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CHAPTER I
STUDY OVERVIEW

Introduction

Managers in both industry and education are facing pressures that they have not faced before relative to direction and intensity of these pressures. The complexity of tasks managers face requires them to avail themselves of the finest training available.

The field of school administration has evolved during the past few decades. The problem faced by the educational administrator require that he have management skills as well as a background in education to cope with present day problems as they are found in the school.¹

Beech concurs that the changed scope and direction of problems faced by the administrator in public schools require competencies that will enable him to resolve problems and be able to survive and succeed in a climate of rapid change. The principal must be provided with means whereby he can improve his skills and acquire knowledge he does not have. One means available to both education and industry is the management development program. Business and education can train managers to perform effectively through the use of management development programs.

The school principal of today must be highly knowledgeable

when he assumes his position. He must keep abreast of all innovations, laws, policies, and regulations in any area pertaining to his task. Updating of skills and knowledge can be accomplished through management in-service training.

What are identifiable problem areas requiring management skills for solution? Some may be: new technology and the knowledge explosion, changes in the national economic picture, changes in population and employment outlooks, the urban crisis, the position of the disadvantaged in our society, changing life styles and values of various age groups, teacher organization and militancy, public opinions regarding school related issues and resulting organizational demands made upon the schools.

To meet these challenges and to prepare for future ones, educational administrators should constantly expand their knowledge and skills. In-service development, according to Pharis, enables the administrator to remain open and receive, interpret, and evaluate new information. A sound in-service development program can enable him to restructure old information into new and meaningful patterns of response.

---


There is a need to upgrade training programs to respond to changing administrative environments. The development of programs that incorporate industrial management skills and knowledge in educational in-service development programs should better enable the educational administrator to solve problems since many of the problems that confront him are interinstitutional. Administrators communicate and react with other organizations daily. As school districts develop they acquire characteristics similar to those of industry. As these organizations become more similar the likelihood that problems faced by both organizations can become more common. The incorporation of a common approach to problem solving may result in a more realistically oriented educational administrator.

Mularz notes there are four major tasks faced by administrators in any organization. These tasks are:

1. The administrator must fulfill the goals of the organization.

2. The administrator must make use of other people in fulfilling these goals, not as if they were machines, but rather in such a way as to release their initiative and creativity.

3. The administrator must try to build into his organization provisions for innovations, for change and for

---

development. In a changing world people and organizations must adjust to changing conditions. The conditions for change must be incorporated into the organization so that there may be a steady process of development rather than a series of sudden, disruptive innovations.

4. The administrator must be concerned with the human relations aspects of his organization. He must be concerned about the way a person or group feels, acts or believes. The kind of feeling, action or belief determines whether there is good or poor morale.

Reller views the competencies educational administrators will need to function in the changing society which confronts him. Briefly, these competencies center about: ability to function in vague, less sharply defined situations; ability to work in conflict situations; ability to work with diverse social, political, economic and racial groups; ability to understand and accept values, feelings, frustrations, and demands of a wide range of interests; ability to formulate his own values; ability to work in a situation in which solutions are not clear and accountability is present; ability to select personnel of diverse views and competencies and to organize them into a cohesive team; ability to lead, insure openness and provide security necessary to effective action; and ability to plan to secure and utilize the masses of data required to make decisions.  


There is a challenge to provide quality in-service training for school administrators. Goldhammer's 1967 statement senses an urgency felt today.

Although neglected at the present time by most of the preparatory institutions and related agencies, the continuous in-service education of administrators is one of the most imperative needs for the revitalization of education in our society. To provide those experiences which can effectively assist the trained professional to modify his behavior, to obtain the new knowledge which he needs, and to build new skills based upon contemporary technology is probably the greatest challenge facing the field of educational administration and all of its institutions and agencies today.

Managers at differing levels will be reacting to the complex problems found in our society. The middle manager, whether in industry or education, will face problems that will require sharply defined skills to solve them.

In reviewing the literature there are relatively few studies that compared training areas in industry and education. There were also few that considered a similarity of needs of middle managers in industry and education.

It could be considered critical that research be added to the field of educational management training and development.

Competent management is critical to both public education

and private industry. There is lack of extensive research, as reported in current literature, that identifies degrees of similarities in industrial and educational management development programs. There is lack of identification of components of management training programs that are considered critical to the satisfactory performance of middle managers in both public and private industry.

Based upon data gathered and reported from both industrial and educational management programs there is little evidence present in educational literature that identifies extensive research that would assist educational administrators in the planning and development of management in-service at the local level.

There is a need to compare management development programs in industry and education.

As indicated previously, there is a need for: increased skills of middle managers in both groups; more of adequate research to compare training areas, a similarity of needs of middle managers, increased research to determine degrees to similarities in industrial and educational management development programs and of components critical to the satisfactory performance of middle managers in both organizations; more adequate assistance to educational administrators to plan and develop management development programs at a local level.

In addition, industry and education are faced with other similar problems. Comparison of management development programs could be
beneficial in many solutions to problems. Some of these problems are noted. There is a need for both industry and education to be accountable for the cost of such programs in that they should improve skills and effectiveness of the middle managers. The public to whom both groups are accountable will be critical of costly ineffective programs.

Both groups face a need to evaluate programs in a critical manner. Those participating in the management development programs and those planning such programs should have clear perceptions of what constitutes a program in terms of plan, design, techniques and/or methodology, and evaluation tools and techniques.

Industry and education have the responsibility to provide a basis upon which middle managers can acquire a systematic acquisition of skills and knowledge appropriate for their job. Improved performance of the middle manager should as middle managers attaining organizational and individual goals.

Middle managers in education and industry, if interested and involved, may find programs undertaken to be more successful. Additional research could point out those areas of interest and perception of middle managers involvement.

Organizational structure in education and industry is becoming more complex. Specific needs of middle managers resulting from this complexity could make necessary that type of management development
programs to handle basic and emerging needs of the middle managers.

Implied in the foregoing paragraphs is that industry and education provide through management development for career advancement and prevention of obsolescence. Also implied is that management development is not separate from the realistic work climate. Management development should be considered as having an effect on managerial behavior as it relates to actual work situations.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to analyze management development programs in private industry and public elementary schools. Specifically, the purpose is to:

1. Identify the existence, content, and description of management development programs in private industry and public education.

2. Identify and rank areas of competency commonly found in management development programs in public education and private industry.

3. Investigate those components considered to be essential by authorities to a total management development program in public education and private industry.

4. Investigate those components most critical to the satisfactory performance of middle managers in public education and private industry.

5. Determine the extent middle management is involved in identification of areas of content to be included in management development programs.

6. Determine the extent management development programs meet priority needs of middle managers in public education and private industry.
The Procedure

A study of the current professional literature was conducted. As a result of this study major focus points were developed to serve as a framework for the study. An analysis of management development programs in public education and private industry was based upon the following focus points:

1. Identification and description of management development programs.
2. Ranking of competencies found in management development programs.
3. Investigation of components considered essential to a total performance of middle managers.
4. Investigation of components critical to the satisfactory performance of middle managers.
5. Determination of the extent middle managers are involved in identification of areas of content to be included in management development programs.
6. Determination of the extent management development programs meet the needs of the middle managers.

The principal methods that were used to collect data to analyze these focus points were:

1. Analysis of written and unwritten management development programs or written data which would describe courses, content or policy related to program formation.
2. Questionnaire related to management development programs.
3. Structured interviews with selected administrators directly responsible for administration of management development programs in public education and private industry and middle managers in both public education and private industry.
After data were gathered from the above sources, further data for analysis were provided by an in-depth interview. These interviews were administered to those directly responsible for the administration of management development programs in both public education and private industry and to middle managers from both public education and private industry.

Validation of the instruments was achieved by a review of the related literature and by utilization of a jury of experts in the fields of educational administration and industrial management. The process by which these experts were chosen and a listing of the jury is found later in the chapter.

**Delimitation of Study**

The results of the questionnaire and the interview responses were limited to a geographic area - Cook County, Illinois. Through a random sampling technique it is assumed that responses received were typical of those that may be achieved in a larger sampling. It is quite conceivable that the reliability of responses would have been more complete and enhanced if a larger sampling were used. Further, it is assumed by the investigator that responses were candid and honest.

The study is further limited by the fact it focused on those people responsible for program formation and the middle manager, in this case, the principal and the department head. Therefore, the implications for others in private industry or public education would have to be qualified.
The conclusions and recommendations were the results of statistical research and interview data. This study could be applicable to those who are seeking to improve and analyze their management development programs.

**Definition of Terms**

In developing this study it was realized that a common definition often was needed so that it would apply to both the area of public education and private industry. In order to aid in understanding the terms used in this study, the following definitions are offered at this point to serve as reference for the remainder of the study:

**Top Management:** Those who are the policymakers responsible for the overall direction and success of the organization's activities. It could, in some cases, be a group consisting of key management personnel. This person or group has power to collaborate with others in the group on important matters affecting any or all phases of the organization's activities. For purposes of this study this will include school superintendents and program administrators as found in private industry.

**Middle Managers:** This group is responsible for the execution and interpretation of policies throughout the organization and for the successful operation of assigned divisions or departments. They have a high degree of responsibility for individual initiative and judgement acting under policies and directives of top management. They have responsibility for recommending new or revised policies and for
establishing objectives of their assigned units. They generally accomplish results through levels of supervision. Important staff functions are assigned this group. For purposes of this study, this will include school principals and department heads found in private industry.

Management Development Programs: This term is synonymous with the terms "in-service development" or "administrative in-service development." It is used in this study to denote one or a series of planned experiences designed to enhance the effectiveness of the manager. It is a program to develop and/or renew competencies of managers in order that they may better achieve organizational and/or personal objectives.

Private Industry: An organization that is privately owned which deals in a product for profit.

Manager: one who uses his authority to organize, direct and contact responsible subordinates in order to coordinate all aspects of labor or service that contribute to the attainment of the organization's purpose. His skills include the art and science of getting things done through people. A manager is synonymous with administrator as used in this study.

Competency: Competency is defined as the kind of knowledge, skill, effectiveness as a manager in the organization.

Organization: In this study organization can refer to either and/or specific institutions or organizations in public education or private industry.
Public Education: That unit of government which provides for the education of children in grades kindergarten through eighth grade.

Priority Need: That need which is identified as being most critical to the success of the program/process/individual in the field of management.

Component: As used in this study, component is a general topical area defined by specific examples of possible content that could be included in the management development program. This specific content could, for this study, be a competency.

Research Design

This section outlines the data sources and the procedures used in this study to gather, analyze, and interpret the data obtained from the respondents in this study.

This section will: 1) review the procedure to develop the focus points of this study; 2) outline the procedure to collect and utilize data necessary to analyze these focus points; 3) discuss the study population and development of instruments utilized to collect data and 4) discuss the administration and analysis of the questionnaire and interview data.

Procedure

A study of the current professional literature was made. Upon completion of this review of literature major focus points were developed to serve as a framework for the study. An analysis of management development programs in public education and private industry were based upon the following focus points.
1. Identification and description of management development programs.

2. Ranking of competencies found in management development programs.

3. Investigation of the components considered essential to a total management development program.

4. Investigation of the components considered essential to a total management development program.

5. Determination of the extent middle managers are involved in identification of areas of content to be included in management development programs.

6. Determination of the extent management development programs meet the needs of the middle manager.

**Procedure to Collect and Utilize Data**

The principal methods that were used to collect data to analyze these focus points were:

1. An analysis of written and unwritten management development programs or written data which would describe courses, content or policy related to program formation.

2. A questionnaire related to management development program (see Appendix A).

3. A structured interview with selected administrator directly responsible for administration of management development programs in public education and private industry and with middle managers in both public education and private industry (see Appendices B and C).
Population

Responses to the questionnaire (see Appendix A) were solicited from one hundred (100) people directly responsible for the administration of the management development program in their respective organizations in public education and private industry. Specifically, responses were solicited from fifty (50) K-8 elementary school districts in Cook County, Illinois, listed in the 1977 Directory of Suburban Public Schools. Chicago was excluded because of its unique size and administrative structure. Fifty (50) responses were solicited from private industries selected from Cook County, Illinois as found in the Cook County, Illinois section of the Manual For Excellent Management. Random selection from the above groups was based on a table of random numbers. This random sampling reflected similar populations, similar socio-economic conditions, similar geographic considerations and contained populations from a definite area.

Responses to the questionnaire (See Appendix A) were also solicited from one hundred (100) people who were at the middle management level. Specifically, responses were solicited from fifty (50) school principals and fifty (50) department heads in private industry. The principals

8 1977 Directory of Suburban Public Schools, published by Public Information Office (Chicago: Educational Service Region of Cook County, 1977), pp. 19-56

and department heads were selected on an alphabetical basis. Each person selected was to have a last name closest to the letter "A." If there was more than one person with the letter "A" or selected letter closest to the letter "A," the person with the most seniority was selected.

Instruments

Questionnaire

Initial impetus in the development of the questionnaire (see Appendix A) came from reviewing Mahoney's study which suggested a recommendation to examine the university of application of trainable manager competencies across various sectors of our society. He noted that there would be merit in replication in education and government because of the size and impact of both of these institutions in our society. If this were to be accomplished, Mahoney further suggested that modification of the instrument and procedure would be necessary. Ten areas of competencies found in his questionnaire were condensed so that management development could be compared in relationship to the framework of this study. The resulting focus points and directions of this study were those of the writer of this study.

The focus points and competencies were further defined by a review of the literature as found in Chapter II.

---

The questionnaire and interview formats (see Appendices B and C) were validated by a jury of experts in the fields of public education and private industry. Personnel comprising the jury of experts in private industry were:

1. Dr. Woodrow W. Reed, managing partner, Reed & Johnson Management Consultants, Chicago.

2. Dr. Ronald Cline, National Training Director, Public Mortgage Insurance Company, San Francisco, California.

3. Mr. H. C. Livingston, Senior Vice President (retired), Continental Oil Company, Chicago.

4. Dr. John Bentz, Director, Psychological Research and Services, Sears, Roebuck & Company, Chicago.

5. Mr. Michael Dell, Director Freight Operations (retired), Rock Island Railroad, Chicago.

Contact was made by letter with Dr. Joseph A. Sarthory, Associate Director, National Academy for School Executives (see Appendix D). Response to this letter (see Appendix E) resulted in membership of the jury representing people from public education. This jury from the field of public education was:

1. Dr. Betty Dillon, Director of Staff Development, Lincoln Public Schools, Lincoln, Nebraska.

2. Dr. Chad Chase, Director of Staff Development, Aurora Public Schools, Aurora, Colorado.

3. Dr. James K. Zaharis, Associate Superintendent, Educational Services, Mesa Public Schools, Mesa, Arizona.

4. Dr. A. Bruce McKay, Coordinator of Administrative Training, Montgomery County Public Schools, Montgomery, Maryland.
5. Dr. Ivan Fitzwater, Director of Staff Development, San Antonio Public Schools, San Antonio, Texas.

Prior to the selection of the jury, contact was made with Dr. Joseph A. Sarthory and Dr. John Bentz. The purpose of these contacts was to refine initial ideas regarding the development of the dissertation, solicitation of materials, and requests for ideas regarding membership in the jury of experts in the field of private industry (see Appendices F, G and H). Initial contact with Dr. Bentz was made in an interview with Mr. John P. Carter (see Appendix I).

Pertinent comments from these jury members were incorporated into the final questionnaire and interview formats that were sent to the participants in this study.

Specifically, respondents to the questionnaire (see Appendix A) were asked to:

1. Place common components considered to be most critical to a total management development program in a rank order.

2. Identify those characteristics which best describe the management development program.

3. Utilize the Likert Scale in responding to the following statements in the questionnaire.

   a. To what extent do you agree this component should be considered essential to a total management development program in your field?

   b. To what extent do you agree this component is critical to the satisfactory performance of the middle manager in your field?

   c. To what extent do you agree the middle manager in your field is involved in identification of areas of content
that will be included in your organization's management development program in this area?

d. To what extent do you agree that management development programs in your organization meet priority needs of middle managers in this area?

Analysis of Questionnaire Data

Kendall's coefficient of concordance was the statistical method used to determine the extent groups in the study tend to agree in their rank order of the ten (10) components contained in the study. Further, an analysis of variance was used to determine if there was a significant difference among groups for each question. Tukey's procedure was employed to determine areas where there was a statistically significant difference.

Respondents were asked to check those areas which best described their management development programs. A simple percentage was used to determine the exact number of times each was used to describe a management development program. Also, the results of this area were used in analysis of the returns.

The Likert Scale was utilized when respondents answered the following statements:

1. To what extent do you agree this component should be considered essential to a total management development program in your field?

2. To what extent do you agree this component is critical to the satisfactory performance of the middle manager in your field?

3. To what extent do you agree the middle manager in your field
is involved in identification of areas of content that will be included in your organization's management development program in this area?

4. To what extent do you agree that management development programs in your organization meet priority needs of middle managers in this area?

In using the Likert Scale a five (5) point scale was utilized. Respondents were asked to express their opinions by checking: Strongly Agree, Agree, Neither Agree nor Disagree, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree. To score this scale, the responses were weighted +2, +1, 0, -1, -2, respectively from Strongly Agree through Strongly Disagree (see Appendix A).

A positive response indicated agreement, and a negative response indicated disagreement. A one-way analysis of variance was used to determine if there were significant differences in responses. Where there was a statistically significant difference, Tukey's procedure was employed to determine the area of difference.

Interview

Further information was gathered via a structured interview with selected administrators directly responsible for administration of management development programs and middle managers in public education and private industry (see Appendix B).

The interview format was reviewed by the same jury that reviewed the questionnaire.

It was a contention that the interview technique was revealing
and would be a useful tool to analyze focus points of this study.

While the interview technique is not new, it was found to be advantageous in collecting additional data.

Van Dalen and Meyer pointed out that people are more willing to communicate orally than in writing and, therefore, will provide data more readily and fully in an interview than on a questionnaire. Face-to-face contact is an advantage since the interviewer can probe into problems more deeply. The interviewer can observe the subject and use auditory and visual cues to elicit information. 11

Mouly cautioned that while flexibility can be counted as a major strength it may also be a major weakness inasmuch as it allows the interviewer to vary his approach and project his own personality and influence the responses of the subject. 12

The following quote sums up the major reasons why the interview was used as a method to collect data.

By means of the interview, it is possible to secure data that cannot be obtained through the less personal procedure of distributing a reply blank. People do not generally care to put confidential data in writing; they may want to see who is getting the information; and receive guarantees as to how it will be used. They need the stimulation of personal contacts in order to be drawn out. Furthermore, the interview enables the researcher


to follow up leads and take advantage of small clues; in complex materials where the development is likely to proceed in any direction, no prepared instrument can perform the task. Again, the interview permits the interviewer to gain an impression of the person who is giving the facts, to form some judgment of the truth of the facts, 'to read between the lines,' things that are not said.

Interview Administration and Analysis

The interview format was administered to ten (10) persons directly responsible for the administration of management development programs, five (5) each from the fields of public education and private industry. Further information was received in the interview process from ten (10) middle managers, five (5) from the field of public education and five (5) from private industry. Both groups were interviewed and responded to the same interview format (see Appendix B).

The respondents to this interview format were selected at random from the respondents to the questionnaire. The random sampling of those involved in this portion of the study was based upon selection of organizations on an alphabetical base that begins with the letter "A". No more than one organization from any one letter was made.

The interview format was designed to provide additional information for the analyzation of the focus points. Questions were designed to solicit comments. The questions were designed to explore policy, procedure, purpose and philosophy of the organization's

management development program. Pertinent comments were included to justify ratings in the narrative analysis.

To provide further data for analysis, a follow-up in-depth interview (see Appendix C) was administered to four (4) people. There were two (2) each of those directly responsible for the administration of management development programs in both public education and private industry and two (2) middle managers from both public education and private industry. Those organizations indicating the most components as being part of their total management development program were selected to be used in this part of the study. A random sampling from the previous group interviewed (see Appendix A) was made to determine which groups would be further interviewed in depth.

The narrative analysis of these interviews (see Appendices A and B) related to the focus points of this study. This narrative analysis of management development programs focused on:

1. Similarities and differences in management development programs in public education and private industry.

2. Strengths and weaknesses of management development programs in public education and private industry.

3. Negative and positive effects on participants in management development programs in public education and private industry.

4. Advantages and disadvantages of operating management development programs in public education and private industry.

Available returns from the questionnaire and interviews provided an opportunity for analysis by:
1. Allowing respondents to identify and rank those areas of competency commonly found in management development programs in public education and private industry. Rankings were based on those components which respondents considered to be most critical to a total management development program.

2. Enabling respondents to determine extent to which each component was considered essential to a total management development program in the specific fields of public education and private industry.

3. Investigation of those components of a management development program most critical to the satisfactory performance of the middle manager in public education and private industry.

4. Determination of extent middle management is involved in identification of areas of content to be included in management development programs.

5. Determination of extent management development programs in public education and private industry meet priority needs of middle managers.

6. Summarization of available content of management development programs found in public education and private industry.

7. Summarization of comments of respondents.

The development of this study required a common definition of terms. These common definitions are found in Chapter I.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter presents a review of the literature pertaining to management development. The contents of this chapter have been divided into four major sections: The Concept of Management, Climate for Acceptance of Management Concepts in Education, Management Components, and Trends in Preparing Educational Leaders.

Concept of Management - Applicability to Education and Industry

In recent years there has been a generally accepted position that the administrative process has both common and unique characteristics in various types of organizations.

Whaling assisted the common or generic approach suggesting that there are more common than uncommon elements in the management of school and business enterprises. He suggests that educators can learn much from well-run business, and that management skills are much the same for school and business operation.14

During the fifties and sixties an intensive study of educational administration revealed that educational administration scholars considered that there was much in common between education and business administration. Walton asserted that administration was basically

the same in all organizations. In 1963, Boyan indicated that in education there should be less emphasis on specialized areas. Further, skills applicable to understanding, predicting and controlling behavior of people appeared to be generally the same in administering organizations of all types.

Differences of opinion regarding the concepts of common management or universal elements has not been resolved in any definitive way. However, Mahoney defines the work of Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler and Weick, in which management is considered a critical group in today's society.

The key occupation group in an industrial society is management. Effective direction of human efforts—whether in the public or private sectors of an economy—is central to the wise and efficient utilization of human and material resources.

Drucker is business management orientated, yet he recognizes


other institutions must have organization in which there are functions similar to business management.  
Knezevich asserts that there is merit in the idea that administration is administration no matter what the institution or organization.

Beech views the practices and roles of education as being influenced by those successful practices and roles of business and industry. This influence is a recent phenomenon.

Beech supports his contention by quoting the North Central Association:

As educators and business have developed greater empathy, the commonalities, as well as differences, between the two fields have become more apparent. Recognized by many leaders of both fields is the continuing need for improved management of required functions to make better use of available resources.

Climate For Acceptance of Management Concepts in Education

Managing a school is a far more complex task than it has been in the past. Administrative dimensions of the job have increased.

Those responsible for the planning of programs to allow school
administrators to function effectively in a climate of change have been challenged. Management of the school requires that personnel be able to improve skills, acquire knowledge, and keep abreast of innovations to avoid becoming obsolete. 23

In reviewing the literature, six trends were discernible that affect concepts of management training for education administrators.

1. **Increased Size of School Districts**

   Campbell, Cunningham and McPhee suggest, based on data supplied by the University Council for Education Administration, that in the 1970's and 1980's fewer school districts will be in existence. There will be greater control by teachers over school matters. There will be a corresponding increase in principals and assistant central office administrative staff. Three significant trends are suggested: First, there will be growing differentiation of the administrative staff; second, the building level will see an increase in the number of specialists in such fields as political science, sociology, and economics; third, there will be administrative staff specialization evolving from the content fields; personnel will increasingly share such titles as director, supervisor or coordinator. 24 Thomas realizes that as school districts become larger there is an increased

---


need for managerial expertise. Taking advantage of management training, administrators will be able to more effectively deal with organizational structure affecting subject matters, social problems, and communication. He knows that nowhere are problems of organizational change more apparent than in those areas where innovations have been attempted. Thomas contends that innovations in larger districts often is not accepted or fails because of problems related to managerial styles and organizational structure. Managerial specialists should be trained to facilitate appropriate organizational change.

2. Accountability

The jargon of business management is swiftly becoming the jargon of the school administrator. Gilkey noted that big business is taking over school systems in total or in part. Eventually, a business approach would be total. It would deal with all aspects of the educational system. In some cases, it is refined and deals with selected portions of the program.

Sciara and Jantz refer to the accountability movement which, starting in the 1960's, has become a full fledged movement in the 1970's. While no precise definition has emerged, it generally


asserts that public schools are accountable, liable, or responsible for proving that students and organizations can meet reasonable standards of achievement. Schools must show that public funds are used wisely. The complex time of the 1970's in which the American public, school boards and educators find themselves make problems of instituting a valid approach to accountability very real. High level management skills are necessary to answer demands of the various publics.\textsuperscript{27}

As school systems are forced to describe and explain programs there will be a corresponding increased demand for individuals who can defend educational programs. To accomplish this task, administrators will utilize the language of the business and education. Problems of measuring behavior, evaluation, selection, unionization and pressure groups will require persons who understand the field of management. The broad perspective of management could better allow the school administrator to explain programs and problems to the public.\textsuperscript{28}

3. Younger Education Administrators

As evidenced by the American Association of School Administrators report, the median age of the superintendent of schools is 48 years. This statistic has indicated that the trend of increasing age, from


studies starting in 1921-1922, has been arrested if not reversed. 29

Often training programs have been more valuable to those individuals who have actually worked in an organization and who have experienced the pressures of problems characteristic to them. This age group of school superintendents were asked which new skill or information they feel they would need to maintain their effectiveness as administrators. PPBS and/or systems administration skill, human relations skills, conflict resolution skill, increased knowledge of public finance, specialized management skills, and knowledge of social and educational change processes were skills they needed. Thirty-one percent of the superintendents thought that the type of specialists needed to help the school system improve performance levels were those trained in business management. When ranking the graduate courses that were most important to them, superintendents gave the highest rankings to school finance systems, personnel administration, public relations, school business management, legal aspects of education, supervision and computer and data processing. 30 Thomas states:

On the positive side, a younger student may be more willing to tackle the difficult and highly structured curriculum that characterizes many MBA programs. Younger students may be more open to the possible relevance of management concepts


30 Ibid., pp. 43-65.
to educational programs. Because of their youthful idealism and energy, they may be more susceptible to the notion that organizations can be changed.

