" which indicated that government agency personnel in local government agencies perceived personnel abilities to be an important managerial ability.

Question 7

The question to be answered was, "Is there a perceived importance of tenure in current position regarding the importance of managerial functions and/or activities including planning, organizing, directing, controlling, communicating and motivating?"

In order to answer this question, it was necessary to analyze the response ratings by managerial functions and/or activities categories.

Planning

Under planning, items 1 through 23 of the Data Collection Instrument were analyzed and utilized in responding to this question. Table 1 contains the frequencies below the theoretical mean (3) and the means for each of the items. Therefore the reader is asked to turn to Table 1 (p. 35) to obtain details which support the following analyses.

Mean responses ranged from 1.122 to 2.154. Of the 23 items in this section, mean responses to 19 items were less than 2.000 and none of those above 2.000 were over 2.154. The average mean responses for this section was 1.658. Mean responses in this section were skewed towards the "1" which indicated that personnel by tenure in current position in local government agencies perceived planning to be an important managerial function and/or activity.

Organizing

Under organizing, items 33 through 55 of the Data Collection Instrument were analyzed and utilized in responding to this question. Table 2 contains the frequencies below the theoretical mean (3) and the means for each of the items. Therefore the reader is asked to turn to Table 2 (p. 36) to obtain details which support the following analyses.

Mean responses ranged from 1.154 to 1.992. Of the 23 items in this section, mean responses to all 23 items were less than 2.000. The average mean response for this section was 1.548. Mean responses in this section were skewed towards the "1" which indicated that personnel by tenure in current position in local government agencies perceived organizing to be an important managerial function and/or activity.

Directing

Under directing, items 65 through 94 of the Data Collection Instrument were analyzed and utilized in responding to this question. Table 3 contains the frequencies below the theoretical mean (3) and the means for each of the items. Therefore the reader is asked to turn to Table 3 (p. 38) to obtain details which support the following analyses.

Mean responses ranged from 1.041 to 1.967. Of the 30 items in this section, mean responses to all items were less than 2.000. The average mean response for this section was 1.596. Mean responses in this section were skewed towards the "1" which indicated that personnel by tenure in current position in local government agencies perceived directing to be an important managerial function and/or activity.

Controlling

Under controlling, items 104 through 115 of the Data Collection Instrument were analyzed and utilized in responding to this question. Table 4 contains the frequencies below the theoretical mean (3) and the means for each of the items. Therefore the reader is asked to turn to Table 4 (p. 39) to obtain details which support the following analyses.

Mean responses ranged from 1.382 to 2.187. Of the 12 items in this section, mean responses to 11 items were less than 2.000 and the one over 2.000 was 2.187. The average mean response for this section was 1.657. Mean responses in this section were skewed towards the "1" which indicated that goverment agency personnel in local government agencies perceived controlling to be an important managerial function and/or activity.

Communicating

Under communicating, items 217 through 241 of the Data Collection Instrument were analyzed and utilized in responding to this question. Table 5 contains the frequencies below the theoretical mean (3) and the means for each of the items. Therefore the reader is asked to turn to Table 5 (p. 40) to obtain details which support the following analyses.

Mean responses ranged from 1.073 to 1.927. Of the 25 items in this section, mean responses to all items were less than 2.000. The average mean response for this section was 1.441. Mean responses in this section were skewed towards the "1" which indicated that personnel by tenure in current position in local government agencies perceived communicating to be an important managerial function and/or activity.

Motivating

Under motivating, items 251 through 266 of the Data Collection Instrument were analyzed and utilized in responding to this question. Table 6 contains the frequencies below the theoretical mean (3) and the means for each of the items. Therefore the reader is asked to turn to Table 6 (p. 42) to obtain details which support the following analyses.

Mean responses ranged from 1.228 to 2.325. Of the 16 items in this section, mean responses to 14 items were less than 2.000 and neither of those above 2.000 was over 2.325. The average mean response for this section was 1.831. Mean responses in this section were skewed towards the "1" which indicated that personnel by tenure in current position in local government agencies perceived motivating to be an important managerial function and/or activity.

Question 8

The question to be answered was, "Is there a perceived importance of tenure in current position regarding the importance of managerial abilities including accounting/finance, data processing, government agency characteristics and personnel performance?"

In order to answer this question, it was necessary to analyze the response ratings by managerial abilities categories.

Accounting/Finance

Under accounting/finance, items 125 through 152 of the Data Collection Instrument were analyzed and utilized in responding to this question. Table 7 contains the frequencies below the theoretical mean (3) and the means for each of the items. Therefore the reader is asked to turn to Table 7 (p. 43) to obtain details which support the following analyses.

Mean responses ranged from 1.504 to 2.577. Of the 28 items in this section, mean responses to 11 items were less than 2.000 and all mean responses were below the theoretical mean (3). The average mean response for this section was 2.026. Mean responses in this section were skewed towards the "1" and "2" which indicated that personnel by tenure in current position in local government agencies perceived accounting/finance abilities to be an important managerial ability.

Data Processing

Under data processing, items 162 through 176 of the Data Collection Instrument were analyzed and utilized in responding to this question. Table 8 contains the frequencies below the theoretical mean (3) and the means for each of the items. Therefore the reader is asked to turn to Table 8 (p. 44) to obtain details which support the following analyses.

Mean responses ranged from 2.439 to 3.919. Of the 15 items in this section, mean responses to all 15 items were more than 2.000 and only 8 of the items had mean responses of less than the theoretical mean (3). The average mean response for this section was 3.011. Mean responses in this section did not indicate that personnel by tenure in current position in local government agencies perceived data processing abilities to be an important managerial ability.

Government Agency

Under government agency, items 186 through 207 of the Data Collection Instrument were analyzed and utilized in responding to this question. Table 9 contains the frequencies below the theoretical mean (3) and the means for each of the items. Therefore the reader is asked to turn to Table 9 (p. 46) to obtain details which support the following analyses.

Mean responses ranged from 1.309 to 2.317. Of the 22 items in this section, mean responses to 19 items were less than 2.000 and none of those above 2.000 were over 2.317. The average mean response for this section was 1.661. Mean responses in this section were skewed towards the "1" which indicated that personnel by tenure in current position in local government agencies perceived government agency abilities to be an important managerial ability.

Personnel

Under personnel, items 276 through 307 of the Data Collection Instrument were analyzed and utilized in responding to this question. Table 10 contains the frequencies below the theoretical mean (3) and the means for each of the items. Therefore the reader is asked to turn to Table 10 (p. 47) to obtain details which support the following analyses.

Mean responses ranged from 1.423 to 2.772. Of the 32 items in this section, mean responses to 16 items were less than 2.000 and no items had a mean response above the theoretical mean (3). The average mean response for this section was 2.008. Mean responses in this section were skewed towards the "1" and "2" which indicated that personnel by tenure in current position in local government agencies perceived personnel abilities to be an important managerial ability.

Question 9

The question to be answered was, "Is there a perceived importance of span of control regarding the importance of managerial functions and/or activities including planning, organizing, directing, controlling, communicating and motivating?"

In order to answer this question, it was necessary to analyze the response ratings by managerial functions and/or activities categories.

Planning

Under planning, items 1 through 23 of the Data Collection Instrument were analyzed and utilized in responding to this question. Table 1 contains the frequencies below the theoretical mean (3) and the means for each of the items. Therefore the reader is asked to turn to Table 1 (p. 35) to obtain details which support the following analyses.

Mean responses ranged from 1.122 to 2.154. Of the 23 items in this section, mean responses to 19 items were less than 2.000 and none of those above 2.000 were over 2.154. The average mean response for this section was 1.658. Mean responses in this section were skewed towards the "1" which indicated that personnel by span of control in local government agencies perceived planning to be an important managerial function and/or activity.

Organizing

Under organizing, items 33 through 55 of the Data Collection Instrument were analyzed and utilized in responding to this question. Table 2 contains the frequencies below the theoretical mean (3) and the means for each of the items. Therefore the reader is asked to turn to Table 2 (p. 36) to obtain details which support the following analyses.

Mean responses ranged from 1.154 to 1.992. Of the 23 items in this section, mean responses to all 23 items were less than 2.000. The average mean response for this section was 1.548. Mean responses in this section were skewed towards the "1" which indicated that personnel by span of control in local government agencies perceived organizing to be an important managerial function and/or activity.

Directing

Under directing, items 65 through 94 of the Data Collection Instrument were analyzed and utilized in responding to this question. Table 3 contains the frequencies below the theoretical mean (3) and the means for each of the items. Therefore the reader is asked to turn to Table 3 (p. 38) to obtain details which support the following analyses.

Mean responses ranged from 1.041 to 1.967. Of the 30 items in this section, mean responses to all items were less than 2.000. The average mean response for this section was 1.596. Mean responses in this section were skewed towards the "1" which indicated that personnel by span of control in local government agencies perceived directing to be an important managerial function and/or activity.

Controlling

Under controlling, items 104 through 115 of the Data Collection Instrument were analyzed and utilized in responding to this question. Table 4 contains the frequencies below the theoretical mean (3) and the means for each of the items. Therefore the reader is asked to turn to Table 4 (p. 39) to obtain details which support the following analyses.

