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Abstract

Public sector organizations continue to be resistant to change. Previous studies regarding work satisfaction (a subject about which this study offers new data) revealed a certain amount of toxicity in organizational life. We propose some methods for reorganizing centralized organizations in which human resources structures are divided between the deciding players and the ones carrying out the tasks; between the executive management level and operational level. The autocratic, bureaucratic and compulsive type of leadership that does not succeed in adopting and making the correct models of Webber’s rational-legal system more efficient characterizes public sector management in Romania. The methodology results contain some approaches regarding the inadequate reduction of the rapport of power within the organizations: an insignificant union life in which the rights of the employee are inadequately defended and in which decentralization, the transfer of power, and participative management are just a desiderate. The public sector also needs solutions for the resolution of conflicts which are accentuated by the inadequate motivation of the employees, neglecting the management’s motivational/mobilizing purpose. Ultimately the hands-off leadership type, without an affective implication on behalf of the public sector’s managers must be replaced with a hands-on (in) type leadership and its associated characteristics. All these realities are occurring in a period of significant change in our organizations and our communities. The need for focused leadership is critical and challenging for all. As we examine our current environment and look to the future, we must develop specific approaches and strategies that will enable the program to grow and to be sustainable. Most importantly, we must keep the focus on the consumers we serve and the staff and the stakeholders who are integral to our continued viability. Now is the time when our rehabilitated organizations need bold leaders who are able to shape and implement a courageous vision for the future and make decisions, with full collaboration from colleagues, employees and community constituencies. The changes in our environment are substantive. Using past practices is not sufficient to address future challenges and opportunities. The vision today’s leaders must look to is the future in order to ensure a solid infrastructure and strong cadre of qualified personnel who will ensure life and vitality to the vision. The paper establishes solutions for combating resistance to change and reconsiders managing in public sector as a leadership process.
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1. Introduction

The compulsive personality quickly reaches the height of their career. Although from a management point of view such people are considered masters, they have a toxic effect upon organizations. Compulsive managers fear that they might find themselves in certain forms of dependency upon people or events. Their main preoccupation is to dominate or be in control and interpersonal relationships are interpreted in terms of domination and obedience. In areas where they are in charge, they insist that lower ranking personnel accomplish their goals without objections. Furthermore they have a sense of perfectionism, which hinders them from seeing the big picture (De Vries, 2003). They are preoccupied with details, establishing norms, regulations and procedures that will correspond to certain easy tasks. They prefer routine and are not able to stray from planned activities or from their environment; thus, they are inflexible to change. They lack creativity or spontaneity; form is more important than the essence and the need for affiliation and relating do not manifest themselves. The usual characteristics of this manner of leadership are: thoroughness, dogmatism and stubbornness. These characteristics are translated into an excessive preoccupation for the rational-legal climate for the management’s organization function and efficiency. Managing decisions is a very difficult task; important decisions are often delayed, due to the fear that actions may not be as efficient as were expected. The compulsive manager is a workaholic; the perception created is the drive “to work hard”, the devotion to, and involvement of which, leads to the neglect of interpersonal relationships.