4. Recruitment From Outside Fields

A discernible trend in education is that the profession will increasingly recruit administrators from the professions outside of education. As this is true, management training will become more important. Management in business and industry and management in education will increasingly draw upon resources of other disciplines to solve problems.

Administrators in public schools are faced with changes resulting from pressure, politics and prejudice. To institute an orderly change and to exert positive leadership, administrators must learn to be development specialists with knowledge of research. They must assume the responsibility for the team of administrators with whom they operate. Administrators must be organization specialists, expert in planning, job descriptions, allocation of authority, staff efficiency, allocation of financial and material resources, staffing patterns, scheduling, and the utilization of physical facilities. They must be communication specialists.  

Barnes concluded that preparation programs for superintendents


must be comprehensive and interdisciplinary in nature. He recommended programs consisting of 1) a foundation program in the related disciplines of economics, sociology, psychology, and communications; 2) a general core of courses including general educational administration, general supervision, curriculum development, and personnel administration; 3) a specialized component with emphasis on business, finance, law, human relation, and public relation; 4) an interdisciplinary approach including management, communication and sociology; and 5) field experience including consultant services, school surveys, workshops, practicums, seminars, conferences and other similar experiences.

As Educators look at educational administration as a professional field rather than a discipline, they must be willing to extract materials and ideas from other fields with a goal of problem solving. This trend would be reflected in more practical applications than in intellectual appeal.

Walton saw that administrative energies are consumed by the organization. Educational administrators have but one career, that of administration. He wants adequate education in practical theory in guiding organizations in public relations, coordination, managing conflict, intelligent use of all types of information systems, curriculum

---

that includes classical literature on the use of power, responsibility of leadership and the sources and nature of educational policy. 34

A Ford Foundation letter dated October 15, 1970 indicates there is support from industry to encourage educators to seek people from outside the field of education. There is reflected a commitment to support programs emphasizing executive training for school administrators.

The latest in a series are grants to the Universities of Chicago, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin. A common feature of the training programs is recruitment of doctoral candidates not only from school work but also from business, government, and other fields where they have demonstrated executive potential. Although these programs, along with similar efforts at five other participating universities, will not turn out their first crop of new style administrator for another two to three years, a growing market for them seems likely. School boards in such cities as Detroit and Philadelphia have recently engaged former business executive and governmental officials for high level school jobs. 35

5. Recent Changes In Management Education

Currently there is evidence of continuing change in content and approach in management education. These changes could be compared to the changes in content and approach in education administrative training. Schools of business have faced problems similar to those of schools of education. There are gaps in knowledge about managerial work, skills and knowledge required for executive success. Problems caused by these gaps have posed concern for those responsible for


management education. A resulting increase in the numbers of corporate school and university level management training, specifically in content areas, has occurred. There has been a wide variety of programs spawned to meet the needs for capable business managers.36

Currently a continuing controversy between the generalists, those advocating a broad approach to educating graduate students, and the specialists, those advocating majors or areas of specialization in the master's programs, in taking place.

Marquette Business Review reported a recent study that found many MBA curriculums are continuing to educate specialists under the guise of the MBA degree. Business was asked to respond to what they would want in the degree program in the spectrum of the generalist-specialists. Response from the list of the "Fortune 500" companies indicated that business wanted the MBA program to 1) specialize in a function area such as finance, marketing or accounting; and 2) obtain broad administrative skills in that area of specialization. In addition, the MBA graduate is viewed as an individual with long range executive potential. Respondents also perceived work experience as a valuable supplement to the MBA degree. The message to the generalists was that some specialization is needed. The weight placed upon business vs. non-business courses would reflect resistance to reducing business

credit in the program in order to increase electives in fields outside of business. Broad administrative skills were preferred to highly specific technical skills. 37

According to Pierson important aspects of modern management training are:

1. The entire graduate experience should be centered on decision making;

2. Business decisions are more an art than a science. Thus business should not be taught as a science;

3. The unique contribution of the manager is to know enough about all major facets of the firm's operation to keep various activities in proper balance while making decisions in a complex, fact-changing environment;

4. The intellectual quality to be fostered in one of making rapid shifts in perspective and discipline, synthesizing, selecting, and patching. 38

Patten views a unique education process that dramatically distinguishes management education programs from the conventional academic graduate or undergraduate course work. He contends:

1. The role of the faculty differs sharply from the assumed role in that the instructors are usually the same age or younger than the management students;

2. The instructor appears more as an equal than as a superior and serves often as a moderator, discussion leader or chairman rather than a teacher;

---


3. He has less tendency to give grades, mark examinations, or presume to pass judgment in any formal way on individual work performed;

4. Very little written work is required in most management education programs because executives often appear lost without their secretaries. They are hard-pressed to revive their reading capacities;

5. The instructor depends upon the intrinsic interest of the material and issues he presents for responsiveness of the students;

6. The instructor appears to be helped by the innate conscientiousness of the executives in his sessions or by their wish to do well before peer groups;

7. The faculty is generally judged for their ability to stimulate useful experience for the participants rather than by their standing as scholars or their rank in their profession;

8. Lectures are less important than are small group discussions, study groups and exchange of experiences. There is pressure on the instructor to make the discussions meaningful.

6. The Business-Education Interface

There are an increasing number of services being performed by business for the schools. Many of the services are those that require limited attention from the superintendent. However, there is a wide range of services and products that are expensive and which directly affect the foundation of the educational program. As this trend is to continue, it may be advisable for the superintendent to employ staff who have been trained to make decisions based on information in the areas where both educational decisions and cost decisions are critical.


Historically, the administrator of the business operations has had some industrial background. Evolution increased his perspectives to encompass both business management and educational administration. The consolidation and reorganization has put emphasis on the need for a highly trained person who must have more knowledge and technical skill than before. Relationships of the various staffs and publics is critical in the area of communication. The administrative tasks will more and more affect outcomes and quality of the educational programs of the district if not carried out or accomplished effectively.  

Management Components

Mahoney concluded that two management issues have not been resolved: The dimensions of management, and by extrapolation of the content of manager training. The second issue involved the differences which might exist between management as found in the industrial sector and management as found in other societal sectors if, in fact, management exists at all in the other sectors in the same terms.  

Mahoney's investigation was undertaken to assist industrial and education administrators in the planning and organizing of curricula for inservice instruction in management competencies. Recommendations for further study were suggested. Among these was the examination of the universality of application of trainable manager competencies across several sectors of society. It was suggested there would be


merit in replication in education and government because of the size and impact of both sectors of our society. Following Mahoney's suggestion for modification of his instrument, ten areas of his questionnaire were condensed so that management development could be compared in industry and education.

**Management Contribution**

Van Miller, Madden and Kincheloe indicate that writers or scholars of administration can be grouped in three schools: the efficiency school, the human relations school and the social science school. Distinctions occur in both the time of the theory formations in history and in the content areas. The concept that administrative development is necessary in the areas of planning, organizing, controlling, coordinating, staffing and motivating would fall into the efficiency school or reference.

Three major streams emerged. Taylor represented scientific management, Weber represented bureaucracy and Gulick and Urwick represented administrative management.

Taylor contended the goal of administration was efficiency, and the means of achieving it was standardization. Weber directed his attention to the form of organization of effort. Gulick and Urwick differ from these in that they were more concerned with analysis of the work at the administrative level. The administrator's work lends itself less to time and motions studies. Consequently, their work

---

43 Ibid., p. 140.
resulted in principles of administration such as planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting and budgeting.  

Self contends that these schools of administrative thought and theory can draw eclectically upon contributions from each other without running into inevitable contradictions. This is, in part, brought about by changing needs and demands of the organization, be it public or private. The theories were formulated from the great complexity of the original theories. One thing that these theories have in common is their concern with problems of management from the viewpoint of the manager.

Drucker makes general reference to very broad and common elements which are referred to as "function of management." These include concepts as planning, organizing, motivating, controlling. Kirk reported a survey research into manager educational needs. He found that middle level managers in education and business had competency needs in areas of communication, customer credit, customer services, merchandise controls and personnel management. Beech quoted a 1963 report of the American Association of School Administrators. In this report the school principal had a role similar to the role of the


45 Peter Self, Administrative Theories and Politics (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972), pp. 48-52.


manager in the private sector. His responsibilities centered about decision making, organizing, staffing, planning, communicating, and directing. These functions are basic to management activities at all levels in all types of endeavors including those in business. 48

A basic element in the general management process is that of control. A flow chart (see Figure 1) taken from the School For Executive Development sponsored by the American Savings and Loan Institution in cooperation with the University of Washington School of Business Administration, 1973 49 illustrates the importance of this function as it applies to various situations. The Feedback Loop of Management Control from Koontz and O'Donnell will similarly indicate the principal of control necessary for effective management. (see Figure 2) 50

In this case control involves elements of what are considered to be basic management functions. Alpander surveyed 217 executives of major corporations. Their rankings of the top six managerial functions were planning, organizing, directing-supervising-motivating, controlling, coordinating, and training and orientation of subordinates.


THE CYCLE OF CONTROL

INTERFACE WITH HIGHER-LEVEL CONTROL OR WITH EXTERNAL ECONOMIC WORLD

1. DETERMINE GOALS OR OBJECTIVES
2. PLAN PROGRAMS
3. DETERMINE WORKLOADS
4. DETERMINE REQUIRED RESOURCES
5. ACQUIRE AUTHORITY TO USE RESOURCES
6. PERFORM WORK

7. COMPARE PERFORMANCE WITH PLAN
8. COMPARE PROGRAM ACHIEVED WITH PROGRAM PLANNED
9. COMPARED GOALS ACHIEVED WITH GOALS WANTED

INTERFACE WITH LOWER-LEVEL CONTROL

Figure 1

Feedback loop of management control

Identification of deviations → Comparison of actual against standards → Measurement of actual performance → Actual performance

Analysis of caused of deviations → Program of corrective action → Implementation of corrections → Desired performance

Figure 2
In rating these more traditional functions of management, they stated that there was, as a result of planning and organization, more efficient organization and distribution of work. 51

Management's Social and Legal Responsibilities

Weiss points to the critical problems of the 1970's that educators will face. They are described as the five R's: rebellion, race, revenue, relevance, and reaction. A portion of Melbo's quote will assist in placing the social and legal responsibilities in perspective:

... Among the specialized studies will be those which focus on the nature of organization and institutions, the social forces and political pattern which apply, the whole field of Educational Economics, the Techniques of Administrative Leadership, the Social Psychology of Education, the nature of the crowd and power ... The superintendent of the 70's will need particularly to know the realities of politics. He must know how prestige is won and lost, how confidence is gained and destroyed, how cooperation is enlisted and rewarded. 52

Industry also faces these five R's. Industry has been criticized for not being aware of the social changes that have occurred in today's world. A paradox is that younger people in industry are more aware of the problems and carry a stronger anti-business attitude than did their parents. 53


52 Robert P. Weiss, "Pre-service and In-Service Preparation Programs for Urban School Superintendents as Viewed by Practitioners and Selected Panel of Authorities" (Doctoral Thesis, Michigan State University, 1971), pp. 11-12.

As a result, industry has had a more difficult time to recruit, train, motivate and retain young people. Young people enter business with high hopes of purpose and organization. They often find management problems more concerned with who is right than what is right. This disenchantment of men entering management filters back to those still in the education process. A result is negative communication and a younger generation less interested in industrial management careers.  

It is impossible to define and deal with every social problem facing administrators in business and education. In Managers For Tomorrow the society-business relationship was placed in context by noting the interdependence of business and society. Corporate reality was such that monetary giving to institutions has reached a level unknown in our society. The purpose of this giving is likely to be more sharply defined.  

As the social and legal relationships confront the manager he will be affected. Basic questions will need to be answered in his total process of education and development. Tannenbaum lists some of these questions and resistance with which managers will need to cope.  

1. Social research will allow the manager to ask if the studies mean trouble for himself or his corporation;  

2. Managers may ask questions of cost. What will they pay for a study which seemingly gives something for nothing;  


3. What benefits will the firm receive from this study or project;

4. Managers will regard the study of social problems as a threat. They may find themselves dealing with fear;

5. In any research, there is a fear that competing companies will be able to gain information not available to them.

The manager holds the key to utilization of ideas of a social or legal nature. Through him unexpressed resistance will be overcome. He will be able to place management in a positive position that will better communicate to the worker and public that which is necessary for growth and strength of the organization. 56

Business Economics

Administrative development that allows the manager to understand basic economic issues facing his organization is becoming more and more important to his ability to function as a manager.

A recent ERS report indicated that this may be considered a trend in the development of school administrators. The PPBS and MBO methods, while evident for a number of years in school districts, has become a training area for those goal oriented administrators who are interested in improved planning. 57

Lewis presents a comprehensively defined attempt to provide educators with a systemized approach to managing the educational program on the basis of clearly delineated objectives. The value was to provide


a system with long and short range planning. Control and coordination is possible since personnel are better utilized. Personnel time, work load and compensation, through a review of job performance, is possible. Importantly, MBO fosters better training development objectives.

Management by objectives, a business related practice, has been successfully incorporated into many industries. Bell Helicopter Company attacked budget and cost problems successfully through this system. Like other organizations they gave MBO a new name, the "Cost Awareness Program." It was found that there was a need to communicate between management levels, to provide information about those economic items that would have impact upon the organization. There were problems encountered in the Bell program. The most common were: goals themselves were inappropriate, the methods of measuring progress were inappropriate, management's attitudes were inadequate, and responsibilities were not clearly fixed. Management by objective can be defined as management by results rather than activities. Specific goals become the concern of managers, and there is a resulting need for training and delegation.

Johnson determined that school principals needed to have knowledge of sources of school finance sufficient to 1) influence intelligently the acquisition of resources through routine fiscal channels;

---


2) stimulate the acquisition of monies from special sources such as grants from private foundations and public agencies; and 3) be able to apply available monies with full knowledge of effects on the total financial picture of the school. 60

Edge and Greenwood recently noted that finance, economics, accounting, marketing and statistics were essential to the education of the manager. 61

Equal importance is given to the myriad of programs of the various government levels by the business community. There has been an evolution of legislation concerning manpower, training and education. Social legislation has brought large amounts of monies into play for training. This has definitely influenced the need for industry to evaluate the uses of these monies and the programs which they sponsor. Management specialists will need to be trained to be assessed and acquainted with legislation as it affects the needs of their industry. The manager must prepare himself to become the organizational spokesman and the source of expertise on the direction of public policy. 62


Support Systems

The development areas that are included in many areas of management training need one vital element included in their context to make them complete. This element is, "Can the manager understand and explain to others the content of the theories or programs?" This portion of management training is often referred to as support systems. Support systems can be treated separately or as a part of many areas of management development.

Benge described that ability to have the necessary information and to be able to transmit that information as a necessary thing that a manager should be able to accomplish. 63

There is a need for more standardized terminology when one writes of the types of methods a manager utilizes in describing what is defined as support systems. The manager has the responsibility to explain so that he can avoid a tremendous burden of duplication of time and effort. Often a management responsibility requires him to be able to communicate in writing those things which result in policy, rules, regulation or design. The importance of these devices to increase his effectiveness in using them as a part of a support system cannot be over-stressed. If the manager can utilize support systems he will be released for other purposes. Often these support systems imply a standard of performance to be attained. 64

Leader Behavior

Hencley asserted that the administrative process cannot be separated from the total behavior of the administrator. His personality is reflected in and cannot be separated from the type, scope, and emphasis of his leadership. 65

French determined that leadership results from a complex combination of traits. The leadership which is considered effective is associated with high performance, high morale and development of human resources. 66

The critical need of management knowledge of leadership behavior was related to the degree of authority used by the manager and the amount of freedom available to his subordinates in reaching decisions. There are various forces that the manager must be aware of in decision making, and the manager must perceive these forces, utilize his perceptions and behave appropriately in light of these perceptions. 67

It could be stated that managers and supervisors are responsible in organizations for the development of subordinates, a term that reflects generally how managers carry out their duties. How a manager

65 Stephen P. Hencley, The Internship in Administrative Preparation, The University Council of Educational Administration and the Committee for the Advancement of School Administration (Washington, D.C. 1973), 83-84.


develops subordinates reflects how a manager conducts himself in relationships with those whom he supervises. There are duties of the manager that delineates upper and middle managerial personnel. Duties such as determining the business in which the organization should be engaged, defending the integrity of the organization from outside attacks, building a sense of mission, and motivating managers to collaborate and work together are different in degree from the middle managers are not expected to be institutional influences. Middle managers must be effective in convincing their subordinates to meet management's expectations. Often the managers leadership training programs are aimed at teaching how to get results from people. Upper level management is not affected by the same pressures as in the middle level manager. Organizational politics, lack of unionized subordinates, factors of greater education, differences in staff problems, political realities, and formal and informal rules can affect the type of training proposals offered by those responsible for training and development. 68

Lipham suggests that administration and leadership have factors in common, but they are not the same. Some administrators maintain an organization, and others affect changes in goals, programs and procedures. The administrator, to better understand leadership, can no longer afford to ignore extra-organizational variables. The leader is part of a larger social structure. The development of leadership

qualities is necessary if he is to relate to his staff and other publics. Training, therefore, in leadership is essential to the successful administrator. 69

**Individual and Group Behavior**

Getting things done through people has been a manager's job. Considered important, it is accomplished in a variety of ways. The changing attitudes toward work make altering the motivating plans of the manager essential to quality job performance.

The manager needs to know theory from Maslow's theory as it relates to the needs of people through McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y. The Manager's task to motivate is difficult if he is to understand these and other theories. He must be concerned with working conditions, wages, fringe benefits and also the challenge of how to provide challenging tasks, new experiences, opportunity for growth and advancement, and be concerned with status, and expectations that lead to absence of dissatisfaction. In his effort to understand the individual, he is also in contact with groups that make up the employee's internal or external world. His ability to know what influences and motivates those under him will allow him to better reach the goals of the organization. 70

---


Management development depends primarily on superior manager subordinate relations. The development process should be considered viable, ongoing and practical. The heart of the development process is in the personal relationship between personnel and management. The manager is the key to the development of job performance since he should hold the essential cards of motivation, knowledge of people, knowledge of behavior, and knowledge of dealing with each person or group. In essence, the manager must be able to deal with problems to accomplish personal and company goals. 71

Knudson placed the management role in perspective. A recent change in training practices places the responsibility of management to make it possible for people to recognize and develop human characteristics for themselves. Management is to be trained to arrange organizational conditions and methods of operations so that people can achieve goals by directing their own efforts toward organizational objectives. The motivations and potential for development the capacity for assuming responsibility, and the readiness to direct behavior toward organizational goals are present in people. 72

Communication

Many developmental programs used today center upon ways to


improve some facet of communication skill. Personal systems for memory improvement and public speaking courses could be included in this general context. Communication is a broad concept whose meaning embraces a wide range of phenomena. It runs the gamut of organizational levels. The manager must remember that it is inseparable from human interaction. The importance of the communication system is noted by Rogers. He contends that the age of authoritarian boss and compliant employees is obsolete. The efficiency of the organization will be through a system whereby persons communicate at all levels freely. Management should be aware that the public image of the organization is affected by better communications. Management has contacts with at least four publics: customers, stockholder, vendors, and employee. These have their counterparts in education.

Concern with image and the concern with communication can be projected into other areas. Culbertson notes four critical behaviors of the effective superintendent. These effective behaviors have implications for communication. For superintendents to perceive


and report will require exceptional variety and development of communication skills.

Effective superintendents will:

1. ... communicate a moral vision and a commitment to education larger than any given societal force or special interest;

2. ... help communities chart clear educational directions amid marked conflict and ambiguity;

3. ... help generate and implement new programs designed to achieve school system objectives and policies.

4. ... help create organizational arrangements designed to facilitate program improvement and change.76

Powell and Davis noted that companies placed high ranking on communication skills. Communication should be included in university executive development programs. Communication is critical to business as is the curriculum areas of decision making ability, knowledge of a manager's area of operation.77

Alpander concurred as he reported that top level through lower level, middle managers placed communication systems and interpersonal communication as the two top priorities of a management development program.78


Management Science

Predicting the form and character of school administration in the future is hazardous, but one thing that is clear is that the organization is becoming exceedingly complex. As problems confronted become more complex, administrators will look to computer systems to plan, study, set goals and solve conflicts. 79

Administrators in schools are aware that scientific management has come into administration under the banner of systems analysis or operations research. Two techniques, PERT (Program Evaluation and Review Technique) and CPM (Critical Path Method) if properly understood, can be useful devices for control and solving of educational problems. The ramifications for the manager are great. The manager must also be trained to understand that his goals must be specific, he must be able to coordinate and combine knowledge from other sources and people, and he must be capable of selecting a capable group of people with whom to work. Once all this is accomplished, he must maintain good relationships with people to accomplish his goals. While many problems do not lend themselves to systems analysis, there are numerous others that do. 80


Industry has become computerized to solve problems. If problems are carefully constructed to enable management to know precisely what has happened and why or what should be happening and why, this type of information will leave management in a strong position to make decisions that are increasingly based upon analysis and less and less on guesses or hunches.  

The computer will alter any type of management. Technology will cause problems for that manager not trained to handle either the inter-relationship between people and machine or the vast amounts of almost instant information that can be available to him or his organization.  

Managers must be able to handle the new kind of bureaucracy accompanied by the technology. They must be ready to handle the new class of worker or technician or technician manager.  

Social change has not kept pace with the technological change. The manager will be able to apply the technology to help solve problems, but his need for training is critical since his training cannot concentrate on the past, rather it must concentrate on the future.  

Optimizing Job Performance  

The task of the manager to develop concepts of job description  

---


and effective methods of communicating them is a most difficult task. McGehee and Thayer devised a three-fold approach which helps ordering the complex problems connected with development planning of components in any organization. These three focus on both job and man analysis:

1. Organizational analysis -- determining where within the organization the education and training emphasis should be placed;

2. Operations and analysis -- determining what should be the contents of programs in terms of what an employee must do to perform a task, job or assignment;

3. Man analysis -- determining what types of behavior change are required on the part of an employee if he is to perform the tasks which constitute his job in the organization.

Communicating performance expectations is a difficult task. Castetter suggests that a compelling reason for communication is to improve effectiveness of personnel so that purpose of job and organization are attained. He contends that a real problem is to develop and improve valid appraisal procedures -- appraisal procedures that will be understood in terms of their strengths and weaknesses.

Modern management methods suggests that as managers review job descriptions, they are considering what is referred to as "vertical

---


loading." This is a process of enrichment by increasing the job holder's autonomy and responsibility. To those organizations who are equal to it, this may call for reduction of unnecessary, duplicated or ineffective external controls; addition of management functions; addition of more challenging technical tasks; granting of new authority; responsibility for time management; authority to make decisions in times of crisis; and greater control over budgeting and financial aspects of non-financial jobs.

To initiate this, six steps are suggested:

1. Gather data and analyze work;
2. Education first of manager who will be affected by concept and of the workers affected;
3. Primary implementation in task areas where there is reason to expect success;
4. Expand this implementation to new workers and new tasks;
5. Pass management of job enrichment project from outside consultant to organization;
6. Analysis of final results to assess further action. 85

McCleary, Peterson, and Lamb note that there is a category of educational administrators who can see the need to reorder the organization to meet new needs, revitalize existing programs, alter program expectations and obtain broader participation in order to

extend program coverage and effectiveness. This type of administrator is vulnerable because this type of stance toward administration is legitimated by tradition and because competencies for affecting analysis and change have not been adequately identified. (see Figure 3)\textsuperscript{86}

\textbf{Labor Relations}

Labor unions are a fact of life in both industry and in education.

It is no surprise that management development stresses this fact in educational programs for both educational and industrial managers. Short courses, as reported Gray\textsuperscript{87} and by Sexton\textsuperscript{88} indicate that union leadership is as concerned as is industrial or educational management leadership. Wynn reports that one of the most demanded games to train educational leaders is that called "Professional Negotiations in Education." Other bargaining games have developed. An example of one bargaining game that differs from others is one that provides multilateral rather than bilateral format for negotiation by including not only teachers and board teams, but also student


\textsuperscript{88} Brendan Sexton, "Staff and Officer Training to Build Successful Unions," \textit{Industrial Relations}, 5 (February 1966): p.83.
government and minority group teams. It deals with two issues, racial balance and tracking systems, rather than with the many issues of personnel policy. In-Service programs offered by school systems are critical to manager development. Forty-three percent of the programs offered to administrators centered about negotiations and strike management. A recent report cites the work of Scott, "Collective Negotiation: Implication for the Preparation of Administrators," as a category important to the education of superintendents because of demands of teacher groups.

Trends in Preparing the Education Leaders

An Interinstitutional project centered at the University of Washington is an attempt to describe and interpret legal factors which constrain the flow of top leadership into educational positions. Once some traditional state certification requirements for educational administrators are overcome, some top talent can flow from other areas. Cornell University has one professor exploring psychological and other barriers which inhibit the flow of leadership talent into the field of education. The National Program for Educational Leadership (NPEL), supported by the U.S. Office of Education is attempting to recruit established leaders from other fields into education.

New Sources of Content

Emphasis continues in the social sciences in the preparation of school


administrators. But the arts and humanities are being drawn upon in an attempt to strengthen offerings in the areas of values and creativity. The future content of education is another content area beginning to attract the attention of those preparing school administrators. Traditional disciplines seem neither committed nor organized in such a way as to provide prospective education leaders with a comprehensive view of the future which they will need. Management and information sciences are becoming increasingly important. The University of Pittsburgh is delving into such subjects as data retrieval and presentation, human information processing, man-machine communication and artificial intelligence.

Instruction Methods

New developments are emerging in the area of instructional methods for preparing education leaders. Simulation approaches are changing. They focus more upon the processes of administration such as educational planning, less on a single role such as the elementary school principalship. They are designed to develop anticipatory and proactive leadership styles rather than reactive, responsive styles. They emphasize the concept of an administrative team rather than that of the unilateral decisionmaker. Traditional descriptive material is being supplemented with interpretive and conceptual content to provide depth and meaning to the problems simulated. Participants receive more meaningful feedback. Greater use of computers is made. More refined materials are being offered. The Harvard litigation packet is an example. It includes two sets of materials dealing with Title I funds misuse and various students' rights issues. Model papers, judicial opinions, complaints, interrogatories, and other legal memoranda along with an annotated bibliography of current decisions and unreported appeals is included.