Mean responses ranged from 1.382 to 2.187. Of the 12 items in this section, mean responses to 11 items were less than 2.000 and the one over 2.000 was 2.187. The average mean response for this section was 1.657. Mean responses in this section were skewed towards the "1" which indicated that departmental personnel in local government agencies perceived controlling to be an important managerial function and/or activity.

Communicating

Under communicating, items 217 through 241 of the Data Collection Instrument were analyzed and utilized in responding to this question. Table 5 contains the frequencies below the theoretical mean (3) and the means for each of the items. Therefore the reader is asked to turn to Table 5 (p. 40) to obtain details which support the following analyses.

Mean responses ranged from 1.073 to 1.927. Of the 25 items in this section, mean responses to all items were less than 2.000. The average mean response for this section was 1.441. Mean responses in this section were skewed towards the "1" which indicated that personnel by span of control in local government agencies perceived communicating to be an important managerial function and/or activity.

Motivating

Under motivating, items 251 through 266 of the Data Collection Instrument were analyzed and utilized in responding to this question. Table 6 contains the frequencies below the theoretical mean (3) and the means for each of the items. Therefore the reader is asked to turn to Table 6 (p. 42) to obtain details which support the following analyses.

Mean responses ranged from 1.228 to 2.325. Of the 16 items in this section, mean responses to 14 items were less than 2.000 and neither of those above 2.000 was over 2.325. The average mean response for this section was 1.831. Mean responses in this section were skewed towards the "1" which indicated that personnel by span of control in local government agencies perceived motivating to be an important managerial function and/or activity.

Question 10

This question to be answered was, "Is there a perceived importance of span of control regarding the importance of managerial abilities including accounting/finance, data processing, government agency characteristics and personnel performance?"

In order to answer this question, it was necessary to analyze the response ratings by managerial abilities categories.

Accounting/Finance

Under accounting/finance, items 125 through 152 of the Data Collection Instrument were analyzed and utilized in responding to this question. Table 7 contains the frequencies below the theoretical mean (3) and the means for each of the items. Therefore the reader is asked to turn to Table 7 (p. 43) to obtain details which support the following analyses.

Mean responses ranged from 1.504 to 2.577. Of the 28 items in this section, mean responses to 11 items were less than 2.000 and all mean responses were below the theoretical mean (3). The average mean response for this section was 2.026. Mean responses in this section were skewed towards the "1" and "2" which indicated that personnel by span of control in local government agencies perceived accounting/finance abilities to be an important managerial ability.

Data Processing

Under data processing, items 162 through 176 of the Data Collection Instrument were analyzed and utilized in responding to this question. Table 8 contains the frequencies below the theoretical mean (3) and the means for each of the items. Therefore the reader is asked to turn to Table 8 (p. 44) to obtain details which support the following analyses.

Mean responses ranged from 2.439 to 3.919. Of the 15 items in this section, mean responses to all 15 items were more than 2.000 and only 8 of the items had mean responses of less than the theoretical mean (3). The average mean response for this section was 3.011. Mean responses in this section did not indicate that personnel by span of control in local government agencies perceived data processing abilities to be an important managerial ability.

Government Agency

Under government agency, items 186 through 207 of the Data Collection Instrument were analyzed and utilized in responding to this question. Table 9 contains the frequencies below the theoretical mean (3) and the means for each of the items. Therefore the reader is asked to turn to Table 9 (p. 46) to obtain details which support the following analyses.

Mean responses ranged from 1.309 to 2.317. Of the 22 items in this section, mean responses to 19 items were less than 2.000 and none of those above 2.000 were over 2.317. The average mean response for this section was 1.661. Mean responses in this section were skewed towards the "1" which indicated that personnel by span of control in local government agencies perceived government agency abilities to be an important managerial ability.

Personnel

Under personnel, items 276 through 307 of the Data Collection Instrument were analyzed and utilized in responding to this question. Table 10 contains the frequencies below the theoretical mean (3) and the means for each of the items. Therefore the reader is asked to turn to Table 10 (p. 47) to obtain details which support the following analyses.

Mean responses ranged from 1.423 to 2.772. Of the 32 items in this section, mean responses to 16 items were less than 2.000 and no items had a mean response above the theoretical mean (3). The average mean response for this section was 2.008. Mean responses in this section were skewed towards the "1" and "2" which indicated that personnel by span of control in local government agencies perceived personnel abilities to be an important managerial ability.

Question 11

The question to be answered was, "What training delivery systems are perceived to be significant to local government agency middle management personnel as a self-development tool?"

In order to answer the question, it was necessary to analyze the response ratings by training delivery systems and managerial functions and/or activities categories.

On-the-Job Training

The on-the-job training responses indicated that 85.4% or more of the participants perceived all items in this section to be important. The responses are found in items 24, 56, 95, 116, 242, 267, 153, 177, 208, 315 and 308 of the Data Collection Instrument as shown in Table 21. Percentage responses ranged from 85.4% to 96.8% responses below the theoretical mean (3). Mean responses ranged from 1.382 to 2.098.

The average mean response for this section was 1.681. Only 2 of the 11 items in this section had mean responses of more than 2.000 and both of them were below 2.049. Only 1 item of the 11 had percentage responses below 75.0% for responses below the theoretical mean and it was 64.2%. The responses to the 11 items clearly demonstrates the importance of on-the-job training for self-development of middle management personnel in local government agencies.

Table 21

TRAINING DELIVERY SYSTEMS
ON-THE-JOB-TRAINING

Item No.	%* 1	%* 2	%* 3	Mean	%* 1+2	%* 1+2+3
24	61.0	22.8	12.2	1.504	83.7	96.0
56	60.2	27.6	8.9	1.496	87.8	96.8
95	65.0	23.6	6.5	1.382	88.6	95.1
116	63.4	25.2	7.3	1.512	88.6	95.9
242	34.1	30.1	24.4	2.098	64.2	88.6
267	37.4	38.2	16.3	1.837	75.6	91.9
153	42.3	35.8	13.8	1.837	78.0	91.9
177	51.2	22.8	11.4	2.049	74.0	85.4
208	67.5	19.5	8.1	1.480	87.0	95.1
315	47.2	30.1	14.6	1.772	77.2	91.9
308	57.7	29.3	3.3	1.520	87.0	90.2

* All percentages reported are those below the theoretical mean.

Formal Education

The formal education responses indicated that 85.3% or more of the participants perceived all items in this section to be important. The responses are found in items 30, 62, 101, 12, 248, 273, 159, 183, 214, 321 and 314 of the Data Collection Instrument as shown in Table 22. Percentage responses ranged from 85.3% to 97.6% responses below the theoretical mean (3). Mean responses ranged from 1.366 to 2.081.

The average mean response for this section was 1.806. Item 248 had a 94.3% response for responses "1" and "2". Only 1 item of the 11 in this section had a mean response of more than 2.000 and it was 2.081. Only 3 items of the 11 had percentage responses below 90.0% for responses below the theoretical mean and none of those were below 85.3%. The responses to the 11 items clearly

demonstrates the importance of formal education for self-development of middle management personnel in local government agencies.

Table 22

TRAINING DELIVERY SYSTEMS
FORMAL EDUCATION

Item No.	%* 1	%* 2	%* 3	Mean	%* 1+2	%* 1+2+3
30	35.8	43.9	14.6	1.862	79.7	94.3
62	38.2	42.3	13.8	1.862	80.5	94.3
101	36.6	40.7	17.1	1.878	77.2	94.3
122	43.1	34.1	13.0	1.959	77.2	90.2
248	74.8	19.5	3.3	1.366	94.3	97.6
273	44.7	35.0	13.0	1.772	79.7	92.7
159	62.6	24.4	7.3	1.553	87.0	94.3
183	54.5	23.6	8.9	1.967	78.0	87.0
214	39.0	26.8	22.8	2.081	65.9	88.7
321	55.3	29.3	8.9	1.610	84.6	93.5
314	39.0	32.5	13.8	1.951	71.5	85.3

* All percentages reported are those below the theoretical mean.

In-House Development Programs

The in-house development programs responses indicated that 81.3% or more of the participants perceived all items in this section to be important. The responses are found in items 29, 61, 100, 121, 247, 272, 158, 182, 213, 320 and 313 of the Data Collection Instrument as shown in Table 23. Percentage responses ranged from 81.3% to 92.7% responses below the theoretical mean (3). Mean responses ranged from 1.821 to 2.285.

The average mean response for this section was 1.930. Only 2 of the 11 items in this section had mean responses of more than 2.000 and neither was above 2.285. Only 1 item of the 11 had percentage responses below 70.0% for

Table 23

TRAINING DELIVERY SYSTEMS
IN-HOUSE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Item No.	%* 1	%* 2	%* 3	Mean	%* 1+2	%* 1+2+3
29	40.7	36.6	15.4	1.821	77.2	92.7
61	43.1	35.0	13.8	1.878	78.0	91.9
100	39.0	35.8	15.4	1.878	74.8	90.2
121	35.0	43.1	13.0	1.959	78.0	91.1
247	26.8	43.9	19.5	2.057	70.7	90.3
272	33.3	40.7	13.8	1.854	74.0	87.8
158	36.6	37.4	17.9	1.927	74.0	91.9
182	31.7	35.8	13.8	2.285	67.5	81.3
213	43.1	36.6	12.2	1.829	79.7	91.9
320	35.0	38.2	17.1	1.878	73.2	90.2
313	39.8	36.6	10.6	1.862	76.4	87.0

* All percentages reported are those below the theoretical mean.

responses "1" and "2" and it was 67.5%. Of the 11 items in this section, nine items had 90.0% or more percentage responses for responses below the theoretical mean and the remaining 3 were 81.3% or above. The responses to the 11 items clearly demonstrates the importance of in-house development programs for self-development of middle management personnel in local government agencies.