The organizational culture created by this type of leadership is one that is resistant to change and it promotes an untrustworthy environment. In order to implement the coordinating function of management, the leader will prefer formal mechanisms of control, in favour of the people’s willingness; in other words, demand in favour of determination. The decisional process is accompanied by persuasion, beyond the limit of manipulation and suspiciousness. The leader’s preoccupation with control will limit the employees’ freedom of action, in a conflicting manner. Thus intrinsic motivations do not work; the organization is not decentralized and the human resources structure is divided between the decisional players (executive managerial level) and the labourer (operational level). The bureaucratic culture of the group is impersonal and inflexible, overrun by the preoccupation for control of operations and the external environment. This type of leader does not lead by means of guidance and determination; they lead through demands and legal or rational authority. Compulsive organizations do all they can to manage surprises and monitor in certain predictable conditions everything that happens within the organization. Bureaucrats are the ones that feel motivated in this type of organizational system whereas the autonomous person feels discouraged due to their freedom of action being confined. Whatever the management’s quality and the manifestation of influential needs, this type of leader will not delegate authority of control of the operation; thus limiting any type of participative management process. Organizational policies are not determined by objective adaptive needs; instead they are determined by the leader’s compulsiveness. The type of operation is done routinely and dominated by the interest of what is taking place within the organization. Details are carefully planned and projected, with the emphasis on being thorough, precise and conforming. Just like suspicious firms, compulsive ones tend to emphasize the function of control of management, although they present specific differences. Within the compulsive firm, control mechanisms are conceived in such a manner that they will monitor the internal aspects of the operations (productivity, costs, programming the activities and performances of the projects), whilst within the suspicious ones the control has to do with external aspects. The control mechanisms of compulsive firms include the standardization of operations and formalizing procedures and policies. Their procedures refer to actions regarding production and marketing, as well as to the dress code, meeting and employees’ attitudes.
The compulsive firms’ concentration, towards the center, is also reflected in their strategies. Compulsive companies that pride themselves in a market leader position can continue to launch new products, even when conditions do not recommend other innovations. Orienting towards the center, does not offer the compulsive type of manager a correct analysis of the market (De Vries, 2003). Variations are characteristics of the compulsive companies; leaders fluctuate from innovations to incremental lines, towards aged production lines, from a position of leader of costs towards a destructive parsimony, from the high quality line towards the total neglect regarding the quality criteria.

Management control and the change of leadership can be achieved as follows:

- Demolishing existing bureaucratic structures
- Involvement in a diversification program in related areas
- Major investments in research and development
- Motivating entrepreneurial management and strategic innovations
- Opening towards the market, quality management principles and clients’ needs
- Quantification of the comparison criteria with organizations that hold lead positions in certain operations (benchmarking).

2. The toxicity of work groups generated by inadequate motivation

Human behaviour is governed by two main systems: a reward and penalty system. Behaviour that is followed by positive results tends to thrive. In opposition to this, behaviour that is followed by negative results tends to diminish. Research in the field of neurosciences and psychology has established the biological basis of the reward system and the identification in the brain of certain nervous structures around the hypothalamus, called “the center of pleasure”. According to Patrick Legeron (Mina, 2009), in the case of animals it is well known that a rat will learn not only to press a handle, but continues to do so regularly if it gets, what psychologists call “an incentive”.

This incentive might turn into a more consistent reward, say a food reward, but it can be obtained by stimulating the rat’s electric center of pleasure as well. Once more, in animals there is a diminishing, or even suppression, of certain behaviours by employing “punishment procedures”. For example, the rat receives an electric shock every time it moves on to the other side of the cage and so it will avoid moving quickly in that direction. What is usually neglected is the fact that the rewards activate extremely intense emotions such as pleasure (with reward) and fear, aggressiveness and conflicting states (with punishment), and it determines motivation. In the field of work an increase in unpleasant consequences can be noticed; what we, in general, might call frustrations. Such frustrations, are rewarded less and less, and constitute permanent sources of organizational conflicts. Material frustrations and psychological frustrations can be distinguished because the rat feeds itself basically with “material incentives”, in other words, with pieces of meat. According to theories regarding human needs, the human being needs recognition, attention and/or affection just the same. These two aspects – material and psychological - are essential for the proper function and emotional balance of the individual and the organization. In native organizations where material motivations are inadequate, especially in the public sector, not only do they not provide human resources with emotional stability but are conflict generators as well. Material motivations can be intrinsic and/or extrinsic. Intrinsic motivation is that which commences from the direct relation between the task and worker and is usually self-applied (Johns, 2001). Extrinsic motivation is that which commences from the task’s external work environment, and is almost invariably applied by the managerial system. Material motivations (extrinsic) are obviously fundamental to human needs. Specialists consider that third millennium wages can, in most positive cases, satisfy our escalating needs. Why do people work? In great part it is to earn money. Therefore, this fact, even though it seems ordinary, confirms that today’s material needs are greater. The pressure of advertisements results in a consumer society and the ideology of ‘to have’ and ‘to be’. Everything is orchestrated in such a manner that it is not possible not to have the latest phone and the latest computer software. “There is no wage increase, and that
diminishes the enthusiasm. We are required to have more and more qualifications, to study computers, English . . . but the salary doesn’t change. It should be that the relations be different, the “I give to myself; you give me” type”. This notion emerged twenty years ago in the United States, after certain investigations were published in The Wall Street Journal, in New York. According to Patrick Legeron, this investigation was carried out on 300 CEOs of America’s largest companies and it revealed that most worked between 60 to 72 hours a week and that they were travelling for business purposes (between 6 to 10 days a month). Moreover, from their point of view, professional life and career mattered more than family life or health. These “Job fixated” individuals do not represent a unique group at the higher levels of the organizations, even though in general it is estimated that they have positions with responsibilities. In the United States it is estimated that they represent around 5% of the active population.