Interorganizational Arrangements

The need for communication and cooperation among the organizations involved in administrative preparation increases as the field becomes more sophisticated. Interuniversity cooperation took place in the fifties and sixties with the development of the UCEA. Through cooperative efforts, human and material resources are contributed to interuniversity projects. There are opportunities for teams of professors and students from different universities to combine talents in the generation and dissemination of new program content, conceptualization and implementation of new preparation strategies and the development and testing of new instructional materials. The Ford Foundation has funded programs in seven diverse university settings. Another type of interorganizational arrangement is begin-
ning to develop between university based preparation programs and professional associations. For example, the National School Public Relations Association is interested in the improvement of preparation programs for its clientele and joint efforts with university personnel are now under way to develop criteria and objectives for the introduction of such programs in a few graduate schools. The USOE has funded programs which foster interaction and cooperation between universities and local school systems. Interinstitutional cooperation is taking place on an international basis. The summer of 1970 saw the Second International Intervisitation Program in Educational Administration.

---

CHAPTER III
CONCERNS FOR EDUCATIONAL MANAGEMENT
IN-SERVICE

Introduction

A need for management in-service training exist. The literature, as reviewed in Chapter II, outlined some dimensions to illustrate that there is a climate for acceptance of management concepts perception of some areas of concern which could affect the actual establishment of management in-service training. Four of these areas will be discussed in this Chapter. These are: Management Obsolescence; The Need for Quality Leadership; Challenges To Management Education and Management Education. In reviewing some of the complexities of these areas of concern greater insight to the problem of establishing a management in-service program could be presented to the reader.

Management Obsolescence

One factor that constrains the ability of educational leaders to exercise educational leadership is that of management obsolescence. A major assumption that a person can occupy a role successfully no matter what the social, political and technological milieu is one that should be questioned.

What is being learned about demands placed on executives in the public and private sectors of our society in periods of rapid social, economic and political change would suggest that administrators must
address themselves to the question of executive obsolescence.  

The fact that change exists and is of importance to educational middle managers needs no proof. Personal experience and common observation belabors the obvious fact that everything is changing. Technology, communication, economics, changing values, traditions and political changes have taken place. The amount of change and the force of change have affected this manager. Ultimately, this change will affect the efficiency and effectiveness of his work performance.

Educational middle manager must realize that there are forces of change acting upon his position of leadership that will require him to remain current in his approach. External forces of change could include such factors as technological advances, legislation, changing expectations and values of society, and monetary concerns. Internal forces stemming from an individual's need for information could include desire for new knowledge of human behavior and ways of organizing, information concerning changing norms of people as related to their jobs, and a need to determine internal modifications that could positively affect or change organization-personnel relationships.

The managerial function is more complex today than it was five years ago. Those in leadership positions are dealing not only with a technology which was the science fiction of yesterday, but with the social values and attitudes that could have been alien to his

background and early training. 95

The fact of life for the school administrator is that he must cope with change. Both he and his professional organizations must confront the issue of management development in a realistic sense.

As the tempo of change occurs, the middle manager must be aware that he could find himself facing forces that resist change. Unless he handles these forces of change properly his credibility as a manager may decrease.

What are some of these forces that resist change? A primary source of resistance to change could be the manager. Generally, the managerial mind is receptive to new methods of management, but it must also be remembered that change is resisted because change represents new habits or patterns. These patterns may represent sacrifice that the manager may not wish to make. The manager may resist change because it represents a form of insecurity. Programs of management development should contain the elements of motivation and involvement to allow the manager to see the value of additional training. 96

The importance of the value of additional training becomes more acute as the manager recognizes that if he is depending upon a limited management development program or management in-service his advancement will be frustrated by obsolescence.


Revising a figure from a Northeastern University Graduate Cooperative Program in Engineering and Mathematics brochure, as found in Patten, 97 to have it apply to educational managers could illustrate this point. The figure, figure four, is found on this page.

**Figure Four**

**Value of Additional Training**

Elaborating further, one's educational program leading beyond the basic bachelor's degree may be obtained through an educational program leading to a master's degree. Through this program, a person will learn

---

to use the advanced tools of his profession. Afterwards, he can specialize and receive an advanced degree. During this time he will practice his occupation. Throughout his career he should update his education. The variety of ways in which updating will be accomplished will supplement the knowledge he gains on the job.

A graduate degree is only one way to prevent obsolescence. A list, while incomplete, to note other methods to prevent obsolescence could contain: on-the-job training, rotation of management positions; tailored educational programs; performance appraisal; professional consultant services; packaged programs; or sabbatical leaves.

Unless there is continual development, the manager of the future will be frustrated by the obsolescence experience. Because the managerial climate changes so quickly the manager will not have a sense of security and stability. Changes occur so quickly that solutions to problems may meet failure in another time. An equally important challenge in management development is the development of an increased scope of subject matter necessary to meet competency needs. Exposure to a wide range of disciplines will be critical to the development of the total manager. 98

Quality Leadership Needed

There have been efforts to develop innovative instructional programs to systematically develop the middle manager in education.

---

These innovations have not fulfilled their promise to develop quality leadership in the middle manager. It is possible that too much attention has been paid to isolated aspects such as scheduling, curriculum and media and too little attention has been paid to the total school as an organization and as a complex social system. Another reason for this failure to develop quality leadership in the middle manager is that it may be essential to recognize that the quality of work environments and learning environments depends primarily on school middle managers and their supervisory-management teams who are less than prepared for their roles. Schools are traditionally managed as individual and competitive units while assuming reactive rather than proactive stances toward problem situations.

School administrators responsible for the management of these units have reacted to social situations which have been responsible for related conflicts or problems in the schools. Causes of such problems should have been recognized prior to the development of "critical" or "crucial" situations. It seems necessary to support the need for renewed focus on managers whose organizational problem solving capability is essential for improvement of learning.

The principalship is part of the management team. No longer can he be thought of as a principal teacher whose attention is rooted in the improvement of instruction.

The reality of the situation is not as clear. Principals, as middle managers, have been asked to adjust to another management level, that which could carry the title of assistant superintendent, business manager or assistant in charge of pupil services. In some districts lines of authority are ill defined or subject to change. It is also possible that the principal may be responsible to a variety of people depending upon the nature of the problem.

While this situation could produce a series of problems there is also the opportunity for the principal middle manager to meet with the superintendent's representatives. In this situation problem solving can occur. There may also be opportunity for input which can lead to a basis for development of management in-service development programs.

Collective negotiation has polarized management and has forced the principal into the management camp. The teacher is one of many forces competing for the time of the principal. He must be available to the citizenry, students, and other management personnel.

As school systems become complex the principals function as middle managers. They occupy the organizational space between the top and lower echelons. In this capacity they funnel intentions of managers with several groups to whom they are assessable, they are the integrators. Without their quality leadership the system could not operate. Their effectiveness as managers is of crucial importance. 100

100 Ibid., pp. 2-3.
Trump contends that the principal and assistant principal, more than anyone else, determine the nature and extent of a school's services. What the management and the teacher accomplish is reflective in what the principals accomplish. The principal is the person who bears responsibility for the degree of teaching and learning excellence. The central office management has impact on schools, as do consultants, university professors, state education department personnel, or others connected with education. However, no one is in a better position than the principal to influence the quality of the school. 101

Economic, demographic, technological, institutional and internal changes challenge leadership. Leadership tends to age. There exists an over supply of qualified professionals in the field. Internal conflict over resources become overt, and traditional consenses decision-making styles fall apart. The leadership need inherent in each of these problems is acute. It is necessary to have leadership that responds to managerial needs that require decisive professional leadership. There is a need to upgrade the organizational and human components to avoid the obsolescence and reneging of leadership. 102

These are tensions producing situations that challenge the quality of leadership. There is considerable effort put forth to acquire new skills of administration. Acquisition of new skills can
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also create tension. This same tension, is at times, sufficient to keep some administrators from advancing their careers. To this extent is valuable. It is a screening device. If the manager is not able to live with tension of improvement then he may not be likely to withstand stress of other offices. Tension also allows a manager to confront himself with questions "Can I handle the tension created by learning. Can I impart this learning to people and situations, and can I make necessary change as a result of training?" To cope with tension the manager must have a strong desire for self-development.\textsuperscript{103}

If educational leadership is compared to the leadership of American business throughout the world, one would tend to conclude that the leadership of business rests on the availability and quality of special preparation and opportunities for continuing development of business leaders more than it does on other factors. Educational leadership roles in educational institutions have been recognized and preparation programs for leadership positions have been provided. Other nations, including Canada and Australia, have also recognized this need. Preparation programs for leadership positions in educational institutions are all but non-existent in most nations of the world. Until other nations, in business and education, establish these leadership training programs the American institutions will hold a competitive edge. In accordance with changes in American in-service,

there have been associated changes in other parts of the world. Concepts developed in the United States are being translated into programs in accordance with the political environments of the country involved. These programs are found in fields from business through government. There still remains the problem of reducing the lag between traditional approaches to the preparation of educational leadership and the magnitude of problems facing administration in the schools. There is a need for total involvement, continuing professional development more sophisticated strategies, and greater allocations of resources to meet the needs of the educational leadership of the future.

Challenges To Management Education

Reference has been made to problems facing school administrators in the development of the field of management training. The many problems, and their dimensions have only been touched upon. A review would note that some of these problems are in the areas of political, technological, social economic, and human relation fields.

One problem confronted by administrators is that of renewing both the administrator and the organization. The school, as an institution, exhibited dynamic growth. The social expectations rise and the institution is able to meet these expectations. As growth occurs there is a feeling of maturity permeating the institution. As the institutionsdisplay
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grow and mature they are confronted by conflict. Expectations outrun the capabilities of the institution to meet them. As a result there is anger, frustration and in some cases, recrimination. The demand for training is obvious. During this period of conflict and growth administrators find that numerous solutions diminish. Confidence and experience, which earlier solved problems, can no longer generate answers. The problem faced by the administrator is to assume the leadership and to intelligently provide for organizational renewal.106

Revised figure taken from Hicks and Gullett illustrates this concept.107 This figure, figure five, this page, should be observed in Organizational Life and Training Demand
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the context than an organization can have a viable life, and that it can be renewed. There are many factors which could affect this growth and attainment at the same time. If developing programs are brought in to restrain decline, the organization can have a long life. The organizational renewal is a problem that will have to be of concern to managers as they cope with change.

Is there a question of sound managerial talent in the field of educational administration?

There are always those in the field of teaching who will assume the role of an administrator and/or middle manager. In New York City the administrators were afraid to press demands that affected their job because of the large number of people who were qualified to take their positions. This is not an unusual position. But the problem must be approached from another angle. Industry has faced this problem. Simply stated it is, how can an organization attract and retain sufficient numbers of qualified managers to run the organization?

In some instances the pool of managers is growing smaller, and this is caused, in part, from a decline in motivation to manage. This shortage is also due to a lack of individual initiative. Motivation differs from initiative in that motivation is that which causes the individual to act and initiative is the energy or aptitude displayed in starting a specific action. 108 Part of the reluctance

to manage may be attributed to an unwillingness to take risks or to assume that the risks taken were not worth the rewards. 109

Those presently in management in education must impress upon those in the field and those entering for the first time that management is not a nine-to-five job. There are, as a result of declining enrollments, older members on the school staff. Older administration is also in evidence at the middle management level. The middle manager will continue to have to take risks and recognize there are problems in educational management. To avoid these problems is to allow the organization to decline in its effectiveness. As managers act and/or react so will the work of their subordinates be affected. Pressure, militant work force, accountability at many levels or regulations are only examples of problem areas the manager faces. The ability to motivate managers is a challenge of management development. Managers must cope with the physical and mental demands brought about by the complexity of the institution. There are many organizations that provide for skill up-dating to allow their managers to cope with problem situations. For example, the military, while not fighting is a training institution that provides for knowledge and skill updating. The medical and business sectors also provide in-service development.

As currently understood by some term "in-service education" has a negative connotation. The challenge to improve management education

109 Ibid., pp. 35-36.
is apparent. Wagstaff and McCollough suggest the shedding of negative overtones and expressing positive ideals associated with an in-service program. Shedding of negative overtones may be accomplished by allowing educators to be viewed as growth seeking individuals who desire esteem and self-actualization in accordance with Maslow's theory. Education must view in-service as self improvement and not as a means or receiving additional pay or compensatory released time. The authors note an idea from Thelen's book, Improving In-Service Education: Proposals and Procedures For Change, that an educator's responsibility is not only to himself but to his clientele and the society of which they are part. The challenge is to make schooling relevant to society. The in-service training program should involve developing flexible structures providing for intimate knowledge of groups and macrosocieties. In-service training becomes a necessary and perpetual retooling process upon which the enterprise depends.

Another challenge to management education is that of providing the proper climate in which to conduct training. A meaningful program of management education calls for full time attention. It would be ideal if there were a person in charge and responsible for a continuous management development program. A case could be made for the fact that the "boss" is not often the most ideal person to

---
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There is a need for the school middle manager to provide continuing education to those subordinates who are responsible to him. The manner and means to accomplish this continued education is critical, but more critical is the fact that middle managers are not as effective as they could be if they do not put that which they have learned into operation. If the principal does not provide for this type of leadership there may be a time when the middle manager is no longer needed. To be trained and then to be second in command is a waste of time, money and energy.

What type of management education should be provided in the future? At this point in our history, education can be considered a declining industry.

Shifts of enrollment allow for buildings to be built, but buildings that are abandoned are increasing at a faster pace. Without attempting to define all aspects of this problem, it will suffice to say that the impact upon what is being taught in management education will be felt by the middle manager.

---


The management tends to age and is locked into place by a lack of opportunity. As a result there can be a corresponding loss of managerial vitality. It is entirely possible that increased cynicism can be turned inward or towards the institution. 115

Reviewing briefly some of the challenges to management education, one conclusion would be that administrators should be more aggressive in development of the programs and tools necessary to educate themselves in administration. If educators are experts in education then the development of programs and tools should be a task they can accomplish. But the complexity, magnitude, and urgency of problems that confront administrators now and in the future demand great and continuing professional action. Among other things the administrators will deal with is program development that is flawed. Administrators will need programs that respond to the critical issues that represent their constituents and their institutions. Programs will need to be coordinated and relevant to content, resources and techniques to meet the challenge of the future.

Management Education

Through the study of the related research, a number of points become evident. Brown, 116 in reviewing the studies of Gross,

115 Ibid., p. 386.

University Council for Educational Administration, and Goldhammer and Becker, states that one problem is that middle managers in schools were poorly trained for administrative positions in the first place. Brown relates two other problems. First, there is a need for training since the various publics served make contrasting demands upon the principal. Second, there is a need for training as an investment in the future. The principal lacks the mobility of the past when school population factors in our society allowed him to secure another challenging position. The new position the principal strived for may also have been viewed in terms of possible movement to central office responsibilities. The opportunities for change, and in some cases, upward mobility, within the educational system of a particular district or geographical area are more limited than before. Middle managers in education should be aware of the cost of formal education, the possible foregoing of earnings perhaps necessary to reach goals, the cost of time involved in attain goals and of the psychic cost involved to the individual as goals are attained. It is economically and educationally wise to continue to train the person who is going to serve the system the longest period of time. Jencks\(^\text{117}\) declares that the most sound reason for full development of the middle manager is one that is essential and fundamental of the position itself. What

---

does count is the relationship among people that makes it possible for students and teachers to learn in ways that matter to them and to the culture. The principal is critical person who gets this task completed.

Jencks' statement as well as those of Moynihan, Glazer, or Banfield are open for debate. What should be noted is that once beyond the debate the principal is still the person who is accountable. After results are in from the debate, after innovations become part of the program, after studies by various agencies have been completed, and after all new tasks are spelled out, the principal remains the key person to see through actual accomplishment. Administrators, particularly the principal middle manager has the challenge to provide the education that does make the difference in the students lives.118

Brown119 contends that continued training for middle managers is a sound practice. However, he states that lack of funds, failure to understand the importance of making such an investment in training, lack of sound in-service programs of consequence available in school districts, and a reluctance of middle managers to seek assistance for fear of being considered weak and ineffective indicate middle
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management programs are not as strong as they could be. This last point is significant since a middle manager may find it difficult to say to his superior that he has problems or that he is not very good at some aspects of his job. The principal perceives a correlation between a request for help and evaluation.

The next step is to look at the sources of help and what is being done in the profession that could provide management development for the middle manager and/or the school administrator.

An important source of help is the university. March views the distinctive competencies of universities as: the talent to deal effectively with people; the talent to manage conflict; and the talent to mediate between the organization and the broader society. He further contends that the university does as good a job as anyone in most aspects of management training. The university has ability to provide basic knowledge or to identify problems. There is a broad experience available in dealing with such areas as interpersonal and intellectual problems. The university has that ability to develop new knowledge and to deal with its implications. The history of universities has been such that it has provided for centers of experimentation. The advantage of the university in the training of administrators can be seen as that of providing research and teaching

the theory and intellectual skills necessary for a sound program in school administration.

The university cannot provide all training. It is not as efficient as a training center as some would wish. It has an intellectual base. To some, course credits, and ingraining attitudes and tradition and built-in inertia familiar to all institutions is found at the university level. 121

The problem of providing training is associated with that of program relevance. To practicing administrators, the relevance of preparatory programs is primarily that set in the university. The university, according to many urban administrators, does not prepare for the realities of the "firing line." The differences between the perceived needs and what is being taught may occur because of the nature of the university-field interactions. Schools have had a tradition of playing the passive role. Schools accept interns, and permit their institutions to be studied. They accept researchers, and they participate, in university sponsored in-service training sessions. Administrators could improve their approach through: helping design more relevant in-service programs; providing more substantial assistance to university personnel in their recruitment, formulation of materials; greater involvement in field experience and in developing plans/programs that may influence department

Program relevance also suffers from a lack of systematic means of evaluating administrative preparation and little differentiation among the training and experiences offered to those preparing for different careers in educational administration. 123

Another source of help for the middle manager is the school district. Ideally, it would make sense for every system to have the necessary resources available for training, but the reality is that few do. Services are incomplete and the middle manager has to rely upon other sources for assistance. The budget squeeze has placed a strain on the resources available. Evaluation is another problem that must be faced in building an intradistrict program. In-service training implies evaluation and sets in motion a negative attitude towards the program from those it is designed to help. 124

Wagstaff and McCollough 125 observe that a vital program of in-service education calls for a full time department of continuing education whose purpose is to provide for planning, development and evaluation of training opportunities. People from the same district
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have the advantage of solving problems which have meaning for them. The development of new attitudes, skills, and knowledge are relevant because they are applied to concrete and personally meaningful problems which face their school.

The institutionalization of in-service programs has associated dangers for it is at odds with the concept of voluntary, self-directed programs. A department responsible for additional in-service for administrators could be viewed as complementing personal efforts by providing motivation, thrust and format about which an administrator may develop a program. 126

Those who are responsible for the development of management training in education should remember that the advantage of a formal program is that it focuses management attention and thinking on problems of growth in a systematic way. Such an approach could force other managers in the organization to approach the standards set by motivated managers in organizing work, delegating responsibility, and appraising subordinates' performances. 127

Where management development is successful, the monetary investment will be considerable. The expense will not be redeemable in readily measurable results. Thus, the decision to proceed with
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management development must come from the conviction that management
development is the best way to train to solve problems. Once the
decision is made to develop a program it should be applicable to all
levels of management. In the decision making process an area of
emphasis could be that of motivation to require participation by
managers at all levels. A goal of universal participation in develop-
mental activities does something more than insure that the total
management establishment is developing and keeping at the forefront
of the profession rather than lagging behind. Involvement could
lead to important by-products such as: attitudes will be affected;
the quality of the developmental effort will improve; and management
development will be viewed as a normal part of order of the organiza-
tion. It must be understood that participation does not imply
inadequately or inability. 128

Large foundations, the professional schools, the professors,
and the federal government have all had a hand in recent efforts to
reform the training available to education administrators.

The thrust of the 1940's and the 1950's lends itself to summary.
The profession toughened its standards and longer and more adequate
training was established. Accreditation improved. The departments
of educational administration recognized the need for cooperation in
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areas outside of education. Content areas were studied and changes took place to improve program content. Educational administration became more of a science. The period from the 1960's saw more changes at the university level in recruitment, curriculum, internship development and job placement.  

Merino\(^1\) states that a change from the 1950's and the 1960's is that it is not unusual to find prospective administrators leading discussion in seminars, solving problems in a multi-media simulation laboratory, supervising personnel, or working in a computer center. These trends have departed from the mid-fifties technique-oriented subject based upon practical experience and toward theory-based disciplines, most notable: sociology, social psychology, economics, and political science and anthropology. Universities have employed professors trained in the disciplines or have cooperated by sending students to other departments for training.

Another major shift has been in the internship. The traditional internship has taken on some characteristics of the rotating internship, one in which the student spends a few weeks in each of several differing settings with which today's administrator must be acquainted. A rotating intern may find experience in other local, state, and


federal educational agencies. The intern may also spend time in such schoolrelated locations as city offices, police and recreation departments as well as business and professional organizations. 131

Campbell and Gregg 132 report the work of Graham to support one concept of the rotating type internship. Since the mid-fifties increased emphasis has been placed on course work in-related fields. The relationship between related course work and educational administration has been enhanced by the intern program. There are a variety of arrangements that could compose intern programs. The field of educational administration is now accepting criteria of other fields, such as health or public administrator, who practices rotation through various departments in the organization and work with community groups.

Instructional approaches have changed. There is still the traditional lecture-textbook approach to training. The lecture textbook approach has been in evidence since there have been schools, but schools are adopting new techniques as have school districts and other training organizations.

Multi-media simulation centers and/or approaches have been utilized. Written, filmed, taped background information describing the

131 Ibid., pp. 60-61.
area of concern to be studied are used to transmit information, problem stimuli and provide for students to analyze and make decisions. These methods of information transmittal are risk free and thus fall short of reality. To utilize these methods does provide an opportunity to learn in less than traditional modes. Wynn considers the instructional methods of training in the field. These are, according to him more unorthodox, since they do not incorporate the traditional aspects of a teacher-pupil relationship. Wynn notes, too, that the list is exhaustive. Among those listed are:

1. Laboratory training (primarily in the area of human relations)
2. Humanities Seminars
3. Case Methods
4. Simulation
5. Games
6. Independent Study

Traditional responses in in-service programs for administrators have serious flaws. Typically, programs have been uncoordinated, lacking in continuity, segmented in approaches, superficial in respect to content, resources, and planning and have tended to be slow to respond to critical issues.

Perhaps education should go to the integrated type of training program referred to as organizational development.

In the 1960's this type of integrated training, known as organizational development, developed as a strategy that uses group processes to focus on the whole organization in order to bring about planned change. Organizational development seeks to change belief, attitudes, values, structures and practices so that the organization can better adapt and live with the fast pace of change.

The focus on the whole organization, systems orientation, research, group processes, feedback, experimental learning, contingency orientation, and use of change agents is part of the process of organizational development. The process covers steps such as diagnosis, data collection, feedback and confrontation, action planning, team building, intergroup development and follow-up. Organizational development makes heavy use of laboratory training approaches such as role playing, gaming, and sensitivity training.

There are benefits and limitations of organizational development. Organizational developments chief advantage is that there is an attempt to deal with change in a whole organization or a major unit within the organization. In this way improvements can be accomplished. The major improvements are increased productivity, better quality of work, higher job satisfaction, improved teamwork, improved resolution of conflict and reduced negative factors such as absences and turnover.
A limitation of organizational development that is the process is time consuming and expensive. The organization may not be able to wait that length of time necessary for the benefits of the process to materialize. A professional consultant is recommended, and if one is not used the program may suffer. Some managers note that there is an invasion of privacy. Managers sometimes are concerned since they are coerced toward group attitudes and conformity. In some cases excessive emphasis is given to behavioral processes rather than to job performance. 136

**Summary**

Attention should be given to the aspects of education in which major changes seem to be essential if future, or even present needs, are to be met. As attention is given, several important conclusions emerge. There must be an adequate program of education for every manager. This becomes important with each passing year. There must be effective planning for improvements in education. This planning must take place at all levels. There must be involvement of many groups in the planning process. Planning should be based on detailed study of all pertinent information concerning trends and probable developments. There must be provision for change in all plans.

Educators must recognize that significant changes in instruction, programs and training will be made only when the need and importance

is understood by those people involved. Educators must recognize and understand that changes may occur more readily as major improvements are made in in-service programs for managers who are professionally involved in education.

This chapter has attempted to note some areas of concern. Specifically: management obsolescence, the need for quality leadership, challenges to management education and management programs were discussed. This overview may illustrate some types of problems that are faced by educational administrators as they plan and participate in management in-service training.
CHAPTER IV
PRESENTATION OF THE FINDINGS

This chapter presents data from the survey instrument that was used to develop a portion of this study.

There are four basic parts of this Chapter. There are:

1. Ranking of common components considered to be most critical to the total management development program.

2. Responses to the four statements contained under each of the ten components.

3. Components now part of management development programs in industry and education.

4. Description of areas which best describe management development programs in industry and education.

I. RANKING OF COMPONENTS

The common components considered to be most critical to the total management development program were placed in rank order by the respondents to the study.

Kendall’s coefficient of concordance was the statistical method used to determine the extent groups in the study agreed in their rank order of the ten (10) components contained in the study. An analysis of variance for ranked data was used to determine if there was a significant difference among groups. If there was a statistically significant difference, Tukey’s procedure was employed to determine the area of difference.

Each of the four groups ranked common components critical to a total management development program. Based on mean scores the
rankings (see Tables one through four, pages 94-95) for each group were:

TABLE 1
Rank Order Of Components Based On Mean Scores
By Middle Managers In Industry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Component</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader Behavior</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual and Group Behavior</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Contribution</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimizing Job Performance</td>
<td>5/6</td>
<td>6.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Systems</td>
<td>5/6</td>
<td>6.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Economics</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management's Social and Legal Responsibilities</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Science</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Relations</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 2
Rank Order Of Components Based On Mean Scores
By Program Directors In Industry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Component</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leader Behavior</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual and Group Behavior</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Systems</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Relations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Science</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Contribution</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Economics</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimizing Job Performance</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management's Social and Legal Responsibilities</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 3
Rank Order Of Components Based On Mean Scores
By Program Directors In Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Component</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leader Behavior</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual and Group Behavior</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Systems</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Contribution</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimizing Job Performance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Economics</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Relations</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Science</td>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>7.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management's Social and Legal Responsibilities</td>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>7.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 4
Rank Order Of Components Based On Mean Scores
By Middle Managers In Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Component</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual and Group Behavior</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Contribution</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader Behavior</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimizing Job Performance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Relations</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Economics</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Systems</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Science</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management's Social and Legal Responsibilities</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An analysis of variance for ranked data was used to determine if there was a statistically significant difference among the four groups.
which are middle managers in industry, program directors in industry, program directors in education, and middle managers in education. Tukey's procedure was used to determine the areas of difference. Table Five, page 96, notes the scores of the variables and where the significant differences among groups occurs in the ranking of the components found in this study.