Workshops

The workshops responses indicated that 86.2% or more of the participants perceived all items in this section to be important. The responses are found in items 25, 57, 96, 117, 243, 268, 154, 178, 209, 316 and 309 of the Data Collection Instrument as shown in Table 24. Percentage responses ranged from 86.2% to 95.1% responses below the theoretical mean (3). Mean responses range from 1.805 to 2.203.

Table 24

TRAINING DELIVERY SYSTEMS WORKSHOPS

Item No.	%* 1	%* 2	%* 3	Mean	%* 1+2	%* 1+2+3
25	17.1	48.8	26.8	2.203	65.9	92.7
57	22.8	54.5	17.9	2.033	77.2	95.1
96	21.1	56.9	16.3	1.992	78.0	94.3
117	25.2	51.2	17.9	2.081	76.4	94.3
243	37.4	44.7	11.4	1.870	82.1	93.5
268	38.2	39.0	16.3	1.805	77.2	93.4
154	35.8	43.9	9.8	1.902	79.7	89.4
178	35.0	35.8	15.4	2.138	70.7	86.2
209	22.0	48.8	19.5	2.130	70.7	90.3
316	34.1	47.2	11.4	1.846	81.3	92.7
309	26.8	43.9	17.1	2.033	70.7	87.8

* All percentages reported are those below the theoretical mean.

The average mean response for this section was 2.003. Five (5) of the 11 items in this section had mean responses of more than 2.000 but none of those remaining were above 2.203. Only 3 items of the 11 had percentage responses below 90.0% for responses below the theoretical mean and none of those were below 86.2%. The responses to the 11 items clearly demonstrates the importance of workshops for self-development of middle management personnel in local government agencies.

Seminars

The seminars responses indicated that 83.8% or more of the participants perceived all items in this section to be important. The responses are found in items 26, 58, 97, 118, 244, 269, 155, 179, 210, 317 and 310 of the Data Collection Instrument as shown in Table 25. Percentage responses ranged from

Table 25

TRAINING DELIVERY SYSTEMS SEMINARS

Item No.	%* 1	%* 2	%* 3	Mean	%* 1+2	%* 1+2+3
26	16.3	44.7	27.6	2.309	61.0	88.6
58	21.1	45.5	23.6	2.203	66.7	90.3
97	21.1	41.5	27.6	2.138	62.6	90.2
118	19.5	47.2	22.8	2.211	66.7	89.5
244	34.1	39.0	15.4	2.057	73.2	88.6
269	35.8	35.8	17.9	1.878	71.5	89.4
155	30.9	35.8	20.3	2.154	66.7	87.0
179	26.8	41.5	15.4	2.333	68.3	83.8
210	23.6	37.4	26.0	2.244	61.0	87.0
317	41.5	33.3	18.7	1.813	74.8	93.5
310	27.6	37.4	21.1	2.065	65.0	96.2

* All percentages reported are those below the theoretical mean.

83.8% to 96.2% responses below the theoretical mean (3). Mean responses ranged from 1.813 to 2.333.

The average mean response for this section was 2.103. Of the 11 items, 2 had mean responses of less than 2.000 but none of the remaining 9 had responses below 2.333. All 11 items clearly demonstrates the importance of seminars for self-development of middle management personnel in local government agencies.

Outside Consultant

The outside consultant responses indicated that 61.0% or more of the participants perceived all items in this section to be important. The responses are found in items 28, 60, 99, 120, 246, 271, 157, 181, 212, 391 and 312 of the Data Collection Instrument as shown in Table 26. Percentage responses ranged

Table 26

TRAINING DELIVERY SYSTEMS
OUTSIDE CONSULTANT

Item No.	%* 1	%* 2	%* 3	Mean	%* 1+2	%* 1+2+3
28	6.5	27.6	39.8	2.878	34.1	74.0
60	5.7	33.3	31.7	2.894	39.0	70.8
99	4.9	35.0	34.1	2.748	39.8	73.9
120	7.3	34.1	32.5	2.846	41.5	74.0
246	10.6	26.8	23.6	3.130	37.4	61.0
271	14.6	27.6	21.1	2.805	42.3	63.4
157	15.4	29.3	26.8	2.732	44.7	71.5
181	20.3	34.1	22.8	2.634	54.5	77.2
212	7.3	25.2	30.1	3.033	32.5	62.6
319	13.8	31.7	22.8	2.740	45.5	68.3
312	9.8	32.5	24.4	2.772	42.3	66.7

* All percentages reported are those below the theoretical mean.

from 61.0% to 77.2% responses below the theoretical mean (3). Mean responses ranged from 2.634 to 3.130.

The average mean response for this section was 2.837. Of the 11 items, 2 had mean responses of more than 3.000, the theoretical mean. Only 5 items of the 11 had percentage responses below 70.0% for responses below the theoretical mean but none of those were below 61.0%. The responses to the 11 items clearly demonstrates that seminars are of less importance for self-development of middle management personnel in local government agencies than the previously discussed training delivery systems.

Equipment Supplier Instruction

The equipment supplier instruction responses indicated that 40.7% or more of the participants perceived all items in this section to be important. The responses are found in items 27, 59, 98, 119, 245, 270, 156, 180, 211, 318 and 311 of the Data Collection Instrument as shown in Table 27. Percentage responses ranged from 40.7% to 82.9% responses below the theoretical mean (3). Mean responses ranged from 2.390 to 3.667.

The average mean response for this section was 3.180. Item 180 had an 82.9% response for responses below the theoretical mean. Of the 11 items, 3 had mean responses of less than 3.000, the theoretical mean. Only 5 of the 11 items in this section had percentage responses of 60.0% or more for responses

Table 27

TRAINING DELIVERY SYSTEMS
EQUIPMENT SUPPLIER INSTRUCTION

Item No.	%* 1	%* 2	%* 3	Mean	%* 1+2	%* 1+2+3
27	10.6	23.6	39.0	2.886	34.1	73.2
59	9.8	19.5	43.9	2.984	29.3	73.2
98	7.3	21.1	39.8	3.041	28.5	68.2
119	6.5	21.1	34.1	3.301	27.6	61.8
245	4.1	16.3	22.8	3.642	20.3	43.0
270	1.6	16.3	22.8	3.667	17.9	40.7
156	7.3	20.3	28.5	3.260	27.6	56.1
180	30.1	33.3	19.5	2.390	63.4	82.9
211	5.7	17.9	28.5	3.293	23.6	52.0
318	5.7	17.9	22.0	3.512	23.6	45.5
311	7.3	27.6	24.4	3.008	35.0	59.3

* All percentages reported are those below the theoretical mean.

below the theoretical mean. The responses to the 11 items clearly demonstrates that equipment supplier instruction is not perceived as important for self-development of middle management personnel in local government agencies.

Question 12

The question to be answered was, "What training delivery systems are perceived to be significant to local government agency middle management personnel as an employee development tool?"

The subordinate training responses indicated that 59.3% or more of the participants perceived all items in this section to be important. The responses are found in the analysis of items 308 through 314 of the Data Collection Instrument as shown in Table 28. Percentage responses ranged from 59.3% to 96.2% responses below the theoretical mean (3). Mean responses ranged from 1.520 to 3.008.

Table 28

MEANS AND PERCENTAGES OF SUBORDINATE TRAINING RESPONSE

Item No.	%* 1	%* 2	%* 3	Mean	%* 1+2	%* 1+2+3
308	57.7	29.3	3.3	1.520	87.0	90.2
309	26.8	43.9	17.1	2.033	70.7	87.8
310	27.6	37.4	21.1	2.065	65.0	96.2
311	7.3	27.6	24.4	3.008	35.0	59.3
312	9.8	32.5	24.4	2.772	42.3	66.7
313	39.8	36.6	10.6	1.862	76.4	87.0
314	39.0	32.5	13.8	1.951	71.5	85.3

* All percentages reported are those below the theoretical mean.

The average mean response for this section was 2.173. Only items 311 and 312 had responses below 85.0% for responses below the theoretical mean and item 311 was the only item of the 7 in this section with a mean above 3.000, the theoretical mean. The responses to the 11 items clearly demonstrates that 5 of the 7 items are perceived as important for employee development by middle management personnel in local government agencies.

Question 13

The question to be answered was, "What forces affecting local government agency performance are perceived to be significant by middle management personnel in these agencies?"

The forces responses indicated that 79.7% or more of the participants perceived all items in this section to be important. Items used in this section were 38 through 41, 52 through 55, 83 through 85, 91 through 94, 189 through 190, 200 through 207, 252, 283 through 287 and 299 through 307 of the Data Collection Instrument as shown in Table 29. Percentage responses ranged from 79.7% to 99.2% responses below the theoretical mean (3). Mean responses ranged from 1.163 to 2.772.