3. Theories regarding the human needs

In 1954, Abraham H. Maslow elaborated a theory with which he tried to explain human behaviour starting from the idea that, there are certain specific needs that differ at different moments of our lives. These needs can have five distinct levels:

- Physiological needs (hunger, thirst, rest, etc.)
- Needs regarding our security (safety, protection, etc.)
- Social needs (acceptance, belonging to a certain group, love, affection, etc.)
- The need for respect (recognition, appreciation, prestige, trust, social status, etc.)
- The need for self-reassurance (self-esteem and accomplishment)

Human behaviours are governed by two great systems: a system of reward and a system of punishment (penalty). Behaviour that is followed by positive results has a tendency to evolve while behaviour that is followed by negative results tends to diminish. An employee delivers 75% of his or her possible effort during the work process. Hygiene factors contribute in maintaining this minimal level of effort. Depending on the absence and presence of certain intrinsic/extrinsic factors, the individual will develop signs of dissatisfaction. These factors are: salary, work and work safety conditions, the type of supervision, control and general policy of the organization (Herzberg Theory).

Victor Vroom adds to the needs and motivational factors a set of approaches, behaviours and values that regard the psycho-character traits:

- Human behaviour is not determined by reality, instead it is determined by the manner in which this reality is perceived by each individual
- The rapport to is influenced by the person’s preferences, by the value he/she confers to an element from the perceived reality
- Every person has certain expectations regarding the possibility/probability that certain actions generate certain results
- Actions are instruments that should lead to results, which the person wishes they would be rewarded with
- Expectation or expectance - E- refers to the evaluation by the employee regarding the possibility of achieving the desired performance through work- the subjective probability that a certain act will generate a certain result and is expressed by the act-result rapport.
- Instrumentality-I-The individual expects that the performance will lead to the desired rewards. If the act is not rewarded, the individual will be discouraged. Instrumentality is expressed by the result-result type relation.
- Feature – F- Affective orientation towards a result (a certain preference) represents the positive or negative value conferred by the employee to the varied results of his work. These preferences can be
external such as salary, promotion, awards, or internal, such as pride in succeeding, accepting responsibilities and interest in the task. If the affective orientation has positive values, work motivation can be positive; if the orientation has negative values, we will have a negative motivation, of avoidance.

In addition people have expectations as follows:

- Regarding the reward of the performances
- Reward should be granted appropriately and according to effort
- Rewarding in comparison to the reward of other people – where a comparison term exists (the theory of relativity).

*The inputs represent* the traits that confer the person’s individuality: age, level of education, professional experience, talent, effort and productivity.

*The results represent* the rewards received by the people during the inputs’ exchange: extrinsic rewards—material, benefits or intrinsic rewards—prestige, social recognition. Every individual compares on one hand, the level of inputs and the achieved results, and on the other hand one’s own rewards with those of other people or colleagues with the same position doing equal work in different companies. From these comparisons the degree of the person’s satisfaction or perception of equity/inequity results. If the input surpasses the result, the person will have a lower degree of satisfaction and will tend to diminish the inequity, by exhibiting a less significant effort, requesting the renegotiating of the salary or leaving the work place.