**TABLE 5**

**Areas Of Significant Differences In The Ranking Of Components**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Probability</th>
<th>Significant Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management Contribution</td>
<td>1.428</td>
<td>0.2392</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management's Social and Legal Responsibility</td>
<td>2.386</td>
<td>0.0738</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Economics</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>0.8886</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Systems</td>
<td>2.152</td>
<td>0.0986</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader Behavior</td>
<td>2.430</td>
<td>0.0698</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual and Group Behavior</td>
<td>0.812</td>
<td>0.4900</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>0.555</td>
<td>0.6460</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Science</td>
<td>2.793</td>
<td>0.0444</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimizing Job Performance</td>
<td>3.003</td>
<td>0.0342</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Relations</td>
<td>3.517</td>
<td>0.0180</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The significant differences occurred in the areas of: leader behavior between program directors in industry and education; management science between middle managers in industry and program directors in industry; optimizing job performance between middle managers in industry and program directors in education; and labor relations.
between middle managers and program directors in industry. These differences are shown in Table Six, page 97.

**TABLE 6**

Areas Of Significant Differences By Groups In Ranking Of Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Difference Between</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leader Behavior</td>
<td>Program Directors in Industry and Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Science</td>
<td>Program Directors in Industry and Middle Managers in Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimizing Job Performance</td>
<td>Middle Managers in Industry and Program Directors in Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Relations</td>
<td>Middle Managers and Program Directors in Industry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When all four groups were considered, the ranking of common components critical to a total management development program followed a slightly different pattern than did the individual group rankings. See Table Seven, page 97.

**TABLE 7**

Ranking Of Components - All Groups Considered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business Economics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.28059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.38305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual and Group Behavior</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.45844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Behavior</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.75060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Contribution</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.75251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management's Social and Legal Responsibilities</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.77920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Relations</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.80439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Systems</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.80830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Science</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.81086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimizing Job Performance</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.84334</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kendall's coefficient of concordance was used to determine the extent the four groups ranking the ten components concurred in their judgment. The coefficient of concordance, .83107, indicated agreement among those participating in the study.

II. RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS FOR EACH COMPONENT

This section will report opinions of the respondents to the four statements contained under each of the ten components in the survey instrument (See Appendix A). The Likert Scale of five points, Strongly Agree, Agree, Neither Agree Nor Disagree, Disagree and Strongly Disagree was used. To score this scale, the responses were weighted +2, +1, 0, -1, -2 respectively, from Strongly Agree through Strongly Disagree. A positive response indicates agreement and a negative response indicates disagreement. A one way analysis of variance was used to determine if there was a significant difference in responses. If there was a statistically significant difference, Tukey's procedure was employed to determine the area of difference.

Responses to the survey instrument were solicited from one hundred (100) people directly responsible for administration of the management development programs in their respective organizations. (Fifty (50) each were solicited from K-8 elementary school districts in Cook County and from private industries in Cook County.

Responses to the survey instrument were solicited from one hundred (100) people at the middle management level. Fifty (50) each
were solicited from school principals and department heads in private industry.

A total of fifty-three (53) people responsible for the development of management development programs and a total of forty-eight (48) middle managers responded to the survey instrument. Slightly over fifty (50) percent overall response to the questionnaire was achieved.

Specifically, responses came from: twenty (20) middle managers in industry; twenty-three (23) program directors in industry; thirty (30) program directors in education; and twenty-eight (28) middle managers in education. Percentage of returns from each group were: forty (40) percent return from middle managers in industry; forty-six (46) percent return from program directors in industry; sixty (60) percent return from program directors in education and fifty-six (56) percent return from middle managers in education.

In this section the Likert Scale data will be presented. Each component of the survey instrument will be handled separately. Likert Scale data will be presented in Table and Graph form. The group name will be listed. The number responding, the total number of points and the maximum points possible will be listed. The line graph will further illustrate responses of the groups to show more clearly their deviation from the mid point.

Each of the ten components will be described as found in the survey instrument. The above mentioned data, including information
regarding areas of significant difference, if any, will be noted.

Management Contribution, Component One, that administrative development which would allow middle management to understand what management does in the areas of planning, organizing, controlling, coordinating.

Likert Scale responses and range of scores to the first question in this section, "To what extent do you agree this component should be considered essential to a total management development program in your field?" are found in Table 8.

**TABLE 8**

**MANAGEMENT CONTRIBUTION -\nESSENTIAL TO TOTAL MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM**

Likert Scale Responses and Range of Scores - Component 1 - Question 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Maximum Points Possible</th>
<th>Range of Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Middle Managers In Industry</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>+15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Program Directors In Industry</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>+25</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1.9130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Program Directors In Education</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>+50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.3333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Middle Managers In Education</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>+34</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.7857</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph One Illustrates the points given to each group.

Graph 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+25</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+34</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is a significant difference at the .05 level between middle managers in industry and program directors in education.

In the area of Management Contribution, Question One, noting extent this component is essential to a total management development program, there is greater agreement between middle managers and program directors in education. There is greater agreement between middle managers in education and program directors in industry than between middle managers in industry and program directors in education. There is greater agreement between middle managers in industry and education than between program directors in industry and education.

Likert Scale responses and range of scores to the second question in this section, "To what extent do you agree this component is critical to the satisfactory performance of the middle manager in your field?" are found in Table 9.

**TABLE 9**

**MANAGEMENT CONTRIBUTION - CRITICAL TO SATISFACTORY PERFORMANCE OF MIDDLE MANAGER**

**Likert Scale Responses And Range of Scores - Component 1 - Question 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Maximum Points Possible</th>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Middle Managers In Industry</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>+10</td>
<td>2.5500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Program Directors In Industry</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>+22</td>
<td>2.0435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Program Directors In Education</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>+38</td>
<td>1.7667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Middle Managers In Education</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>+28</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graph Two illustrates the points given to each group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a significant difference at the .05 level between middle managers in industry and program directors in education.

In the area of Management Contribution, Question Two, where this component is critical to the satisfactory performance of the middle manager, there is greater agreement between program directors and middle managers in education than between program directors and middle managers in industry. There is greater agreement between program directors in industry and education. There is greater agreement between middle managers in education and program directors in industry than between middle managers in industry and program directors in education.

Likert Scale responses and range of scores to the third question in this section, "To what extent do you agree the middle manager in your field is included in the identification of areas of content that will be included in your organization's management development program in this area?" are found in Table 10.
TABLE 10

MANAGEMENT CONTRIBUTION -
EXTENT MIDDLE MANAGERS INCLUDED IN CONTENT IDENTIFICATION

Likert Scale Responses And Range of Scores - Component 1 - Question 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Maximum Points Possible</th>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Middle Managers In Industry</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Program Directors In Industry</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>+11</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.5217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Program Directors In Education</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>+34</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.8667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Middle Managers In Education</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>+33</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.1786</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph Three illustrates the points given to each group.

Graph 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+33</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a significant difference at the .05 level between middle managers in industry and all three other groups.

In the area of Management Contribution, Question Three, where extent middle managers are included in content identification of this area, there is greater agreement between middle managers and program directors in education than between middle managers and program directors in industry. There is greater agreement between program directors in industry and education than between middle managers in industry and middle managers in education than between program directors in education and middle managers in industry.
Likert Scale responses and range of scores to the fourth question in this section, "To what extent do you agree that management development programs in your organization meet priority needs of middle managers in this area?" are found in Table 11.

**TABLE 11**

**MANAGEMENT CONTRIBUTION - EXTENT MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS MEET PRIORITY NEEDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likert Scale Responses And Range of Scores - Component 1 Question 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Middle Managers In Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Program Directors In Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Program Directors In Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Middle Managers In Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Graph 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points - Group</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>+3</th>
<th>+14</th>
<th>+21</th>
<th>+24</th>
<th>+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the area of Management Contribution, Question Four, where extent management development programs meet priority needs in this area, there is greater agreement between program directors and middle managers in education than between program directors and middle managers in industry. There is greater agreement between program directors in industry and education than between middle managers in
education and program directors in industry than between middle managers in industry and program directors in education.

To the question, "Is this area now part of your total management development program?" the responses of the four groups involved in the study are found in Table 12.

**TABLE 12**

**MANAGEMENT CONTRIBUTION - INCLUSION IN MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Middle Managers In Industry</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Program Directors In Industry</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Program Directors In Education</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Middle Managers In Education</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Management's Social And Legal Responsibilities, Component Two, that administrative development which would allow middle management to understand contributions and power of government, interest groups and other segments outside of the organization.

Likert Scale responses and range of scores to the first question in this section, "To what extent do you agree this component should be considered essential to a total management development program in your field?" are found in Table 13.
**TABLE 13**

**MANAGEMENT'S SOCIAL AND LEGAL RESPONSIBILITIES - ESSENTIAL TO TOTAL MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Maximum Points Possible</th>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Middle Managers In Industry</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>+15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Program Directors In Industry</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>+14</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.3913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Program Directors In Education</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>+23</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.2333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Middle Managers In Education</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>+24</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.1429</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Graph 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points -</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>+14</th>
<th>+15</th>
<th>+23</th>
<th>+24</th>
<th>+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were no significant differences at the .05 level between any of the reporting groups.

In the area of Management Social and Legal Responsibilities, Question One, noting extent this component is essential to a total management development program, there is greater agreement between program directors and middle managers in education than between program directors and middle managers in industry. There is greater agreement between middle managers in education and industry than between program directors in education and industry. There is greater agreement between middle managers in industry and program directors in education.
than between middle managers in education and program directors in industry.

Likert Scale responses and range of scores to the second question in this section, "To what extent do you agree this component is critical to the satisfactory performance of the middle manager in your field?" are found in Table 14.

**TABLE 14**

**MANAGEMENT'S SOCIAL AND LEGAL RESPONSIBILITIES - CRITICAL TO SATISFACTORY PERFORMANCE OF MIDDLE MANAGER**

**Likert Scale Responses And Range of Scores - Component 2 - Question 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Maximum Points Possible</th>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Middle Managers In Industry</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.9000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Program Directors In Industry</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.8696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Program Directors In Education</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>+16</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.4667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Middle Managers In Education</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>+24</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.1429</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 6 illustrates the points given to each group.

**Points -**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a significant difference at the .05 level between middle managers in industry and middle managers in education.

In the area of Management's Social and Legal Responsibilities,
Question Two, where this component is critical to the satisfactory performance of the middle manager, there is greater agreement between program directors and middle managers in industry than between program directors and middle managers in education. There is greater agreement between program directors in industry and education than between middle managers in industry and education. There is a greater agreement between program directors in industry and middle managers in education than between program directors in education and middle managers in industry.

Likert Scale responses and range of scores to the third question in this section, "To what extent do you agree the middle manager in your field is included in the identification of areas of content that will be included in your organization's management development program in this area?" are found in Table 15.

**TABLE 15**

**MANAGEMENT'S SOCIAL AND LEGAL RESPONSIBILITIES - EXTENT MIDDLE MANAGERS INCLUDED IN CONTENT IDENTIFICATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Maximum Points Possible</th>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Middle Managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Industry</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.9500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Program Directors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Industry</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.9130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Program Directors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Education</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>+14</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.4933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Middle Managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Education</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>+27</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.0357</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graph 7 illustrates the points given to each group.

Points -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>+1</th>
<th>+2</th>
<th>+14</th>
<th>+27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a significant difference at the .05 level between middle managers in industry and middle managers in education.

In the area of Management's Social and Legal Responsibilities, Question Three, where extent middle managers are included in content identification of this area, there is greater agreement between program directors and middle managers in industry than between program directors and middle managers in education. There is greater agreement between program directors in industry and education than between middle managers in industry and education. There is greater agreement between program directors in education and middle managers in industry than between program directors in industry and middle managers in education.

Likert Scale responses and range of scores to the fourth question in this section, "To what extent do you agree that management development programs in your organization meet priority needs of middle managers in this area?" are found in Table 16.

**TABLE 16**

| MANAGEMENT'S SOCIAL AND LEGAL RESPONSIBILITIES - EXTENT MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS MEET PRIORITY NEEDS |
| Likert Scale Responses And Range of Scores - Component 2 - Question 4 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Maximum Points Possible</th>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Middle Managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Industry</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>3.3500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16 Con't.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Maximum Points Possible</th>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Program Directors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Industry</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.9130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Program Directors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Education</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>+8</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.7333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Middle Managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Education</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.3214</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 8 illustrates the points given to each group.

Graph 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>-7</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>+2</th>
<th>+8</th>
<th>+16</th>
<th>+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a significant difference at the .05 level between middle managers in industry and middle managers in education.

In the area of Management's Social and Legal Responsibilities, Question Four, where extent management development programs meet priority needs in this area, there is greater agreement between program directors in industry and education than between middle managers in industry and education. There is greater agreement between program directors and middle managers in education than between program directors and middle managers in industry. There is greater agreement between middle managers in industry and program directors in education than between middle managers in education and program directors in industry.
To the question, "Is this area now part of your total management development program?" the responses of the four groups involved in the study are found in Table 17.

**TABLE 17**

**MANAGEMENT'S SOCIAL AND LEGAL RESPONSIBILITIES - INCLUSION IN MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Middle Managers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Program Directors</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Program Directors</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Middle Managers</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Business Economics, Component Three, that administrative development which would allow middle management to understand basic economic issues facing the organization and the impact of local, state and federal monies on the budget and the general economic outlook of the organization.

Likert Scale responses and range of scores to the first question in this section, "To what extent do you agree with this component should be considered essential to a total management development program in your field?" are found in Table 18.
TABLE 18
BUSINESS ECONOMICS - ESSENTIAL TO TOTAL MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Likert Scale Responses And Range of Scores - Component 3 - Question 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Maximum Points Possible</th>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Middle Managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Industry</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>+27</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.6500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Program Directors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Industry</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>+23</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1.0006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Program Directors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Education</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>+36</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.8000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Middle Managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Education</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>+31</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.8929</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 9 illustrates the points given to each group.
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There were no significant differences at the .05 level between any of the reporting groups.

In the area of Business Economics, Question One, noting extent this component is essential to a total management development program, there is greater agreement between program directors in industry and education than between middle managers in industry and education.

There is greater agreement between program directors in industry and middle managers in education than between program directors in education and middle managers in industry. There is greater agreement
between program directors and middle managers in education than between program directors and middle managers in industry.

Likert Scale responses and range of scores to the second question in this section, "To what extent do you agree this component is critical to the satisfactory performance of the middle manager in your field?" are found in Table 19.

**TABLE 19**

BUSINESS ECONOMICS - CRITICAL TO SATISFACTORY PERFORMANCE OF MIDDLE MANAGER

Likert Scale Responses And Range of Scores - Component 3 - Question 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Maximum Points Possible</th>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Middle Managers In Industry</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>+14</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Program Directors In Industry</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>+22</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.0435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Program Directors In Education</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>+28</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.0667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Middle Managers In Education</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>+20</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.1786</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 10 illustrates the points given to each group.

Graph 10
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There were no significant differences at the .05 level between any of the reporting groups.
In the area of Business Economics, Question Two, where the component is critical to the satisfactory performance of the middle manager, there is greater agreement between program directors and middle managers in education than between program directors and middle managers in industry. There is greater agreement between program directors in industry and middle managers in education than between middle managers in industry and program directors in education. There is greater agreement between program directors in industry and education than between middle managers in industry and education.

Likert Scale responses and range of scores to the third question in this section, "To what extent do you agree the middle manager in your field is included in the identification of areas of content that will be included in your organization's management development program in this area?" are found in Table 20.

**TABLE 20**

**BUSINESS ECONOMICS - EXTENT MIDDLE MANAGERS INCLUDED IN CONTENT IDENTIFICATION**

| Likert Scale Responses And Range of Scores - Component 3 - Question 3 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Group | Number Responding | Maximum Points Possible | Range of Scores |
| 1. Middle Managers In Industry | 20 | 3.1500 |
| 2. Program Directors In Industry | 23 | 2.5217 |
| | | | |
Table 20 Cont'd.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Maximum Points Possible</th>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Program Directors</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>+21</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Middle Managers</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>+15</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.4643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 11 illustrates the points given to each group.

Graph 11
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>-3</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>+11</th>
<th>+15</th>
<th>+21</th>
<th>+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a significant difference at the .05 level between middle managers in industry and program directors in education.

In the area of Business Economics, Question Three, where extent middle managers are included in content identification of this area, there is greater agreement between program directors in industry and education than between middle managers in industry and education. There is greater agreement between program directors and middle managers in education than between program directors and middle managers in industry. There is greater agreement between program directors in industry and middle managers in education than between program directors in education and middle managers in industry.

Likert Scale responses and range of scores to the fourth question in this section, "To what extent do you agree that management develop-
ment programs in your organization meet priority needs of middle
managers in this area? are found in Table 21.

TABLE 21

BUSINESS ECONOMICS -
EXTENT MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS MEET PRIORITY NEEDS

Likert Scale Responses And Range of Scores - Component 3 - Question 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Maximum Points Possible</th>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Middle Managers</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Program Directors</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.9130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Program Directors</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>+18</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Middle Managers</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>+11</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 12 illustrates the points given to each group.

Graph 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+11</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+18</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a significant difference at the .05 level between middle
managers in industry and program directors and middle managers in
education.

In the area of Business Economics, Question Four, where extent
management development programs meet priority needs in this area,
there is greater agreement between program directors in industry and
education than between middle managers in industry and education.
There is greater agreement between program directors and middle
managers in education than between program directors and middle
Managers in industry. There is greater agreement between program directors in industry and middle managers in education than between program directors in education and middle managers in industry.

To the question, "Is this area now part of your total management development program?" the responses of the four groups involved in the study are found in Table 22.

**Table 22**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Middle Managers In Industry</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Program Directors In Industry</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Program Directors In Education</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Middle Managers In Education</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Support Systems, Component Four, that administrative development which would allow middle management to understand and explain: organization, philosophy, appraisal system, compensation system, development system, policies.

Likert Scale responses and range of scores to the first question in this section, "To what extent do you agree this component should be considered essential to a total management development program in your field?" are found in Table 23.
TABLE 23

SUPPORT SYSTEMS -
ESSENTIAL TO TOTAL MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Likert Scale Responses And Range of Scores - Component 4 - Question 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Middle Managers In Industry</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>+28</td>
<td>1.6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Program Directors In Industry</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>+30</td>
<td>1.6957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Program Directors In Education</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>+37</td>
<td>1.8000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Middle Managers In Education</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>+20</td>
<td>2.1786</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 13 illustrates the points given to each group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+28</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+30</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+37</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were no significant differences at the .05 level between any of the reporting groups.

In the area of Support Systems, Question One, noting extent this component is essential to a total management development program, there is greater agreement between program directors and middle managers in industry than between program directors and middle managers in education. There is greater agreement between program directors in industry and education than between middle managers in industry and education. There is greater agreement between program directors in...
education and middle managers in industry than between program directors in industry and middle managers in education.

Likert Scale responses and range of scores to the second question in this section, "To what extent do you agree this component is critical to the satisfactory performance of the middle manager in your field?" are found in Table 24.

**TABLE 24**

**SUPPORT SYSTEMS - CRITICAL TO SATISFACTORY PERFORMANCE OF MIDDLE MANAGER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Maximum Points Possible</th>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Middle Managers In Industry</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>+28</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Program Directors In Industry</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>+29</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1.7391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Program Directors In Education</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>+35</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.8333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Middle Managers In Education</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>+28</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 14 Illustrates the points given to each group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points - Group</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>+28</th>
<th>+29</th>
<th>+35</th>
<th>+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were no significant differences at the .05 level between any of the reporting groups.

In the area of Support Systems, Question Two, where this component
is critical to the satisfactory performance of the middle managers, there is greater agreement between program directors in industry and education than between middle managers in industry and education. There is greater agreement between program directors and middle managers in industry than between program directors and middle managers in education. There is greater agreement between program directors in education and middle managers in industry than between program directors in industry and middle managers in education.

Likert Scale responses and range of scores to the third question in this section, "To what extent do you agree the middle managers in your field is included in the identification of areas of content that will be included in your organization's management development program in this area?" are found in Table 25.

TABLE 25

SUPPORT SYSTEMS - EXTENT MIDDLE MANAGERS INCLUDED IN CONTENT IDENTIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likert Scale Responses and Range of Scores - Component 4 - Question 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Maximum Points Possible</th>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Middle Managers</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>+9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.5500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Program Directors</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>+15</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.3478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Program Directors</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>+25</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.1667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Middle Managers</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>+20</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.1786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graph 15 illustrates the points given to each group.

**Graph 15**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>+9</th>
<th>+15</th>
<th>+20</th>
<th>+25</th>
<th>+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were no significant differences at the .05 level between any of the reporting groups.

In the area of Support Systems, Question Three, where extent middle managers are included in content identification of this area, there is greater agreement between program directors and middle managers in education than between program directors and middle managers in industry. There is greater agreement between program directors in industry and education than between middle managers in industry and education. There is greater agreement between program directors in industry and middle managers in education than between program directors in education and middle managers in industry.

Likert Scale responses and range of scores to the fourth question in this section, "To what extent do you agree that management development programs in your organization meet priority needs of middle managers in this area?" are found in Table 26.

**TABLE 26**

SUPPORT SYSTEMS - EXTENT MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS MEET PRIORITY NEEDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likert Scale Responses and Range of Scores - Component 4 - Question 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Middle Managers In Industry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 26 Con't.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Maximum Points Possible</th>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Program Directors</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>+11</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.5217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Program Directors</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>+19</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.3667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Middle Managers</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>+17</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.3929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 16 illustrates the points given to each group.

Graph 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were no significant differences at the .05 level between any of the reporting groups.

In the area of Support Systems, Question Four, where extent management development programs meet priority needs in this area, there is greater agreement between program directors and middle managers in education than between program directors and middle managers in industry. There is greater agreement between program directors in industry and education than between middle managers in industry and education. There is greater agreement between program directors in industry and middle managers in education than between program directors in education and middle managers in industry.

To the question, "Is this area now part of your total management
development program?" the responses of the four groups involved in the study are found in Table 27.

**TABLE 27**

**SUPPORT SYSTEMS - INCLUSION IN MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Middle Managers</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Program Directors</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Program Directors</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Middle Managers</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Leader Behavior, Component Five, that administrative development which would allow middle management to be familiar with leadership assumptions and their implications for work productivity.

Likert Scale responses and range of scores to the first question in this section, "To what extent do you agree this component should be considered essential to a total management development program in your field?" are found in Table 28.

**TABLE 28**

**LEADER BEHAVIOR - ESSENTIAL TO TOTAL MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Maximum Points Possible</th>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Middle Managers</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>+31</td>
<td>1.4500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 28 Con't.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Maximum Points Possible</th>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Program Directors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Industry</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>+35</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1.4373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Program Directors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Education</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>+50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.3333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Middle Managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Education</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>+41</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.5357</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 17 illustrates the points given to each group.
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<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were no significant differences at the .05 level between any of the reporting groups.

In the area of Leader Behavior, Question One, noting extent this component is essential to a total management development program, there is greater agreement between program directors and middle managers in industry than between program directors and middle managers in education. There is greater agreement between program directors in industry and middle managers in education than between program directors in education and middle managers in industry. There is greater agreement between middle managers in education and industry than between program directors in industry and education.

Likert Scale responses and range of scores to the second question
in this section, "To what extent do you agree this component is critical to the satisfactory performance of the middle manager in your field?" are found in Table 29.

TABLE 29

LEADER BEHAVIOR - CRITICAL TO SATISFACTORY PERFORMANCE OF MIDDLE MANAGER

Likert Scale Responses and Range of Scores - Component 5 - Question 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Maximum Points Possible</th>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Middle Managers In Industry</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>+27</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.6500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Program Directors In Industry</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>+29</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1.7391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Program Directors In Education</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>+42</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Middle Managers</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>+38</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.6429</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 18 illustrates the points given to each group.

Graph 18
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There were no significant differences at the .05 level between any of the reporting groups.

In the area of Leader Behavior, Question Two, where this component is critical to the satisfactory performance of the middle manager, there is greater agreement between program directors and middle managers in education than between program directors and middle
managers in industry. There is greater agreement between middle managers in industry and education than between program directors in industry and education. There is greater agreement between program directors in education and middle managers in industry than between program directors in industry and middle managers in education.

Likert Scale responses and range of scores to the third question in this section, "To what extent do you agree the middle manager in your field is included in the identification of areas of content that will be included in your organization's management development program in this area?" are found in Table 30.

**TABLE 30**

LEADER BEHAVIOR - EXTENT MIDDLE MANAGERS INCLUDED IN CONTENT IDENTIFICATION

| Likert Scale Responses and Range of Scores - Component 5 - Question 3 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Group | Number Responding | Points | Maximum Points Possible | Range of Scores |
| 1. Middle Managers In Industry | 20 | +7 | 40 | 2.6000 |
| 2. Program Directors In Industry | 23 | +15 | 46 | 2.3478 |
| 3. Program Directors In Education | 30 | +30 | 60 | 2.0000 |
| 4. Middle Managers In Education | 28 | +28 | 56 | 2.0000 |

Graph 19 illustrates the points given to each group.

**Graph 19**
There is a significant difference at the .05 level between middle managers in industry and program directors in education.

In the area of Leader Behavior, Question Three, where extent middle managers are included in content identification of this area, there is greater agreement between program directors in industry and middle managers in education than between program directors in education and middle managers in industry. There are identical scores in two groups, the program directors and middle managers in education. There is less agreement between program directors and middle managers in industry. There is greater agreement between program directors in industry and education than between middle managers in industry and education.