Item 38 had responses of 87.0% for response "1". Items 203 and 206 had responses of 71.5% each for response "1". Items 38, 40, 41, 54, 55, 83, 92 and 203 had responses above 90.0% for responses "1" and "2". Only 12 items of the 42 in this section had responses below 90.0% for responses below the theoretical mean and none of those were below 79.7%. Only 13 items had mean responses of more than 2.000 and none of those were more than 3.000. The average mean response of this section was 1.699. The responses to the 42 items in this section clearly demonstrates the importance of forces affecting local government agency performance for middle management personnel in these agencies.

Table 29

FORCES AFFECTING GOVERNMENT AGENCY PERFORMANCE

Item No.	%* 1	%* 2	%* 3	Mean	%* 1+2	%* 1+2+3
38	87.0	11.4	0.8	1.163	98.4	99.2
39	60.2	29.3	8.9	1.537	89.4	98.4
40	51.2	40.7	6.5	1.593	91.9	98.4
41	51.2	39.0	8.1	1.610	90.2	98.4
52	62.6	24.4	8.1	1.593	87.0	95.1
53	60.2	26.8	9.8	1.553	87.0	96.8
54	55.3	35.8	4.9	1.537	91.1	96.0
55	48.8	42.3	4.1	1.650	91.1	95.1
83	64.2	27.6	6.5	1.480	91.9	98.4
84	37.4	40.7	12.2	1.959	78.0	90.3
85	67.5	22.8	7.3	1.472	90.2	97.6
91	46.3	37.4	12.2	1.650	83.7	96.0
92	57.7	35.8	4.9	1.512	93.5	98.4
93	57.7	3.09	6.5	1.618	88.6	95.1
94	57.7	26.8	10.6	1.659	84.6	95.1
189	48.8	28.5	13.8	1.732	77.2	91.1
190	53.7	26.0	9.8	1.707	79.7	89.4
200	37.4	38.2	17.9	1.878	75.6	93.5
201	24.4	40.7	27.6	2.089	65.0	92.7
202	17.9	35.8	36.6	2.317	53.7	90.3
203	71.5	19.5	4.1	1.390	91.1	95.1
204	31.7	47.2	13.8	1.935	78.9	92.7
205	52.8	34.1	8.1	1.577	87.0	95.2
206	71.5	16.3	8.1	1.398	87.8	96.0
207	49.6	34.1	6.5	1.748	83.7	90.3
252	54.5	35.0	6.5	1.520	89.4	96.0
283	54.5	28.5	8.9	1.748	82.9	91.9
284	45.5	40.7	11.4	1.724	86.2	97.6
285	54.5	26.8	11.4	1.821	81.3	92.7
286	50.4	36.6	9.8	1.642	87.0	96.8
287	17.9	39.0	30.9	2.382	56.9	87.8
297	41.5	31.7	10.6	2.220	73.2	83.7
298	30.9	28.5	9.8	2.772	59.3	89.1
299	43.9	30.1	8.9	2.195	74.0	82.9
300	22.8	36.6	25.2	2.463	59.3	84.6
301	24.4	36.6	21.1	2.480	61.0	82.1
302	32.5	37.4	16.3	2.293	69.9	86.2
303	28.5	30.9	23.6	2.480	59.3	82.9
304	33.3	24.4	22.0	2.472	57.7	79.7
305	46.3	26.8	18.7	1.935	73.2	91.9
306	29.3	32.5	23.6	2.317	61.8	85.4
307	30.1	27.6	27.6	2.382	57.7	85.4

* All percentages reported are those below the theoretical mean.

Summary

This chapter has provided an analysis and interpretation of the data needed for determining the managerial functions, activities and abilities needed by middle management personnel in local government agencies. These skills were identified by using a computer program designed to produce frequencies, means, and select crosstabulations for the responses to each item on the completed questionnaires. Each questionnaire item which received a population mean rating below 3.000 was an indication by the respondents that the managerial function, activity or ability was needed by middle managers in local government agencies.

The data in Tables 1 through 29 identified managerial skills for middle management in local governments in the Las Vegas Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area. This information was presented in the 10 managerial areas.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This study was conducted to determine the managerial functions, activities and abilities needed by middle management personnel in local government agencies within the Las Vegas Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area. The specific questions answered by the data which were collected and analyzed were: (1) determining the management functions, activities and abilities needed by middle managers in local government agencies, (2) determining the effect level of management responsibility had on the managerial functions, activities and abilities needed by middle management in local government agencies, (3) determining the effect government department had on the managerial functions, activities and abilities needed by middle management in local government agencies, (4) determining the effect government agency had on the managerial functions, activities and abilities needed by middle management in local government agencies, (5) determining the effect tenure in current position had on the managerial functions, activities and abilities needed by middle management in local government agencies, (6) determining the effect span of control had on the managerial functions, activities and abilities needed by middle management in local government agencies, (7) determining which training

delivery systems for self-development and for employees were more effective for middle management in local government agencies, and (8) determining the effect of forces which affect local government agency performance on middle management in these agencies.

An analysis of information from a review of the related literature produced data relating to managerial functions, activities and abilities. This review revealed ten areas of managerial skills. Although many studies have been done regarding managerial skills for middle managers, none of those studies have been done for middle management personnel in local government agencies.

The procedure in the study included the development of an instrument by which to determine the managerial functions, activities and abilities needed by middle management personnel in local government agencies in the Las Vegas Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area.

Six (6) incorporated local government agencies were used as the population for this study. These agencies were chosen because they were the total population of incorporated local government agencies in Clark County, Nevada which is the geographic area of the Las Vegas Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area.

The questionnaire, the major data collection instrument, was organized by categories and use a Likert method of summated ratings. The data collection instrument was distributed to 232 middle management personnel, the entire identified middle management population, through their respective agencies. A total of 123 completed, usable questionnaires were returned which represented a 53.0% response.

Analyses and interpretation of the data collected was through use of means and percentage ratings on each question. Any question which received a

mean rating by the respondents of 3.000 or more was considered to be unimportant for identifying the managerial functions, activities and abilities of middle management personnel in local government agencies.

Findings

The mean and percentage responses for each item on the questionnaire were prepared and utilized. Additionally, tabulations were prepared to give the mean and percentages by levels of management responsibility. Of the 303 specific questions on the survey instrument, 97.0% had a mean below 3.000. According to selections criteria, each of the items with a mean of 3.000 or below should be considered as a needed managerial function, activity or ability.

The analyses of the data in this study have resulted in the following findings:

1. The managerial functions and/or activities which included planning, organizing, directing, controlling, communicating and motivating were identified as important to middle management personnel in local government agencies.

2. The managerial abilities which included accounting/finance, government agency characteristics and personnel performance were identified as important to middle management personnel in local government agencies.

3. Data processing failed to be identified as important as a managerial ability for middle management personnel in local government agencies.

4. No significant differences of needed managerial functions, activities and abilities for middle management personnel in local government agencies were found by levels of management responsibility.

5. Neither government department nor government agency demonstrated differences in the importance of the managerial functions, activities, and abilities needed by middle management personnel in local government agencies.

6. Neither tenure in current position nor span of control demonstrated differences in the importance of the managerial functions, activities and abilities needed by middle management personnel in local government agencies.

7. The training delivery systems of on-the-job training, formal education and in-house development programs were determined to be more important to middle management personnel in local government agencies than other training delivery systems for self-development and employee development.

8. Forces which affect local government performance were determined to be important to middle management personnel in local government agencies.

Conclusions

Certain conclusions can be drawn from the results of the analyses of the data collected for this research study. Those conclusions include:

1. All middle management personnel in local government agencies recognized the importance of understanding the functions, activities and abilities of management in the everyday performance of their duties.

2. The use of data processing has not been developed to the extend that middle management personnel in local government agencies in the Las Vegas Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area see the advantages, uses or need for training in data processing.

3. Middle management personnel in local government agencies need training and admit that need for training.

4. Middle management personnel in local government agencies perceived formal delivery systems to be more valuable than informal delivery systems in training.

5. The middle management personnel in local government agencies reported career goals which included continued work and advancement in government type positions.

6. The middle management personnel in local government agencies recognized the need for self-development.

7. Middle management personnel in local government agencies are interested in an immediate reward rather than a future reward.

Implications

Certain implications can be drawn from the results of the analyses of the data collected for this research study. Those implications include:

1. Based on the frequency counts there is a need to make more opportunities for minorities and women to become a part of management. This group needs to be encouraged to apply for promotion and to get the needed training to make them promotable. Training is needed not only to make them qualified for promotion but also to enable them to better handle the management positions once they are attained.

2. The majority of the middle managers in this study ranged in age from 36 to 50. Losing individuals over the age of 50 is losing a valuable asset. A method for retaining the long term and/or older manager should be developed.

3. With 232 identified middle managers in the Las Vegas Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area local governments, the agencies should consider training by joining together to offer management development programs. The agencies should use agency personnel and local college personnel for teaching these courses. Arrangements should be made to give participants college credit for courses completed.

4. Based on the reported responses, some type of immediate reward should be used to recognize those individuals who are seeking self-development. Continual renewal and revision of management thinking is needed in all endeavors and immediate reward might encourage more managers and line personnel to develop the needed managerial skills.

5. Based on the frequency counts, data processing is used primarily for retrieval of information needed in decision making.

Recommendations for Further Research

Based on the related literature and the findings from this study, additional items not addressed in this study need to be researched. The suggestions for further research were:

1. Studies should be conducted in local government agencies for each of the ten managerial functions, activities and abilities to determine further the importance and utilization of each managerial skill.