If the result surpasses the input, the employee works better, is motivated and wishes to maintain the level of expectation.

Change is one of the most important aspects of our lives. After the economic crises in 2007 consumers became more hesitant making financial decisions, there was increased public scrutiny of financial decisions, unemployment ran at the highest level for the last 40 years and the loss of personal income and savings, reduced trust of corporate and government leaders. According to Farlane, Schroeder, Enriquez and Dew (2011), “Most states are struggling with significant deficits in their budgets and government is incurring significant deficits resulting in funding reduction across more programs”. Stresses and changes are realities of our society, including organizations and employees across all the sectors of workforce. From the new recruit to the most senior member of staff, from the operational human resources to the seasoned executive, everyone is part of the stress generated by implementing change in organizations. For many of these changes, literature has limited knowledge about the cases and the responses to them, the strategies needed to negotiate a response and, in many instances, they lack historical experience on which to base managerial decisions. Hood (2011), describes the current budget imbalances that many states are facing as a “nightmare for governors and legislators that will therefore not end when the effects of the recession do”. The inability of formal leaders to make timely and strategic decisions often increases the negative consequences of these decisions and changes.

Now is the time when our rehabilitation organizations need bold leaders who are able to shape and implement a courageous vision for the future and make decisions, with full collaboration from colleagues, employees and community constituencies. The changes in our environment are substantive. Using past practices is not sufficient to address the future challenges and opportunities. The vision for today’s leader must look to the future and ensure a solid infrastructure and strong cadre of qualified personnel who will ensure life and vitality to the vision”. (Heifetz, Grashow & Linsky, 2009).

4. The methodology of research. The purpose and objectives of the research

Based on the aforementioned objectives, starting from the fundamental theory and the results of the qualitative analysis, the present research suggests the following objectives:

- Identifying the employees’ perception of the union leaders
- Evaluation and investigation of the union leader’s ability and methods of negotiation, in order to assure the proper objectives of representation regarding the employees’ interests, and not those of influence or manipulation, and the use of collective interests in achieving their personal objectives.
Based on these objectives, this study suggests the practical certification of the manner of support for the following research hypotheses:

- Union leaders are negatively perceived by the group, whose interests they represent, resulting in a tendency of rejection
- Leadership style is characterized by an orientation towards individual values, in opposition to the orientation towards the task or the group
- The ability to negotiate is dominated by manipulative tendencies for personal interest, the attitude of the union leaders being characterized by its orientation towards Machiavellism and social influence

The research was based on two main axis:

- The manner of employees’ perception of union leaders
- Investigating the personality traits and attitudes of the union leaders, mainly manipulative

Hypotheses and research’s design are:

**Axis I: The manner of employees’ perception of union leaders**

The first path of investigation requires the use of the collective approval index, in order to verify the manner in which union leaders are perceived by the whole group that it represents, and also to identify the elements that lead to their rejection. The index’s administration was carried out using the following creed, adapted after Warner Burke’s original. In the present study, participants were instructed to:

- Think of all the union leaders whom you have collaborated with, in different circumstances – negotiations, representing your interests, private discussions, professional or extra-professional activities. Then, in your own mind, try to identify a certain union leader. It is not necessary to tell us or write down his/her name. For every characteristic from the table below, try to grade how you would describe them with numbers from 1 to 8. The significance of number 1 or 8 is given at the end of every description. We ask that you should work as fast as you can and try not to think about it for too long. Provide the answer that comes up immediately in your mind, because that is the best one.