Likert Scale responses and range of scores to the fourth question in this section, "To what extent do you agree that management development programs in your organization meet priority needs of middle managers in this area?" are found in Table 31.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Maximum Points Possible</th>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Middle Managers In Industry</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.7000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Program Directors In Industry</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>+16</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.3403</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 31 Con't.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Maximum Points Possible</th>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Program Directors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Education</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>+29</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.0333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Middle Managers</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>+25</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.1071</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 20 illustrates the points given to each group.

Graph 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>points</th>
<th>Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+25</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a significant difference at the .05 level between middle managers in industry and program directors and middle managers in education.

In the area of Leader Behavior, Question Four, where extent management development programs meet priority needs in this area, there is greater agreement between program directors and middle managers in education than between program directors and middle managers in industry. There is greater agreement between program directors in industry and education than between middle managers in industry and education. There is greater agreement between program directors in industry and middle managers in education than between program directors in education and middle managers in industry.

To the question, "Is this area now part of your total management development program?" the responses of the four groups involved in the study are found in Table 32.
TABLE 32
LEADER BEHAVIOR - INCLUSION IN MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle Managers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Directors</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Directors</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Managers</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 32 shows the response distribution for the inclusion of leader behavior in management development programs. The table presents the number of respondents for each group and their responses to the question regarding the essentiality of this component.

Individual and Group Behavior, Component Six, that administrative development which would allow middle management to understand the meaning of personality, behavior and human needs as they relate to motivation, job performance, conflict, group formation and impact upon organization.

Likert Scale responses and range of scores to the first question in this section, "To what extent do you agree this component should be considered essential to a total management development program in your field?" are found in Table 33.

TABLE 33
INDIVIDUAL AND GROUP BEHAVIOR - ESSENTIAL TO TOTAL MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Maximum Points Possible</th>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle Managers</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>+28</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 33 provides the Likert Scale responses and range of scores for the component's essentiality in management development programs, specifically focusing on the field's perspective.
Table 33 Con't.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Maximum Points Possible</th>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Program Directors In Industry</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>+38</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Program Directors In Education</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>+42</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Middle Managers</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>+42</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 21 illustrates the points given to each group.

Graph 21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points -</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>+28</th>
<th>+38</th>
<th>+42</th>
<th>364</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were no significant differences at the .05 level between any of the reporting groups.

In the area of Individual and Group Behavior, Question One, noting extent this component is essential to a total management development program, there are identical scores between program directors in education and middle managers in industry. There is less agreement between program directors in industry and middle managers in education. There is greater agreement between program directors in industry and education than between middle managers in industry and education. There is greater agreement between program directors and middle managers in industry than between program directors and middle managers in education.
Likert Scale responses and range of scores to the second question in this section, "To what extent do you agree this component is critical to the satisfactory performance of the middle manager in your field?" are found in Table 34.

**TABLE 34**

**INDIVIDUAL AND GROUP BEHAVIOR - CRITICAL TO SATISFACTORY PERFORMANCE OF MIDDLE MANAGER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Maximum Points Possible</th>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Middle Managers</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>+23</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.8500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Program Directors</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>+37</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1.4348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Program Directors</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>+32</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.6667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Middle Managers</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>+44</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.4286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 22 illustrates the points given to each group.

Graph 22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points - Group</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>+23</th>
<th>+32</th>
<th>+37</th>
<th>+44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were no significant differences at the .05 level between any of the reporting groups.

In the area of Individual and Group Behavior, Question Two, where this component is critical to the satisfactory performance of the
middle manager, there is greater agreement between program directors in industry and education than between middle managers in industry and education. There is greater agreement between program directors and middle managers in education than between program directors and middle managers in industry. There is greater agreement between program directors in industry and middle managers in education than between program directors in education and middle managers in industry.

Likert Scale responses and range of scores to the third question in this section, "To what extent do you agree the middle manager in your field is included in the identification of areas of content that will be included in your organization's management development program in this area?" are found in Table 35.

TABLE 35

INDIVIDUAL AND GROUP BEHAVIOR - EXTENT MIDDLE MANAGERS INCLUDED IN CONTENT IDENTIFICATION

Likert Scale Responses and Range of Scores - Component 6 - Question 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Maximum Points Possible</th>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Middle Managers In Industry</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>+8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Program Directors In Industry</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>+16</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.3478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Program Directors In Education</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>+26</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.9333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Middle Managers In Education</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>+24</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.1429</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graph 23 illustrates the points given to each group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Middle Managers in Industry</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>+7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were no significant differences at the .05 level between any of the reporting groups.

In the area of Individual and Group Behavior, Question Three, where extent middle managers are included in content identification of this area, there is greater agreement between program directors and middle managers in education than between program directors and middle managers in industry. There is greater agreement between program directors in education and industry than between middle managers in education and industry. There is greater agreement between program directors in industry and middle managers in education than between program directors in education and middle managers in industry.

Likert Scale responses and range of scores to the fourth question in this section, "To what extent do you agree that management development programs in your organization meet priority needs of middle managers in this field?" are found in Table 36.

TABLE 36

INDIVIDUAL AND GROUP BEHAVIOR - EXTENT MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS MEET PRIORITY NEEDS

Likert Scale Responses and Range of Scores - Component 6 - Question 4
Table 36 Con't.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Maximum Points Possible</th>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Program Directors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Industry</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>+15</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Program Directors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Education</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>+28</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Middle Managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Education</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>+24</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 24 illustrates the points given to each group.

Graph 24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+24</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+28</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were no significant differences at the .05 level between any of the reporting groups.

In the area of Individual and Group Behavior, Question Four, where extent management development programs meet priority needs in this area, there is greater agreement between program directors in industry and education than between middle managers in industry and education. There is greater agreement between program directors and middle managers in education than between program directors and middle managers in industry. There is greater agreement between program directors in industry and middle managers in education than between program directors in education and middle managers in industry.

To the question, "Is this area now part of your total management
development program?" the responses of the four groups involved in the study are found in Table 37.

TABLE 37

INDIVIDUAL AND GROUP BEHAVIOR - INCLUSION IN MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Middle Managers In Industry</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Program Directors In Industry</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Program Directors In Education</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Middle Managers In Education</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Communication, Component Seven, that administrative development which would allow middle management to understand the significance of communication and the leader's role in the communication process.

Likert Scale responses and range of scores to the first question in this section, "To what extent do you agree this component should be considered essential to a total management development program in your field?" are found in Table 38.

TABLE 38

COMMUNICATION - ESSENTIAL TO TOTAL MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Maximum Points Possible</th>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Middle Managers In Industry</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.5000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 38 Con't.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Maximum Points Possible</th>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Program Directors</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>+38</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1.3478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Program Directors</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>+50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.3333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Middle Managers</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>+44</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.4286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 25 illustrates the points given to each group.

Graph 25

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points - Group</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>+30</th>
<th>+38</th>
<th>+44</th>
<th>+50</th>
<th>+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were no significant differences at the .05 level between any of the reporting groups.

In the area of Communication, Question One, noting extent this component is essential to a total management development program, there is greater agreement between program directors in industry and education than between middle managers in industry and education. There is greater agreement between program directors and middle managers in education than between program directors and middle managers in industry. There is greater agreement between program directors in industry and middle managers in education than between program directors in education and middle managers in industry.

Likert Scale responses and range of scores to the second question
in this section, "To what extent do you agree this component is critical to the satisfactory performance of the middle manager in your field?" are found in Table 39.

**TABLE 39**

**COMMUNICATION - CRITICAL TO SATISFACTORY PERFORMANCE OF MIDDLE MANAGER**

Likert Scale Responses and Range of Scores - Component 7 - Question 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Maximum Points Possible</th>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Middle Managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Industry</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>+29</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.5500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Program Directors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Industry</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>+38</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1.3478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Program Directors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Education</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>+48</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Middle Managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Education</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>+44</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.4286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 26 illustrates the points given to each group.

**Graph 26**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+29</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+38</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+44</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+48</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were no significant differences at the .05 level between any of the reporting groups.

In the area of Communication, Question Two, where this component is critical to the satisfactory performance of the middle manager, there is greater agreement between program directors in industry and
education than between middle managers in industry and education. There is greater agreement between program directors and middle managers in education than between program directors and middle managers in industry. There is greater agreement between program directors in industry and middle managers in education than between program directors in education and middle managers in industry.

Likert Scale responses and range of scores to the third question in this section, "To what extent do you agree the middle managers in your field is included in the identification of areas of content that will be included in your organization's management development program in this area?" are found in Table 40.

TABLE 40

COMMUNICATION - EXTENT MIDDLE MANAGERS INCLUDED IN CONTENT IDENTIFICATION

Likert Scale Responses and Range of Scores - Component 7 - Question 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Maximum Points Possible</th>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Middle Managers In Industry</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Program Directors In Industry</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>+21</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1.4387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Program Directors In Education</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>+38</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.4832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Middle Managers In Education</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>+27</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.4902</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 27 illustrates the points given to each group.
Graph 27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were no significant differences at the .05 level between any of the reporting groups.

In the area of Communication, Question Three, where extent middle managers are included in content identification of this area, there is greater agreement between middle managers in industry and education than between program directors in industry and education. There is greater agreement between program directors and middle managers in education than between program directors and middle managers in industry. There is greater agreement between program directors in education and middle managers in industry than between program directors in industry and middle managers in education.

Likert Scale responses and range of scores to the fourth question in this section, "To what extent do you agree that management development programs in your organization meet priority needs of middle managers in this area?" are found in Table 41.

**Table 41**

**COMMUNICATION - EXTENT MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS MEET PRIORITY NEEDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likert Scale Responses and Range of Scores - Component 7 - Question 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Middle Managers In Industry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 41 Con't.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Maximum Points Possible</th>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Program Directors In Industry</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>+18</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1.6957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Program Directors In Education</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>+23</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.6667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Middle Managers In Education</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>+25</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.5357</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 28 illustrates the points given to each group.

**Graph 28**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+23</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+25</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were no significant differences at the .05 level between any of the reporting groups.

In the area of Communication, Question Four, where extent management development programs meet priority needs in this area, there is greater agreement between program directors in industry and education than between middle managers in industry and education. There is greater agreement between program directors and middle managers in industry than between program directors and middle managers in education. There is greater agreement between program directors in industry and middle managers in education than between program directors in education and middle managers in industry.

To the question, "Is this area now part of your total management
development program?" the responses of the four groups involved in the study are found in Table 42.

**Table 42**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNICATION - INCLUSION IN MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Middle Managers In Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Program Directors In Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Program Directors In Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Middle Managers In Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Management Science, Component Eight, that administrative development which would allow middle management to best use new management systems such as: problem solving techniques and how they are applied to problem solving/decision making, planning and coordination.

Likert Scale responses and range of scores to the first question in this section, "To what extent do you agree this component should be considered essential to a total management development program in your field?" are found in Table 43.

**TABLE 43**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MANAGEMENT SCIENCE - ESSENTIAL TO TOTAL MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likert Scale Responses and Range of Scores - Component 8 - Question 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Middle Managers In Industry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 43 Con't.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Maximum Points Possible</th>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Program Directors</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>+18</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.2174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Program Directors</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>+17</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.4667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Middle Managers</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>+20</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.2857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 29 illustrates the points given to each group.

There were no significant differences at the .05 level between any of the reporting groups.

In the area of Management Science, Question One, noting extent this component is essential to a total management development program, there is greater agreement between program directors in industry and education than between middle managers in industry and education. There is greater agreement between program directors and middle managers in education than between program directors and middle managers in industry. There is greater agreement between program directors in industry and middle managers in education than between program directors in education and middle managers in industry.

Likert Scale responses and range of scores to the second question
in this section, "To what extent do you agree this component is
critical to the satisfactory performance of the middle manager in your
field?" are found in Table 44.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Maximum Points Possible</th>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Middle Managers In Industry</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>+22</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.9000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Program Directors In Industry</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>+14</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.3913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Program Directors In Education</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>+17</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.4333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Middle Managers In Education</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>+19</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.2143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 30 illustrates the points given to each group.
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There were no significant differences at the .05 level between
any of the reporting groups.

In the area of Management Science, Question Two, where this
component is critical to the satisfactory performance of the middle
manager, there is greater agreement between program directors in
industry and education than between middle managers in industry and education. There is greater agreement between program directors and middle managers in industry. There is greater agreement between program directors in industry and middle managers in education than between program directors in education and middle managers in industry.

Likert Scale responses and range of scores to the third question in this section, "To what extent do you agree the middle manager in your field is included in the identification of areas of content that will be included in your organization's management development program in this area?" are found in Table 45.

**TABLE 45**

**MANAGEMENT SCIENCE - EXTENT MIDDLE MANAGERS INCLUDED IN CONTENT IDENTIFICATION**

Likert Scale Responses and Range of Scores - Component 8 - Question 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Maximum Points Possible</th>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Middle Managers</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.0500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Program Directors</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>+8</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.6522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Program Directors</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>+9</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.7000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Middle Managers</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>+16</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.4386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 31 illustrates the points given to each group.

**Graph 31**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points - Group</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There were no significant differences at the .05 level between any of the reporting groups.

In the area of Management Science, Question Three, where extent management are included in content identification of this area, there is greater agreement between program directors in industry and education than between managers in industry and education. There is greater agreement between program directors and middle managers in education than between program directors and middle managers in industry. There is greater agreement between program directors in industry and middle managers in education than between program directors in education and middle managers in industry.

Likert Scale responses and range of scores to the fourth question in this section, "To what extent do you agree that management development programs in your organization meet priority needs of middle managers in this area?" are found in Table 46.

**TABLE 46**

**MANAGEMENT SCIENCE -**

**EXTFNT MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS MEET PRIORITY NEEDS**

**Likert Scale Responses and Range of Scores - Component 8 - Question 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Maximum Points Possible</th>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Middle Managers In Industry</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Program Directors In Industry</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>+7</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.6957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Program Directors In Education</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.8333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Middle Managers In Education</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.8214</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graph 32 illustrates the points given to each group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3&amp;4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a significant difference at the .05 level between middle managers and program directors in industry.

In the area of Management Science, Question Four, where extent management development programs meet priority needs in this area, there is greater agreement between program directors and middle managers in education than between program directors and middle managers in industry. There is greater agreement between program directors in industry and education than between middle managers in industry and education. There is greater agreement between program directors in industry and middle managers in education than between program directors in education and middle managers in industry.

To the question, "Is this area no part of your total manager development program?" the responses of four groups involved in the study are found in Table 47.

**TABLE 47**

**MANAGEMENT SCIENCE - INCLUSION IN MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Middle Managers In Industry</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Program Directors In Industry</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Optimizing Job Performance, Component Nine, that administrative development which would allow middle management to understand and develop fundamental concepts of job description and effective methods for communicating performance expectations.

Likert Scale responses and range of scores to the first question in this section, "To what extent do you agree this component should be considered to a total management development program in your field?" are found in Table 48.

### Table 48

**Optimizing Job Performance - Essential to Total Management Development Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Maximum Points Possible</th>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Middle Managers In Industry</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>+14</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Program Directors In Industry</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>+28</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1.7826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Program Directors In Education</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>+41</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.6333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Middle Managers In Education</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>+35</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.8214</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graph 33 illustrates the points given to each group.

Graph 33

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a significant difference at the .05 level between middle managers in industry and program directors in education.

In the area of Optimizing Job Performance, Question One, noting extent this component is essential to a total management development program, there is greater agreement between program directors in industry and education than between middle managers in industry and education. There is greater agreement between program directors and middle managers in education than between program directors and middle managers in industry. There is greater agreement between program directors in industry and middle managers in education than between program directors in education and middle managers in industry.

Likert Scale responses and range of scores to the second question in this section, "To what extent do you agree this component is critical to the satisfactory performance of the middle manager in your field?" are found in Table 49.

**TABLE 49**

**OPTIMIZING JOB PERFORMANCE - CRITICAL TO SATISFACTORY PERFORMANCE OF MIDDLE MANAGER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likert Scale Responses and Range of Scores - Component 9 - Question 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Middle Managers in Industry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graph 34 illustrates the points given to each group.

There is a significant difference at the .05 level between middle managers in industry and program directors in education.

In the area of Optimizing Job Performance, Question Two, where this component is critical to the satisfactory performance of the middle manager, there is greater agreement between middle managers in industry and education than between program directors in industry and education. There is greater agreement between program directors and middle managers in industry than between program directors and middle managers in education. There is greater agreement between program directors in industry and middle managers in education than between program directors in education and middle managers in industry.

Likert Scale responses and range of scores to the third question

Table 49 Con't.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Maximum Points Possible</th>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Program Directors In Industry</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>+24</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1.9566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Program Directors In Education</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>+40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Middle Managers In Education</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>+27</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.0357</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Points -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>+14</th>
<th>+24</th>
<th>+27</th>
<th>+40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a significant difference at the .05 level between middle managers in industry and program directors in education.
in this section, "To what extent do you agree the middle manager in your field is included in the identification of areas of content that will be included in your organization's management development program?" are found in Table 50.

**TABLE 50**

**OPTIMIZING JOB PERFORMANCE - EXTENT MIDDLE MANAGERS INCLUDED IN CONTENT IDENTIFICATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likert Scale Responses and Range of Scores - Component 9 - Question 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Middle Managers In Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Program Directors In Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Program Directors In Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Middle Managers In Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 35 illustrates the points given to each group.

**Graph 35**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points - Group</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>+1</th>
<th>+8</th>
<th>+20</th>
<th>+31</th>
<th>+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

There is a significant difference at the .05 level between program directors in education and program directors and middle managers in industry.

In the area of Optimizing Job Performance, Question Three, where extent middle managers are included in content identification of this...
area, there is greater agreement between program directors and middle
managers in industry than between program directors and middle managers
in education. There is greater agreement between middle managers in
industry and education than between program directors in industry and
education. There is greater agreement between program directors in
industry and middle managers in education than between program directors
in education and middle managers in industry.

Likert Scale responses and range of scores to the fourth question
in this section, "To what extent do you agree that management develop­
ment programs in your organization meet priority needs of middle
managers in this area?" are found in Table 51.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 51</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPTIMIZING JOB PERFORMANCE - EXTENT MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS MEET PRIORITY NEEDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likert Scale Responses and Range of Scores - Component 9 - Question 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Maximum Points Possible</th>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Middle Managers In Industry</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Program Directors In Industry</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>+9</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.6087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Program Directors In Education</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>+27</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Middle Managers In Education</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>+19</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.2143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 36 illustrates the points given to each group.
There is a significant difference at the .05 level between middle managers in industry and program directors in industry, program directors in education and middle managers in education.

In the area of Optimizing Job Performance, Question Four, where extent management development programs meet priority needs in this area, there is greater agreement between program directors and middle managers in education than between program directors and middle managers in industry. There is greater agreement between program directors in industry and education than between middle managers in industry and education. There is greater agreement between program directors in industry and middle managers in education than between program directors in education and middle managers in industry.

To the question, "Is this area now part of your total management development program?" the responses of the four groups involved in the study are found in Table 52.

**TABLE 52**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPTIMIZING JOB PERFORMANCE - INCLUSION IN MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Middle Managers In Industry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 52 Con't.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Program Directors In Industry</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Program Directors In Education</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Middle Managers In Education</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Labor Relations, Component Ten, that administrative development which would allow middle management to understand the organization's involvement and philosophy in the area of law, role, rights, procedural matters and future trends.

Likert Scale responses and range of scores to the first question in this section, "To what extent do you agree this component should be considered essential to a total management development program in your field?" are found in Table 53.

**TABLE 53**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LABOR RELATIONS - ESSENTIAL TO TOTAL MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Likert Scale Responses and Range of Scores - Component 10 - Question 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Maximum Points Possible</th>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Middle Managers In Industry</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>+11</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.0500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Program Directors In Industry</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>+18</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.2174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 53 Con't.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Maximum Points Possible</th>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Program Directors In Education</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>+36</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.8000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Middle Managers In Education</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>+33</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.8214</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 37 illustrates the points given to each group.

Graph 37

Points - Group

0 +11 +18 +33 +36 +
1 2 4 3

There were no significant differences at the .05 level between any of the reporting groups.

In the area of Labor Relations, Question One, noting extent this component is essential to a total management development program, there is greater agreement between program directors and middle managers in education than between program directors and middle managers in industry. There is greater agreement between middle managers in industry and education than between program directors in industry and education. There is greater agreement between program directors in education and middle managers in industry than between program directors in industry and middle managers in education.

Likert Scale responses and range of scores to the second question in this section, "To what extent do you agree this component is critical to the satisfactory performance of the middle manager in your
field?" are found in Table 54.

TABLE 54

LABOR RELATIONS - CRITICAL TO SATISFACTORY
PERFORMANCE OF MIDDLE MANAGER

Likert Scale Responses and Range of Scores - Component 10 - Question 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Maximum Points Possible</th>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Middle Managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Industry</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>+9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.5500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Program Directors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Industry</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>+15</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.3478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Program Directors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Education</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>+33</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.9000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Middle Managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Education</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>+33</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.8929</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 38 illustrates the points given to each group.

Points -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>+9</th>
<th>+15</th>
<th>+33</th>
<th>+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>364</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were no significant differences at the .05 level between any of the reporting groups.

In the area of Labor Relations, Question Two, where this component is critical to the satisfactory performance of the middle manager, there is greater agreement between program directors in industry and education than between middle managers in industry and education. There is greater agreement between program directors and middle managers in education than between program directors and middle
managers in industry. There is greater agreement between program
directors in industry and middle managers in education than between
program directors in education and middle managers in industry.

Likert Scale responses and range of scores to the third question
in this section, "To what extent do you agree the middle managers in
your field is included in the identification of areas of content that
will be included in your organization's management development
program in this area?" are found in Table 55.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LABOR RELATIONS - EXTENT MIDDLE MANAGERS INCLUDED IN CONTENT IDENTIFICATION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Likert Scale Responses and Range of Scores - Component 10 - Question 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Maximum Points Possible</th>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Middle Managers In Industry</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Program Directors In Industry</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>+13</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.7820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Program Directors In Education</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>+25</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.1667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Middle Managers In Education</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>+28</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.8929</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 39 illustrates the points given to each group.
There is a significant difference at the .05 level between middle managers in industry and program directors and middle managers in education. There also is a significant difference at the .05 level between program directors in industry and middle managers in education.

In the area of Labor Relations, Question Three, where extent middle managers are included in content identification of this area, there is greater agreement between program directors in industry and education than between middle managers in industry and education. There is greater agreement between program directors and middle managers in education than between program directors and middle managers in industry. There is greater agreement between program directors in industry and middle managers in education than between program directors in education and middle managers in industry.

Likert Scale responses and range of scores to the fourth question in this section, "To what extent do you agree that management development programs in your organization meet priority needs of middle managers in this area?" are found in Table 56.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 56</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LABOR RELATIONS - EXTENT MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS MEET PRIORITY NEEDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likert Scale Responses and Range of Scores - Component 10 - Question 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Maximum Points Possible</th>
<th>Range of Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Middle Managers In Industry</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.6000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is a significant difference at the .05 level between middle managers in industry and program directors in industry, program directors in education and middle managers in education.

In the area of Labor Relations, Question Four, where extent management development programs meet priority needs in this area, there is greater agreement between program directors in industry and education than between middle managers in industry and education. There is greater agreement between program directors and middle managers in education than between program directors and middle managers in industry. There is greater agreement between program directors in industry and middle managers in education than between program directors in education and middle managers in industry.

To the question, "Is this area now part of your total management development program," the responses of the four groups involved in the study are found in Table 57.
**TABLE 57**

**LABOR RELATIONS -**  
**INCLUSION IN MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Middle Managers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Program Directors</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Program Directors</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Middle Managers</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

In the ranking of components, there was general agreement in the top three areas between all groups. Middle managers in industry ranked the top three components as communication, leader behavior and individual and group behavior. Program directors in industry ranked the top three components as leader behavior, individual and group behavior, and communication. Program directors in education ranked the top three components as leader behavior, communication and individual and group behavior. Middle managers in education ranked the top three components as individual and group behavior, communication and management contribution. (See Tables 1-4, pages 94-95).

There were significant differences in four areas. These differences were: leader behavior between program directors in industry and education; management science between program directors and middle
managers in industry; optimizing job performance between middle managers in industry and program directors in education; and labor relations between middle managers and program directors in industry. (See Table 6, page 97).

Table 58 illustrates the frequency with which the groups participating in the study agreed when considering all four questions in the survey instrument.

**TABLE 58**

**Frequency of Agreement -- All Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Combinations</th>
<th>Frequency Of Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle Managers In Industry and Program Directors in Industry</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Managers In Education and Program Directors In Education</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Managers In Industry and Middle Managers In Education</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Directors In Industry and Program Directors In Education</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Directors In Industry and Middle Managers In Education</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Directors In Education and Middle Managers In Industry</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 59 further defines the breakdown into the frequency of agreement of the four questions contained in each of the ten components.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions And Group Combinations</th>
<th>Frequency of Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To what extent do you agree this component should be considered essential to a total management development program in your field?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Managers In Industry and Program Directors In Industry</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Managers In Education and Program Directors In Education</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Managers In Industry and Middle Managers In Education</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Directors In Industry and Program Directors In Education</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Directors In Industry and Middle Managers In Education</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Directors In Education and Middle Managers In Industry</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To what extent do you agree this component is critical to the satisfactory performance of the middle manager in your field?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Managers In Industry and Program Directors In Industry</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Managers In Education and Program Directors In Education</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Managers In Industry and Middle Managers In Education</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Directors In Industry and Program Directors In Education</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Directors In Industry and Middle Managers In Education</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Directors In Education and Middle Managers In Industry</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To what extent do you agree the middle manager in your field is included in the identification of areas of content that will be included in your organization's management development program?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Managers In Industry and Program Directors In Industry</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Managers In Education and Program Directors In Education</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Managers In Industry and Middle Managers In Education</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Directors In Industry and Program Directors In Education</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Directors In Industry and Middle Managers In Education</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Directors In Industry and Middle Managers In Industry</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To what extent do you agree that management development programs in your organization meet priority needs of middle managers in this area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Managers In Industry and Program Directors In Industry</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Managers In Education and Program Directors In Education</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Managers In Industry and Middle Managers In Education</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Directors In Industry and Program Directors In Education</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Directors In Industry and Middle Managers In Education</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Directors In Education and Middle Managers In Industry</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 60 indicates the frequency significant differences were found to each of the four major questions of this study.