2. A study should be conducted to determine the usage of electronic data processing in local government agencies with implications for better utilization.

3. Studies should be conducted by type of local government agency (city, county) using several agencies possibly from different geographical areas to further determine the importance and utilization of the managerial skills.

4. Studies should be conducted by size of local government agency to determine any differences in the importance and utilization of the managerial skills.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Banovetz, J. M. (Ed.). Managing the Modern City. Washington, D. C.: International City Management Association, 1971.

Barrett, R. J. Management in the Public Sector. Current Municipal Problems, 1976-1977, 3, 7-16.

Beckett, J. A. The Total-Systems Concept: Its Implications for Management. In C. Myers (Ed.), The Impact of Computers on Management. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The M.I.T. Press, 1967, 204-235.

Bell, D. The Coming of Post-Industrial Society. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1973.

Bromage, A. W. Introduction to Municipal Government and Administration. New York: Appleton-Century-Croft, Inc., 1957.

Carey, M. L. Revised Occupational Projections to 1985. Monthly Labor Review, November, 1976, 99, 10-22.

Carey, O. L., Marking, R. J., Montgomery, A. A., Sampson, R. J., Tousley, R. D. Trends in Distribution, Services and Transportation: With Particular References to the State of Washington. Pullman, Washington: The Washington Sate Department of Commerce and Economic Development, 1966.

Carlisle, H. M. Management Essentials: Concepts and Applications. Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1979.

Carmichael, J. H. An Analysis of Activities of Middle Management Personnel in the Retail Trade Industries with Implications for Curriculum Development in Post-Secondary Institutions. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1968.

Chaney, H. S. D. Determining Management Training Needs of Health Services Managers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Texas A & M University, 1980.

Clark, C. E. A Study of the Curriculum Needs of Middle Managers in the Oklahoma City Metropolitan Area. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1979.

Clark, D. T. & Gottfried, B. A. Dictionary of Business and Finance. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1957.

Crane, D. P. & Jones, W. A., Jr. The Public Manager's Guide. Washington, D. C.: Bureau of National Affairs, Inc., 1982.

Davis, R. C. The Principles of Business Organization and Operations. Easton: Hive Publishing Company, 1973.

DeCarlo, C. R. & Robinson, O. W. Education in Business and Industry. New York: Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1966.

Drucker, P. F. Management. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1973.

Duncan, W. J. Essentials of Management. Hinsdale, Illinois: The Dryden Press, 1975.

Erdoes, P. L. Professional Mail Surveys. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1970.

Fayol, H. General and Industrial Management translation by C. Storrs. London: Sir Issac Pitman & Sons, Ltd., 1949.

Flippo, E. & Munsinger, G. M. Management. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1975.

Fuchs, V. R. The Service Economy. New York: Columbia University Press, 1968.

Greenfield, H. I. Manpower and the Growth of Producer Services. New York: Columbia University Press, 1966.

Guglielmino, P. J. Perceptions of Skills Needed by Mid-Level Managers in the Future and the Implications for Continuing Education: A Comparison of the Perceptions of Mid-Level Managers, Professors of Management, and Directors of Training. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, 1978.

Gulick, L. Notes on the Theory of Organization. In L. Gulick & L. Urwick (Eds.), Papers on the Science of Administration. New York: Institute of Public Administration, 1937.

Hampton, D. R. Contemporary Management. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1977.

Hodge, B. & Hodgson, R. N. Management and the Computer in Information and Control Systems. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1969.

Horne, J. H. & Lupton, T. The Work Activities of "Middle" Managers—An Exploratory Study. The Journal of Management Studies, February, 1965, 2, 1965, 14-33.

Huck, S. W., Cormier, W. H., Bounds, W. G., Jr. Reading Statistics and Research. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1974.

International City Manager's Association. The Technique of Municipal Administration. Chicago: The International City Manager's Association, 1947.

Janger, A. R. The Personnel Functions: Changing Objectives and Organization. New York: The Conference Board, 1977.

Kay, E. The Crisis in Middle Management. New York: AMACOM, a division of the American Management Association, 1974.

Kelly, J. How Managers Manage. Englecliffe, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1980.

Kiani-Aslani, R. The Implications of Quantitative Tools of Decision Making for Accounting: An Empirical Investigation. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1975.

Koontz, H. and O'Donnell, C. Principles of Management: An Analysis of Managerial Functions. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1955.

Koontz, H. and O'Donnell, C. Principles of Management: An Analysis of Managerial Functions. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1968.

Lewis, R. The New Service Society. London: Longman Group Limited, 1973.

McQueen, H. J. Characteristics of Middle Management Positions in Selected Tennesse Industrial Firms. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1978.

Meltzer, M. F. The Information Center: Management's Hidden Asset. New York: American Management Association, Inc., 1967.

Mendoza, R. E. Quantitative Goals as Operational Measures of Effectiveness for Public Agencies. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1970.

Middlebrook, B. J. Analysis of Trends in Middle Management Training and Development between 1963 and 1979. Unpublished doctoral disseratation, North Texas State University, 1980.

Myers, C. Introduction. In C. Myers (Ed.), The Impact of Computers on Management. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The M.I.T. Press, 1967.

Newman, W. H. Administrative Action: The Techniques of Organization and Management. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1951.

Nie, N. H., Hull, C. H., Jenkins, J. G., Steinbrenner, K., Bent, D. H. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975.

Niles, M. C. The Essence of Management. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1958.

Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development. Training for Urban Management. Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development, 1979.

Pearse, R. F. Manager to Manager: What Managers Think of Management Development. New York: AMACOM, a division of the American Management Association, 1974.

Personick, V. A. The Outlook for Industry Output and Employment. Monthly Labor Review, August, 1981, 104, 28-37.

Piccone, R. J. Managerial Skills: A Comparison of the Perceptions of NASPAA and Selected Public Administrators. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University, 1980.

Powers, S. P., Brown, F. G., Davis, A. S. (Eds.). Developing the Municipal Organization. Washington, D. C.: International City Management Association, 1974.

Ramo, S. The Computer in Management. In S. PoKemper, & R. O'Conner (Eds.), Senior Management and the Data Processing Function. New York: The Conference Board, Inc., 1974.

Richards, G. L. The Emerging Role of Collegiate Schools of Business in the Continuting Education of Middle Managers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University, 1971.

Samson, H. E. The Nature and Characteristics of Middle Management in Retail Departmental Stores. Madison, Wisconsin: Distributive Educational Resource Center, 1969.

Shafritz, J. M., Balk, W. L., Hyde, A. C., Rosenbloom, D. H. (Eds.) Personnel Management in Government: Politics and Process. New York: Marcel Dekker, Inc., 1978.

Shaeffer, R. G. Monitoring the Human Resource System. New York: The Conference Board, 1977.

Sord, B. and Welsch, G. A. Business Education: A Survey of Management Planning and Controlling Practices. New York: Controllership Foundation, Inc., 1962.

Terry, G. R. Principles of Management. Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, 1964.

Tucker, J. T. Government Employment: An Era of Slow Growth. Monthly Labor Review, October, 1981, 104, 19-25.

U. S. Government, Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. Tomorrow's Jobs. Occupational Outlook Handbook, Bulletin 1875. Washington D. C.: U. S. Department of Labor, 1976.

Wren, D. A. The Evolution of Management Thought. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1972.

APPENDIX

P. O. Box 18432-138
Las Vegas, NV 89114
April 4, 1983

Dear Government Employee:

I am doing research for my doctorate at the University of Oklahoma and would appreciate your cooperation in this effort.

Attached is a questionniare designed to determine the management skills and knowledge needed by middle management personnel in city and county governments. Please respond by indicating the level of importance each item is to you in the performance of your current job.

The results of this study should not only identify by groups and degrees of importance the skill and knowledge needed but will also help determine the areas where training could aid middle managers in their jobs and better prepare them for promotion.

All responses to this questionnaire will be kept confidential. The final report will in no way identify any individual who participates.

After completing the questionnaire, please return it in the attached, self-addressed, stamped envelope. Thank you for you time and assistance.

Sincerely

Betty Rogers

P. O. Box 18432-138
Las Vegas, NV 89114
April 17, 1983

Dear Government Employee:

Few independent studies have been done on middle managers and very few have been done in the public sector. My doctoral research covers both of these areas but I need your help.

I would like my research results to be representative of every middle management position in the local governments of Clark County. To reach this goal I need you. If you have not, please complete and return the questionnaire you recently received.

All replies will be kept confidential and the final report will in no way identify any individual who participates.

If you have returned the questionnaire, thank you very much for your cooperation and time.

Sincerley,

Betty Rogers

P. O. Box 18432-138
Las Vegas, NV 89114
May 1, 1983

Dear Government Employee:

Do individuals in the public sector need the same management skills as those in private business? In public organizations, are the needed management skills the same independent of organization size? Does level of responsibility determine which management skills are more important? Do these skills vary according to departments within the public sector?

The answers to these questions could be determined through the research I am conducting for my doctorate. But I need your input.

If you have not completed and returned the questionnaire you recently received, please do so. If you have any questions or problems, you can contact me at 459-0415. All responses will be kept confidential.

If you have returned the questionnaire, thank you very much for sharing with me the management skills required for your job and for giving of your time in so doing.