The items of the scale were chosen as follows:

- **Pleasant** 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 **Unpleasant**
- **Friendly** 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 **Unfriendly**
- **Rejected** 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 **Accepted**
- **Tense** 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 **Relaxed**
- **Distant** 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 **Intimate**
- **Unsociable** 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 **Caring**
- **Athlete/Cooperative** 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 **Hostile**
- **Boring** 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 **Interesting**
- **Harmonious** 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 **Inharmonious**
- **Somber** 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 **Sociable**
- **Open** 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 **Cautious**
- **Disloyal** 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 **Loyal**
- **Trustworthy** 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 **Untrustworthy**
- **Presentable** 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 **Unacceptable**
- **Antipathetic** 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 **Sympathetic**
- **Affable** 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 **Disagreeable**
- **Liar** 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 **Honest**
- **Complaisant** 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 **Repulsive**

The results have been arranged as rough scores, the high scores indicate an attitude of acceptance of the leader, while the lower scores represent an attitude of rejection.
Axis II: Investigating the union leaders’ personality traits and behaviors

The second direction of the research requires the investigation of the union leaders with the help of certain instruments that take into consideration the following:

- Leadership style
- The ability to manage conflicts
- The ability to negotiate, with regard to protecting the interests of the employees, their proper representation, to and not to influence/manipulate

**Inventorying the leadership style**

The questionnaire was devised by Warner Burke (Agabrian, 2007) and its purpose is to identify leadership style, in other words it is oriented towards people or tasks. The questionnaire contains 35 items (descriptions of the actions of the leaders) to which the subject can answer, having at his/her disposal 5 choices: “always”, “frequently”, occasionally”, “sometimes” and “never”. A few examples of items from the questionnaire are mentioned below:

- “Encourage working overtime”
- “Allow your subordinates to find personal solutions to the problems”
- “Speak out on behalf of the whole group”
- “Work hard for individual promotion”

**The ability to manage conflicts**

It is a 15 items instrument, adapted after Thomas-Kilmann and regards the management style of conflict through competition, collaboration, compromise, avoidance and adjustment.

The subjects are asked to think about the manner in which they react to daily conflicting situations, and then, to identify to what extent the 15 statements correspond, on a scale of 4 steps: “frequently agree”, “usually agree”, “usually do not agree”, “frequently do not agree”. A few examples of these items in the questionnaire are:

- “I’m trying to attain my position”
- “I’m trying to find a proper combination between gain and loss for everybody”
- “I try to not adopt a role that might generate controversies”

**The negotiation ability evaluation test (P. Pojaud & G. Gatier), frequently used in demonstrating the manipulation resources**

The test confronts the subjects with an ensemble of social situations, which represent the meeting of a client, who at first refuses to buy a product, and a sales agent whose purpose is to sell that certain product or service. These situations determine, on behalf of the salesman, different reactions (answers) and its analysis allows us to evaluate the adapting mode. The test was conceived from the necessity of work that was felt in the present day world in order for everyone to adopt commercial attitudes (even a technician from a project office must be able to sell producers their ideas or projects). The test pursues the knowledge of adapting abilities to the surroundings, in certain situations of the seller-buyer relationship and monitoring the capability of influence or manipulation. The information received by ones that have communication approaches, which are less adapted to the situation, regarding the evaluation level of undertaking the role of a salesman, can be used in order to distinguish among the subjects’ methods/styles of communication that might be considered compatible with the requirements of a commercial occupation. This distinction does not however, constitute the only conclusiveness of the test, as we will see. Current civilization emphasizes the ability to negotiate, which requires the understanding of the other’s point of view. The ability to negotiate becomes, in a broader sense, the corner stone of succeeding in adapting and promoting the individual in the industrial structures. The test lays out 28 situations, representing two players exchanging replies. The players are stylitze: their faces have no expression, in order not to induce, from the start, answers in a certain direction. The reply of one of the players is shown in a box and the subject’s task is to imagine the other player’s answer and to write it down in the empty left box. The 28 situations can be regrouped in 5 categories, according to the dominant subject:
Category I: The buyer’s refusal to communicate. The refusal to communicate might be caused by weariness or lack of time. The buyer adopts the attitude of someone that does not engage in dialogue. Items that are part of this category: 1, 4, 6, 10, 14, 17, 18, and 19.

Category II: The buyer’s assessment of the product, producer or the salesman. The reply of the buyer regards the quality of the product or questions the need for that product. Items that are part of this category: 2, 5, 8, 9, 12, 25, 26, and 27.

Category III: The buyer’s reference on the product, by comparing it to the competition’s product. The buyer’s speech focuses on comparing the product with the competition’s product, in unfavorable or pejorative terms regarding the product the salesman suggested. Items that are part of this category: 3, 7, 13, 20, and 24.

Category IV: The buyer’s disapproval regarding the price. Seldom are the sales or negotiating situations in which the buyer’s objections do not exist, either as an essential point, or as a final argument addressed to the salesman. Items that are part of this category: 21, 23, and 28.

Category V: Direct confrontation. Displeased or annoyed, the buyer addresses the salesman in a more or less aggressive manner. Items in this category are: 11, 15, and 22.

The test was individually applied, without a time limit; its application was between 20-30 minutes, based on the following principle: “In every image from this notebook you will find 2 players that are ready to talk. One player’s reply is known. Imagine what the other player from the image will answer and write down the first answer that comes to mind, in the free space. Carry on without hesitating too much!”

The subjects’ answers can be grouped in the following types (categories):

Attitudes in which ASCENDENCY is dominant (Noted: A)

The answers that indicate this type of attitude can have a different adaptive value. Starting from answers that channel a manifested opposition towards the interviewer, and which are justified by the situation in which the salesman wants to avoid their immediate removal from the interaction, it can move to aggressive answers that lead to blocking the interaction.

The attitudes with a dominant ascendancy reflects the salesman’s difficulties tolerating the frustrations determined by the interlocutor, but will only be considered totally inadequate if they lead to blocking the interaction.

The distinction is made among the categories regarding attitudes with a dominant ascendancy as follows:

✓ Answers that affirm the authority of the salesman without presenting any justification
✓ Answers that doubt the reply of the interlocutor in a manner that is more or less direct or polite
✓ Answers that dictate the conduit that the interlocutor should adopt
✓ Answers that encompass the denigration of the competition or its product
✓ Ironic answers, by making fun of someone or something, the behaviour being contrary to the expectations. The irony is part of the aggressive attitudes’ category, contrary to humour which has an adaptive positive value.

5. Conclusions

Changes in public sector leadership mean that there is a need to shift from a hands-off type of management leadership to some hands-on proceedings. Leaders must be clear in their beliefs and values, responsive to the expectations of the staff and consumers they serve, and relentlessly committed to enabling each person to make a difference so that resistance is swept down. One of this study’s objectives was to demonstrate the inadequate attenuation of the power’s rapport within the organizations: an unrepresentative union life, in which the rights of the employee are inadequately defended, in which decentralization, the transfer of power and the participative management is just wishful thinking.

There are fundamental differences between these two characteristics: hands-off and hands-in. Promoting the autocratic type, in combination with the bureaucratic compulsive type, determines a major gap between the
executive managerial level and the operational one. Inadequate union activity is also responsible for the centralism within organizations and the toxic influence it has on change.

These are the conclusions of a study regarding the Romanian union leader’s perception (Mina, 2013). In order to identify the social perception of union leaders, we have conducted 80 unstructured interviews with the employees, at different levels and in certain areas (Mina, 2009). The recorded interviews have been subjected to scrupulous content analysis that, due to the frequency of certain words, have resulted in the emergence of 5 dominant subjects. The predominant subject is that of political involvement, expressed by phrases such as: “He/she like being with the ones in power….”, “He/she carries out whatever the party tells them to”, “he/she negotiated on their own terms (the ones in power)”, and “He/she is persuaded by the ones in power….”, etc.

The conflicting attitudes in the group relationships represent the second important subject, manifested by phrases such as: “He/she talks nonsense/badly…”, “They treat us in a condescending manner…”, “They think they are better than us…”, and “He/she is autocratic”, etc.

Union leaders are also perceived as being weak negotiators, manifested by phrases such as: “He doesn’t know how to fight for our interests…”, “He doesn’t know how to communicate to the management…”, and “He can barely speak, and when he does, the director does it for him…”, etc.

Another important subject regards personal interest, therefore the interviewed people use expressions such as: “He’s changed three cars since he’s become union leader….”, “He is only interested in money…”, “He knows how to address the problem only if there is something in it for him…..”, and “He is interested only for his personal gain, the collective objectives being the last thing on his mind…”, etc.

We can also notice that inadequate relations with mass media are characteristic of union leaders. The most frequent expressions that lead to this subject are: “He is afraid of making any statements…”, “He would probably run if the TV reporters were to drop by…”, “He is ethically compromised, he is afraid of articles from the press…..”, and “He is a weak relationist, who organizes inadequate press conferences”, etc.

The informational basis of the content analysis (Chelcea, 2001) has been constituted by the 80 protocols, the research group being formed by 48 men (60%) and 32 women (40%):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent%</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With regards to the active period within the institution, the interviewed subjects have an average of 9.26 years, a median of 10 years and a standard deviation of 3.09 years. The most frequent category is that of 11 years, active period of employees being between 4 and 14 years.

Based on the median value (Schermheron, 2002), we can appreciate that the subjects with less than 10 years are considered relatively new subjects within the institution, and the ones that have over 10 years are considered older.

Regarding the seniority level, we can appreciate that, out of the 80 interviewed subjects, 53 people (66.3%) hold executive level positions and 27 (33.8%) hold headship positions.

This relative imbalance is explained by the number of headship positions in comparison to the executor positions, within the organizational ensemble.

After indentifying the subjects, we have proceeded to the codification of presence or absence of one of the five subjects, for every investigated subject. The presence of the subject was noted with a value of “1”, whereas the absence has a value of “0”.

A number of 53 interviewees (66.3%) have mentioned, in their protocols, the fact that the union leaders are weak negotiators, whereas 27 people (33.8%) were not present at this subject.

The “personal interest” subject has been identified in the case of 50 subjects (62.5%), whereas 30 subjects (37.5%) have not revealed this subject in their answers.
60 people (75%) identified political co-involvement as a subject whereas 20 subjects (25%) have not perceived this subject about the union leaders.

48 people (60%) perceived union leaders as having inadequate relations with mass media whereas 32 subjects (40%) did not point out this aspect in their interview. 55 people (68%) identified conflicting aspects among group relations, whereas 25 people (31.3%) did not notice this type of conflicting relations. In identifying the predominant subjects, we have used the non-parametric statistical test of difference $X^2$ between the observed frequency of appearance of an event and the theoretical frequency, when it is presumed the equal presence of the categories. Identifying the significant subjects with the help of the significant difference test, among the frequencies. As can be noticed in the table, the main observed subject is political co-interest, an important subject, identified significantly by the interviewed subjects ($x^2=20.00; \ p<0.01$). Furthermore, union leaders are significantly perceived as being conflicted with regard to their group relations ($x^2=5.00; \ p<0.05$). The subject of inadequate relations with mass media, although important, cannot be considered significant. The difference in perception of union leaders by the senior hired personnel (greater than 10 years) in comparison with the latter hired personnel (lower than 10 years) has been studied with the help of the significant difference test among the ranks U Mann-Whithey (Schermerhon, Hunt & Osborn, 2007). The meaning of the significant difference among the senior personnel and the latter could be explained:

A general tendency of negative increase can be observed, in the sense of the present subject, of a number of 3 subjects: the individual interest ($Z=-2.66; \ p<0.01$), the inadequate capacity for negotiation ($Z=-2.12; \ p<0.05$) and the inadequate relation with the mass media ($Z=-2.11; \ p<0.05$). Within this context, the senior personnel have the tendency to significantly point out the presence of these subjects in comparison to the latter, younger personnel (lower than 10 years).
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