**TABLE 60**

Significant Difference  
All Responses Considered To  
Each Question In Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Frequency Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To what extent do you agree this component should be considered</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>essential to a total management program in your field?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To what extent do you agree this component is critical to the</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfactory performance of the middle manager in your field?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To what extent do you agree the middle manager in your field is</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>included in the identification of areas of content that will be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>included in your organization's management development program?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To what extent do you agree that management development programs in</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>your organization meet priority needs of middle managers in this area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 61 illustrates the specific areas of significant differences between the four groups participating in the study. In this Table all questions in each of the ten component areas of the survey are considered.
**TABLE 6.1**

**Significant Difference Between Four Groups To All Questions In Ten Component Areas of Survey**

**KEY:**
- **MMI** - Middle Managers in Industry
- **PDI** - Program Directors in Industry
- **PDE** - Program Directors in Education
- **MME** - Middle Managers in Education

Significant differences between two or more groups are identified by the use of the above initials.

**Question**

1. To what extent do you agree this component should be considered essential to a total management development program in your field?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MMI</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDE</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. To what extent do you agree this component is critical to the satisfactory performance of the middle manager in your field?

   | MMI | MMI | N | N | N | N | N | N | N | N | PDE | N |

3. To what extent do you agree the middle manager in your field is included in the identification of areas of content that will be included in your organization’s management development program?

   | MMI | PDI | N | N | N | N | PDE | N | N | N | PDE | MME |

4. To what extent do you agree that management development programs in your organization meet priority needs of middle managers in this area?

   | MMI | MMI | N | N | PDE | MMI | MMI | N | MME | N | N | PDE | MME |

**Key:** Significant difference between two or more groups that are identified by below numbers:
- 1. Middle Managers, Industry
- 2. Program Directors, Industry
- 3. Program Directors, Education
- 4. Middle Managers, Education
- **N**. No Significant Difference.
III. COMPONENTS NOW PART OF MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

The respondents to this study were asked to check either "yes" or "no" by each of the ten components which were now part of their organization's total management development program. Results are shown in Table 62.

**TABLE 62**

Component Inclusion In Management Development Program By All Groups In Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Middle Managers</th>
<th>Program Directors</th>
<th>Program Directors</th>
<th>Middle Managers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Contribution</td>
<td>Yes 15</td>
<td>Yes 17</td>
<td>Yes 26</td>
<td>Yes 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management's Social and Legal Responsibility</td>
<td>No 4</td>
<td>No 6</td>
<td>No 3</td>
<td>No 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Economics</td>
<td>Yes 10</td>
<td>Yes 11</td>
<td>Yes 18</td>
<td>Yes 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Systems</td>
<td>Yes 14</td>
<td>Yes 12</td>
<td>Yes 22</td>
<td>Yes 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Behavior</td>
<td>Yes 15</td>
<td>Yes 17</td>
<td>Yes 26</td>
<td>Yes 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual and Group Behavior</td>
<td>Yes 14</td>
<td>Yes 16</td>
<td>Yes 26</td>
<td>Yes 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Yes 14</td>
<td>Yes 20</td>
<td>Yes 26</td>
<td>Yes 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Science</td>
<td>Yes 14</td>
<td>Yes 17</td>
<td>Yes 11</td>
<td>Yes 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimizing Job Performance</td>
<td>Yes 13</td>
<td>Yes 12</td>
<td>Yes 25</td>
<td>Yes 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Relations</td>
<td>Yes 12</td>
<td>Yes 10</td>
<td>Yes 23</td>
<td>Yes 23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DESCRIPTION OF MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Respondents were asked to check those areas which best describe their management development program and those areas which were true of their management development program.

Tables 63 and 64 record these responses in percentage form.
TABLE 63

DESCRIPTION OF MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM—INDUSTRY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Directors in Industry</th>
<th>Areas Which Best Describe The Management Development Program</th>
<th>Middle Managers in Industry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>A. A joint function between your organization and a related professional organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>B. A joint function between your organization and a university or college.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>C. A joint function between your organization and a consultant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>D. A joint function between your organization and a related organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>E. A joint function between your organization and a state or federal agency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>F. An in-house function.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>G. Field experience or internship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>H. Independent or small group study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>I. Special Assignment/special projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>J. Job rotation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>K. Management meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>L. Individualized programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>M. Other.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Areas True of Organizations Management Development Programs

| N   | %   | A. The management development program is realistically planned because it is geared to the organization's present situation and future needs. | 9 45 |
Table 63 Con't.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G. The management development program is a continuing one.

---

TABLE 64

DESCRIPTION OF MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM - EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Directors In Education</th>
<th>Areas Which Best Describe The Management Development Program</th>
<th>Middle Managers In Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. A joint function between your organization and a related professional organization.
B. A joint function between your organization and a university or college.
C. A joint function between your organization and a consultant.
D. A joint function between your organization and a related organization.
Table 64 Con't.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>A joint function between your organization and a state or federal agency.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>An in-house function.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>Field experience or internship.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.</td>
<td>Independent or small group study.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>Special assignment/special projects.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.</td>
<td>Job rotation.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.</td>
<td>Management meetings.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.</td>
<td>Individualized programs.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.</td>
<td>Other.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Areas True of Organizations
Management Development Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>The management development program is realistically planned because it is geared to the organization's present situation and future needs.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>The management development program has the full cooperation of top management.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Our management development program is distinct from other training programs.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>The management development program instills the overall management viewpoint in its managers.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>The management development program broadens the managers for their own jobs as well as for their future advancement.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 64 Con't.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. The results of the management development program are appraised realistically and regularly.

G. The management development program is a continuing one.
CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter will present an analysis of the data found in Chapter V. The analysis of data will center upon the six focus points of the study. The focus points are:

1. Identification and description of management development programs.
2. Ranking of competencies found in management development programs.
3. Investigation of components considered essential to a total management development program.
4. Investigation of components critical to the satisfactory performance of the middle manager.
5. Determination of extent middle managers are involved in identification of areas of content to be included in management development programs.
6. Determination of extent management development programs meet the needs of middle managers.

The analysis of data will include statistical information from the questionnaire, information from taped interviews with program directors and middle managers in industry and education, and written and unwritten data which would describe courses, content or policy related to program formation.

Analysis of Data

Identification and Description of Management Development Programs

No respondents in returning their survey instrument included any supporting data which could be considered course content policy or
other descriptive material. In the interview situation some materials of a general nature were presented by both program directors in education and industry. In no case did the middle manager of either group submit written information which would describe the organization's management development policy or management development program.

There was a vagueness of response on the part of both industry and educational middle managers and program directors in attempting to determine if policy guidelines were written and available to middle managers.

Approximately one-half of the program directors said there were none, but that there were guidelines of a general nature. In no case was a board policy or a company guideline viewed. Yet, eighteen people, both middle managers and program directors, noted that policy could and would be subject to revision. The policy revision was handled through: directions; memos; policy change; or administration and/or board decisions. In all cases there were no firm time lines spelled out for policy review. General responses to indicate when policy revision could occur could be categorized as: as the need arises; as necessary; constantly; often yearly or quarterly reviewed.

Respondents from education noted that if change was necessary it would be a cooperative effort between such combinations as: administrators; administrators and staff; or by those involved based on feedback from those affected. In one case an unnamed outside agency
would be called in to assist in revision of policy. Committees of managers could, in two cases involving school districts, submit revision proposals.

The majority of those interviewed agreed that policy guidelines should be written. However, four middle managers in industry and one middle manager in education did not know or wish to state the process that this may take. Program directors in education and industry were for involvement of those responsible and affected by training in the development of written guidelines.

All middle managers and program directors were of the opinion that policies were generally flexible enough to provide for training needs. The impression was left that vague and flexible were synonymous.

The description of program evolvement again was general in nature, but six general categories were identified to describe program evolvement. These were: development of what is here; evolvement based on needs (categorical/as need arises); development from informal to formal; development accomplished through additions by the training director; development based on objectives; and development based on personal growth and personal need.

From the amount of specific programs described, the number of available guidelines available or from the description of the process involved to revise programs it is not clear as to how reported large sums of money were actually being spent on managerial development.
This is in direct contrast to the report of Lynton and Pareek who reported that over six hundred million dollars was spent on industrial management development programs in the United States. The educational monetary level of commitment is viewed in relationship to the number and scope of content of the variety of educational management development offerings in the United States. This level of commitment is reflected in the report of the UCEA-Atlanta Project which grew from those concerns of urban school leaders and from the 1973 proposed U.S. Office of Education budget outlay of over six billion dollars for instructional materials and programs benefiting educational systems, government units, military groups and private corporations.

Three program directors in industry and one in education suggested strongly that the key to the organization's success was a "good boss" or a "good leader." A middle manager's adequate training is essential since they are instrumental in the success of those under them.


Program directors and middle managers in industry talked more of levels of training; or training for which a man is ready. Educational program directors and middle managers saw development as growth or "better understanding of a problem."

What was not stated reflected on the success of the program. Middle managers in neither group identified the leadership as being instrumental in the success of the management development program.

The development of managers is one responsibility of those considered to be a manager's immediate superior. Industrial middle managers hinted at this since determining ability to solve problems and determining when a man is capable of moving to new levels of training is based on the skill and perception of another person.

Direction of the organization's future growth and expansion of the management development program can be best summarized by statements of those interviewed. The quotes could be generalized to the extent that they incorporate less than direct statements. Quotations are: "We think of programs in terms of how to develop people;" "We think of programs based on organizational change;" "Our program is going to be based more on problem solving, assessment, climate and procedures;" "Programs will be based on people not nuts and bolts issues;" and "Our program will be the same. It will be based on communication, feedback and identification of needs." Two people from industry and one from education at the middle management level did not see any change of
significance taking place soon. Industry people often spoke of different programs for different managers based on their individual needs and goals. Job orientation often dictated course content.

In no case did any person interviewed exclusively associate personal future growth and expansion with horizontal growth. There was some indication of this as industrial managers spoke of diversified programs based on needs or job content.

One implication is that organizationally it is healthy to recognize that people have capacity to grow on the job, and that a person does not have to "move up" to grow. This concept of growth is seen by Flory to be sound since the management development process can function effectively even though there is no "payoff" in vertical advancement.

Responses reflected that general areas of growth would contain: analysis of personnel; review of policy programs and procedures to improve management potential; development of communication skills; development of special areas of skill or competency and reviewing of program methodology.

Management development programs were considered successful by those responsible for their development and by the middle manager. Middle managers in industry, on two occasions, considered the programs only moderately successful. Three middle managers in education looked

---

to success if there were adequate structure and adequate funding to meet needs.

A difference in viewpoint of the middle managers was perceived. The middle managers in education were more concerned with costs of the management development program. Educational middle managers contended that if there were no programs available because of lack of funds there could be no measure of success. Industrial middle managers did not share this cost concern. Baldridge and Deal\textsuperscript{141} viewed the risks that the school administrator must take as those which will allow him to institute programs that will survive in the organization's environment. The administrator must view politics and costs as almost inseparable. Many educational plans fail since they do not take into account all costs to facilitate the plan. Politically, educators utilize personnel, skill and sources of talent available. Utilization may indicate that educators are not alienating colleagues and at the same time cutting costs.

All those interviewed had a general theme for success that included: development by our own people based on individual/organizational needs; people orientated; utilization of a team approach; and security based on leadership and solving problems/needs of those involved.

Section Summary:

Tables 63 and 64, pages 165-168, Chapter IV, illustrate some agreement and commonalty between the four groups involved in this study. Generally, programs were realistically planned to meet needs of the organization; the management development program has full cooperation of top management; the management development program instills a management viewpoint; the manager is broadened for his job as well as future jobs; and that the management program is a continuing one. None of the groups exhibited a great deal of confidence in evaluation of programs when asked if the program is appraised realistically and regularly. Middle managers in education indicate they are not trained for their present or future jobs as are the middle managers in industry. There tends to be an inability in any group to consider the management training program as distinct from others.

Some training programs were just that. Training was training. It may not have been considered management development. All groups agree that management development is an in-house function. Programs reflect special assignment or projects. Programs could meet individual needs.

Even though there were responses in the category of "other" no specific example was given to reflect thinking of those responding in this way.

A greater attention to details of specific policy and guidelines
would have been valuable in focusing on specific programs and directions management development programs may take in the future.

There was reluctance or inability of both program directors or middle managers in both groups to put forth programs for perusal.

Are actual programs or policy available? Discussion indicated that programs and policy are available. A person may have to be part of or closer to the organization to have access to this program and policy information.

Those involved in the interviews referred to policy in their conversation. It was suggested that policy revision could/would be made. Therefore, it must be a revision of something, if even a philosophy or some unwritten policy, that is incorporated into the thinking of those involved.

Data from tapes indicated that both middle managers and program directors in industry and education had input for change and revision. In this context of generality and vagueness came the conclusion that policy was flexible to provide for training needs. The impression was left that if a need arose it would be met.

The direction that policy and/or management development was to take in the future could be described as sound. Comments of all groups reflected knowledge of their field. Problem solving and personal development were key concerns. A positive attitude was evidenced in the interview situation towards direction and ability of programs to meet current needs.
It was more difficult for a program director or middle manager in industry to be less able to relate to the total scope of program(s) available due to size and complexity of the organization.

Seldom, in the four groups, was there any in-depth discussion that project the idea that management training programs were designed to meet specific goals or objectives. There was no evidence of a concrete needs assessment. This needs assessment and goal setting would be necessary to the design of a management training program.

All groups considered, there was a note of concern for subject matter, skill development and the manager himself. As the interviews indicated, the program's were designed so that the manager met success at attaining skills, mastering subject matter and in achieving a better understanding of his ability to understand his own actions and motivations.

Results of the survey indicate that there are a number of management development programs in operation in both industry and education. Results to the question, for each of the ten components, "Is this area now part of your total management program?" were shown in Table 62, Chapter IV and are reproduced on page 179.
TABLE 62
Component Inclusion In Management Development Program By All Groups In Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Middle Managers</th>
<th>Program Directors</th>
<th>Program Directors</th>
<th>Middle Managers</th>
<th>Program Directors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Contribution</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management's Social and Legal Responsibility</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Economics</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Systems</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader Behavior</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual and Group Behavior</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Science</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimizing Job</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The areas generally ranked highest by the four groups were leader behavior, individual and group behavior, and communication. These also were those areas in which many of the programs are in existence. Areas generally ranked lowest by the four were labor relations and management's social and legal responsibilities. These two areas contained fewest programs. (Tables 1 through 4, Chapter IV, pages 94-95.)

Both groups in education consider they have more programs in operation than do both groups in industry.

It was not clear from this study what constitutes a program. Results of the interview show those groups in education loosely
defined programs and thus would consider themselves to have many management development programs in operation.

Based on the response of all those interviewed from education, an implication may be that both those responsible for the development of management training programs and those participating in these programs are more interested in conducting and attending programs than in assessing needs and formulating sound programs.

Middle managers have a responsibility to assist in determining program needs. The program directors and the middle managers in education may base this assessment about organizational analysis, task analysis and personnel analysis.

Program definition and function may be facilitated and/or strengthened.

At no time was there an actual indication of the numbers of people in attendance in any particular program during a specific time period. An observation was that a program may be carried by title only.

Generally, there was no apparent follow-through evaluation resulting from individual attendance at management development programs. Superintendents did indicate that they may require a principal's attendance. This lack of follow-through or as in industry of total knowledge of who attends management development programs could reflect a negative value to the educational middle manager who may question the value of the management development
programs offered by his district. Two added dimensions were brought into focus. One, the size of the educational organization allowed the program director to realize the number of people in attendance at in-service programs at any given time. A person who could be considered the superior could send out "signals" that are clear in meaning. In education the signal was sent by the program director who was in most instances, the "ultimate" superior. Second, educational program directors saw their team as one that takes part in management development. Over a given period of time those in education avoided training only the "promotable" manager.

Only in the area of management science did industry offer more programs than did education.

Ranking of Competencies Found In Management Development Programs

Four groups involved in the study preferred similar components considered critical to the management development program. Kendall's coefficient of concordance indicated agreement among groups. These components were communication, leader behavior, individual and group behavior, and management contribution. (See Tables 1-4, Chapter IV, pages 94-95.)

Similarly, the four groups involved in this study saw labor relations, management's social and legal responsibilities, management science, and business economics as being less necessary to the total management development program.
Nineteen members of the total group interviewed viewed communication as being a critical component necessary to be a successful manager.

Sixteen members of the total group indicated that leadership course work was an essential competency that should be refined in management development programs. There was no indication in the interview process why there were differences between program directors in industry and education in attendance in any particular program during a specific time period. An observation was that a program may be carried by title only.

The four groups involved in the study identified those areas which viewed management development as a means to develop the leadership function as opposed to the concept that development improves basic task efficiency.

Those interviewed said that the ranking of the components was difficult. "They are all important" or "it is difficult to choose among equals" could reflect the point of view that of the many courses offered, each could be of value to an organization for specific reasons. The wide variety of courses offered and the difficulty in ranking could suggest that while offerings vary widely the importance of gaining knowledge through management development was critical.

In their ranking of the competencies, no person interviewed could identify when their choice of a top ranked component was made part of the total management development program. Being unable to identify when a component became part of a program may be attributed to the fluid movement of the managers at any level in and out of the organization. Difficulty in determining when a component became part of a
program may also be a low priority item as to accomplishing work required by the job. There were hints that "it changes year to year," or that "it depends on program emphasis." Those interviewed gave the general impression that these top ranked components such as communication have been and will continue to be valuable since concrete tasks can be tangent while communication and other skills must be developed.

Twenty-one of the twenty-eight interviewed indicated that program administrators and middle managers participated in the process that would allow them to rank competencies found in the management development program. Four middle managers in education did not identify with the process of component evaluation. Three middle managers in industry shared this viewpoint.

All interviewed, with exception of those seven middle managers noted, held the opinion that both top and middle managers participated in the component evaluation process. Program directors in both groups were seen to have final responsibility and authority to change the management development program. The responsibility to change the management development program falling to the program director is in concurrence with statements of Lynton and Parteek. These writings state that training involves three groups. These groups are the organization, the participant and the training institutions, Lynton and Pareek favor involvement of superiors in management development program decisions. 142

The process of ranking competencies found in management development programs was usually informal. The process of ranking components normally took place during a face to face evaluation and/or interview. Informal communication in the form of a memo to the "boss" or director suggested a process. The process involving informal communication was noted when, of the total group, seventeen program directors and eight middle managers viewed this in the interview as being an effective way to give opinions or to make suggestions relative to nature and content of the program.

Evaluating the interviews, the participation of the middle managers in the component evaluation could have illustrated that program directors did receive input regarding management development programs. While program directors did exercise final responsibility the drawbacks associated with one person determining what was "good for all" was avoided. Communication indicated that the learner accepted some responsibility for design of the program. This collection of information could influence the nature and content of the programs.

Another implication is that communication did take place. Management development does depend upon a sound superior subordinate relationship. The exchange of ideas, the development of stable attitudes and the ability to deal with the uniqueness of individuals stemming from the informal communication may lead to a sound program.

The ranking of competencies was done by all groups at least once per year. Educators placed emphasis on summer evaluation and planning.
Eight program directors in industry did evaluation and ranking on a semi-annual basis. The remaining group responses ranged from "ad hoc" to "any time at all." In four cases, program directors in education said they ranked competencies "as needed."

Program directors in education and industry saw an opportunity for all middle managers to participate in the top ranked component program in their organization. Two middle managers in industry indicated that all managers could but there is a need factor involved in participation. Industry program directors on two occasions noted that "senior staff middle management does not take part in all meetings." It is assumed that the interviewee was referring to another level of middle management. Probing of this unfamiliar area of management was not done. Awareness of this being taped was not recognized at the time of the interview.

The percentages varied as to how many middle managers participated in ranking of components, but it was seen as high by all those interviewed. There was no change seen in the number participating or in any percentage participating in the future. The summer months did provide a time period free from school year distractions in which evaluation could take place. Industry did put greater emphasis on more formal time arrangements to accomplish this evaluation.

There was a recognition that growth is a long term process. There was no evidence of the type of thinking to indicate management development is dominated by great preoccupations with one's self or
of stressing security at the expense of growth.

An implication for training is that there were less "older" attitudes prevailing that would make management development difficult because personnel could not deal with issues or content in a flexible and open manner.

The number of participating opened the way for the variety of opinions in which the organizations could view their management development programs realistically.

The size of the organization affected the nature of the response of industry program directors and industry middle managers.

In industry managers personally knew only those in their immediate area. Directors in industry had limited knowledge of extent of personal participation. They did know selected personnel. Program directors and middle managers in education were members of an organization small enough to recognize and know each other. Most would be included in ranking and evaluation. This factor was not evident in industry.

"No, probably not, don't know, not really," and "I doubt it," were summary answers that illustrated that all but one middle manager and one program director in education recognized that components do not remain static. "The needs of many people are critical to operation of this business - from the top down!" illustrated to some extent a concern for personnel.

On all groups interviewed replacement of components on any list
at any time were seen to be caused by: social change; needs of managers; supplication of needs and knowledge; needs of subordinate staff; demands or changes in job structure; needs of the organization; and expectations of those with whom you are responsible. Realization that components could be replaced reflects a concept of growth. The areas noted by the groups interviewed illustrated that management development affects and is affected by a myriad of factors.

Section Summary

The evaluation of components critical to a management development program does take place. Based on all interviews this evaluation seemed more informal than formal.

There was agreement among all groups as to which components were considered critical to the total management development program. There was agreement among all groups as to which components were considered to be less critical to the total management development program. All groups were in agreement on those components considered critical and less than critical to the total management development program.

Personal consideration of the components in the study were given by those participating in this study. There was a high degree of degree of agreement among all groups that communication was a most critical component to include in a management development program.

There were a few differences in attitudes, as perceived by the interview process, regarding the value of the components to the total program, or the reasons given as to why components change, or
need to be reevaluated.

Educators did reflect a summer preference to do the above tasks while industry personnel viewed the tasks as something that had to be completed at their industry's time table. Size of organization had bearing on the amount and nature of personal involvement. Interviews indicated that the groups viewed themselves as competent. Groups were concerned with refinement of skills and acquiring new knowledge. Philosophy was part of the competency content consideration as it related to personal, organizational or subordinate needs.

Investigation Of Components Considered Essential To A Total Management Development Program

To the question, "To what extent do you agree this component should be considered essential to a total management development program in your field?" there were two significant differences. These were in the areas of Management Contribution and Optimizing Job Performance. In both cases, the middle manager in industry did not agree with the program director in education. (See Tables Fifty-nine, Sixty and Sixty-one, pages 161, 162, 163, Chapter Four. Middle managers and program directors in education viewed these two areas as being more essential to a total management development than did those groups from industry. Application of the traditional principals of management has been part of the industrial scene longer than it has been in education. Formulation of job descriptions and communicating more formal job expectations is a relatively new phenomenon in education. There has
been progress shown as universities are incorporating management concepts into preparatory programs. During the latter part of this decade an array of forces affected the school and university systems. Pressure from urban administrators was one factor that allowed management concepts to be allowed into university programs. 143

One possibility is that education in view of Culbertson's remarks related applying knowledge and technique in the interview which have been part of management's traditional training and structure.

The responses, borne out in the interviews and in the survey instrument, to be most essential to a total management program were: leader behavior; individual and group behavior; and communication. (See Tables Twenty-eight, Thirty-three, and Thirty-eight, pages 123, 124, 129, 135, Chapter Four.).

Twenty interviewees noted communication in some form such as: memos, staff meeting, and discussion of day to day problems, as being essential to the management process. Closely associated, in seventeen of these interviews, was leader behavior. It was difficult at times to disassociate leadership behavior and individual and group behavior. Respondents often assumed that "leaders can influence actions of groups."

Respondents were viewed as those whose leadership was used to influence groups through the use of action or words indicating praise or satisfaction. Their positive approach extended to the interview since there was an attempt to make the interviews comfortable in the interview process.

Another observation was, that of those interviewed, one theme evident throughout was the capacity of both middle managers and program directors in all groups to be able to deal with situations and personalities. Illustrations used to reinforce a point of view reflected an ability to utilize a person's or a situation's strength or weakness to illustrate the specific point being made at that time.

One program manager in industry noted business economics and support systems as being critical to a management program. No one in education considered this in their discussion.

All program directors and middle managers in industry and education spoke of evaluation, be it evaluation of the manager or program. Their assumptions were that leaders, as managers, should act in a managerial manner, and on that basis they will be judged. The overtone was that the manager is constantly being evaluated by many groups. This evaluation, formal or informal, will influence his behavior or success. Emphasis was that the manager deals with a "need and people oriented problem."

Labor relations, as a topic, was only mentioned by one middle manager and one program director in industry. "We don't concern ourselves with that, there is a legal staff that takes care of all negotiations" was the response of one program director in industry.

Those in education, while not noting labor relations directly as a topic, alluded to this area in the interview. Four middle managers
in education noted such things as, "labor problems can often be settled quickly if the principal is a good manager" or "communication is critical when you sit in on negotiations or deal with a grievance."

Educators noted above, viewed "bargaining" being positively affected by improved communication, leadership and knowledge of individual and group behavior.

Two implications stem from educational middle manager's concern regarding labor relations. First, the middle manager has been newly placed in the front line of responsibility of dealing with union employees. The management in industry is more accustomed to handling this responsibility. Industrial organizations have had experience in setting up machinery and departments to deal with union related problems. Second, the responses of the middle manager in education were not sophisticated. Through experience and participation in current training activities this sophistication could develop. The humanistic approach will need to be tempered to deal with the scope of problems presented by professional and white collar unionism that will affect the middle manager in education.

Overall, those interviewed saw the inclusion of aforementioned leading components in terms of growth, additional knowledge taught to the manager, review of what he already knew to be used in a practical way on the job, or in terms of helping develop another person's abilities or skills.

Three program directors in education related that the organization would benefit by managers trained in critical areas they
consider important. One superintendent related, "growth of his district would take place if good people become better."

Two middle managers in education invisional training as "making their job more interesting."

The major concepts that all of those interviewed would wish to be included in management development programs could be summed into two areas: formal management skills and problem solving techniques and/or experience. Of these two, there was more interest expressed in problem solving, games group skill techniques, or discussion of specific leader behavior as related to solving personnel problems. One industrial manager stated, "I want a how to do it approach for my new managers and I want leadership from the others."

All groups interviewed cited similar training goals and techniques of training. From these interviews a conclusion may be advanced that sound methods and approaches to train managers is sought. Both educators and industrial managers are subjected to similar techniques in classes, seminars, or other training sessions. While there is information dissemination skills provided there is also that type of training provided which could allow the middle managers to develop skills related to handling problems on a here and now basis.

All middle managers and program directors from industry and education were of the opinion they worked together to determine what is in the program and whether it will remain. They also agreed that both groups evaluated together to make these decisions.
Three program directors in industry noted that managers, at all levels, attend management training programs.

Program directors in education spoke of programs for others. Inclusion of the superintendent took place on a basis of his availability, interest, or coincidence. Coincidence here is defined as being part of a group where there happens to be a meeting or in-service.

Overall, superintendents did not avail themselves of "in-service programs." No presidents of industrial organizations were interviewed to be able to determine if the same thing would be true of their participation. Organizational structure is different and criticism of the superintendent should not be implied. However, the superintendent is more visible in a small organization and his inaction is noted more readily.

One implication is that the superintendent, unlike a top level manager in industry, has knowledge of the field. He cannot be excused from attendance because the meeting topic is not his specialty. The participation of the superintendent may insure that future programs would contain concepts valuable to both the manager and the organization. His input and evaluation would be valuable. He should be viewed as the leadership person in the district. Middle managers could identify with his leadership. For example, if the management training centered about decision making, he could be looked to as a decision maker. His participation in the teaching learning process may be valuable.

There was virtually no difference in the types of responses
from industry and education when reasons for working together were
given. Basically, mutual trust and confidence were built when coopera-
tion took place. Those interviewed expressed responsibility to the
organization and to themselves to do a good job. Middle managers
expressed an interest in "policy making" when this cooperation took
place.

The process by which directors and middle managers worked together
to determine content of the programs and whether content will remain
and the related evaluation did not vary in the groups involved in this
study. According to nine program directors in industry and seven
program directors in education the process was formal. Middle managers
in education and industry did not vary greatly in this appraisal.
Eleven middle managers in education and six middle managers in industry
viewed the process as formal. The formal process was defined by both
groups as a face to face meeting or written communication in which
content was described or in which recommendations were made. Program
directors in education usually placed evaluation on the agenda.

The use of formal or informal could be questioned. What was
implied could not always be proven since written evaluations were not
available. Greater documentation would have assisted the formal
versus informal definition.

Examination of this documentation could have provided criteria
upon which program decisions were made. This documentation may have
also provided a basis for change resulting in program spin-off or
approach variations. Documentation may have provided a basis to illustrate which factors are involved in value no value judgment.

The realistic outcomes or false expectations of programs resulting from correlation of efforts of program directors and middle managers may have provided insight into program evolution.

One program director in industry was of the opinion, "Push away, keep them on their own and force them to make their own decisions." This attitude was not a general one of any group. There could be many reasons for this attitude. Some may be leadership style, anger, frustrations or reflection of an attitude found more often in industry than in education. It would be difficult to determine reasons based on data available.

While industrial oriented people spoke of loyalty, decision making, problem solving at a management level, or ability to handle problems and need to request assistance if necessary, educators spoke of active participation, group decisions, hands on activity and talking it over.

The vocabulary to describe differences was evident. This difference, in part, may stem from dissimilarity in training, background, and problems faced. In education there appeared to be greater personal knowledge of the people directly involved in a given situation. Industry reflected from a variety of different management areas and problems. The size of the organization led to more impersonal observation and reflection. However, industrial middle managers knew personnel in their immediate area.
The response to description of changes to provide for continual effectiveness of components for manager training was disappointing. Generally, the answer was, "the same as usual", or "no change at this time," or "our system works good as it is."

Program directors in industry did on three occasions note that job reviews, job descriptions, or review by the vice president (in this case - training officer) will take place. Middle managers were not aware of changes to provide for continual effectiveness of components for manager training.

Program directors in education saw greater participation by total staff and greater participation of the administrative group to determine direction. One middle manager in education viewed the change to provide continued effectiveness as, "reading more critically." In education middle managers were not aware of a change in process to provide continual effectiveness of components for manager training.

Section Summary

Overall, there was more agreement than disagreement among the groups involved in the study. The components of concern to each group were similar. Significant difference was between middle managers in industry and program directors in education in the component areas of management contribution and optimizing job performance. The most essential components were leader behavior, individual and group behavior, individual and group behavior and communication.

Labor relations was more critical to both groups in education than to both groups in industry.
Both groups of middle managers viewed inclusions of leading components in the management development programs to provide for growth, additional knowledge, or for review of that which he already knew.

Middle managers in industry appeared to be more independent in their responses to problems. Middle managers in education viewed their responses to problems in terms of a group. There appeared to be a closer middle manager role relationship with the program director, in most cases at the superintendency level. While they take independent action they can receive support from the "top" as a back up.

The groups involved in the study saw inclusion of certain components in their management training as helpful in teaching that knowledge which would be essential to the manager's growth. All groups looked for additional, fresh ideas to make them more productive. There was little to support the idea that the organization is capable of assisting the manager, or of providing organizational resources to the middle manager to carry out specific tasks. All groups viewed the process to determine or evaluate course content to be a formal process.

Investigation of Components Critical To The Satisfactory Performance of The Middle Manager

To the question, "To what extent do you agree this component is critical to the satisfactory performance of the middle manager in your field?" there were significant differences. These were in the areas of Management Contributions, Management's Social and Legal Responsibility, and Optimizing Job Performance. In two cases the
middle managers in industry did not agree with the program director in education. In the other case, Management's Social and Legal Responsibility, the middle managers in industry and education did not agree. (See Tables Fifty-nine, Sixty, Sixty-one, pages 161, 162, 163, Chapter Four).

Overall agreement by the four groups involved in the study were greatest in the areas of support systems, leader behavior, individual and group behavior and communication. (See Tables Twenty-four, Twenty-nine, Thirty-four and Thirty-nine, pages 119, 125, 131, 137, Chapter Four).

With one minor exception, this agreement was evidenced in the interviews. The exception was that seven middle managers in education discussed the fact that labor relations is a critical component to their satisfactory performance. Comments relative to labor relations also were pertinent to optimizing job performance.

There is a correlation between focus point C and D of the survey instrument in that communication, leader behavior, and individual and group behavior were considered critical to both satisfactory performance of the middle manager and as components necessary in a total management development program.

One component, managements social and legal responsibility, was considered by both groups in education to be more critical to the satisfactory performance of the middle manager than it was by either reporting group in industry.
Results from the survey instrument and interviews would indicate that both groups in education are more aware of social change and its ramifications than are both groups in industry.

It may be possible that educators are more directly affected by reverberations of forces such as racial polarization, group pressures, social issues, student and parent unrest or those many other things which bring issues caused by social change directly into the educational unit.

This is not to say industry is not influenced by these same social forces. Davis\textsuperscript{144} summarizes arguments for and against industry pursuing social responsibilities. Arguments against are: conflict with the profit goal of business, prohibitive costs of social involvement, lack of skills to solve social problems, weakening of economics productivity, lack of broad support, lack of accountability of management in social areas and the fact that business already has enough social power. The arguments for are: long-range self interest and viability of business, avoidance of government regulations, stockholder interest, resources to solve problems are at the business level, strengthening of public image and assumption of social responsibility can be profitable.

The managerial level of involvement does not appear to be at the individual middle management level. Middle managers are affected by

what Davis notes, but their involvement, based on the interview process is minimal. Industrial management concerns were not registered in the survey. Based on these two things concern was not evidenced.

Four middle managers in industry related that what is critical is defined by the superior or by the "boss". What is critical is also that which is appropriate for career advancement.

Five middle managers in education identified the superintendent or district office personnel as being instrumental in deciding what areas could be considered critical. No middle managers in education reflected that career advancement was associated with management in-service training.

Based on interview results as reported in the sections: Investigations of Components Considered Essential To A Total Management Development Program and Ranking Of Competencies Found In Management Development Programs the concept of extensive involvement of the program director or immediate superior is again evident. The drawbacks noted previously would continue to hold true.

With only one exception by an industrial middle manager, all interviewed noted that a variety of exposures to different methods and concepts were provided in the management development programs.

Those types of exposures which were stated in the interview correspond to the results appearing in the survey instrument. All groups mentioned management meetings, speakers and/or consultants,
problem solving, gaming, and/or simulation techniques as presented in the district or industry. (See Tables Sixty-three and Sixty-four, pages 165 through 168, Chapter Four).

There was agreement between the groups interviewed that teaching exposures most effective and the degree of carry over to actual job experience was similar.

Exception to this was that five industrial middle managers viewed on-the-job training as being effective. The middle managers in education were not as direct in their wording. Two definitely hinted at this with statements such as "just getting in there and doing the job was important to me. It taught me a lot," or "I learned I didn't know everything once I got the principalship."

One exposure mentioned in three interviews of middle managers in education was visitation to other buildings or districts. There was no equivalent response from those in industry. Here, the uniqueness of the organization determined this response. Industrial inter and/or intra visitation is a reality.

Other exposures noted in the interviews were: case studies, small group discussions, course work, decision making techniques, speakers, films and seminars.

The carry-over was seen by middle managers in both industry and education to be most effective when "something practical" was taught. Educational middle managers related that the carry-over was
great when they were "face to face" with teachers and they felt they could solve the problem at hand. Two program administrators in industry related to the "personal approach" as a way to solve problems. Middle managers in industry did not respond in such a way as to indicate that their concerns were that personal. Their effectiveness was seen in terms of problem solving. They did mention people, but direct feelings were not perceived. For example, one middle manager in industry related how he could help "his sales force solve problems."

Results from the interview and the questionnaire indicated that a wide variety of instructional approaches have been used in management training programs. All groups were exposed to similar techniques. All middle managers were searching for a results in the form of practical approaches, or experience that could be transferred to the job. No one interviewed noted that no matter what exposure is provided, exposure itself cannot substitute for a well designed management training program. It was difficult for any of the groups interviewed to identify which exposure was most effective is supported by Goldstein who identifies numerous studies alluding to the difficulty of determining which method was most effective in training personnel.

Defining satisfactory performance was seen by all interviewed as a joint process with the person considered the superior as the final authority.

Those in education saw the definition and review process in a less formal manner than did those in industry. In nine interviews, those in industry suggested formal evaluation to determine satisfactory performance.

In five interviews, program directors in education said that people other than middle managers participated in management development programs. Usually these were support staff at the district office level. On one occasion the "outstanding teachers were selected because they could profit from the experience." Both middle managers and program directors in education reflected the concept that there was a need for direct contact with others in the system.

Middle managers and program directors in industry did not note others, except upper levels of management, participating in management training programs. They indicated in their discussion that there were definite career line and responsibility requirements prior to being accepted into management development programs. It was noted that "levels as far down as foreman should be considered." This may suggest more formal programs and participation requirements. It could also suggest that the organizational design and size influenced responses. If teachers could be equated with foreman or if upper levels of management in industry could be equated with district office personnel, the differences of responses may be semantic. The career line or level of responsibility was not directly noted by either group in education as being a factor affecting attendance.
Industry, more than education, in the interview process suggested defined goals of the organization and degrees of progress be specified for those who attend management training programs. This suggests, again, the more formal approach to management development found in industry vs. that found in education. On five occasions industry noted that the personnel directors influenced attendance at management development programs. Six people from industry at the middle management level suggested this and/or the fact that their immediate supervisor made participation recommendations.

Neither industry nor education suggested a written policy as a guideline that would be part of the process of choosing selected men for participation in management development programs.

Both program directors and middle managers in education suggested general guidelines such as, "all are eligible," or "they can do their own thing as long as needs are met."

Each of the people interviewed did mention that placement in some program of management development could take place as a result of evaluation of them as managers or as a result of evaluation of their work.

Section Summary

There was general agreement as to what components could be considered critical to the satisfactory performance of the middle managers in industry and education.

There was significant difference between middle managers in
industry and program directors in education in the areas of management
collection and optimizing job performance. Middle managers in
industry and education in the area of managements social and legal
responsibility.

There was agreement by all four groups in the area of support
systems, leader behavior, individual and group behavior and com-
munication. Labor relations remained critical to the middle manager
in education.

Those components that are usually considered critical is a
decision made by a specific person. This person was the one who set
the goals or expectations for the person and/or organization. To this
end program directors set organizational consistency as a pattern to
be followed.

The influence of the program directors over the program was
evident and corresponded to similar involvement noted in other sec-
tions of this study.

Both educational groups interviewed related a need for knowledge
of how to get things accomplished. The knowledge focused about
problem solving techniques such as: approaches to scheduling; facts
about budgeting methods and procedures; how to improve appearance of
grounds or how to handle specific tasks such as procedures to discuss
personnel. All groups stated an interest in a variety of methods or
approaches to management development training.

Middle managers in both groups indicated an interest to learn
on the job. To what extent on the job training was reality orientational is only conjecture. Managers do not recognize the need to know what people are saying, to understand trends or movements, and to make judgments based upon interpretation of what is happening around them.

Based on the responses to the questionnaire (see Tables 63 and 64, pp. 165-168, Chapter IV) and upon the interview all groups related they observed value in other preparation outside of actual management development programs found at the organizational level. These programs may or may not fall under the umbrella of management development programs.

There was a greater managerial emphasis when determining who participates in the management development programs in industry than that found in education. This may be related to commitment to the organization, the tradition of industrial management and that of developing a dual role such as engineer and manager. A more formal approach was evident in industry than in education when determining who was to participate in management development programs.

Determination of Extent Middle Managers Are Involved In Identification of Areas of Content To Be Included In Management Development Programs

To the question, "To what extent do you agree the middle manager in your field is included in the identification of areas of content that will be included in your organization's management development program in this area?", there were six significant differences.
These were in the area of **Management Contribution**, **Management Social and Legal Responsibilities**, **Business Economics**, **Leader Behavior**, **Optimizing Job Performance**, and **Labor Relations**.

The middle manager in industry did not agree with any of the other three groups in the area of management contribution. Middle managers in industry and education did not agree in the area of management's social and legal responsibility. Middle managers in industry did not agree with program directors in education in the areas of business economics and leader behavior. Middle managers in industry did not agree with program directors in industry or education in the area of Optimizing Job Performance. Middle managers in industry disagreed with program directors and middle managers in education in the area of Labor Relations. Program directors in industry and middle managers in education also did not agree in this area. (See Tables Fifty-nine, Sixty and Sixty-one, pages 161, 162, 163, Chapter IV).

Overall agreement of the four groups involving this study were in the areas of: **Support Systems**, **Individual and Group Behavior**, **Communication and Management Science**. (See Tables 25, 35, 40, 45, pages 120, 132, 138 and 144, Chapter IV).

The results of the interview process, with some exceptions that will be noted, did not confirm the existence of disagreement or discord among the four groups involved in the study.

Reasons for this failure to confirm disagreement or discord may
include: an anonymous survey that could produce different results than face to face contact; time spent with person interviewed was not adequate to gain trust or confidence relative to data usage; loyalty to organization may have prevented the revealing of more precise data; or that incorrect questions were asked to further probe for insights.

The data offered in this section is similar to that previously presented. There were some vague responses that may suggest other implications. One implication suggests a side issue middle managers in both groups desire greater participation in the identification of areas of content that would be included in management development programs. This participation could lead to another problem. As participation is achieved program directors and middle managers may have more conflicting viewpoints to resolve. The middle manager in industry reflected conflict in the survey instrument because he did not feel as greatly involved as did the educational middle managers.

With three exceptions of middle managers in industry, all those interviewed noted there is identification of content areas to be included in the management development programs and that this identification is a joint function of program administrators and middle managers.

One middle manager from industry noted, "There can be our needs and those of others. We seem to be left out!" In further conversation he suggested that he and his immediate superior did not see "eye to eye on company issues." Two other industrial middle
managers indicated there was a process, but decisions were left to others. "Their department got some items through the paperwork, but not many...."

Koontz and O'Donnell state that planning helps the manager shape the future. Planning prevents the manager from reacting to immediate crisis. Involvement of the middle manager would commit both the organization and the middle manager to a plan of action that he would be part of from the very beginning.

The process used by both industry and education to identify needs were similar. Three program directors and two middle managers in industry indicated there were organizational goals to be met. These same people also stated that regional offices or their equivalence were instructed to set their own goals. Feedback came from department heads and were transmitted to management in what would be considered the home offices. Two superintendents alluded to goals of the district. Their data gathering process was very informal. The superintendents put forth efforts to develop general district goals.

Middle managers and program directors in education considered summer brainstorming, personal conferences, administrative type meetings, suggestions from principals in memo form to be a process.

Managers in industry suggested that "manager reviews" contain

---

goals. Follow-up meetings at staff levels or at personal levels suggested, at times, training possibilities.

Both groups, education and industry, said that superiors suggest training needs.

Middle managers in education suggested that most materials and methods to be included in the management development program. Two program directors in industry stated specific materials and methods which middle managers could utilize. Middle managers in industry only made general remarks such as, "Yes, we can suggest speakers," or "We can recommend someone we know of to speak." In the full context of the interviews, their response was not seen as positive. One implication is that while the process of involvement of middle managers in both groups is similar the process of involvement in education was less structured. The size of the organization, perceived the relationship middle managers in education have with the superintendent, the informal nature of the involvement process and familiarity with materials and techniques could suggest reasons why the process in education is less structured.

The program directors do have a responsibility for planning. In this context the involvement of the middle manager is decreased. What middle managers do is based upon the thinking and planning of higher level managers. The middle manager is more concerned with day to day operations while the program directors are involved in broader planning and organizational goal setting.
Program directors in industry had the most positive response to utilization of outside people or personnel. Five program directors in industry indicated outside personnel were brought in, and two others indicated that money/time was no object.

Program directors in industry made reference to annual reviews and suggested a formal evaluation procedure. When asked if this took a written form and/or format the answer was "yes." No evidence of forms or format were given.

Five program directors in education used outside people and agencies. The difference in the interviews indicated variations in amounts of of money spent; time; distance traveled; and program location. Program directors in education used the most available people, usually co-op personnel university people, or "experts" in the fields of law, curriculum or other fields of interest. Both groups in education considered conventions as in-service, as they did administrative meetings. Middle managers in education were limited in the amount of time available during the year to attend meetings or other types of programs considered by them to be part of their management development program.

One program director in industry stated, "We get the best there is in the field, if there is anyone better we will get him." Two program directors indicated they had specific programs "on the boards" and will present them to the management soon. One of these program directors also indicated his company had access to a specific geo-
graphic location where in-service development could take place.

Middle managers indicated on two occasions they were limited by their specialty, but that they did attend management development courses in their area of expertise.

The results of the interviews with all groups did indicate a desire to bring competent management consultations into the management development programs. Their knowledge, experience, and viewpoints were portrayed as being an asset to help middle managers deal with problems.

Because of money and staff available, industry could select industrial consultants from a wider variety of places. Industry had greater flexibility of program availability to the middle managers.

Individuals who are brought into industry and education management development programs offer their assistance to the group by helping evaluate the outcomes of the programs.

A majority of those in all groups interviewed indicated informal and/or personal comments were made or heard concerning a person's worth to the group in the in-service situation.

Other more formal evaluations took place similar to those evaluation methods and techniques found in the evaluation of the management development program.

Interview did not yield the same responses as the survey instrument in the area of evaluation of the in-service program (see Tables Sixty-three and Sixty-four, pages 165 through 168, Chapter Four). The
interview process indicated an evaluation process. The program
directors in both groups were again responsible for identification and
evaluation of content of the management development programs.

No documentation was offered to illustrate a formal evaluation
process. The evaluation of the programs was discussed. Changes that
took place as a result of the program were not discussed.

No one person interviewed indicated that they have not been
exposed to some form of outside assistance as a means of management
development.

The specific person, in the final analysis, responsible for
identification of areas of content to be included in the industrial
management development programs was the program director or vice
president. The other responses included the "boss" or the "manage-
ment." In education, the superintendent or assistant superintendent
was finally responsible for the identification of areas of content to
be included in the management development programs. One middle
manager in education stated that identification of content to be
included in a management development program was a team effort. One
superintendent mentioned, "but, as you know, the board is aware of the
total program, and as such has final approval."

Eighteen members of the groups interviewed suggested practical,
realistic case study of reality materials about which content should
be organized. Members of all groups combined these reality materials
with conceptual material. Two program directors in education and two
program directors in industry suggested content to be organized about need. Skill building materials were noted by three middle managers in education and industry as that about which content areas should be built.

Three middle managers in industry did include, as part of their commentary, that it was generally difficult to be motivated by upper management. Program directors were seen as conservative and "slow but steady" movers. They were seen as people who were "less committed to program of education than they should be." It may be possible that because of size of the district, personal contact with the superintendent or because of perceived involvement, middle managers in education did not describe their superintendents or program directors in this way.

The middle managers were viewed as being motivated because they perceived themselves to be part of a team. The availability of the superintendent or the more relaxed summer atmosphere, at what ideas are shared, was viewed as a motivating factor. The educational middle managers involved, felt a level of acceptance or perceived management development in terms of future benefits.

Section Summary

The tone of the response of the interview was not the same as the response of the survey instrument. The interview process did not reveal this disagreement. The variations in the interview process were noted. These could indicate middle management dissatisfaction in
the industrial group. Educational middle managers generally were of the opinion they were more involved in the overall management development program.

There were six areas of significant difference. Middle managers in industry did not agree with the other three groups in the area of management contribution. Middle managers in industry and education did not agree in the area of management's social and legal responsibilities. Middle managers in industry and program directors in education did not agree in the areas of business economics and leader behavior. Middle managers in industry and program directors in industry did not agree in the area of optimizing job performance. Middle managers in industry and both groups in education did not agree in the area of labor relations. The areas of agreement were support systems, individual and group behavior, communication and management science.

Middle managers in industry seemed to be a small part of a large organization. This was not so in education where districts, by comparison were small and involvement and personal contact was easier. However, some superintendents were firm direction setters and worked skillfully with the principals in making them feel part of the total process.

Goal setting and evaluation took on a more formal if not meaningful stance in industry than in education. One impression was that results in performance were expected at the industrial area that were not expected
at the educational level. Identification of areas of content to be included in management development programs was seen as a joint function between middle managers and program directors.

The process to identify needs was similar. Educators had a more informal process of identification of needs.

Industry was less restricted than education in selection of speakers, availability of money and the selection of sites to hold programs. Outside resource people were available to both industry and education to help evaluate programs.

Educators at the program director level and at the middle management level loosely defined the area of management development. At times, through the interview process, the impression was that if anything was done it may be considered management development. For example, administrator's meetings were viewed as management development. Based on interviews this did not appear to be true in the industrial sector.

All those interviewed could identify those responsible for program development. There were different perceptions of the program directors by the middle managers in industry and education.

Determination of Extent Management Development Programs Meet the Needs of the Middle Manager

To the question, "To what extent do you agree that management development programs in your organization meet priority needs of middle managers in this area?", there were seven significant differences. These were in all areas except Support Systems, Individual and Group Behavior and Communication.
The middle manager in industry did not agree with any of the other three groups in the areas of Optimizing Job Performance and Labor Relations. The middle manager in industry did not agree with the program director or middle manager in education in the areas of business economics and leader behavior. The middle manager in education did not agree with the middle manager in education in the areas of management contribution or management’s social and legal responsibilities. The middle manager in industry and the program director in industry did not agree in the area of management science.

Overall agreement of all groups were in the area of Support Systems, Individual and Group Behavior and Communication. (See Tables Fifty-nine, Sixty and Sixty-one, pages 161, 162, 163, Chapter IV).

The results of the interview process again, with some exceptions, did not confirm existence of disagreement or discord among the four groups involved in the study. Reasons previously noted apparently may be valid in this portion of the study.

Middle managers in education and three middle managers in industry stated that their superiors perceived and/or identified the needs of the middle manager. It was upon these needs that many of the programs were built.

A program director in industry on one occasion concurred that they identify needs of the middle manager. However, other responses from program directors indicated other resources could be utilized to determine needs about which programs could be built. For example, program directors
mentioned personnel department cooperation, personnel jackets availability, set programs, face to face meetings whose purpose is to review performance and formal evaluation as basis upon which programs can be established.

Program directors in education perceived a cooperative effort with middle managers could assist in needs. This cooperative effort occurred at meetings where "needs are brought out." Program directors in education, on two occasions, said that in-service is "happening all the time." End of year evaluations, availability of course work and proximity to universities were means by which priority needs could be identified and met. Face to face meetings were identified by five program directors in education as a method to determine priority needs. These meetings were less formal. For example, one superintendent mentioned that, "he hears things from the community.... he then calls in the principal.... if there is a need it can be identified."

Program directors assumed the responsibility to identify priority needs of middle managers in both industry and education. The program directors in education were less formal in the manner in which they identified needs. The program director in education could, from the interview, relate better to his middle manager since he was in direct contact with them. The industrial program director may have had others between him and the middle manager, a factor, which could affect the identification process.

Manager behavior was seen to be a priority need by two program directors in education. Not one person from industry noted behavior as a
specific need. Four principals noted leadership and group behavior as personal individual needs.

There was a difference of responses to the question, "To what extent does the identification of priority needs determine if a person is to take part in a program?"

Program directors in both groups were of the opinion that what they observed as needs were dealt with in some manner. This did include management development programs. In the interview process three program directors from industry and five program directors from education included face-to-face evaluations as a form of "manager development." Industry "face-to-face" was more formal than that of education.

Middle managers in education on all but two interviews suggested that by the end of the year they had "an idea" of where they are weak or where improvement could take place.

One industrial middle manager said he had no choice in what in-service program he was to take part.

Middle managers in all groups indicated that they received direction or insight from their superiors. A most interesting factor presented in the interview was the reaction of the program director. Not only did these program directors assume responsibility for identification of needs they also assumed that personal contact to point out weaknesses and strengths was a form of management development.

All those interviewed indicated evaluation takes place to determine if priority needs of the middle manager are being met. There was general
consensus as to type of evaluation that occurs. All program directors in education indicate informal evaluations take place at one time or another during the year. Five middle managers in education indicated the same idea. A conflict was perceived at this point. These same people interviewed mentioned that some evaluations were written, some were formal and some were face-to-face. One assumption may be that, in education, there is no clear cut manner of evaluation.

Industry had more definite responses. Three middle managers and five program directors noted: goal setting, formal interview and/or evaluation and evaluation based on performance. Two program directors indicated that on-going informal evaluations took place throughout the year.

When asked about evaluation a middle manager in education noted that, "it is up to the superintendent".

All people interviewed in education and industry indicated in some way that success on the job is the way in which the organization determines if the priority needs of the manager are being met. Program directors or superiors in both industry and education were instrumental in determining if priority needs were being met. Interviews indicated a direct process, a process that would involve the middle manager.

It was also the opinion of those interviewed that identification of priority needs is a definite part of the overall management development program. Consensus was that without identification of needs there would be no management development programs.

The most often identified priority needs of those involved in the study were:
Middle Managers in Industry

1. Communication
2. Leadership
3. Motivation of people

Program Directors in Industry

1. Communication
2. Leadership
3. Management skills

Program Directors in Education

1. Communication
2. Leadership
3. Group dynamics

Middle Managers in Education

1. Leadership
2. Communication
3. Problem solving abilities

All middle managers in education related their choices in some way to staff development, curriculum problems, evaluation, group dynamics, and the general area of concern as to how to solve problems that arise in the building.

By contrast middle managers in industry related to motivational skills, job needs of various types, and the reasons why communication or leadership is valuable to the manager.

Both middle management groups need job skills to handle problems. The industrial middle manager reflected a need to improve and to be a better manager. This management orientation that was not apparent in the middle manager in education. One conclusion that may be drawn is that industrial managers perceived a need to improve and/or to be successful.
This perception did not appear as strongly in middle management in education.

The two processes that all groups interviewed mentioned as a method by which a priority need becomes part of the management development program were goal setting and detailed evaluation of managers.

In all groups interviewed goals were set both individually and collectively by the group. Two middle managers in industry saw their superiors as the final authority who determines when priority needs become part of the management development programs. Middle managers in education had a tendency to say "we set goals..." indicating they were a definite part of this group process. Yet, there was dependence as noted in the interview process.

With the exception of two middle managers in industry, there was a general acceptance that awareness of goals was made evident through agenda items, staff announcements, listing in evaluations, and checking evaluations to determine if goals were accomplished. Recommendation for any future action were part of this evaluation process.

Section Summary

Priority needs are determined in a variety of ways. While there are similarities between industry and education, there is more money, time and personnel available to industry that are not available to education to determine priorities and programs. Industry is more formal in its approach to identification, participation and evaluation of priorities.
When all questions were considered by the four groups involved in the study, the greatest agreement was between:

1. Program directors in industry and education.
2. Program directors in industry and middle managers in education.
3. Program directors and middle managers in education.

The middle manager disagreed more often with the other groups in this study. The greatest disagreement was between middle managers in industry and education. Middle managers in industry disagreed with the other three groups in the areas of optimizing job performance and labor relations. Middle managers in industry disagreed with both groups in education in the areas of business economics and leader behavior. Middle managers in education and industry disagreed in the areas of management contribution and management's social and legal responsibilities. Program directors and middle managers in industry did not agree in the area of management science. This disagreement was not evident in the interview process. (See Table Fifty-eight, page 160, Chapter IV).

Another example of this is illustrated in Table Fifty-nine, page 161, Chapter IV, where the breakdown is in each area of questions.

One assumption may be that greater independence of thought of the industrial middle manager is based on self perception or type of skills involved in job or training. The middle manager in education considers himself to be more involved in decision making than does the middle manager in industry. From this study the size of the organization may foster or encourages dependence upon, in this study, the program director. Through the interview process it was observed that there was greater responsibility
and more formal evaluation of the industrial middle manager. This may foster less dependence.

This degree of independence is also observed as middle managers and program directors in industry agree only one time in all questions in this portion of this study. (See Table Fifty-nine, page 161, Chapter IV). There is corresponding disagreement of middle managers in industry with program directors and middle managers in education. This pattern is evident throughout the study.

Significant disagreement was found most often in this section. (See Table Sixty, page 162, Chapter Four).

Program directors in both groups influenced how needs are identified, who takes part in the program, evaluation of extent priority needs are met, methods of evaluation and process by which identified needs become part of the program. There could be a variety of methods and/or tools to help determine middle management needs.

The identification and evaluation process was more formal in industry than in education.

CONCLUSION

As a result of collection and analysis of data, the following conclusions could be made:

1. There was lack of programs, interest and comment in the area of management's social and legal responsibilities. This awareness is critical considering the climate of the times.
2. There was a general agreement among all groups in the ranking of components critical to a total management development program.

3. There was a definite lack of materials available that describe program content or identify contents of programs.

4. Middle managers in industry are more independent in their thoughts, actions and responsibility to accomplish job goals than those middle managers in education. The reasons, at this point, are not clearly identified.

5. There was general agreement as to what components were considered essential to a total management development program.

6. Components in the study were viewed as helpful to those managers wishing knowledge that would enable them to do a more adequate job.

7. Middle managers in education do not see management development programs as career oriented as do middle managers in industry.

8. Management development programs are, according to those groups participating in this study, for management people.

9. Industry is more goal oriented than education in the area of management development programs.

10. All groups involved in the study saw the value of additional knowledge both to them as people and to improving their job capability.

11. Evaluation was more formal in industry than in education.

12. The extent middle managers are involved in identification of areas of content and the extent middle management programs meet needs of the middle managers were two areas of greatest disagreement.
13. Middle managers in industry gave lower overall ranking in all categories than did any other group involved in the study.

14. Middle managers and program directors in education have closer relationship than do those groups in industry. Those middle managers in education are more dependent upon their program directors than those in industry.

15. There are greater amounts of money for management development at the industrial level than at the educational level.

**IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY**

This study did support the concept that there are similar components that are included in management development programs in both industry and education. There was a uniformity of ranking of these components by those involved in this study.

There are, within the components, different levels of skills and/or knowledge. These levels are related to the specific diverse tasks of the middle manager. Specifically, industry has managers in areas from engineering through personnel. Educational middle managers' diversity relate to educational tasks from curriculum through community relations.

There is a lack of precision in the definition of management development in each area. Even though there is this lack of precision there is also a broadly acceptable range of competencies that make up the management development program in industry and education. It could be argued that middle managers may benefit from similar courses. It could also be argued
that both those in industry and education may make contributions to inter-
organizational management development programs.

There is a definite need to improve management development programs
through more adequate assessment and identification of needs, understanding
of involvement and more thorough evaluation of personnel and programs.

The role of the program director, while significant and critical,
should be re-evaluated to allow for greater middle manager input.

Better definition of the management development program, definition
of general areas of competencies, ability to interchange personnel for
Teaching purposes, and more adequate planning may allow those who plan or
participate in a management development program to do so on more than an
intuitive basis.

A concern of these same people may be to determine how adequately the
programs, as they exist, train the middle manager. It is not clear, as a
result of this study, who should take part in identified areas of manage-
ment development programs. Program directors, middle managers or organiza-
tion philosophy may decide who participates in programs. It is also
possible that levels of managerial training could be developed based upon
such factors as: orientation, organizational goals, assessed needs of
middle managers or personal needs assessment.

If there are a limited number of top management positions available,
then program directors may consider the importance of a management training
program which will develop personal and professional needs of middle
managers. This type program incorporating these noted needs may provide a
dual purpose. Its purpose may be a pool to replenish leadership; and to meet specific needs of middle managers.

It is essential that individual units within each group, industry and education, review their management development program to determine if it meets the need and goals of their organization and/or middle managers. Programs should reflect changes in society and technology.

RECOMMENDATIONS

As a result of this study the following recommendations are suggested for further inquiry for those interested in the area of comparison of middle management programs in industry and education. These recommendations are:

1. Use the study, but limit the study to people-oriented groups in industry, such as banking or insurance.

2. Select specific industrial and educational organizations and compare and contrast specific scope and/or content of one or more components found in this study.

3. Determine which specific skills, concepts or attitudes are being developed in educational management development programs in education or industry.

4. Review and analyze in depth all written materials that relate to management development programs in education or industry.

5. Develop a study which would analyze attitudes and background of those in education to determine if there is an industrial or business orientation.
6. Survey extent select universities share course content and/or instructors in the area of educational administration and industrial management.

7. Survey a school district to determine needs of the middle managers. Formulate a model program.

8. Develop a model and/or make recommendations after surveying instruments and procedures of pre-post test participation in management development programs.
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APPENDIX A
Dear Sir:

Your assistance in completing this survey instrument will be greatly appreciated. This should take no more than five minutes of your time. It is part of a doctoral study being completed at Loyola University, Chicago.

This study will include responses from both those responsible for the administration of management development programs and selected middle managers in your organization. It is further requested that one of the two enclosed survey instruments be given to a middle manager in your organization. To facilitate a random sample it is requested that this middle manager's name begin with the letter "A" or that letter which is closest to the letter "A". If more than one person at the middle management level whom you would select to respond has a last name beginning with the selected letter, please select that person who has been with your organization for the longest number of years.

Briefly, the purpose of the paper will be to determine identification and investigation of components of management development programs and the ranking of those components investigated.

I thank you in advance for your consideration and time. Your help is appreciated.

Respectfully,

Charles H. Hayes
SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Name of Organization: _______________________________________________________

Title/name of person filling out questionnaire: ___________________________________

Directions: Attached is a questionnaire containing ten areas in which management development programs occur. You are asked to: (1) Rank all ten in the order that they are considered critical to a total management development program. The most critical area would receive a one (1) while the least critical area would receive a ten (10).

(2) Check yes or no to the question, "Is this area now part of your total management development program?"

(3) Respond to each question listed under each component by circling one response to indicate extent of agreement. The responses to choose from include: SA - Strongly Agree; A - Agree; N - Neither agree nor disagree; D - Disagree; SD - Strongly Disagree.

(4) Include any supporting data which would be considered course content, policy, description or other written information to describe program(s).

(5) Check those areas which best describe and are true of your management development program.

Thank you for your assistance. It is greatly appreciated. Please return all data in the addressed, stamped envelope to:

Charles H. Hayes
P. O. Box 90
Orland Park, IL 60462
MANAGEMENT CONTRIBUTION - That administrative development which would allow middle management to understand what management does in the areas of planning, organizing, controlling, coordinating, staffing, and motivating.

1. To what extent do you agree this component should be considered essential to a total management development program in your field?

SA A N D SD

2. To what extent do you agree this component is critical to the satisfactory performance of the middle manager in your field?

SA A N D SD

3. To what extent do you agree the middle manager in your field is included in the identification of areas of content that will be included in your organization's management development program in this area?

SA A N D SD

4. To what extent do you agree that management development programs in your organization meet priority needs of middle managers in this area?

SA A N D SD

5. Is this area now part of your total management development program?

Yes___ No___

MANAGEMENT'S SOCIAL AND LEGAL RESPONSIBILITIES - That administrative development which would allow middle management to understand contribution and power of government, interest groups and other segments outside of the organization.

1. To what extent do you agree this component should be considered essential to a total management development program in your field?

SA A N D SD

2. To what extent do you agree this component is critical to the satisfactory performance of the middle manager in your field?

SA A N D SD

3. To what extent do you agree the middle manager in your field is included in the identification of areas of content that will be included in your organization's management development program in this area?

SA A N D SD
4. To what extent do you agree that management development programs in your organization meet priority needs of middle managers in this area?

SA A N D SD

5. Is this area now part of your total management development program?

Yes No

BUSINESS ECONOMICS - That administrative development which would allow middle management to understand basic economic issues facing the organization and the impact of local, state and federal monies on the budget and the general economic outlook of the organization.

1. To what extent do you agree this component should be considered essential to a total management development program in your field?

SA A N D SD

2. To what extent do you agree this component is critical to the satisfactory performance of the middle manager in your field?

SA A N D SD

3. To what extent do you agree the middle manager in your field is included in the identification of areas of content that will be included in your organization's management development program in this area?

SA A N D SD

4. To what extent do you agree that management development programs in your organization meet priority needs of middle managers in this area?

SA A N D SD

5. Is this area now part of your total management development program?

Yes No

SUPPORT SYSTEMS - That administrative development which could allow middle management to understand and explain: organization, philosophy, appraisal system, compensation system, development system, policies.

1. To what extent do you agree this component should be considered essential to a total management development program in your field?

SA A N D SD

2. To what extent do you agree this component is critical to the satisfactory performance of the middle manager in your field?

SA A N D SD
3. To what extent do you agree the middle manager in your field is included in the identification of areas of content that will be included in your organization's management development program in this area?

SA A M D SD

4. To what extent do you agree that management development programs in your organization meet priority needs of middle managers in this area?

SA A M D SD

5. Is this area now part of your total management development program?

Yes  No

LEADER BEHAVIOR - That administrative development which could allow middle management to be familiar with leadership assumptions and their implications for work productivity.

1. To what extent do you agree this component should be considered essential to a total management development program in your field?

SA A M D SD

2. To what extent do you agree this component is critical to the satisfactory performance of the middle manager in your field?

SA A M D SD

3. To what extent do you agree the middle manager in your field is included in the identification of areas of content that will be included in your organization's management development program in this area?

SA A M D SD

4. To what extent do you agree that management development programs in your organization meet priority needs of middle managers in this area?

SA A M D SD

5. Is this area now part of your total management development program?

Yes  No

INDIVIDUAL AND GROUP BEHAVIOR - That administrative development which could allow middle management to understand the meaning of personality, behavior and human needs as they relate to motivation, job performance, conflict, group formation and impact upon organization,
strategies, change and performance.

1. To what extent do you agree this component should be considered essential to a total management development program in your field?

   SA  A  N  D  SD

2. To what extent do you agree this component is critical to the satisfactory performance of the middle manager in your field?

   SA  A  N  D  SD

3. To what extent do you agree the middle manager in your field is included in the identification of areas of content that will be included in your organization's management development program in this area?

   SA  A  N  D  SD

4. To what extent do you agree that management development programs in your organization meet priority needs of middle managers in this area?

   SA  A  N  D  SD

5. Is this area now part of your total management development program?

   Yes  No

COMMUNICATION - That administrative development which could allow middle management to understand the significance of communication and the leader's role in the communication process.

RANK ORDER

1. To what extent do you agree this component should be considered essential to a total management development program in your field?

   SA  A  N  D  SD

2. To what extent do you agree this component is critical to the satisfactory performance of the middle manager in your field?

   SA  A  N  D  SD

3. To what extent do you agree the middle manager in your field is included in the identification of areas of content that will be included in your organization's management development program in this area?

   SA  A  N  D  SD

4. To what extent do you agree that management development programs in your organization meet priority needs of middle managers in this area?

   SA  A  N  D  SD
Is this area now part of your total management development program?

Yes  No

MANAGEMENT SCIENCE - That administrative development which could allow middle management to best use new management systems such as data processing, information systems, problem solving techniques and how they are applied to problem-solving/decision-making, planning, and coordination.

To what extent do you agree this component should be considered essential to a total management development program in your field?

SA  A  N  D  SD

To what extent do you agree this component is critical to the satisfactory performance of the middle manager in your field?

SA  A  N  D  SD

To what extent do you agree the middle manager in your field is included in the identification of areas of content that will be included in your organization's management development program in this area?

SA  A  N  D  SD

To what extent do you agree that management development programs in your organization meet priority needs of middle managers in this area?

SA  A  N  D  SD

Is this area now part of your total management development program?

Yes  No

OPTIMIZING JOB PERFORMANCE - That administrative development which could allow middle management to understand and develop fundamental concepts of job description and effective methods for communicating performance expectations.

1. To what extent do you agree this component should be considered essential to a total management development program in your field?

SA  A  N  D  SD

2. To what extent do you agree this component is critical to the satisfactory performance of the middle manager in your field?

SA  A  N  D  SD
1. To what extent do you agree the middle manager in your field is included in the identification of areas of content that will be included in your organization's management development program in this area?

SA  A  N  D  SD

2. To what extent do you agree that management development programs in your organization meet priority needs of middle managers in this area?

SA  A  N  D  SD

3. Is this area now part of your total management development program?

Yes___  No___

LABOR RELATIONS - That administrative development which could allow middle management to understand the organization's involvement and philosophy in the area of law, role, rights, procedural matters and future trends.

RANK ORDER

4. To what extent do you agree this component should be considered essential to a total management development program in your field?

SA  A  N  D  SD

5. To what extent do you agree this component is critical to the satisfactory performance of the middle manager in your field?

SA  A  N  D  SD

6. To what extent do you agree the middle manager in your field is included in the identification of areas of content that will be included in your organization's management development program in this area?

SA  A  N  D  SD

7. To what extent do you agree that management development programs in your organization meet priority needs of middle managers in this area?

SA  A  N  D  SD

8. Is this area now part of your total management development program?

Yes___  No___
your assistance is also requested in completing the following:

1. Please check each area that best describes your management development program.
   
   ___ A. A joint function between your organization and a related professional organization.
   
   ___ B. A joint function between your organization and a university or college.
   
   ___ C. A joint function between your organization and a consultant.
   
   ___ D. A joint function between your organization and a related organization.
   
   ___ E. A joint function between your organization and a state or federal agency.
   
   ___ F. An in-house function.
   
   ___ G. Field experience or internship.
   
   ___ H. Independent or small group study.
   
   ___ I. Special assignment/special projects.
   
   ___ J. Job rotation.
   
   ___ K. Management meetings.
   
   ___ L. Individualized programs.
   
   ___ M. Other.

2. Please check the following statements if they are true of your organization's management development program.
   
   ___ A. The management development program is realistically planned because it is geared to the organization's present situation and future needs.
   
   ___ B. The management development program has the full cooperation of top management.
   
   ___ C. Our management development program is distinct from other training programs.
   
   ___ D. The management development program instills the overall management viewpoint in its managers.
E. The management development program broadens the managers for their own jobs as well as for their future advancement.

F. The results of the management development program are appraised realistically and regularly.

G. The management development program is a continuing one.

Comment:
APPENDIX B
Focus Point D - Investigation of components critical to the satisfactory performance of middle managers.

9. What criteria do you use to rate components necessary for satisfactory performance?

10. Which is the most critical component a manager must possess to perform satisfactorily in the management field?

11. Is there a process by which the components necessary for satisfactory performance are identified?

Focus Point E - Determination of extent middle managers are involved in identification of areas of content to be included in management development programs.

12. Is there a process by which management development programs are developed?

13. If yes, in what way is the middle manager involved?

14. What parts of your current management development program have been suggested by middle managers?

Focus Point F - Determination of extent management development programs meet the needs of the middle manager.

15. In what way is the management development program designed to meet priority needs of the middle manager?

16. In what ways are the priority needs of the middle manager identified?

17. In what way is the effectiveness of the management development program evaluated?
APPENDIX C

IN-DEPTH INTERVIEW

Focus Point A - Identification and description of management development programs.

Question 1. Are policy guidelines written and available to middle managers in your organization?

A. If yes, are the policies subject to revision?

B. If yes, how often is this done?

C. By whom or by what process is this revision completed?

D. If not, should policy guidelines be written? What form should this process take?

2. Are policies generally flexible enough to provide for all training needs?

3. Could you describe how the management development program in your organization evolved?

4. Could you describe the direction your company is going in relationship to any future growth/expansion of the management development program?

5. For what reasons, if any, is your management development program successful?

Focus Point B - Ranking of competencies found in management development programs.

6. What factors enter into your consideration when ranking competencies found in your program?

7. Do program administrators or middle managers participate in any process of ranking competencies found in the management development program?
a. Yes____ No____
b. Who?
c. How often?
d. How is this done?
e. If no, should there be?

8. How many middle managers take part in the top ranked component management development program?
   a. What percentage of the total number of managers eligible for participation in this?
   b. Will this number/percentage be an increase over last year? Over next year?

9. How many years has this top ranked component been part of your management development program?

10. Did this top ranked component always have top ranking?
    a. If not, what did it replace?
    b. Why was it replaced?

Focus Point C - Investigation of components considered essential to a total management development program.

11. Which component or components are most essential to a total management development program?

12. By inclusion of these components, what dimension is added to the program that would be most beneficial to the middle manager?

13. Which major concepts are included in these components that, in your opinion, are to be considered essential to the education/training of the middle manager?

14. Do middle managers and program administrators ever correlate their efforts to determine if components remain and will continue to be considered essential to the total management development program?
   a. Yes____ No____
b. How or by what process is this accomplished?

15. Could you describe some of the most recent changes made by your organization to provide continual effectiveness of these components for manager training?

Focus Point D - Investigation of components critical to the satisfactory performance of middle managers.

16. Participation in what part of the management development program is most essential for the satisfactory performance of the middle manager in your organization?

17. Which factors are most critical to a manager's satisfactory performance?

18. Are a variety of exposures to different methods and concepts provided in the Management Development Program?

   Yes _____ No _____

   If yes,

   a. What type of exposures are considered most effective?

   b. Could you describe the carryover from training to actual job experience?

19. Is "satisfactory performance" defined by the: Program Administrator _____ Middle Manager _____ Organization Policy _____ Joint effort of _________ Other _____

20. Do personnel other than middle manager participate in the Management Training Program?

   a. Yes _____ No _____

   b. For what reasons?

21. By what process are men chosen for participation in the Management Development Program?
Focus Point E - Determination of extent middle managers are involved in identification of areas of content to be included in management development programs.

22. Is the identification of content areas to be included in the management development program a joint function between the program administrators and the middle managers?
   a. Yes ___ No ___
   b. If yes, what is the process used to involve the middle manager?
   c. If no, should it be?
   d. Do middle managers suggest materials/methods to be included in the management development program?

23. Are outside agencies/personnel brought in to assist in the identification of areas of content to be included in the management development program?
   a. Yes ___ No ___
   b. If yes, what is the source of this assistance? In what ways is their assistance valuable? By what process is this assistance evaluated?
   c. If no, should outside assistance be sought?

24. In a final analysis, is a specific person responsible for identification of areas of content to be included in the management development program?
   a. Yes ___ No ___
   b. If yes, what is this person's title? Is his job description defined in written form?
   c. If no, should it be?

25. Are the identified areas of content organized about:
   a. Practical, realistic case study or reality materials?
   b. Conceptual theory oriented materials?
   c. Other?
Focus Point F - Determination of extent management development programs meet the needs of the middle manager.

26. Could you describe how the priority needs of the middle managers are identified.

27. To what extent does the identification of priority needs determine if a person is to take part in the program?

28. To determine if priority needs of the middle manager are being met:
   a. Is there a pre and post evaluation?
   b. What form does this take?
   c. If not, should there be? What form would you suggest?
   d. What is, in your opinion, the most successful way in which your organization determines if priority needs are being met?

29. Is the identification of priority needs of the middle manager a definite part of the overall management development program?

30. What is the most often identified priority need of the middle manager:
   a. As identified by the middle manager.
   b. As identified by the program administrator.

31. By what process does a priority need become part of the management development program?
Dr. Joseph A. Sarthory
Associate Director
National Academy for School Executives

Dear Dr. Sarthory:

Enclosed are five copies of the survey instrument and interview sheets to be used in my doctoral study. Your help in selecting four men in education, plus yourself, to act as a jury is appreciated.

This study will encompass private industries and public elementary school districts. Responses to the survey and interviews will be from both those defined to be middle managers and training directors in these various sectors.

As noted, I would appreciate some basic information on jury members so that it may be included in the paper.

Briefly, the purpose of the paper is to determine identification and investigation of components of management development programs and the ranking of those components investigated.

Thank you for your help.

Cordially,

[Signature]

Charles H. Hayes

[Handwritten signature]
APPENDIX E
April 6, 1977

MEMORANDUM

TO: Chad Chase, Betty Dillon, Ivan Fitzwater, Bruce McKay, and Jim Zaharis

FROM: Joe Sarthovery

SUBJECT: Help!

The enclosed letter from Charles Hays and instrument should be self-explanatory. Essentially Charles is doing a dissertation in the area of management development programs and asked me to solicit input from some people in school districts around the country who are doing exciting things in this area. I would sincerely appreciate it if you would complete and return the instrument at your earliest convenience to Charles. The return address, you will note, is on the bottom of the first page.

Thanks much for your help.

JAS:lg
APPENDIX E
American Association of
School Administrators
National Academy for
School Executives
1201 16th Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

Gentlemen:

I am formulating a doctoral dissertation proposal to complete studies at Loyola University, Chicago, Illinois. To accomplish this end, I am requesting your cooperation. First, would you forward information regarding the background and organization of the National Academy of School Executives. Second, would it be possible, through some kind of statement, to help me determine similarities of organization and procedures of the National Academy for School Executives and that type of organization known as the Assessment Center which is used in industry.

As I feel further correspondence or phone calls will be necessary for me to pursue this topic, please indicate that person with whom I might be in contact.

Your cooperation is deeply appreciated.

Very truly yours,

Charles E. Hayes
July 30, 1975

Mr. Charles H. Hayes  
P.O. Box 90  
Orland Park, Illinois  60462

Dear Mr. Hayes:

In response to your letter of July 9 I am forwarding, under separate cover, some information descriptive of the background and organization of the National Academy for School Executives. I hope that information will help you complete your doctoral studies.

Relative to the question of the similarity of NASE to an assessment center, there is none. As I understand an assessment center, it is an emerging organizational structure which attempts to access the potential of organizational members for administrative or management positions. NASE does not do this but rather provides inservice training for people who are already in management positions.

I hope this information is useful to you. If I can be of any further assistance, please contact me at your convenience.

Regards,

Joseph A. Sarthoff  
Associate Director

Enclosure

JAS/hlb
Mr. V. John Bentz  
Director  
Psychological Research and Services  
National Personnel Department  
Sears Roebuck & Co.  
233 South Wacker Drive  
Chicago, Illinois

Dear Mr. Bentz:

Thank you for the time given to me August 1, 1975. As mentioned before, I will be in contact with you on some more specific items on or about the first part of September.

Since I talked with you I have been in contact with Dr. Sarthory of the National Academy of School Executives. He has respectfully requested that you send him copies of the material you gave me since the National Academy is planning some future evaluations and innovations. Dr. Sarthory's address is:

American Association of  
School Administrators  
National Academy for School Executives  
1201 16th Street, N.W.  
Washington, D. C. 20036

I look forward to being in contact with you and spelling out the details of my doctoral dissertation. Your cooperation and, I must say, very pleasant manner enabled me to take one more step toward the completion of this project.

Sincerely,

Charles H. Hayes

Charles H. Hayes
Mr. John P. Carter
Department Operations Manager
Sears Roebuck & Co.
233 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois

Dear Mr. Carter:

Thank you very much for the time given to me on August 1. The effort you made to put me in contact with Mr. Bentz is greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,

Charles E. Hayes

CHH/b
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Dr. Max A. Bailey
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Administration and Supervision
School of Education, Loyola

Dr. Jasper J. Valenti
Associate Dean and Professor
School of Education, Loyola

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval by the Committee with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education.
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