Sincerely,

Betty Rogers

QUESTIONNAIRE

Background Information

Educational Background of Respondent:

High School Graduate	( )	College: Degree	( )
Technical School	( )	No Degree	( )
Specialized Training	( )	Advanced Degree	( )
	None of the above ( )		

Age of Respondents:

21-25	( )	26-30	( )	31-35	( )
36-40	( )	41-45	( )	46-50	( )
51-55	( )	56-60	( )	61-over	( )

Sex Male ( ) Female ( )

Race

Black	( )	Hispanic	( )	
Amer. Ind.	( )	Caucasian	( )	
Asian	( )	Other	( )	_____

Number of people directly under your supervision:

0-5	( )	6-10	( )	11-15	( )
16-20	( )	21-25	( )	26+	( )

Years in management experience:

0-5	( )	6-10	( )	11-15	( )
16-20	( )	21-25	( )	26+	( )

Years of management experience you have with current organization*:

0-5	( )	6-10	( )	11-15	( )
16-20	( )	21-25	( )	26+	( )

Years you have been in your current position:

0-5	( )	6-10	( )	11-15	( )
16-20	( )	21-25	( )	26+	( )

Arrived at current position:

Thru promotion	( )
By transfer	( )
From outside the organization	( )

Career Expectations:

a)	Further job training	( )
b)	Promotion	( )
c)	Transfer	( )
d)	Self improvement	( )
e)	None	( )

* Organization refers to a city, county or metropolitan police-whichever employs you. This definition applies throughout the questionnaire.

NOTE: All questions should be interpreted according to your job as a manager in your organization.

PLANNING

SCALE: Very Important, circle (1)
Moderately Important, circle (2)
Slightly Important, circle (3)
Unimportant, circle (4)
No Opinion, circle (5)
Not Applicable, circle (NA)

Rate the relative importance of the following to an individual in your position:

The ability to develop short-range (less than 1 year) goals and objectives for your:

a)	organization	1	2	3	4	5	NA	1. _____
b)	department	1	2	3	4	5	NA	2. _____
c)	division	1	2	3	4	5	NA	3. _____
d)	work unit	1	2	3	4	5	NA	4. _____

The ability to develop long-range (over 1 year) goals and objective for your:

a)	organization	1	2	3	4	5	NA	5. _____
b)	department	1	2	3	4	5	NA	6. _____
c)	division	1	2	3	4	5	NA	7. _____
d)	work unit	1	2	3	4	5	NA	8. _____

The ability to determine the resources necessary to obtain the goals and objectives of the:

a)	organization	1	2	3	4	5	NA	9. _____
b)	department	1	2	3	4	5	NA	10. _____
c)	division	1	2	3	4	5	NA	11. _____
d)	work unit	1	2	3	4	5	NA	12. _____

The ability needed to:

a)	make decisions	1	2	3	4	5	NA	13. _____
b)	locate relevent information	1	2	3	4	5	NA	14. _____
c)	research problems or issues	1	2	3	4	5	NA	15. _____
d)	determine courses of action	1	2	3	4	5	NA	16. _____
e)	make changes	1	2	3	4	5	NA	17. _____
f)	enlist cooperation and support of others	1	2	3	4	5	NA	18. _____

An understanding of the bases for the organization to establish:

a)	goals	1	2	3	4	5	NA	19. _____
b)	objectives	1	2	3	4	5	NA	20. _____
c)	policies	1	2	3	4	5	NA	21. _____
d)	procedures	1	2	3	4	5	NA	22. _____
e)	programs	1	2	3	4	5	NA	23. _____

If you were seeking to develop planning skills or knowledge, how would your rate these training circumstances:

a)	on-the-job training	1	2	3	4	5	NA	24. _____
b)	workshop	1	2	3	4	5	NA	25. _____
c)	seminar	1	2	3	4	5	NA	26. _____
d)	equipment supplier	1	2	3	4	5	NA	27. _____
e)	consultant	1	2	3	4	5	NA	28. _____
f)	development program	1	2	3	4	5	NA	29. _____
g)	formal education	1	2	3	4	5	NA	30. _____

COMMENTS: 31. & 32. _____

_____

_____

_____

ORGANIZING

SCALE: Very Important, circle (1)
Moderately Important, circle (2)
Slightly Important, circle (3)
Unimportant, circle (4)
No Opinion, circle (5)
Not applicable, circle (NA)

Rate the relative importance of the following to an individual in your position:

The ability to develop a structure of tasks and authority based on goals of the:

a)	organization	1	2	3	4	5	NA	33. _____
b)	department	1	2	3	4	5	NA	34. _____
c)	division	1	2	3	4	5	NA	35. _____
d)	work unit	1	2	3	4	5	NA	36. _____

The ability to coordinate and integrate the separate units in order to achieve goals and objectives:

1 2 3 4 5 NA 37. _____

An understanding of the following organizing factors:

a)	people	1	2	3	4	5	NA	38. _____
b)	services	1	2	3	4	5	NA	39. _____
c)	division of work	1	2	3	4	5	NA	40. _____
d)	relationships among divisions	1	2	3	4	4	NA	41. _____

The ability to identify and/or assign:

a)	responsibility	1	2	3	4	5	NA	42. _____
b)	authority	1	2	3	4	5	NA	43. _____
c)	accountability	1	2	3	4	5	NA	44. _____
d)	personnel	1	2	3	4	5	NA	45. _____
e)	function	1	2	3	4	5	NA	46. _____
f)	physical factors	1	2	3	4	5	NA	47. _____

Rate the relative importance of the following to an individual in your position:

The ability to determine:								
a)	personnel requirements and assign specific tasks	1	2	3	4	5	NA	48. _____
b)	authority and assign specific responsibilities	1	2	3	4	5	NA	49. _____
c)	resource capabilities and provide them	1	2	3	4	5	NA	50. _____
d)	priorities and ensure their attainment	1	2	3	4	5	NA	51. _____
The ability, for effective operations, to develop and enforce:								
a)	rules	1	2	3	4	5	NA	52. _____
b)	regulations	1	2	3	4	5	NA	53. _____
c)	requirements for division	1	2	3	4	5	NA	54. _____
d)	guides	1	2	3	4	5	NA	55. _____

If you were seeking to develop organizing skills or knowledge, how would you rate these training circumstances:

a)	on-the-job training	1	2	3	4	5	NA	56. _____
b)	workshop	1	2	3	4	5	NA	57. _____
c)	seminar	1	2	3	4	5	NA	58. _____
d)	equipment supplier	1	2	3	4	5	NA	59. _____
e)	consultant	1	2	3	4	5	NA	60. _____
f)	development program	1	2	3	4	5	NA	61. _____
g)	formal education	1	2	3	4	5	NA	62. _____

COMMENTS: 63. & 64. _____

_____

_____

_____

DIRECTING

SCALE: Very Important, circle (1)
Moderately Important, circle (2)
Slightly Important, circle (3)
Unimportant, circle (4)
No Opinion, circle (5)
Not applicable, circle (NA)

Rate the relative importance of the following to an individual in your position:

The ability to put plans into action:		1	2	3	4	5	NA	65. _____
The ability to get employees to identify with the goals and objectives of the:								
a)	organization	1	2	3	4	5	NA	66. _____
b)	department	1	2	3	4	5	NA	67. _____
c)	division	1	2	3	4	5	NA	68. _____
d)	work unit	1	2	3	4	5	NA	69. _____

Rate the relative importance of the following to an individual in your position:

The ability to supervise operations for maximum utilization of:								
a)	people	1	2	3	4	5	NA	70. _____
b)	money	1	2	3	4	5	NA	71. _____
c)	materials	1	2	3	4	5	NA	72. _____
d)	facilities	1	2	3	4	5	NA	73. _____
e)	equipment	1	2	3	4	5	NA	74. _____
The ability to assess the group's present feelings and future expectations about:								
a)	rewards	1	2	3	4	5	NA	75. _____
b)	tasks	1	2	3	4	5	NA	76. _____
c)	management performance	1	2	3	4	5	NA	77. _____
The ability to:								
a)	delegate decision making	1	2	3	4	5	NA	78. _____
b)	satisfy the needs of subordinates	1	2	3	4	5	NA	79. _____
c)	create a supportive work environment	1	2	3	4	5	NA	80. _____
d)	persuade and motivate subordinates	1	2	3	4	5	NA	81. _____
The extent to which you need to know about your subordinates work:		1	2	3	4	5	NA	82. _____
An understanding of your role in relation to:								
a)	higher manager	1	2	3	4	5	NA	83. _____
b)	peer group	1	2	3	4	5	NA	84. _____
c)	goals of the organization	1	2	3	4	5	NA	85. _____
The ability to:								
a)	guide the work unit	1	2	3	4	5	NA	86. _____
b)	give authoritative instructions	1	2	3	4	5	NA	87. _____
c)	motivate others	1	2	3	4	5	NA	88. _____
d)	monitor and regulate work	1	2	3	4	5	NA	89. _____
e)	guide through advice, information, instruction	1	2	3	4	5	NA	90. _____
The ability to work with others in other:								
a)	organizations	1	2	3	4	5	NA	91. _____
b)	departments	1	2	3	4	5	NA	92. _____
c)	divisions	1	2	3	4	5	NA	93. _____
d)	work units	1	2	3	4	5	NA	94. _____
If you were seeking to develop any of the directing skills or knowledge, how would you rate these training circumstances:								
a)	on-the-job training	1	2	3	4	5	NA	95. _____
b)	workshop	1	2	3	4	5	NA	96. _____
c)	seminar	1	2	3	4	5	NA	97. _____
d)	equipment supplier	1	2	3	4	5	NA	98. _____
e)	consultant	1	2	3	4	5	NA	99. _____
f)	development program	1	2	3	4	5	NA	100. _____
g)	formal education	1	2	3	4	5	NA	101. _____

COMMENTS: 102. & 103. _____

CONTROLLING

SCALE: Very Important, circle (1)
Moderately Important, circle (2)
Slightly Important, circle (3)
Unimportant, circle (4)
No Opinion, circle (5)
Not applicable, circle (NA)

Rate the relative importance of the following to an individual in your position:

An understanding of the factors that make control necessary:

a)	complexity of the organization	1	2	3	4	5	NA	104. _____
b)	resources	1	2	3	4	5	NA	105. _____
c)	delegation of authority	1	2	3	4	5	NA	106. _____

The ability in the control function to:

a)	measure progress toward a goal	1	2	3	4	5	NA	107. _____
b)	detect deviations from a planned goal	1	2	3	4	5	NA	108. _____
c)	take remedial action	1	2	3	4	5	NA	109. _____
d)	assure that actual activities conform to planned activities	1	2	3	4	5	NA	110. _____

The ability to establish standards for measuring:

a)	employee performance	1	2	3	4	5	NA	111. _____
b)	quality of work performed	1	2	3	4	5	NA	112. _____
c)	quantity of work performed	1	2	3	4	5	NA	113. _____
d)	cost of equipment	1	2	3	4	5	NA	114. _____
e)	time requirements	1	2	3	4	5	NA	115. _____

If you were seeking to develop controlling skills or knowledge, how would you rate these training circumstances:

a)	on-the-job training	1	2	3	4	5	NA	116. _____
b)	workshop	1	2	3	4	5	NA	117. _____
c)	seminar	1	2	3	4	5	NA	118. _____
d)	equipment supplier	1	2	3	4	5	NA	119. _____
e)	consultant	1	2	3	4	5	NA	120. _____
f)	development program	1	2	3	4	5	NA	121. _____
g)	formal education	1	2	3	4	5	NA	122. _____

COMMENTS: 123. & 124. _____

ACCOUNTING FINANCE

SCALE: Very Important, circle (1)
Moderately Important, circle (2)
Slightly Important, circle (3)
Unimportant, circle (4)
No Opinion, circle (5)
Not applicable, circle (NA)

Rate the relative importance of the following to an individual in your position:

An understanding of the annual report of your government agency:	1	2	3	4	5	NA	125.	_____
An understanding of:								
a) operational costs	1	2	3	4	5	NA	126.	_____
b) material costs	1	2	3	4	5	NA	127.	_____
c) labor costs	1	2	3	4	5	NA	128.	_____
d) facility overhead	1	2	3	4	5	NA	129.	_____
An understanding of records relating to:								
a) costs of materials acquired	1	2	3	4	5	NA	130.	_____
b) labor cost incurred	1	2	3	4	5	NA	131.	_____
c) operation costs	1	2	3	4	5	NA	132.	_____
d) cost of services or goods provided	1	2	3	4	5	NA	133.	_____
The ability to interpret information about:								
a) account balances	1	2	3	4	5	NA	134.	_____
b) encumbrances	1	2	3	4	5	NA	135.	_____
c) balance remaining	1	2	3	4	5	NA	136.	_____
d) budgets	1	2	3	4	5	NA	137.	_____
The ability to systematically:								
a) summarize financial information	1	2	3	4	5	NA	138.	_____
b) analyze financial information	1	2	3	4	5	NA	139.	_____
The ability to develop guidelines for:								
a) developing managerial budgets	1	2	3	4	5	NA	140.	_____
b) developing economic forecasts	1	2	3	4	5	NA	141.	_____
The ability to control systems to:								
a) monitor organization functions	1	2	3	4	5	NA	142.	_____
b) monitor organization projects	1	2	3	4	5	NA	143.	_____
An understanding of financial control methods including:								
a) break-even	1	2	3	4	5	NA	144.	_____
b) departmental cost effectiveness	1	2	3	4	5	NA	145.	_____
c) zero-based budgeting	1	2	3	4	5	NA	146.	_____
The ability to plan future performance based upon:								
a) related expenditures	1	2	3	4	5	NA	147.	_____
b) revenues	1	2	3	4	5	NA	148.	_____
c) allotments	1	2	3	4	5	NA	149.	_____

Rate the relative importance of the following to an individual in your position:

The ability to utilize statistical computations for:

a)	cost effectiveness	1	2	3	4	5	NA	150. _____
b)	cost projections	1	2	3	4	5	NA	151. _____
c)	managerial decisions	1	2	3	4	5	NA	152. _____

If you were seeking to develop your accounting or finance skills or knowledge, how would you rate these training circumstances:

a)	on-the-job training	1	2	3	4	5	NA	153. _____
b)	workshop	1	2	3	4	5	NA	154. _____
c)	seminar	1	2	3	4	5	NA	155. _____
d)	equipment supplier	1	2	3	4	5	NA	156. _____
e)	consultant	1	2	3	4	5	NA	157. _____
f)	development program	1	2	3	4	5	NA	158. _____
g)	formal education	1	2	3	4	5	NA	159. _____

COMMENTS: 160. & 161. _____

_____

_____

_____

DATA PROCESSING

SCALE: Very Important, circle (1)
Moderately Important, circle (2)
Slightly Important, circle (3)
Unimportant, circle (4)
No Opinion, circle (5)
Not applicable, circle (NA)

Rate the relative importance of the following to an individual in your position:

The ability to operate electronic data processing equipment to:

a)	assimilate information	1	2	3	4	5	NA	162. _____
b)	design models	1	2	3	4	5	NA	163. _____
c)	develop reports	1	2	3	4	5	NA	164. _____
d)	monitor operations	1	2	3	4	5	NA	165. _____
e)	control costs	1	2	3	4	5	NA	166. _____

Access to the information provided by data processing equipment to:

a)	assimilate information	1	2	3	4	5	NA	167. _____
b)	design models	1	2	3	4	5	NA	168. _____
c)	develop reports	1	2	3	4	5	NA	169. _____
d)	monitor operations	1	2	3	4	5	NA	170. _____
e)	control costs	1	2	3	4	5	NA	171. _____

Rate the relative importance of the following to an individual in your position:

An understanding of the basic usage of electronic data processing to:

a)	assimilate information	1	2	3	4	5	NA	172. _____
b)	design models	1	2	3	4	5	NA	173. _____
c)	develop reports	1	2	3	4	5	NA	174. _____
d)	monitor operations	1	2	3	4	5	NA	175. _____
e)	control costs	1	2	3	4	5	NA	176. _____

If you were seeking to develop your data processing skills or knowledge, how would you rate these training circumstances:

a)	on-the-job training	1	2	3	4	5	NA	177. _____
b)	workshop	1	2	3	4	5	NA	178. _____
c)	seminar	1	2	3	4	5	NA	179. _____
d)	equipment supplier	1	2	3	4	5	NA	180. _____
e)	consultant	1	2	3	4	5	NA	181. _____
f)	development program	1	2	3	4	5	NA	182. _____
g)	formal education	1	2	3	4	5	NA	183. _____

COMMENTS: 184. & 185. _____

_____

_____

_____

GOVERNMENT AGENCY

SCALE: Very Important, circle (1)
Moderately Important, circle (2)
Slightly Important, circle (3)
Unimportant, circle (4)
No Opinion, circle (5)
Not applicable, circle (NA)

Rate the relative importance of the following to an individual in your position:

An understanding of the organization:

a)	structure	1	2	3	4	5	NA	186. _____
b)	purpose/responsibility	1	2	3	4	5	NA	187. _____
c)	history and development	1	2	3	4	5	NA	188. _____
d)	legal framework	1	2	3	4	5	NA	189. _____
e)	political environment	1	2	3	4	5	NA	190. _____

An understanding of the goals and objectives of the:

a)	organization	1	2	3	4	5	NA	191. _____
b)	department	1	2	3	4	5	NA	192. _____
c)	division	1	2	3	4	5	NA	193. _____
d)	work unit	1	2	3	4	5	NA	194. _____

Rate the relative importance of the following to an individual in your position:

An understanding of the major components of organization:

a)	authority structure	1	2	3	4	5	NA	195. _____
b)	labor divisions	1	2	3	4	5	NA	196. _____
c)	coordination processes	1	2	3	4	5	NA	197. _____
d)	performance measurements	1	2	3	4	5	NA	198. _____
e)	communication flow	1	2	3	4	5	NA	199. _____

An understanding of the structure, function, and relationship of your organization and those of the:

a)	other local government agencies in the area	1	2	3	4	5	NA	200. _____
b)	state agencies	1	2	3	4	5	NA	201. _____
c)	federal agencies	1	2	3	4	5	NA	202. _____

How your organization is viewed by:

a)	community	1	2	3	4	5	NA	203. _____
b)	other government agencies	1	2	3	4	5	NA	204. _____
c)	fellow workers	1	2	3	4	5	NA	205. _____
d)	yourself	1	2	3	4	5	NA	206. _____
e)	media	1	2	3	4	5	NA	207. _____

If you were seeking to develop your agency skills or knowledge, how would you rate these training circumstances:

a)	on-the-job training	1	2	3	4	5	NA	208. _____
b)	workshop	1	2	3	4	5	NA	209. _____
c)	seminar	1	2	3	4	5	NA	210. _____
d)	equipment supplier	1	2	3	4	5	NA	211. _____
e)	consultant	1	2	3	4	5	NA	212. _____
f)	development program	1	2	3	4	5	NA	213. _____
g)	formal education	1	2	3	4	5	NA	214. _____

COMMENTS: 215. & 216. _____

_____

_____

_____

COMMUNICATING

SCALE: Very Important, circle (1)
Moderately Important, circle (2)
Slightly Important, circle (3)
Unimportant, circle (4)
No Opinion, circle (5)
Not applicable, circle (NA)

COMMUNICATING

Rate the relative importance of the following to an individual in your position:

The ability to effectively write:								
a)	letters	1	2	3	4	5	NA	217. _____
b)	memorandums	1	2	3	4	5	NA	218. _____
c)	reports	1	2	3	4	5	NA	219. _____
The ability to effectively communicate orally to:								
a)	individuals	1	2	3	4	5	NA	220. _____
b)	small groups	1	2	3	4	5	NA	221. _____
c)	large groups	1	2	3	4	5	NA	222. _____
The ability to communicate:								
a)	work plans	1	2	3	4	5	NA	223. _____
b)	work schedules	1	2	3	4	5	NA	224. _____
c)	orders	1	2	3	4	5	NA	225. _____
d)	instructions	1	2	3	4	5	NA	226. _____
e)	directions	1	2	3	4	5	NA	227. _____
The ability to communicate with subordinates by:								
a)	writing	1	2	3	4	5	NA	228. _____
b)	speaking	1	2	3	4	5	NA	229. _____
c)	listening	1	2	3	4	5	NA	230. _____
d)	actions	1	2	3	4	5	NA	231. _____
The importance of improving most communications through:								
a)	use of more precise words and expressions	1	2	3	4	5	NA	232. _____
b)	use of fewer but more effective words	1	2	3	4	5	NA	233. _____
c)	use of current rules of grammar and punctuation	1	2	3	4	5	NA	234. _____
The ability to:								
a)	use correct grammar	1	2	3	4	5	NA	235. _____
b)	punctuate correctly	1	2	3	4	5	NA	236. _____
c)	vary word usage	1	2	3	4	5	NA	237. _____
d)	spelling	1	2	3	4	5	NA	238. _____
e)	construct proper sentences	1	2	3	4	5	NA	239. _____
f)	develop complete paragraphs	1	2	3	4	5	NA	240. _____
g)	organize flow of thought through presentation	1	2	3	4	5	NA	241. _____

If you were seeking to develop your communication skills or knowledge, how would you rate these training circumstances:

a)	on-the-job training	1	2	3	4	5	NA	242. _____
b)	workshop	1	2	3	4	5	NA	243. _____
c)	seminar	1	2	3	4	5	NA	244. _____
d)	equipment supplier	1	2	3	4	5	NA	245. _____
e)	consultant	1	2	3	4	5	NA	246. _____
f)	development program	1	2	3	4	5	NA	247. _____
g)	formal education	1	2	3	4	5	NA	248. _____

COMMENTS: 249. & 250. _____

_____

_____

_____

MOTIVATING

SCALE: Very Important, circle (1)
Moderately Important, circle (2)
Slightly Important, circle (3)
Unimportant, circle (4)
No Opinion, circle (5)
Not applicable, circle (NA)

Rate the relative importance of the following to an individual in your position:

A basic understanding of human behavior, its relationship to employees and their work: 1 2 3 4 5 NA 251. _____

A basic understanding of groups and their purposes: 1 2 3 4 5 NA 252. _____

An understanding of procedures for effectively motivating subordinates:

a) awards 1 2 3 4 5 NA 253. _____
b) recognition 1 2 3 4 5 NA 254. _____
c) discipline 1 2 3 4 5 NA 255. _____
d) monetary 1 2 3 4 5 NA 256. _____

An understanding of how behavior is:

a) energized 1 2 3 4 5 NA 257. _____
b) intensified 1 2 3 4 5 NA 258. _____
c) directed 1 2 3 4 5 NA 259. _____
d) sustained 1 2 3 4 5 NA 260. _____
e) diminished 1 2 3 4 5 NA 261. _____
f) stopped 1 2 3 4 5 NA 262. _____

An understanding of motivation as it relates to interpersonal skills with:

a) supervision 1 2 3 4 5 NA 263. _____
b) peers 1 2 3 4 5 NA 264. _____
c) subordinates 1 2 3 4 5 NA 265. _____

The ability to handle individual actions in the work unit: 1 2 3 4 5 NA 266. _____

If you were seeking to develop your motivating skills or knowledge, how would you rate these training circumstances:

a)	on-the-job training	1	2	3	4	5	NA	267. _____
b)	workshop	1	2	3	4	5	NA	268. _____
c)	seminar	1	2	3	4	5	NA	269. _____
d)	equipment supplier	1	2	3	4	5	NA	270. _____
e)	consultant	1	2	3	4	5	NA	271. _____
f)	development program	1	2	3	4	5	NA	272. _____
g)	formal education	1	2	3	4	5	NA	273. _____

COMMENTS: 274. & 275. _____

_____

_____

_____

PERSONNEL

SCALE: Very Important, circle (1)
Moderately Important, circle (2)
Slightly Important, circle (3)
Unimportant, circle (4)
No Opinion, circle (5)
Not applicable, circle (NA)

Rate the relative importance of the following to an individual in your position:

An understanding of personnel:

a)	recruitment	1	2	3	4	5	NA	276. _____
b)	selection	1	2	3	4	5	NA	277. _____
c)	placement	1	2	3	4	5	NA	278. _____
d)	training	1	2	3	4	5	NA	279. _____
e)	management development	1	2	3	4	5	NA	280. _____
f)	promotion	1	2	3	4	5	NA	281. _____
g)	transfer	1	2	3	4	5	NA	282. _____

An understanding of the:

a)	merit system	1	2	3	4	5	NA	283. _____
b)	employee benefits	1	2	3	4	5	NA	284. _____
c)	union contract	1	2	3	4	5	NA	285. _____
d)	organization structure	1	2	3	4	5	NA	286. _____
e)	organization history	1	2	3	4	5	NA	287. _____

The ability to:

a)	collect and analyze employment	1	2	3	4	5	NA	288. _____
b)	identify problem areas	1	2	3	4	5	NA	289. _____
c)	set goals and timetables	1	2	3	4	5	NA	290. _____
d)	develop programs to achieve related goals	1	2	3	4	5	NA	291. _____
e)	communicate goals	1	2	3	4	5	NA	292. _____

Rate the relative importance of the following to an individual in your position:

The ability to analyze and/or requisition personnel needs:
1 2 3 4 5 NA 293. _____

Interviewing candiates prior to possible employment:
1 2 3 4 5 NA 294. _____

Direct involvement in the training of subordinates:
1 2 3 4 5 NA 295. _____

Providing alternative methods of training subordinates:
1 2 3 4 5 NA 296. _____

An understanding of the managers role during:
a) negotiations 1 2 3 4 5 NA 297. _____
b) strikes 1 2 3 4 5 NA 298. _____
c) relations with union representatives
1 2 3 4 5 NA 299. _____

An understanding of the major problems that confront the collective bargaining process:
a) legal problems 1 2 3 4 5 NA 300. _____
b) social problems 1 2 3 4 5 NA 301. _____
c) economic problems 1 2 3 4 5 NA 302. _____
d) political problems 1 2 3 4 5 NA 303. _____

The ability to establish and implement an affirmative action program:
1 2 3 4 5 NA 304. _____

An understanding of established affirmative action regulations by:
a) organization 1 2 3 4 5 NA 305. _____
b) State Government 1 2 3 4 5 NA 306. _____
c) Federal Government 1 2 3 4 5 NA 307. _____

An appropriate training circumstance for your subordinates:
a) on-the-job instruction 1 2 3 4 5 NA 308. _____
b) workshops 1 2 3 4 5 NA 309. _____
c) seminars 1 2 3 4 5 NA 310. _____
d) equipment supplier 1 2 3 4 5 NA 311. _____
e) consultant 1 2 3 4 5 NA 312. _____
f) development programs 1 2 3 4 5 NA 313. _____
g) formal education 1 2 3 4 5 NA 314. _____

If you were seeking to develop your personnel skills or knowledge, how would you rate these training circumstances:
a) on-the-job instruction 1 2 3 4 5 NA 315. _____
b) workshops 1 2 3 4 5 NA 316. _____
c) seminars 1 2 3 4 5 NA 317. _____
d) equipment supplier 1 2 3 4 5 NA 318. _____
e) consultant 1 2 3 4 5 NA 319. _____
f) development programs 1 2 3 4 5 NA 320. _____
g) formal education 1 2 3 4 5 NA 321. _____

COMMENTS: 322. & 323. _____

FINAL COMMENTS SECTION

What additional comments do you have on ways which would help in:

a) self-development of yourself, your people, or your organization.

b) improving your productivity or contribution to the division.

c) eventual promotion

What are your job-related career goals:

a) In 5 years:

b) In 10 years: