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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Background for the Study

One of the most pressing strategic issues facing the United States and its youth-serving organizations today is how to best facilitate the development of our youth. The future of the nation, and the future of world civilization, will soon rest in the hands of today's young people.

To become productive and contributing individuals who can be effective and proactive in determining the course of tomorrow's world, today's youth must develop positive leadership knowledge, skills, and attitudes. Continued progress and development in all sectors of society including business and industry, government, families, research and education, health and safety, religion, and so forth requires such leadership. How to best prepare today's young people for their roles as tomorrow's leaders is a challenge we all face.

The importance of this issue is widely understood and accepted. As Mackett and Steele (1982) pointed out, the variety of forces and trends in all sectors of society make it essential for leaders to be prepared to anticipate and manage the future. Gardner (1984) further noted that the nation must be moved towards ever-higher standards of achievement in education and
public life in order to maintain and strengthen ourselves as a civilization. Peters and Austin (1985) presented similar arguments not only for leaders in education and government, but for those in the business world as well. Although Naisbitt (1982) discounted the value of leadership development in terms of its "traditional" connotation of the education of a "chosen few" within hierarchies, he vividly illustrated the importance of the development of individuals who can succeed in a rapidly-changing world.

Because of the social nature of humankind, leaders are essential. Rather than living life as isolated individuals, humans interact with others in groups, work and play cooperatively and competitively with others, and in short, function as parts of much larger wholes throughout their lives. Leadership and leaders are an important part of facilitating these human interaction processes. Various kinds of leaders provide focus in group processes, inspire and motivate people towards action, induce compliance to make possible larger and more important efforts, provide influence and persuasion, facilitate compromise, do the things necessary to facilitate progress, use power, serve as instruments of goal achievement, initiate and help maintain the structures within which we operate, and so forth. If such leadership is not provided, the progress of humankind and our ability to survive as a civilization will be in jeopardy. Clearly, our young people must develop leadership knowledge, attitudes, skills, and aspirations for the progress and development of society to continue.
As Richardson (1984) noted, considerable effort has gone into the development of leadership training programs for adults who have already assumed formal leadership roles, and a number of these programs have been administered to adolescents as well. Further, numerous youth-serving groups and organizations conduct leadership development programs with the goal of facilitating the development of knowledge, attitudes, skills, and aspirations related to leadership. For example, Campfire, church youth groups, Farm Bureau, 4-H, Future Farmers of America, Future Homemakers of America, Grange, schools, Scouts, YMCA, YWCA, and many other organizations conduct leadership development programs for teenage clientele who are at a life stage at which they are developmentally able to succeed in such programs.

Of concern to those who work through such organizations has been the fact that although many youth serving groups conduct leadership development programs and provide a variety of learning experiences for teenagers, little research has been done to identify which kinds of experiences are most important for youth to develop life-long leadership abilities. Of the several hundred formal and informal experiences suggested in the literature for the facilitation of such development, only a few appear to be grounded in a solid research base which indicates whether they do in fact consistently enable youth to become leaders. Further, little research appears to have been done with established leaders to determine whether commonalities exist in their experiences as
teenagers, or in the recommendations they might make for enabling today's adolescents to develop leadership.

Such research is needed to strengthen leadership development programs. Therefore, this research project was designed to help meet this need. As a result of this research project, commonalities were discovered in the backgrounds and experiences of current leaders in the United States, as well as in the recommendations they made for leadership development experiences for teenagers. These commonalities can provide a basis for developing more effective youth leadership programs.

Problem Statement

The purpose of this study was to determine what experiences established leaders in the United States identify as being most important for the development of leadership by teenagers. Thus, the major research question to be answered was: What leadership development experiences are identified by established leaders as most important for leadership development by adolescents? Supporting research questions were

(a) What, if any, commonalities exist among the backgrounds and adolescent experiences of these established leaders?, and

(b) Is there a relationship between the leaders' backgrounds and demographic factors such as sector in which leadership is exercised, gender, marital status, age, family background, education, religion, and their recommendations?
Specific objectives explored in this study included:

**Objective I**

To identify experiences recommended and identified by established leaders in the United States as important for the development of leadership by adolescents.

**Objective II**

To identify backgrounds and experiences of these leaders which may have contributed to their leadership development.

**Objective III**

To discern whether there are relationships between the recommendations of these leaders and such factors as sector in which leadership was exercised, personal leadership definition, self-perceptions of leadership, personal leadership strengths and weaknesses, personal leadership development experiences, gender, marital status, age, education, religion, and family background.

**Objective IV**

To discover what, if any, similarities existed between the recommendations these leaders identified as important for today's teenagers in the development of leadership, and the actual experiences and backgrounds of the leaders themselves.

**Assumptions**

It was assumed for the purposes of this study that the concept of leadership held by the respondents and their own life experiences would provide an adequate basis to support their recommendations.
Definition of Terms

Leadership - a broad concept related to the knowledge, attitudes, skills, and aspirations utilized by one person in influencing, motivating, inspiring, and otherwise causing actions and reactions by others. (Rather than limiting the focus of this research to leadership as defined by a particular scholar, or to a particular perspective, it was the intent of the researcher to incorporate and accept a variety of viewpoints in a broad definition which included and synthesized the diverse opinions and theories held by those involved.)

Leadership development experiences - any learning experiences or background gained by an individual which facilitate the development of leadership.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

It is necessary to address such issues as what leadership is, characteristics of leaders, and how leadership is believed to be developed to provide background for identifying the kinds of experiences which are most important for the development of leadership by teenagers. In addition, methodologies used in related research must be studied to ascertain the most appropriate approach for such identification. Various authors have provided supporting theory and rationale, relevant opinions, and research with which these issues can be approached.

What Leadership Is

As Burns (1978) pointed out, leadership is one of the most observed and least understood of all phenomena. This point was recently re-emphasized by Sheive and Schoenheit (1987) who characterized the study of leadership as an examination of the elusive. Although many have developed theories related to leadership, the concept has yet to be explained adequately enough to be applicable in every environment, culture, situation, and setting. While some scholars have argued the merits of one definition of leadership, others have presented equally well-documented cases to support opposing viewpoints. Even those theorists who conceptualize leadership in frameworks of
types and styles of leadership have not reached consensus on an all-encompassing system which takes into account the varied perspectives from which they view the concept.

**Definitions of Leadership**

Bass and Stogdill (1981) outlined a scheme of classification built on the similarities between the many definitions of leadership advanced by scholars since the turn of the century. This scheme included the following categories of definitions:

(a) leadership as a focus of group process  
(b) leadership as personality and its effects  
(c) leadership as the art of inducing compliance  
(d) leadership as the exercise of influence  
(e) leadership as a group of acts or behaviors  
(f) leadership as a form of persuasion  
(g) leadership as a power relationship  
(h) leadership as an instrument of goal achievement  
(i) leadership as an effect of interaction  
(j) leadership as a differentiated role  
(k) leadership as the initiation and maintenance of structure.

**Leadership as a Focus of Group Process.**

According to the definitions of one group of scholars, because group members tend to focus on leaders, the leader is the nucleus of the group. As a result of this focus and central position in the group, leaders are influenced by the needs and interests of the group, and can easily utilize their central position to control communications and facilitate the group's movement in a desired
direction. Authors Bass and Stogdill cited who defined leadership from this perspective included Cooley (1902), Mumford (1906-1907), Blackmar (1911), Chapin (1924), Bernard (1927), Smith (1934) Redl (1942), Brown (1936), Krech and Crutchfield (1948), and Knickerbocker (1948).

**Leadership as Personality and Its Effects**

Other authors identified leadership as vested in those persons with strong personalities and charisma. Bass and Stogdill identified personality theorists as ones who view leadership as a one-way influence in which leaders, with an air of assurance, prestige, and boldness, easily influence and lead others. Scholars who defined leadership in terms of personality and personal characteristics include Bowden (1926), Bingham (1927), Kilbourne (1935), Bernard (1926), Tead (1929), Bogardus (1934), and Chakraborti, Kundu, and Rao (1983).

**Leadership as the Art of Inducing Compliance.**

The art of directing others and inducing obedience, respect, loyalty, and cooperation in accomplishing a task is essential for leaders to practice, according to the definitions of a third group of scholars. As Bass and Stogdill illustrated, such authors as Munson (1921), Allport (1924), Moore (1927), Bundel (1930), Phillips (1939), Allen (1958), Bennis (1959), and Prentice (1961) regarded leadership as the unidirectional process of molding the group to one's will. Although many behaviorists reject this view as too authoritarian to be considered an acceptable definition of leadership, the authors listed identified the inducing of compliance
as critical to leadership and accepted the authoritarian, directive, and coercive approaches that are sometimes used as but three of the many aspects of the definition.

Leadership as the Exercise of Influence.

Other scholars noted that, by definition, leaders must influence group members as they do a job, reach a goal, or change their behavior, with the effectiveness of the leader dependent upon the results of the group. Nash (1929), Shartle (1951), Tannenbaum, Weschler, and Massarik (1961), Cartwright (1965), Katz and Kahn (1966), Hollander and Julian (1965), and Bass (1961) were some of the scholars who defined leadership from this perspective. They recognized that individuals differ in their effectiveness in influencing others, and thus defined leaders as those who successfully influence others in the group towards the attainment of some goal.

Leadership as a Group of Behaviors.

What leaders do and how they do it is how behavioral theorists tend to define leadership. Carter (1953), Shartle (1956), Hemphill (1949), and Fiedler (1967) viewed such acts as structuring work, praising or criticizing members of the group, showing consideration, and other actions as just a few of the behaviors that constitute leadership.

Leadership as a Form of Persuasion.

Another group of authors identified persuasion as essential in a leadership definition. Persuading others to accept a given goal, expectation, or belief, as well as to cooperate in working towards
that aim was identified as a hallmark of effective leaders by such authors as Schenk (1928), Cleeton and Mason (1934), Copeland (1942), and Koontz and O'Donnell (1955).

Leadership as a Power Relationship

Many authors such as Raven and French (1958), Janda (1960), Warriner (1955), Gerth and Mills (1953), and Bass (1960) identified accumulating power and using it as one works with others to attain goals, and maintain order as key to the concept of leadership. For example, Raven and French (1958) postulated five power bases including referent power, expert power, reward power, coercive power, and legitimate power. Blanke (1981) further elaborated and expanded this concept of building a coalescence of energy or power to accomplish management goals. He identified power over, power through, power with, power created, and power against as the five kinds of strategies which are available to leaders.

Leadership as an Instrument of Goal Achievement

Numerous theorists included enabling a group to achieve its goals efficiently and effectively as a part of their definition of leadership. For example, Cowley (1928), Bellows (1959), Knickerbocker (1948), Cattell (1951), Davis (1942), Urwick (1953), and Davis (1962) each defined leadership in terms of its value in accomplishing group goals and meeting group needs.

Leadership as an Effect of Interaction

According to some scholars, when people work together, leadership is that which naturally emerges in a person or persons
who take charge, control, or coordinate the group processes. 
Bogardus (1929), Pigors (1935), Anderson (1940), Merton (1969), and Drecksel (1984) are five authors who called attention to the fact that leadership grows out of the interaction process itself. Drecksel, for example, found that compared to non-leaders in group situations, leaders who emerged tended to interact with a wider variety of people and to interact in more diverse and complex ways. According to their definitions, true leadership exists only when it is acknowledged and granted by members of the group.

Leadership as a Differentiated Role

Several modern sociologists defined leadership as a part of a role theory model, in that leaders serve the role of coordinating other people and assume roles in groups to keep things unified and moving smoothly. For example, Jennings (1944), Gibb (1954), Gordon (1955), Sherif and Sherif (1956), and Newcomb, Turner, and Converse (1965) each defined leadership as a role relationship to other group members.

Leadership as the Initiation and Maintenance of Structure

Several writers viewed leadership as the process of originating and maintaining structures and organization of the roles in a group. Theorists such as Smith (1935), LaPiere and Farnsworth (1936), Gouldner (1950), Gibb (1947), Bavelas (1960), Homans (1950), Hemphill (1954), and Stogdill (1959) defined leadership in terms of such processes variables which lead to the differentiation and maintenance of role structures within a group. Derakshan and Fatechi (1985) went a step further and concluded that historical
evidence from Germany supported the hypothesis that bureaucracy can even be a substitute for leadership.

**Types and Styles of Leaders**

Rather than limiting themselves to a single definition, other authors have attempted to explain the concept of leadership through a classification of types and styles of leaders and the situations in which they function. As Bass and Stogdill (1981) noted, for example, LeBon and Conway (1913) illustrated three types of crowd leaders: (a) crowd-compellers who inflame followers with their point of view, (b) crowd-exponents who sense what the crowd wants and give expression to it, and (c) crowd-representatives who voice already-formed opinions of the group.

They (Bass and Stogdill, 1981) went on to explain that scholars related their classification systems to how leaders function in organizations. For example, they noted Bogardus (1918) identified four types of organizational leaders: (a) the autocratic leader who rises to office in a powerful organization, (b) the democratic leader who represents the interests of the group, (c) the executive who is granted leadership because she or he can get things done, and (d) the reflective-intellectual type who may find it difficult to recruit a following, but who provides a philosophical dimension from which the group can operate. On the other hand, Bartlett (1926) said there are three types: (a) institutional leaders who use prestige, (b) domineering leaders who use power and influence, and (c) persuasive leaders who influence through their ability to influence others. Burns (1934) identified six types of leaders in his
categorization of organizational and institutional leaders: (a) intellectuals, (b) business types, (c) diplomats, (d) small group leaders, (e) mass leaders, and (f) administrators.

Some authors identified special types and styles of leadership as typical to education. For example, Harding (1949) identified twenty-one types of educational leaders including autocrats, cooperators, elder statespersons, eager beavers, pontifical types, muddled persons, loyal staffers, prophets, scientists, mystics, dogmatists, open-minded persons, philosophers, business experts, benevolent despots, child protectors, laissez-faires, community-minded leaders, cynics, optimists, and clemocrats. In a similar vein, Spaulding (1934) said there are five types of student leaders: (a) the social climber, (b) the intellectual success, (c) the good guy or gal, (d) the athlete, and (e) the student activity leader.

The roles that leaders play in a variety of situations provided categories for classification for another group of scholars. For example, Jennings (1960) divided leadership into three types: (a) supermen and superwomen who gain leadership because they can do anything and everything well, (b) heroes who inspire the respect and admiration of others, and (c) royals who use power to dominate others. Klein and Weber (1983) also categorized leaders into five types dependent upon the roles they play: (a) activators who involve others and contribute to their ability to solve problems, (b) controllers who tell people what to do and when to do it, (c) martyrs who play the roles of code-reinforcers and guilt-producers using behaviors which make people feel guilty and
as a result, feel pity, (d) cavaliers who play the role of providing
pleasure and entertainment to the group, and (e) abdicators who
passively leave others on their own.

Several current authors have classified leadership types and
styles according to how the leaders relate to the tasks of groups
and the people involved in those groups. For example, Jones
(1983) proposed four conceptual dimensions to explain how
leaders relate to people and tasks: (a) obtrusive vs unobtrusive
control, (b) situational vs. personal control, (c) professional vs.
paternalistic control, and (d) process vs. output control. In their
more well-known model, Hersey and Blanchard (1983) identified
four basic leadership style quadrants (a) high task and low
relationship, (b) high task and high relationship, (c) high
relationship and low task, and (d) low relationship and low task.
They proposed that each type is usually needed at some point in a
group. Similarly, although developed from a synthesis of the styles
resulting from the Myers-Briggs (in Bates & Kiersey, 1974)
dimensions of introversion vs. extroversion, intuition vs. sensing,
thinking vs. feeling, and perceiving vs. judging, Bates and Kiersey's
(1974) system of classifying leaders as (a) traditional/judicials, (b)
catalysts, (c) troubleshooters/negotiators, and (d) visionaries was
remarkably similar to the one outlined by Hersey and Blanchard.

Other scholars have supported such style classifications by
verifying their applicability in field studies. For example,
Sabermahani (1984) found a relationship between Hersey and
Blanchards' leadership styles and graduate academic majors at the
University of Oklahoma in that social science majors were significantly more relationship oriented than were applied science majors. Leavenworth's (1984) testing of the Myers-Briggs typology with freshmen college students revealed differences between leaders and non-leaders, and between groups of female leaders and male leaders. Similarly, Portnoy's (1986) findings that Myers-Briggs preference strength scores varied significantly according to whether the junior high students in the study were male or female, or formal or informal leaders lent support for such style classifications.

Implications Related to the Classification of Leadership Definitions and Concepts - Integrated Approaches

Borich and Baugher (1984) took an integrative approach in making a number of generalizations related to the results from various leadership classification systems. For example, they illustrated that although people who fall into the same classification of leadership style or tendency may arrive at decisions quickly and "be on the same wavelength" when working together, their decisions may suffer since they share the same strengths and weaknesses instead of complementing each other. Conversely, although people who fall into different categories of leadership styles and tendencies usually differ greatly in their views, opinions, actions, and approaches, and may become embroiled in conflict, Borich and Baugher illustrated that decisions resulting from their interaction benefit from the differing strengths and points of view each contributes. They noted that people tend
to be sensitive about their areas of weakness, and conflict may occur when others representing different categories of strength point out those areas. However, although people normally gravitate toward others with similar strengths and viewpoints, they may be drawn to those from differing categories because the strengths of one type are admired and needed by the other.

Borich and Baugher went on to illustrate that leaders' values, beliefs, decisions, and actions are usually greatly influenced by the characteristics and dimensions common to their typology. However, they noted that leaders can learn to strengthen their weaker dimensions and characteristics, and develop versatile leadership strategies to overcome problems which may result from their weaknesses.

As a result of these generalizations, Borich and Baugher proposed four implications for leaders. First, groups with a preponderance of representation from one classification or type of leadership should seek out and listen to individuals of different types when making decisions. Second, rather than being concerned about differences which result from variations in style, leaders should understand and value the perspective they give. Third, human interaction can be more satisfying and productive if those involved understand and appreciate the tendencies of strengths and needs of others and adjust to them. Finally, Borich and Baugher cautioned that leaders should be careful to identify their values as such, and concentrate on the facts and forces involved rather than on defense of value positions during
interaction. Since then, Baugher (1986) has further studied the multidisciplinarity of leadership in relation to the new information environment, and has re-emphasized the need for leaders as generalists who understand leadership in a broad context of existence and meaning rather than as specialists who function from a singular style or theory of leadership.

Results from experiments by Leary, Robertson, Barnes, and Miller (1986) also substantiated the fact that leaders can develop such flexible styles. They found that undergraduates were able to adopt either a task-oriented or relationship-oriented approach when led to believe that one or the other would be most effective in facilitating group performance. Similarly, work by Hunt, Osborn, and Marton (1981) with the U.S. Army supported the use of flexible, discretionary leadership as the complexity of the situations studied increased.

Other scholars also used integrative approaches in the study of leadership. For example, Hermann and others involved in the Mershon Leadership Development Program (1984) proposed seven key leadership functions (a) planning and agenda setting, (b) gaining and maintaining legitimacy, (c) coalition building and consensus seeking, (d) public advocacy, (e) bargaining and negotiation, (f) designing and maintaining organizations, and (g) media interaction. Each of these functions requires a variety of approaches and different kinds of leadership-related strengths. The group went on to note that leadership requires a high degree of versatility, and recognized that different kinds of leaders may be needed at different times and in different environments.
Blanke (1984) proposed similar goals as essential for leadership in organizations to succeed: (a) productivity, (b) satisfaction of workers or group members based on opportunity, (c) building legitimacy and morality, (d) resource acquisition, and (e) development of coalitions inside and outside of the organization. He also emphasized the importance of versatility and integration of leadership approaches for effective leadership as he supported (a) Scott’s (1981) contention that groups and organizations must be understood from rational, natural, and open perspectives, and (b) Mintzberg’s (1979) proposals for effectively applying an understanding of the work flows by which a group accomplishes these five goals.

Cunningham (1983) outlined a similar integrative approach in his model of eight functions educational leaders of the future must serve. These included (a) focusing on present and future issues simultaneously and planning for various time frames, (b) sensing rates of change and communicating goals to followers, (c) providing rationales, stamina, and concentration to bring about desired outcomes, (d) reconciling the interests of many sectors and using mixed scanning techniques, (e) appraising organizational willingness and ability to adapt to conditions, (f) using intuition creatively, (g) developing decision-making policy, and (h) monitoring how leadership is understood and followed.

While literature, experience, and research may show that a particular conception of leadership may be relevant in one situation, that perspective may not be applicable in another setting.
By definition, concepts provide a framework from which people operate. One's conception of what leadership is, then, whether in the form of a definition of leadership or a more complex theory of leadership types and styles, can significantly influence one's opinions related to how leadership is developed. Because the leaders involved in this study conceptualized what leadership is in many different ways, it is important to understand the perspectives from which they operate, and to consider the relationships between their conceptualizations and their responses in the study.

**Characteristics of Leaders**

Fiedler (1969) commented that even though psychologists have believed special personality traits distinguish leaders from followers, several hundred research studies have shown the search to be futile. He further noted that although people who become leaders tend to be somewhat more intelligent, bigger, more assertive, and more talkative than others in their group, these traits are far less important than most people think. Instead, he observed that what frequently distinguishes leaders is that they know more about the group task, can do it better, or have more ownership of it than do others in the group. In his argument that different styles of leadership emerge in various situations, he explained that a person can become a leader by happenstance, by being in the right place at the right time, or because of such factors as age, education, experience, family background, and wealth. Although as Fiedler illustrated, research may not always support
the "great person" notion that inherent traits determine whether or not a person is a leader, leaders appear to develop some characteristics in common. For example, in three later field studies with U.S. Army mess halls, Army squad leaders, and public health teams, Fiedler (1986) found that leaders' intellectual abilities play a direct role in group performance.

Zaleznik (1977) differentiated between leaders and managers in that in his definition, leaders tended to exhibit characteristics of being inspired and inspiring, being active rather than reactive, working from high-risk positions, constantly working in fresh directions, being determined, being emotionally involved, being separate entities from the organizations for which they work rather than belonging to them, and so forth. In contrast, managers tended to be logical, steady, objective, flexible facilitators.

Watts (1984) took a somewhat different approach by noting that leaders possess undesirable as well as desirable characteristics, and that the optimum amounts of each needed for success is undocumented. He distinguished effective leaders from ineffective leaders based on their success in achieving (a) attractive goals and workable programs, (b) order and structure, (c) persuasive communications, (d) emphasis on human interplay, (e) the expectation of appropriate reward, (f) fulfillment of a distinctive behavior and role. He recognized, though, that to achieve this success, effective leaders characteristically exhibit high energy levels, drive, perservance, education and scholarship, intelligence, good judgment, stature, personality, objectivity and balance, enthusiasm and optimism, and strong wills.
Cleveland (1980) further illustrated that leaders must develop a sense of public responsibility, and function in a generalistic people-oriented role rather than remain occupied solely with technical areas of expertise. In addition, Cleveland noted that leaders must understand complexities and the paradoxical nature of true leadership, operate with a sense of the whole rather than a particular segment of it, and continually concentrate on being up-to-date with or slightly ahead of the times. Engel (1976) identified similar traits such as drive to get things done, competitive attitude, ambition, determination, dynamism, intelligence, energy, tact, persuasiveness, humor, courage, optimism, and creativity as important leadership characteristics.

Peters and Austin (1985) focused on characteristics and styles of leadership that produce excellent results in business, industry, government, and education. Their observations indicated that leaders who approached their jobs with a passion and who consistently took care of their customers and their workers were those who were most successful. Additionally, they noted effective leaders more often than not approach management by wandering around, giving attention to symbols, playing things up with a high degree of drama and excitement, recognizing all achievements both small and large, debureaucratizing their organizations as much as possible, and providing for innovation and creativity.

Bennis and Nanus (1985) and Maccoby (1981) similarly supported the importance of people-centered leadership, providing inspiration, and paying attention to the largest and smallest details
as essential for effective leadership. For example, Bennis's (1984) list of the four competencies found in 60 corporate leaders and 30 public leaders included management of attention, trust, meaning, and self. He concluded that in organizations with effective leaders, people feel significant, learning and competence matters, people are a part of the community, and work is stimulating. In addition, current popular authors such as Abodaher (1982) and Manchester (1978) identified personal characteristics important to leaders such as high energy, a sense of vision, belief in oneself, one's people, and one's product, political know-how, and a willingness to take extraordinary risks.

Millar and Yerby (1982) found that communication apprehension is a good predictor of task leadership in small groups of college students, in that a lack of communication apprehension led to behavior which was perceived by other group members as leadership. White (1984) similarly found that leaders use communication more effectively than do non-leaders in terms of their accessibility, verbal skills, recognition of individual differences, community involvement, and listening abilities.

Sergiovanni's (1981) study with school leaders indicated that effective leaders can be distinguished from ineffective ones by the manner in which they give attention to different things; by their consciousness of their leadership; by the way they espouse and model purposes, standards, and beliefs; and by the manner in which they build staff loyalty to organizational norms and expectations. Ollila's (1983) study of the reading, work habits,
and backgrounds of young educational leaders revealed that the 75 leaders identified by the Phi Delta Kappa professional educator's association spent a mean of 19.5 hours per week reading, and a mean of 62.5 hours per week working, and that a significant number of these leaders mentioned hard work and having a mentor as important to their leadership.

Ortyoyande (1984) also studied the characteristics of educational leaders and found that although there was no relationship between leadership and such characteristics as age, gender, educational background, marital status, social status, career paths, professional memberships, or publications, that other factors were positively related to leadership. For example, he found that a significant number of the leaders in his study were first born children from small families, and that prior leadership experience was predictive of leadership performance. These findings were supported by studies of female leaders by Eckstein (1978) and Kelly (1983) who found that first born females from small families were significantly over-chosen for positions of leadership when compared to youngest females and those from larger families.

One of the most comprehensive summaries of characteristics which distinguished leaders, however, is Bass and Stogdill's (1981) citation of extensive research which indicated that leaders usually exceed or score higher than average group members in relation to the following characteristics: technical skills, friendliness, task motivation and application, group task supportiveness, amount of social participation, social and
interpersonal skills, leadership effectiveness and achievement, emotional balance and control, administrative skill, general personal impression given, intelligence, scholarship, dominance and decisiveness, willingness to assume responsibility, ethical conduct and personal integrity, maintaining closeness within the group, maintaining coordination and teamwork, communication skills, physical energy, conformation to norms, creativity and independence, maintenance of standards of performance, informal group control, helpfulness, experience and involvement, courage and daring, maturity, cultured approach to life, dependability in completing responsibilities, socioeconomic status, initiative, persistence, know-how in getting things done, self-confidence, alertness and insight into situations, cooperativeness, popularity, adaptability, excellence in faction associated with a specific group, originality, judgment, aggressiveness, desire for excellence, sense of humor, liveliness, and athletic ability. They also noted evidence that leaders tend to be taller, weigh more, have a more muscular build, dress better and more powerfully, and control their emotions better than the average person in their group.

Gender Differences in Leadership

Differences of opinion exist as to whether or not gender is significant in the development of leadership. Until recently, most researchers, including those thus far cited, either made no such differentiation, or used masculine pronouns, a practice that until the early 1970's was generally accepted as including both sexes. Additionally some current authors such as Sargent (1983) have
argued that leadership in its purist state is an androgynous concept, and that the most effective leaders and managers are those who successfully blend "male" and "female" management styles. However, a third group of researchers have concluded that gender differences are significant both in the development of leadership and in how males and females lead others.

The arguments of the group of scholars who believe that leadership is an adrogynous concept, and that gender makes no difference in leadership were supported by the results of the Sirianni-Brantley (1984) and Remland (1982) studies which found no significant differences in sex role orientation in regard to leadership. However, these studies showed that training produces significant differences. Trained leaders of both sexes were perceived to be better than untrained leaders on almost all tasks and measures of leadership styles and group success.

In their study with undergraduate students Schneier and Bartol (1980) similarly found no differences in the proportion of males and females to emerge as leaders through sociometric choice, and that regardless of gender, emergent leaders were more likely than non-leaders to be perceived as exhibiting positive behaviors. Moore, Shaffer, Goodsell, and Baringoldz (1983) also found that gender in itself was not a significant factor in undergraduate student leadership, but that sex-role stereotypes were specific to various leadership situations. For example, they found regardless of the gender of the subject, he or she made more statements of disapproval and more statements regarding produced quantities when the confederate was male rather than female.
Intriligator (1983) noted that most current research on women leaders concentrates on themes which are treated in terms of male-oriented leadership theory. However, her study similarly concluded that no significant differences appear between the perceptions of men and women in school unions in relation to essential leadership skills and most incentives.

Hopponen and Anderson (1986), however, cited a number of studies which showed significant differences between males and females which would have an influence on leadership. As they illustrated, Gilligan's (1982) findings that females have a morality of care and tend to make judgments based on sensitivity, connectedness, and relationship while males have a morality of justice and make judgments based on logic, individual rights, and separation, would certainly indicate that the ways leaders make judgments may depend somewhat on their gender. In addition, Hopponen and Anderson also pointed out that most early "benchmark" studies of human development and interaction including those by such renowned scholars as Piaget and Freud, either eliminated females from their studies because numerous differences were attributed to gender, or labeled those differences as deviant. The fact that such differences were found also lends support to the argument that gender may be a factor that must be considered in the study of leadership development.

Other researchers have identified gender differences which illustrate its importance in leadership development. For example, Golub and Canty (1982) found that females were not likely to
assume leadership when paired with males, as evidenced by the fact that the 30 females in their study played the leadership role only 33% of the time in cross-sex pairs, as compared with 60% in same-sex pairs.

Young's (1981) study of the leadership characteristics and effectiveness of eighty-nine male and female high school varsity basketball coaches also showed that males and females displayed significantly different leadership characteristics. However, they were equally effective in terms of win-loss records.

Hennig and Jardin (1977) found that females tended not to make career commitments to advancement over the long term at as early an age as males, exhibited a greater sense of passivity than did males, and emphasized individual self-improvement to a greater extent than did males. Additionally, their findings indicated females did not generally include rewards and recognition as part of their career definitions, they regarded jobs and careers as two separate issues, they regarded risk as almost entirely negative, and they assumed without thinking that the quality of relationships was the most important priority to be acted upon. Males, on the other hand, tended to hold entirely different views.

Similarly, Harragan's (1977) comment that "working is a game women never learned to play", and her handbook approach to teaching women how to succeed in the male-dominated world pointed out key differences in the ways men and women might perform as leaders. Other authors such as Berman (1981), Weil
(1984), and Morgan-Lee (1986) also documented such differences between males and females experiences and approaches to management as socialization and attitudes, communications methods, approaches to teamwork, views toward competition, and conflicts between personal lives and careers.

In Mulkerne and Mulkerne's (1984) study to determine if differences exist between the leadership behaviors of fourteen men and fourteen women in Florida special education administrative positions, males scored significantly higher on the "Leadership Behavior Description Form XII" than did their female counterparts. Knight and Saal (1982) reported related findings in their study of the effects of sex differences on leader influence and performance evaluation. They illustrated instead that leaders of both sexes working on masculine tasks received significantly higher ratings in expertise than those involved with traditionally feminine tasks. For leaders involved in feminine tasks, expertise ratings tended to be higher for female leaders chosen by female agents than for those chosen by male agents, and for male leaders chosen by either gender.

Mark (1984) concluded that the female college administrators who participated in her study of self-perceptions of leaders in higher education perceived themselves as more masculine, more feminine, and more neutral in their jobs than did their male counterparts. In other words, the scores of female leaders tended towards the extremes of the perception scales, while males tended to score in the average ranges. Similarly, Whitfield's (1984)
case-study investigation of patterns of success of six non-traditionally prepared mature women educational leaders revealed that they were fully self-actualized on the Maslow hierarchy, lead highly integrated lives, and continued to experience and offer mentoring.

The Berryman-Pink and Wheerless (1984) study of the attitudes of 178 employees from various types of organizations showed that attitudes of females toward women in general, toward women as managers, and their perceptions of communications competencies of women were more positive than were those of male respondents. Further, all subjects who had worked for or with women managers reported more positive attitudes toward women as managers than those who had not.

Watson (1984) concluded that women with male subordinates were more influential when they employed the feminine considerate style than when they use more masculine styles such as the dominant style. However, no significant differences related to gender-style in influence were apparent when subordinates include both males and females. Further, the results of the study indicated that conflict management was a particularly sensitive issue for women in leadership positions.

Crouch and Powell's (1983) study of the sex, sex role identity, leadership styles, and job satisfaction in a university housekeeping unit revealed (a) supervisors' assessments of their leadership styles was related to their subordinates' satisfaction with their work, pay, supervision, co-workers, and general job satisfaction,
(b) supervisors' sex role identification was related to subordinates' sex role identification and job satisfaction, and (c) perceived leadership styles could be used as a predictor of subordinate job satisfaction in terms of work, pay, opportunities for promotion, supervision, co-workers, and the job in general.

Smith's (1982) review of literature on gender and leadership revealed that females are generally perceived to lack attributes regarded as important for leadership. He specifically noted that women are typically given unchallenging assignments which lessen their organizational abilities, are perceived to be high in considerate behavior and low in aggressiveness even when their behavior does not evidence this, and as a result are caught in a vicious cycle of being passed over for promotion and relegated to unimportant and low-salaried positions.

Hoferek (1981) further illustrated that women were underutilized and underrepresented in leadership roles in higher education, and that the degree of underutilization and underrepresentation increased with the power of the role in question. Noting that the effects of sex discrimination against women may lead them to undervalue themselves as a group and to undervalue the careers of other women, Hoferek suggested additional effort be devoted to structuring professional opportunities to train women as leaders rather than continuing to socialize them into a system that perpetuates their underutilization. However, Schmuck (1983) suggested strategies to increase the number of women in public school administration.
including efforts to change (a) individual attitudes, behaviors, and understanding, (b) organizational policies and practices, and (c) hiring practices.

Klonsky (1983) also found that gender was an important factor to be considered in leadership development in his study of high school boys and girls' baseball and softball teams. He found that boys benefitted most from intense socialization, while girls benefitted from less intense socialization and having a major role in family decision-making processes.

Although the literature is by no means conclusive, enough evidence exists to suggest gender differences may be a factor to be considered in any leadership study. Therefore, it was important that this issue be addressed as this research was completed.

Development of Leadership

To develop background from which to approach the question of what adolescent leadership development experiences are most important, it was necessary to review prior research related to leadership development. Since relatively few studies have been completed with youth populations, it was important not only to consider those, but also to review the curriculum content of various youth leadership development programs. A review of the findings of studies and programs done with adult populations which were applicable to teen leadership development provided further background.
Youth Leadership Development

Relatively few studies have addressed how adolescents can best develop leadership abilities. For the most part, these have examined and identified as important such general experiences as being raised in a supportive and interactive family, being mentored or having strong role models, being well educated, and participating and serving in leadership roles in youth groups and organizations.

Biddie et al. (1980), Davey and Paolucci (1980), and Hall (1980) were among those who identified the importance of strong and supportive family relationships as important for the development of leadership by adolescents. In general, regular positive interaction with supportive family members was found to enhance the abilities of adolescents, not only in leadership, but also in such related areas as self-confidence, interpersonal skills, and so forth.

Studies by Daloz (1983), Smith (1981), Weiner (1985), Williams (1980), and Barton (1984) provided evidence of the importance of mentoring and role modeling to the leadership development of adolescents. Their studies with teenagers, as well as other studies with adult leaders, illustrated that mentors and role models were very important for adolescent leadership development. Barton's study also indicated that adult community leaders had slightly more childhood role diversity that had non-leaders. In addition, studies by Evans and Bowers (1982) and Nichols (1984) illustrated that the experience of serving as a role model or mentor for
other youth facilitated adolescents' leadership development, and supported Hohmann's (1982) findings that serving in group leadership positions and roles enhanced youth leadership development.

Although many youth serving organizations such as Campfire, church youth groups, Farm Bureau, 4-H, Future Farmers of America, Future Homemakers of America, Grange, schools, Scouts, YMCA and YWCA, and others conduct leadership development programs, for the most part their literature and the experiences they provide did not identify a base of supporting research to show whether the experiences provided through such programs were in fact important in enabling participants to become leaders.

For example, a survey of forty-four current 4-H junior and teen leadership projects and teaching packages from thirty-two different states and regions (Cox, 1985) revealed many commonalities in terms of the kinds of experiences provided. However, these experiences were, for the most, part derived from the recommendations of committees of Extension professionals who developed the publications, rather than from valid, reliable research-based recommendations from actual leaders who had successfully developed leadership abilities. This is not to say the programs surveyed were not effective in enabling participants to become leaders. In fact, preliminary results from studies currently being completed by the National 4-H Council and in several states with alumni have indicated that 4-H experience does enhance leadership development. Each of the programs surveyed appeared
to be grounded in a model of developmental needs, and several of the publications summarized the common needs and interests of youth in the age ranges with which 4-H teen leaders most commonly work. The approach used in every state was to involve youth in "learn-by-doing", real-life experiences in actual leadership roles. More than 300 different experiences were suggested in the 4-H literature as means by which teenagers could develop leadership knowledge, attitudes, skills, and aspirations. A few states organized these experiences in terms of "life skill development experiences" in such areas as communication, decision-making, getting along with others, learning, management, understanding self, and working in groups. Others opted for organizing the experiences into "levels" of experience or environment in which leadership roles were assumed. However, most used program development models as a means for facilitating and organizing the experiences in which the youth participated.

Horton's (1983) survey of Ohio Extension professionals and volunteers summarized their views as to which of the life-skills leadership experiences suggested in the Southern Region Leadership Subcommittee's materials were most important for leadership development. He found that volunteers and teen leaders rate club-centered leadership activities as higher on importance and involvement while 4-H agents rate county-centered leadership activities higher, and recommended further evaluation of leadership activities. Cantrell, Doebler, and Heinsohn (1985) also studied 4-H member life skill development,
including the development of leadership. They found that teens involved in local club leadership had higher interpersonal skill levels than did those who were not involved in club leadership. At the county level, life skills development dramatically increased if 4-H teens were involved in actual leadership roles. A variety of evaluation projects have also been conducted with 4-H junior leadership programs in each state, and most have indicated that participation in junior leadership programs does have a positive impact. For example, Gamon's (1984) experiments with resource materials at two Iowa 4-H leadership camps showed no differences between treatment levels and participation of members in small group activities, leadership styles, or group productivity. Significant positive differences were noted in the delegation, drive, and cohesiveness of participants who received the special leadership training.

Rockwell's (1981) survey of 318 Nebraska 4-H alumni revealed that over 90% of the respondents felt that the leadership experiences they had as members were helpful in some degree in preparing them for adult leadership roles. Benefits cited most frequently included learning a specific skill, and having a chance to meet people. Other helpful experiences noted included public speaking experiences, competitive opportunities, project experiences, and preparation for occupations.

Of all the studies reviewed related to 4-H and Extension, however, none have been found which show whether or not such experiences are actually helpful to youth in facilitating the
development of long-term leadership. Also, as might be expected, no identification of which experiences are the most important has received wide acceptance.

Similarly, a review of literature from other youth organizations showed a lack of reference to research related to youth leadership development. Although common sense dictates that the experiences suggested for youth leadership roles (Center for Youth Development and Research, 1977; Gorman, 1982; and Hopkins, 1982), in the Farm Bureau Youth Schools, in FHA's (1982) Program Action Impact and degree programs, in FFA's parliamentary procedure and public speaking programs, and in extra-curricular activities conducted through schools, did promote the development of leadership by the participants, strong research was lacking to support that contention. Even in the evaluation studies which have been completed, little attention has been paid to which, if any, of the experiences are the most beneficial in terms of leadership development.

Kleinfeld and Shinkwin's (1983) interviews with adults and members associated with two 4-H clubs, two Girl Scout Troops, and two Boy Scout troops showed that each of the groups served as channels by which youth entered the adult world by increasing youth contact with responsible, civic-minded, generous, and concerned adults. Kleinfeld and Schinkwin went on to note that of the three organizations, 4-H provided the most extensive youth-adult network. Although the curriculum for all three organizations included teaching leadership skills and civic
responsibility, the authors highlighted the Boy Scouts as providing an especially structured leadership development program. However, the success of these organizations in actually enabling participants to develop leadership was not verified.

The Vocational and Industrial Clubs of America (1980) outlined a guide for leadership development by VICA student officers. First, officers explored the qualities that distinguish several famous leaders. In the second section, they addressed the development of leadership abilities including becoming acquainted with VICA history, understanding parliamentary procedure, knowing the responsibilities of VICA officers and members, learning to get along with others, knowing oneself, and mastering the basics of public relations. Again, however, no mention was made of research to indicate whether or not such training helped participants develop life-long leadership abilities.

Black (1984) drew his model for leadership development for gifted youth from theories and models in many disciplines. It included four stages for developing leadership including (a) encouraging familiarity leadership characteristics and using creativity and divergent thinking, (b) role-playing, observing and analyzing the leadership of others and doing creative thinking exercises, (c) creating ambiguity and removing shortcuts to force the students to struggle for solutions, and (d) real life experiences in leadership. Once again, however, long-term findings as to whether or not this model actually enabled the participants to become leaders were not available.
McDiarmid (1982) outlined the content of the highly rated Chevak Village Youth Association for educating and integrating youth into Alaskan village life. The involvement of adolescents in planning and organizing social, recreational, economic, community service, and academic activities was cited as particularly important for accomplishing the purposes of the association. Again, the hypothesized causal relationship between the activities provided and the development of leadership was not verified.

Recent studies related to outdoor education for leadership development such as those by Weiner (1984), Phipps (1986), and Raiola (1986) have not conclusively shown whether or not such curricula help participants become leaders. However, participants have attained higher scores in such leadership-related dimensions as problem solving, interpersonal relationships, collaborativeness, and decision-making after participation in the programs.

Richardson's (1984) study of the effects of the use of a leadership training program based the Fiedler contingency theory, showed no significant differences in leadership effectiveness in influencing group performance by either the trained or untrained team leaders on selected high school basketball teams. It was also noted that leadership trained team leaders were perceived to be more influential than were those who did not participate in the training.

Hearson (1983) outlined the following leadership-related results from his case-study investigation of the relationship of prior experiences to self-confidence, leadership, and student
teaching activities: (a) prior leadership experience and pre-student teaching self-confidence were positively related, (b) neither leadership experience nor pre-student teaching self-confidence appeared to weigh significantly in eventual student teaching success, (c) academic achievement did not appear to be significantly related to self-confidence, leadership ability, or eventual student teaching success, and (d) although the student teaching experience appeared to have a slightly negative effect upon self-confidence, it had a positive effect upon leadership ability.

A few studies cited by Bass and Stogdill (1981) did indicate that leadership exhibited in organizations at the high school level may persist in college and in later vocational, professional, and community life, especially when the leadership tasks are similar from group to group (Shannon, 1929; Levi, 1930; Clem and Dodge, 1933; Page, 1935; Courtenay, 1938; Williams and Harrell, 1964; Roskens, 1958; and Bass, 1960). More recently, the Ontario Camp Leadership Center survey (1982) of 202 participants, 40 sponsors, and 20 non-sponsors showed high evaluations of the leadership development experiences provided in the three-week camp. The development of interpersonal skills and leadership abilities was identified as especially positive, although again, long term results in terms of leadership development were not identified. However, they did not identify what kinds of experiences produced this leadership in the first place.
Additionally, Peterson's (1984) study with recent officers of Michigan state vocational organizations to determine the usefulness of state officer leadership training for later life demonstrated that personal facilitation skills such as communication, social etiquette, time management, contact with business and industry, group discussions, and promotion of sex and racial equity were used most frequently by former officers in all organizations. Whether the development of such skills was a result of the leadership training, experience as an officer, or other variables, however, was unclear.

In short, while a variety of studies lent credence to the theory that experiences during the teen years enable youth to develop life-long knowledge, attitudes, skills, and aspirations related to leadership, there was a lack of information related to the kinds of experiences which best enhance this development. Clearly, additional research is needed to determine which experiences enable youth to develop life-long leadership skills and abilities.

Adult Leadership Development

Since research related to youth leadership development has been somewhat limited, research results related to adult leadership development also needed to be considered in developing background from which to approach the question of what teen leadership development experiences are most important. These results provided insights into the kinds of experiences which may be most important in the development of leadership knowledge, attitudes, skills, and aspirations by youth.
Bass and Stogdill (1981) provided a system for classifying theories which explain the factors involved in the emergence of leadership and its nature. This system included the following: (a) great person theories, (b) environmental theories, (c) personal-situational theories, (d) interaction-expectation theories, (e) humanistic theories, and (f) exchange theories. Each of these represented a slightly different view of how leadership emerges or is developed.

Great person theorists, especially, attempted to explain the development of leadership on the basis of inheritance. Above all else, they believed that personality and character traits including those related to leadership, are inherited (Galton, 1879; Woods, 1913; Wiggam, 1931; Carlyle, 1907; Dowd, 1936; Jennings, 1960; Bernard, 1926; and Bingham, 1927, in Bass and Stogdill, 1981). Current authors such as Gardner (1984), documented the decline of hereditary privilege in American society, but at the same time recognized that vestiges of a stratified society survive because the characteristics of human interaction and social organization that first produced societies of hereditary privilege have not changed. More recently, Clontz (1984) supported analysis of at least one leader's sociological, psychological, and biographical data as a useful method for understanding leadership. Thus, the explanation of leadership development in terms of "born leaders" or "great persons" is accepted as one theory for explaining how leaders emerge.

Environmental theorists, according to Bass and Stogdill (1981) advanced the view that the emergence of leadership was a result
of time, place, and circumstance (Mumford, 1909; Bogardus, 1918; Hocking, 1924; Person, 1928; Schneider, 1937; and Murphy, 1941). Current scholars of situational leadership have also incorporated this view into their theories of leadership development. For example, Watts (1984) argued that different styles of leadership ranging from autocratic leadership, through task oriented, follower-oriented, transactional, democratic, management by objectives, inductive, considerate, and participative leadership emerge as groups progress through four stages of development: (a) forming, (b) storming, (c) norming, and (d) performing.

Personal-situational scholars cited by Bass and Stogdill (1981) advanced the belief that leadership results from the interaction of both individual and situational factors (Westburgh, 1931; Case, 1933; Gerth and Mills, 1952; Gibb, 1954; Stogdill and Shartle, 1955; Bennis, 1961; Cattell, 1951; and Hollander, 1964). In addition, Bates and Kiersey (1974), Hersey and Blanchard (1972) and others cited earlier in this review proposed that people who operate with a particular set of strengths or leadership style tend to emerge and function most easily as leaders in environments conducive to their styles of operation, although with adaptability they can learn to function as leaders in other situations.

Interaction-expectation theorists have proposed that leadership is developed as a result of the interactions and expectations involved in various situations. For example, Homans (1950) defined leadership emergence in terms of origination of interaction, and Stogdill (1959) proposed that leadership develops
when a member of a group maintains and initiates structure in interaction and expectation. Drecksel's (1984) findings that leaders in groups use more diverse and complex forms of interaction also supported this theory. Bass (1960) viewed leadership development as the result of the effort of one member to change the behavior or motivation of other group members. Also, Fiedler's (1967) contingency theory of leadership that the development of a given pattern of leadership behavior is contingent upon the situation was an example of the relationship of interaction and expectation upon the development of leadership.

According to Bass and Stogdill (1981) humanistic theorists have operated from the belief that leadership develops as a result of individuals modifying organizations to maximize the potential for individuals to fulfill their own needs while contributing to the realization of organizational goals, and that leaders who have best achieved this modification are the most successful. For example, in his Theory X and Theory Y proposals, McGregor (1966) outlined the view (a) that people were either passive and resistant to organizational needs (Theory X) and needed leadership to be motivated and directed to fit such needs, or (b) that they were already motivated to assume responsibility (Theory Y) and that leadership developed in response to fulfill their needs while achieving organizational objectives. Argyris (1964) identified conflicts between organizational needs and individual needs as an area of concern for leadership development, and Likert (1967) saw building group cohesiveness and motivation for productivity as
important leadership development functions. Blake and Mouton (1964) organized leadership on a managerial grid in which concern for people represents one axis, and concern for production the other, and outline a process for leadership development for strength in each of the four resulting quadrants. Gardner (1984) took yet another approach in his statement that rather than inventing motivation in their followers, effective leaders learn to unlock it. He observed that leaders must develop an understanding of the wants, purposes and values of their people, and overcome the inertia that afflicts most people most of the time. Gardner's view was that shared values were crucial and that leaders should teach the framework of values aimed towards a vision of what the society, organization, or group could be at its best. He stressed the importance for leadership development of valuing such motivators as satisfaction, hope, challenge, response, expectations, faith, freedom and liberty, and obligation and duty.

Exchange theorists cited by Bass and Stogdill (1981) such as Homans (1958), Thibaut and Kelley (1959), Gergen (1969), Blau (1964), and Jacobs (1970) proposed theories based on the assumption that group members contribute to the group or organization in exchange for rewards from the group or organization. Their arguments indicated that leadership is developed by those who can best gain power in exchange for meeting the needs of group members, through means such as those outlined by Blanke (1981) in describing power relationships in groups.
Another approach to leadership development is the use of specific leadership educational training experiences. Bass and Stodgill (1981) noted that industry, the armed services, and educational administrators are known for a variety of approaches for leadership training, and that training for leadership can be done in many different ways. Lectures, textbooks, and teaching aids have been extensively used by industry and the armed services while other groups have made more use of role-playing, group exercises, and sensitivity training. Lectures and discussion, role playing, simulations, computer and other programmed instructional methods, sensitivity training, behavior modeling, and on-the-job leadership training have been shown to be both effective and ineffective in a variety of different studies. In other words, what has worked in one setting has not always produced the same results in another situation.

For example, Savan's (1983) research to measure a supervisory training program's effectiveness in positively changing participant scores on the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire and in supervisory performance indicated several factors which may or may not influence the development of leadership in a training program. Participants in the total training program exhibited significant improvement in supervisory job performance six months following the training program while those who did not receive such training did not. However, factors other than those associated with the training program such as years of experience and age of the participants may have been more of an influence than the
experiences in the training program itself. In fact, results of the simulation exercise showed significantly better performance by the untrained control group than by the trained participants on the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire.

Although none of the specific methodologies by which leadership training has been given has appeared be any more effective than any of the others, Bass and Stogdill cited several studies which indicated that direct training in the techniques of leadership tended to improve trainees' leadership and effectiveness in groups. For example, when participants received training in succeeding as a leader, training emphasizing democratic leadership and human relations, training emphasizing participative and/or directive leadership, training emphasizing consideration and/or initiating structure, or multidimensional training, they demonstrated changes in leadership knowledge, skills, and attitudes related to the topic about which they receive instruction. At the same time, Bass and Stogdill (1981) referred to other studies which indicated that attributes of the trainees, the composition of the groups of which they are a part, followup reinforcement and feedback, the behavior of the trainer, congruence of training and the organizational environment within which the trainee works, and similar factors also were shown to have an impact upon the leadership development of participants.

Vroom (1977) argued that leaders could learn to lead by consistently following a decision process flowchart to make the most feasible decisions in various situations. Geller (1983)
similarly outlined a sequence of learning components he considered essential for professional development. First, he emphasized the importance of broadening knowledge and comprehension, followed by opportunities for improved application of that knowledge. Finally, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation of knowledge bases and dissemination strategies were seen as important for long-term growth.

On the other hand, Bittel (1984) emphasized the importance of developing a leadership style balanced between task-orientation and consideration-orientation. Hurst (1984) similarly proposed development of the ability to be effective in managing simultaneously with hard facts and soft processes was essential for persons who aim to provide leadership.

Culler and others on the Family Community Leadership Board (1984) focused on the importance of enabling people to form and maintain groups, work as a team, communicate effectively, manage meetings, define and analyze issues, plan courses of action, engage in problem solving, influence and use power effectively, and do on-going evaluation and monitoring as essential for leadership development. They provided a package of instruments and lesson plans by which they suggested this enabling could be facilitated.

Kanter (1983) emphasized the importance of providing for innovation, the development of an entrepreneurial spirit, open communications, network formation, mobility, security, and a decentralization of resources, for the development of leadership within an organization. In a similar vein, Katz (1975) outlined
technical, human, and conceptual skill development as important for leadership development.

A number of studies and leadership development activities focused particularly on leadership development in educational programs. For example, the Florida Extern Leadership Training Program for Local Administrators of Vocational Education used an individualized instructional system of self-directed modules, supportive audiovisual aids, and supervised field and clinical experiences to develop trained and certified leaders for local vocational programs.

Cleveland and Saari (1980) noted that today's leaders have become so by competence and competition, and that the result has been an aristocracy of achievement with no one person or class in charge. However, they went on to say that equipping minds for leadership ought to be what is "higher" about higher education, and proposed that attention needs to be paid to such content as strategic thinking, curiosity, breadth of vision and synthesis of complexities, integration, and analysis.

Johnson and Snyder's (1980) survey of 195 administrative personnel in a Fort Worth school system prioritized areas of felt need for training in management and leadership skills related to (a) the job or leadership role such as the principalship, (b) the school as an ecosystem, (c) creative problem-solving, (d) planning for planning, (e) staff development, (f) long-range planning, and (g) personal awareness. Hopkins (1982) illustrated the critical importance of increasing leadership for vocational education across
the nation for future success and effectiveness, while Howe (1981) illustrated the importance of hands-on "learn by doing" experiences for the development of leadership by adult volunteers in the 4-H program. The Buckeye Association of School Administrators (1984) addressed such needs and focused on developing anticipatory and prescriptive management and leadership techniques in its annual "Project Leadership" workshops.

Studies with adults have also identified the importance of mentoring and role-modeling for leadership development. Baugher and Kellett (1983) were two researchers who placed emphasis on the importance of mentoring for the development of leadership, rather than on specific content or learning experiences. Peters and Austin (1985) also advanced this concept, but defined it as "coaching" and placed importance on the retention of individualism and focus by the person being coached.

Schaeffer (1984) summarized essential differences between successful and unsuccessful approaches in the development of strategic leadership in chief executives as follows: (a) successful approaches required intensive and extensive effort, happened primarily on the job, focused on the specific company's own strategic planning needs and problems, featured individualized development, provided important rewards for learning and effective job performance, were primarily run by line executives with staff assistance, and were a systematic and integral part of the way the company managed itself, while (b) unsuccessful
approaches occurred when less effort was invested, happened primarily off the job, emphasized abstract concepts and/or applications by other companies, featured standardized courses for all, offered few rewards for learning, were primarily run by staff executives or outsiders, and were isolated experiences rather than parts of a whole. These differences may or may not be generalizable to other leadership development programs as well.

Summary

Clearly, leadership development is a complex area of study. A variety of approaches have been used to determine what leadership is. Dozens of leadership definitions, theories, types and styles of leadership, and classifications of leaders have been advanced by scholars to achieve that aim.

Other studies have focused on characteristics of leaders, while still others have researched such factors as gender and background which may affect leadership development. However, there appears to be little consistency in the results and recommendations of the authors who have studied the subject.

Although many youth serving organizations have conducted leadership development programs and provided a variety of learning experiences for teenagers, little research has been done to identify what, if any, experiences are most important in youth leadership development. While several hundred formal and informal experiences have been suggested in the literature for the facilitation of such development, few have appeared to be grounded in a solid research base which indicated whether they
have in fact consistently enabled youth to become leaders. Further, little research appears to have been done with established leaders to determine if commonalities exist in their experiences as teenagers, or in the recommendations they might make for youth with aspirations towards leadership.

To discover which experiences are most important for the development of leadership by teenagers, and for leadership development program offerings for teenagers to be strengthened, additional research needs to be conducted. Implications for designing more effective youth leadership development programs could be identified by determining commonalities that exist among established leaders' recommendations for important experiences for the development of leadership in teenagers, as well as by examining the kinds of experiences such leaders had in common during their adolescent years.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to determine what experiences established leaders in the United States identify as being most important for the development of leadership by teenagers. In addition, the relationships between these recommendations and the backgrounds and experiences of the respondents were investigated.

Research Design

The descriptive research design was chosen for this study. Data were collected to answer the research question, "What leadership development experiences are identified by established leaders as most important for leadership development by teenagers?" as well as to answer supporting research questions related to the commonalities among the backgrounds and experiences of the leaders studied, and whether the views of the leaders varied according to these backgrounds and experiences.

Sample

A stratified sample of 1,000 established leaders was chosen randomly from 70 directories of public and private sector leaders in the United States to participate in the national study. While many of the directories were lists of all individuals in particular positions, others were compiled through nomination processes and included self-nominations.
One hundred twenty-five (125) leaders were selected from each of the value and institution categories of leadership outlined by Lasswell (in Cunningham, 1983):

(a) Power - leaders in government, courts, and related organizations
(b) Affection - leaders of families and family support groups
(c) Skills - leaders in primary, secondary, and technical schools, and in technical skill related occupations
(d) Enlightenment - leaders in higher education, research organizations, and the media
(e) Wealth/Poverty - leaders in business, insurance, foundations, poverty programs, and landowners
(f) Well-Being - leaders of health organizations, medicine, security, safety, and supporting societies and organizations
(g) Respect - leaders of civic groups, fraternities, sororities, and cultural and entertainment programs
(h) Rectitude - church and religious organization leaders

The sample (see Appendix B) included participants from every state and the District of Columbia, as well as participants from the territories of Puerto Rico and American Samoa. Six hundred ninety-two (69.2%) of the participants in the sample were male and 308 (30.8%) were female.

Four hundred ten (410) of the 1,000 leaders surveyed returned completed, usable questionnaires, for a response rate of 41%. Of these, 322 questionnaires were returned from the first mailing, and 88 were returned from the second, follow-up mailing.
The respondents were generally representative of the sample with regard to distribution among leadership categories, gender, and state of residence. In addition, no significant differences were found between the early and late respondents in relation to 20 of the 22 variables investigated. Therefore, because (a) the stratified sample was drawn randomly and reflected a balance of leadership categories, state of residence, and gender within the population identified, (b) because the distribution of respondents reflected a similar balance, and (c) because literature (Smith, 1984) has shown that non-response error is minimal when early and late responses are similar and such similarity was apparent between the early and late respondents in this study, the findings can be viewed with confidence as to their generalizability to the population of established leaders in the United States.

Respondents were distributed throughout Lasswell's (Cunningham, 1983) leadership categories from which the sample was drawn. Table 1 illustrates this distribution.

Table 2 shows that, on a percentage basis, females responded at a slightly higher rate than did males. While only 30.80% of the sample was female, females represented 33.66% of the respondents. However, the proportion of male and female respondents was similar to the proportion in the sample.

Usable responses were received from participants in every state with the exception of Idaho and Mississippi, and the territories of Puerto Rico and American Samoa. The distribution of sample participants and respondents by state of residence was similar to the population distribution, as shown in Appendix F.
Table 1

**Distribution of Sample Population and Respondents by Leadership Categories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>No. in Sample</th>
<th>Percent of Sample</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percent of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affection</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>16.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlightenment</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>13.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealth/Poverty</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-Being</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>12.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rectitude</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>14.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

**Distribution of Sample Population and Respondents by Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>No. In Sample</th>
<th>Percent of Sample</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percent of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>30.80%</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>33.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>69.20%</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>66.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There were few significant differences in the responses of early respondents (those who returned the first questionnaire) and late respondents (those who returned the follow-up questionnaire). These differences were in the leadership sectors of the respondents' mentors, and the respondents' personal leadership development experiences. No significant differences were found between the early and late respondents and the leadership development experiences they recommended as important for teenagers, nor any of the other nineteen variables. Therefore, as Smith (1984) illustrated, the non-response error in this study can be considered minimal, and the results can be considered generalizable to the population of leaders from which the sample was drawn. The table of chi-square relationships between the early and late respondents in relation to each of the 22 variables investigated is shown in Appendix G.

Of the 410 respondents, 400 answered the questions related to current marital status and age, while 398 provided information about their level of education. A majority (73.75%) of the leaders who responded to the study were married (Table 3). As Table 3 illustrates, a slightly higher percentage of the leaders were married or divorced than the general adult population of the United States (US Bureau of the Census, 1986). Most (69.50%) of the respondents in the sample were between the ages of 40 and 64, with the median age being between 50 and 59 (Table 4). A large majority (83.92%) were college educated with 41.46% holding doctorates (Table 5).
### Table 3

**Marital Status of Respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>1985 % of USA Adult Population</th>
<th>N of Respondents</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>63.00%</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>73.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>21.50%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>7.60%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>7.90%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4

**Ages of Respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N of Respondents</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>14.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>12.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Age Range</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>16.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>12.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-69</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 75</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5
Respondents' Educational Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>N of Respondents</th>
<th>Percent of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No High School Diploma</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Diploma</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech. or Assoc. Degree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's Degree</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>20.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Degree</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>21.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>41.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Twenty-five of the leaders who responded to the questionnaire and who agreed to take part in a qualitative follow-up interview were selected to participate in a telephone interview to further develop and test the results generated through the questionnaire. Of these 25, one female and two males were chosen at random from each of the eight Lasswell categories, and one additional male from the rectitude category was randomly selected. Each interviewee was asked to respond to identical questions to verify and prioritize the results obtained from the questionnaire. A copy of the interview schedule is included in Appendix A.

Instrumentation

Because a review of related literature showed no clear answers to the research questions in this study, and because there appeared to be a variety of supported but conflicting theories about leadership and factors which contribute to its development by
teenagers, it was determined that a written questionnaire to obtain data for analysis from established and recognized leaders would be the best means by which preliminary answers to the research questions could be found. The results from this questionnaire then could be analyzed, and a follow-up series of telephone interviews could be conducted to confirm the findings.

Therefore, data were collected in this study through the use of two instruments: a written questionnaire, and a telephone interview schedule. The items administered in the questionnaire and the interviews were developed from the concepts, theories, and research findings resulting from the review of related literature. In addition, the results obtained through the questionnaire were used to develop the specific interview items (see Appendix A).

**Development of The Questionnaire**

As noted, the items administered in the questionnaire were developed from the concepts, theories, and research findings obtained from the review of related literature. The questionnaire was reviewed by a panel of experts and pilot-tested with two groups during development to ensure clarity, validity, and reliability, as well as to appropriately revise the items to be included on the questionnaire (see Appendix A) to be administered to the national sample (see Appendix B).

During the week of December 15, 1985, eight home economics education graduate students at The Ohio State University were asked to complete a sample questionnaire, identify weaknesses in
the instrument and accompanying materials, and make comments and suggestions for improvement. The results of this initial test, along with further suggestions from experts in research and leadership development, were used to revise the instrument before it was used with the second pilot-test group of selected established leaders in Ohio.

Lasswell's (Cunningham, 1983) value and institution categories of leadership were used as a framework from which to select the non-random sample of 30 established Ohio leaders for the second pilot test. Four Ohio leaders were selected from each of the categories of power, skills, enlightenment, wealth, well-being, and rectitude, and three were selected from the remaining two categories of affection and respect (see Appendix C).

The procedures used with the Ohio pilot sample were identical to those later used with the national sample. An individualized cover letter on Ohio State University stationery, a questionnaire, a return envelope, an abstract and interview request return postcard, and an Ohio State University pencil were mailed to the selected Ohio leaders January 16, 1986. One follow-up packet for non-respondents which included an individualized cover letter illustrating the importance of returning the questionnaire, an additional questionnaire, and a return envelope was mailed February 5, 1986.

Fifteen of the 30 leaders (50.00%) in the pilot study returned completed usable questionnaires. Six others returned incomplete unusable questionnaires and/or notes explaining that they did not have time to participate.
The results from this pilot study were used as a basis for categorizing responses and developing the analysis procedures for the national study, as well as for making minor modifications in the instrument before it was typeset, printed, and mailed to the national sample. However, since the participants in the Ohio pilot study were selected non-randomly, the results from the pilot study were not included with the data obtained from the national sample in the analysis of results reported later in this document.

The Questionnaire Used In The National Survey

The questionnaire used in the national survey included 23 items. Twenty-two of the items related directly to the objectives and research questions in the study, and the twenty-third asked for permission to quote responses to the two open-ended questions related to recommended and personal leadership development experiences.

The first item asked respondents to check the one definition from Bass and Stogdill's (1981) classification of definitions that most closely matched their personal definition or to give their personal definition if it was different from any of those listed. Then, on the next seven items, respondents were asked to identify the Merrill (Pascarella, 1982), Hersey-Blanchard (1983), Bates-Kiersey (1974) and Myers-Briggs (Bates & Kiersey, 1974) leadership style descriptors that most accurately described them. These questions served not only to obtain data from the respondents with which to answer the research questions and achieve the objectives of the study related to the backgrounds and
personal views of the leaders, but they also helped the respondents think about the concept of leadership from various research-based perspectives before tackling the more complex open-ended items.

Through the first two open-ended questions respondents were asked to identify what they believed to be their three greatest strengths and weaknesses as leaders. Then they listed the experiences they recommended as important for teen leadership development and the experiences which had contributed to their personal leadership development in response to items 11 and 12.

Finally, the leaders were asked to identify their personal backgrounds and experiences related to a series of ten factors which had been identified in other studies as factors which influence an individual's attitudes and beliefs and which, in turn, may have had some relationship to the recommendations made by the respondents. These included marital status, age, education level, socio-economic status, childhood family structure, place of residence, religion, involvement in groups and organizations, and role models and mentors.

The questionnaires were professionally typeset and printed with dark blue ink on high-quality pale blue textured stock so that the finished instrument would reflect the fact that the study was an important one, and a higher response rate would be encouraged. A total of 2,500 questionnaires were printed to provide enough copies for two mailings to the 1,000 leaders in the sample plus additional copies for use with audiences in explaining the study once it was completed.
The Interview Schedule

The items for the interviews were developed from the review of literature and the results obtained through the questionnaire. Each of the 25 taped interviews were conducted using the same schedule of major questions. However, additional individualized follow-up qualitative questions were asked on a few occasions to clarify responses which were ambiguous or unclear.

The interview schedule (see Appendix A) included five types of items:

(a) introductory comments, thanks for completion of the questionnaire, review of the purpose of the interview to verify and prioritize results
(b) review of recommendations made by the individual for teen leadership development experiences, and provision of opportunity for additions and/or changes
(c) review of the 20 categories of teen leadership development experiences identified through the study in which interviewee was asked to rank each as (i) very important, (ii) somewhat important, or (iii) not important for the development of leadership by teenagers
(d) verification of correlations between responses and backgrounds and personal experiences reported
(e) thanks, opportunity for interviewee questions, and closing

Data Collection Procedures

Quantitative and qualitative methods were used to collect the data. Categories surveyed with both open-ended and forced-choice
questions in the questionnaire and interviews included:

(a) experiences identified and recommended by the leaders as important for the development of leadership by teenagers.

(b) backgrounds and experiences of the leaders which may have contributed to their effectiveness.

(c) demographic and other characteristics of the leaders.

Following the testing, revision, and printing of the questionnaire and other materials, the 1,000 leaders in the stratified random sample (see Appendix B) were each mailed a questionnaire coded with an individual identification number, an abstract and interview permission postcard (see Appendix A), with an individualized cover letter (see Appendix D), a stamped return envelope, and an OSU pencil the week of June 10, 1986. An individualized follow-up packet was sent to non-respondents the week of July 25, 1986. This follow-up packet included an individualized cover letter (see Appendix E), an additional identification-coded questionnaire, and a stamped return envelope. Official Ohio State University Extension Administration stationery was purchased for the cover letters and envelopes for the packets, to lend additional credibility and emphasize the study's tie to a highly regarded institution, as well as to avoid any biases that could be created through the use of stationery from a particular youth-serving organization or academic department.

Four hundred ten (410) completed usable questionnaires were returned, for a usable response rate of 41%. Survey packets were
returned as unforwardable by the postal service for 57 individuals who had moved or otherwise could not be located. Also, 53 unusable incomplete questionnaires, 42 of which included letters explaining reasons for non-response, were received.

The 25 recorded telephone interviews were conducted and taped the week of December 15, 1986. Interview procedures outlined in *Telephone Surveys as an Extension Tool* (WEX, 1978) were used to gain further information and insights related to the findings.

**Analysis Procedures**

The data resulting from the survey were analyzed using the SAS statistical program package to determine frequency distributions, percentages, and chi squares of interactions for each of the categories studied, as outlined by Kennedy (1978). Data resulting from the telephone surveys were analyzed using nomitive group prioritizing techniques and qualitative modified analytic induction techniques as outlined in Bogdan and Biklen (1982) and Guba and Lincoln (1983).

All of the data and syntheses generated from the study were analyzed to reveal answers to the original research questions and to achieve the identified objectives. The answer to the major research question for the study, "What leadership development experiences are identified by established leaders as most important for leadership development by adolescents?", was obtained by using the SAS statistical program to determine the frequency distributions and percentages of responses to item 11 on
the questionnaire, "What experiences (specific activities) do you believe are most important for the development of leadership by today's teenagers?". The importance of the experiences thus identified was confirmed by the use of nomitive group prioritizing techniques to analyze responses to the telephone survey.

The first supporting research question, "What, if any, commonalities exist among the backgrounds and experiences of these established leaders?" was answered by the use of the SAS program to determine frequency distributions and percentages of responses to 21 different items (items one through 10, and 12 through 21) on the questionnaire. These items requested information related to various background and experience factors which had been identified through the literature review as potential influences on leadership development.

Twenty-one separate sets of chi-square tests were performed to determine whether the recommended leadership development experiences identified through item 11 were independent of the 21 other items related to the backgrounds and experiences of the leaders. The results from these chi-square tests were used to answer the second supporting research question, "Is there a relationship between the leaders' backgrounds and demographic factors, and their recommendations?" The chi square test was the most appropriate test with which to evaluate the relationships since all the data were nominal (Kennedy, 1978). The findings, discussion, conclusions, implications, limitations, and recommendations are summarized in chapters four and five of this document.
CHAPTER IV
FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The major research question to be answered through this study was "What experiences do established leaders in the United States identify as being most important for the development of leadership by teenagers?". Answers were also sought for the supporting research questions (a) "What, if any, commonalities exist among the backgrounds and adolescent experiences of these established leaders?", and (b) "Is there a relationship between the backgrounds and experiences of the leaders and their recommendations?". Thus, the findings will be discussed in terms of these three areas of concern.

First, findings related to the backgrounds and experiences of established leaders will be reported. This will provide a frame of reference from which the experiences they identified as being most important for the development of leadership by teenagers can be understood. Then, after these backgrounds and experiences and recommendations have been considered as separate entities, the findings regarding the relationships between the two will be discussed.

Backgrounds and Experiences Of The Leaders

Findings related to the backgrounds and experiences of the leaders in the study not only provided general information about the respondents, but also furnished an indication of how these
leaders developed their own leadership abilities. The respondents' definitions of leadership, descriptions of themselves as leaders, and various demographic factors were investigated.

Definitions of Leadership

Participants in the study were asked to check the one definition of leadership derived from Bass and Stogdill's (1981) classification of leadership definitions which most closely matched their personal definition. Of the 402 respondents who answered the item, 106 (26.37%) identified the definition "enabling groups to achieve goals efficiently and effectively" which was derived from Bass and Stogdill's category of "leadership as an instrument of goal achievement". Seventy-one (17.66%) identified leadership as the exercise of influence, 63 (15.67%) identified the art of inducing compliance, and 61 (15.17%) chose leadership as an effect of interaction. Table 6 shows that no other definition was selected by more than 10% of the participants.

Self-Descriptions of Leadership Types and Styles

The leaders in the study were asked to describe themselves according to the categories of types and styles of leadership identified by by Merrill (Pascarella, 1982), Hersey and Blanchard (1983), Bates and Kiersey (1974), and Myers-Briggs (in Bates and Kiersey, 1974). Merrill's and Bates and Kiersey's findings indicated the majority of formal leaders were drivers, or traditional-judicial types. However, most respondents in this study described themselves as expressive leaders on Merrill's categorization, as high task/high relationship leaders on Hersey and Blanchard's.
Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership as...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...an instrument of goal achievement (enabling groups to achieve goals)</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>26.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...the exercise of influence (influencing others as they do a job, reach a goal, or change their behavior)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>17.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...the art of inducing compliance (directing others and inducing obedience, respect, and loyalty...)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>15.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...an effect of interaction (a natural result of human interaction in which the leadership of the person who takes charge is acknowledged)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>15.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...a group of acts of behaviors (behaviors such as structuring work, managing, showing consideration, etc.)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...a focus of group process (the result of being in a central position where communication &amp; progress can be controlled &amp; facilitated)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...personality and its effects (strong personality and charisma)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...a form of persuasion (a form of persuasion)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...a differentiated role (a definite role such as an office or definite position in a group)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...the initiation and maintenance of structure (the initiation &amp; maintenance of structure)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...a power relationship (a relationship in which leaders accumulate and use power with others)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...other personally-developed definitions</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
categorization, as catalysts or visionaries on Bates and Kiersey's model, and as extroverted, sensing, thinking, perceiving leaders on the individual Myers-Briggs categorizations.

Specifically, of the 402 leaders who responded to the third item on the questionnaire, 202 (50.25%) of the leaders described themselves as expressive leaders with regard to the categories of leadership proposed by Merrill. Eighty-eight (21.89%) described themselves as analytical leaders, 65 (16.17%) as drivers, and 47 (11.69%) as amiable leaders.

Of the 404 participants who responded to the fourth item, 318 (78.71%) believed they were equally high task and high relationship oriented on Hersey and Blanchard's model. Forty-seven (11.63%) identified themselves as high task and low relationship leaders, 34 (8.42%) as low task and high relationship leaders, and 5 (1.24%) as low task and low relationship leaders.

With regard to the categories proposed by Bates and Kiersey, 397 responded. One hundred fifty-four (38.79%) identified themselves as catalysts, and 111 (27.96%) identified themselves as visionaries. Seventy-eight (19.65%) said that they were troubleshooter-negotiator types of leaders, and 54 (13.60%) identified themselves as traditional-judicial leaders.

As Table 7 illustrates, when the leaders were asked to rate themselves with regard to the individual Myers and Briggs leadership descriptors, the leaders more frequently described themselves as extroverted, sensing, thinking, and/or perceptive than as introverted, intuitive, feeling, and/or judging.
Table 7

Leaders Self-Descriptions of Myers and Briggs Typologies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Descriptor Pairs</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extrovert</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>63.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introvert</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>34.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced Extrovert/Introvert</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensing</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>57.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intuitive</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>38.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced Sensing/Intuitive</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>58.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>38.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced Thinking/Feeling</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptive</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>86.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judging</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>12.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced Perceptive/Judging</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=403

As the table shows, 254 (63.03%) of the 403 leaders who responded identified themselves as extroverts, 139 (34.49%) as introverts, and 10 (2.48%) as balanced between the two categories. With regard to the sensing vs. intuition category, 232 (57.57%) identified themselves as sensing, while 156 (38.71%) believed they were more intuitive, and 15 (3.72%) identified themselves as balanced between the two. In addition, 236 (58.85%) believed that they were thinking leaders, while 154 (38.40%) believed they were more feeling leaders, and 11
(2.74%) identified themselves as balanced. Finally, 351 (86.88%) identified themselves as perceptive leaders, 51 (12.62%) believed they were judging leaders, and 2 (0.50%) felt they reflected a balance between the two dimensions.

Although not related to the purposes or research questions of this study, it was interesting to note if the responses of the leaders in this study related to the Myers and Briggs descriptors were grouped for each individual as Kiersey and Bates did in formulating their categorizations of leadership types, a somewhat different pattern would emerge from what would be expected. As Appendix J shows, while most leaders identified themselves as catalysts, followed in order by visionaries, troubleshooters, and traditional leaders in response to item four, a combination of Myers and Briggs descriptors from items five through eight indicated most would be categorized as troubleshooters, followed in order by visionaries, catalysts, and traditional leaders. In short, the first and third most selected categories would be reversed. While these preliminary indications were not analyzed for significance since they were not directly related to the purposes of this study, they indicate a need for additional research in leadership related topics such as self-perceptions of leadership types vs. tested categories of leadership types, and validity of the Bates and Kiersey (1974) model.

Leadership Strengths and Weaknesses

In responding to the two open-ended questions in which they were asked to identify their three greatest strengths and
weaknesses as leaders, participants in the study gave a variety of answers. These answers were grouped first into 79 groups of similar specific responses. Then these 79 specific groups were organized into 20 major categories of related responses.

Similar categories were used for clarity and ease of analysis of the responses to items 11 and 12 on the questionnaire with regard to the personal leadership development experiences of the respondents, as well as to items 9 and 10 with regard to their personal leadership strengths and weaknesses. Therefore, it was necessary to maintain the integrity of each of the 20 categories rather than to attempt to merge separate categories which may have included only a few responses to a given item.

Fifteen of the categories were directly related to the dimensions identified as important and used as criteria for leaders evaluated in assessment centers (Smith, Hakel, et al, 1984). They were: communications abilities and experiences, group leadership abilities and experiences, personal characteristics and personal characteristic development experiences, abilities and experiences in planning and organization, decision-making and judgment abilities and experiences, teaching and helping others develop, flexibility and patience, organizational sensitivity and vision, assertiveness and self-confidence, abilities and experiences in objectivity, experiences and abilities in perception, experiences and abilities related to sensitivity, management control abilities and experiences, collaborative abilities and experiences, and evaluation abilities and experiences. The remaining five categories (formal
education, cultural and citizenship abilities and experiences, employment and internship experiences, experiences with mentors/role models and other nurturers, and significant life and background experiences) were synthesized by the researcher from the results of related studies outlined in the review of literature.

Each leader was asked to identify three strengths on item nine and three weaknesses on item ten. Several leaders identified two or more almost identical responses which were coded into the same groups and categories. For example, one leader listed "commitment" and "dedication" as two separate strengths, both of which were coded into the grouping "loyalty, commitment, and dedication" and the major category "personal characteristics and abilities". Therefore, both the frequency with which responses were identified, and the numbers of individuals who made the responses will be reported.

As Table 8 shows, the leaders in the study most often identified personal leadership strengths in the categories of personal characteristics and abilities, communications, management control, sensitivity, decision-making and judgment, group leadership, planning and organization, behavioral flexibility, organizational sensitivity, and collaborativeness. Each of these ten categories was identified as important for effective administration in the dimensions developed by Smith, Hakel, and others (1984). The complete list of the frequency with which leaders identified strengths in each of the 20 categories is included in Appendix H.
Table 8

**Most Frequently Identified Personal Leadership Strengths**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Freq</th>
<th>Freq %</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Characteristics and Abilities</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>24.20</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>19.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications Abilities</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>8.57</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>8.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Control Abilities</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>8.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>8.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making and Judgment</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>7.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Leadership Abilities</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>6.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Organization Abilities</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>6.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Flexibility</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>6.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Sensitivity</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>5.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborativeness</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of all the categories of leadership strengths identified, the category of personal characteristics was listed most frequently by more individuals than any other. Specific strengths were listed in the following groups of similar personal characteristics:

(a) integrity, honesty, morals, or fairness
   (frequency = 75 [6.04%), and n = 65 [5.44%])

(b) friendliness, humility, and personality
   (frequency = 38 [3.05%], and n = 37 [3.10%])

(c) loyalty, commitment, and dedication
   (frequency = 33 [2.65%], and n = 31 [2.59%])

(d) intelligence and memory
   (frequency = 32 [2.57%], and n = 32 [2.68%])

(e) hard work, workaholism, willingness to work, and doing one's best (frequency = 24 [1.93%], and n = 24 [2.01%])
(f) creativity
   (frequency = 23 \[1.84\%\], and n = 23 \[1.93\%\])

(g) persistence, perseverance, and determination
   (frequency = 22 \[1.68\%\], and n = 22 \[1.84\%\])

(h) drive, energy, desire, and ambition
   (frequency = 18 \[1.44\%\], and n = 18 \[1.51\%\])

(i) sense of humor
   (frequency = 13 \[1.09\%\], and n = 13 \[1.09\%\])

(j) enthusiasm and interest
   (frequency = 13 \[1.04\%\], and n = 13 \[1.09\%\])

(k) initiative and self-reliance
   (frequency = 8 \[0.64\%\], and n = 8 \[0.67\%\])

(l) optimism and positive attitude
   (frequency = 3 \[0.24\%\], and n = 3 \[0.25\%\])

These findings are similar in nature to those characteristics identified by Watts (1984), Abodahr (1982), Engle (1976), and others who cited personal characteristics as important for leadership. In a related observation about these findings, it was interesting to note that although only seven \(1.74\%\) participants in the study defined leadership in terms of "personality and its effects" on item one of the questionnaire, "personal characteristics and abilities" were identified as among their greatest leadership strengths by a majority \(24.20\%\), and n = 212 \[19.40\%\]) of the respondents!

Communications abilities were the second most frequently identified strengths by the leaders in the study \(107\)}
This is also supported by the findings of such scholars as Watts (1984), White (1984), Millar and Yerby (1982), and Bass and Stogdill (1981) that a characteristic of leaders is effective communications skill. Listening abilities were the most often identified specific strengths in the communications category, with 47 (3.93%) individuals identifying their ability to listen as one of their greatest leadership strengths. Forty-six leaders (3.85%) listed general communications skills and abilities as among their strengths, while oral communications abilities were identified by seven (0.59%) of the individuals, written communications abilities by four (0.34%), interpersonal communications skills by two (0.17%), and public speaking abilities by one (0.08%).

Of the specific management control strengths identified by the leaders in the study, most related to paying attention to details and using resources for the most effective outcomes and goals (frequency = 52 [4.17%], and n = 50 [4.18%]). Responsibility, self-discipline, toughness, firmness, and reliability formed the second highest grouping of specific strengths identified in this category (frequency = 27 [2.17%], and n = 25 [2.09%]). People management skills and ability to delegate were identified 22 times (1.76%) by 20 (1.67%) leaders, and time management skill was listed by one person (0.08%). Such findings are further supported by earlier findings such as those of Bennis and Nanus (1985) and Maccoby (1981) whose studies identified management control abilities as important leadership strengths.
In the next most frequently identified category of leadership strengths (sensitivity) strengths related to concern, sensitivity, consideration for others and their feelings and needs, compassion, caring, and other such closely related or synonymous concepts were identified 85 times (6.82%) by 82 (6.86%) individuals. Eleven other leaders (0.92%) identified the specific strength of intuition as one of their greatest strengths. The importance of sensitivity as a leadership characteristic was also evident in other literature such as the works by Bennis (1984) and Gilligan (1982).

Abilities related to decision making and judgment comprised the next most listed category of leadership strengths. Decision making and judgment abilities were identified 89 times (7.14%) by 86 (7.11%) individuals. These abilities included securing information, defining goals, developing alternatives, and actually making decisions. Previous studies such as those by Hermann (1984), Bennis (1984), and Bass and Stogdill (1981) also identified decision making and judgment ability as an important leadership characteristic.

Most of the responses (frequency = 78 [6.25%], and n = 71 [5.94%]) in the category of group leadership strengths were included in the closely related grouping of strengths in group and individual leadership, influence, encouragement, persuasiveness, motivation, salesmanship and so forth as Watts (1984) did. Three individuals (0.25%), however, identified supervisory abilities and consistency as among their greatest strengths, while one (0.08%) listed abilities related to the position of being the chief executive officer of his organization.
The 68 leaders (5.77%) who listed planning and organization as among their greatest strengths said that they tended to approach things systematically and logically. Then as they proceeded, they prioritized their work, established step-by-step courses of action, and took measures to assure follow-up. The importance of planning and organization as a leadership strengths was also supported by literature such as the works by Hermann (1984) and Watts (1984).

Leadership strengths related to behavioral flexibility were listed 71 times. Of these, the group of strengths of adaptability, open mindedness, ability to compromise, and flexibility were identified 61 (4.89%) times, by 58 (4.85%) people. In addition, ten (0.84%) leaders identified strengths in tolerance and patience as among their leadership strengths. The importance of flexibility as a leadership characteristic was highlighted in the work of Bass and Stogdill (1981) and others including Borich and Baugher (1984).

Organizational sensitivity was the seventh most identified category of important leadership strengths by the participants in the study. Specifically, having a "vision" or long-range focus for the organizations and groups with which they were working was cited 54 times (4.33%) by 51 individuals (4.27%), lending support for the visionary category that Bates and Kiersey (1974) proposed. Also, particular strength was identified by 15 individuals (1.25%) in understanding policies and procedures and using them appropriately.
Of the individuals who listed collaborativeness among their greatest leadership strengths, most identified their abilities to work cooperatively with others (frequency - 44 [3.53%], and n - 41 [3.43%]). Interpersonal skills was identified 18 times (1.44%) by 17 (1.42%) people, and two (0.17%) mentioned teamwork as one of their leadership strengths. The importance of working with people in a collaborative fashion was also documented throughout the leadership literature in works such as those by Borich and Baugher (1984), Hermann (1984), Cunningham (1983) and others.

In addition to the most frequently mentioned leadership strengths identified by leaders in the study, a number of leaders listed other strengths as important. These included employment strengths and job related abilities, evaluation abilities, teaching abilities, perception, assertiveness and self-confidence, objectivity, significant background and life experiences, formal education, cultural and citizenship strengths, and having mentors, role models, and support relationships. These strengths were similarly well documented as important through the literature in works such as those by Smith, Hakel, and others (1984), Borich and Baugher (1984), Hermann (1984), and others.

Employment strengths and job related abilities were the next most often identified category of leadership strength. Twenty-four (2.008%) respondents identified expertise in their specific jobs, specific work experiences, or knowledge about the job to be done as personal leadership strengths, while general employment strengths were identified 18 times (1.44%) by 17 individuals (1.42%).
Those who identified their evaluation abilities as among their greatest leadership strengths listed two kinds of specific strengths. First, 31 (2.59%) individuals listed skills in assessing and judging, learning from mistakes, and giving feedback and credit to subordinates. Secondly, being able to gain satisfaction, having a sense of proportion, and having realistic expectations were listed ten times (0.80%) by nine leaders (0.75%).

Abilities in teaching and helping others learn was listed 28 times (2.245%) by 25 (2.09%) individuals. Respondents identified strengths both in direct teaching and in development of co-workers through a variety of means.

Perception ranked fourteenth out of the 20 categories of strengths identified. Perceiving the big picture and recognizing problems and potential problems were strengths identified 24 times (1.93%) by 23 (1.93%) of the leaders in the study.

Assertiveness and self-confidence was the fifteenth most identified category of greatest strength by the participants, and objectivity was the sixteenth. The grouping self-confidence, self-esteem, and self-worth was listed by 14 individuals (1.17%), and six others (0.50%) listed strengths in assertiveness. Eleven of the leaders (0.92%) identified being objective as one of their three greatest leadership strengths.

Having significant life experiences and background was listed as an important leadership strength by eleven individuals. Of these, six (0.50%) identified their faith as being a very important strength, two (0.17%) cited fitness and good health as important,
two others (0.17%) said they had good luck and were in the right place at the right time, and one (0.08%) indicated that financial experience was one of his greatest strengths.

Formal education was identified as a strength by only seven individuals (0.59%), all of whom either mentioned a "good education" or a "broad education" as being one of their leadership strengths. Similarly, seven of the leaders in the study identified cultural and citizenship experiences as real strengths. Of these, six (0.50%) said that being well-read, broadly informed, and up on current events was one of their leadership strengths, while one (0.08%) said that travel and cross cultural experience was a strength. Finally, three (0.25%) of the individuals in the study said their greatest strengths included having supporters and strong networking abilities.

Leadership Weaknesses

The process by which leaders in the study identified their three greatest leadership weaknesses on item ten was identical to the process by which they identified their strengths on item nine. Similarly, the process by which the responses were coded, analyzed, and prepared for reporting were identical.

It was interesting to note as the responses were coded and analyzed that what one leader identified as a strength would be listed as a weakness by others. Of the seven dimensions identified by more than five percent of the leaders as personal weaknesses, five were similarly listed by more than five percent of the respondents as strengths.
Since the groups and categories into which the weaknesses were coded were similar to those into which the strengths were coded, and since those categories and groups have already been explained and supported by related literature, the findings related to the weaknesses the leaders identified will be reported in table format with further explanation provided only where needed.

Table 9 summarizes what the leaders in the study most frequently identified as their greatest leadership weaknesses. A complete outline of all the leadership weaknesses that were listed is included in Appendix I.

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weakness</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Freq.%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management Control</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>25.29</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>21.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Flexibility</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>12.69</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>12.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness &amp; Self-Confidence</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>10.79</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>10.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Characteristics &amp; Abilities</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>9.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications Abilities</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>7.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>6.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Abilities</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personal Leadership Development Experiences

The experiences of the leaders in the study which they felt contributed to their leadership development was another important consideration. Knowing what the leaders believed
helped them become leaders is almost as important as knowing what experiences they recommended for today's teenagers. For example, those experiences which most frequently occurred in the backgrounds of the leaders and which they also recommended for leadership development by teenagers could be considered most important. Conversely, those which occurred less frequently and were recommended less often might be considered as having a lower priority. This can be considered as especially true since each personal leadership development experience category listed by five percent or more of the respondents was later identified by more than five percent of the respondents as one they would recommend for leadership development by today's teenager.

Participants in the study were asked to identify through an open-ended question up to three experiences which helped them personally to become leaders. Table 10 outlines the most frequent responses by leadership development experience category.

Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Leadership Experiences</th>
<th>Freq</th>
<th>Freq %</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experiences with Mentors &amp; Nurturers</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>20.08</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>16.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant Life/Background Experiences</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>17.28</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>16.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Leadership Experiences</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>12.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Experiences</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>10.21</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Education</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>7.49</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>8.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment &amp; Internship Experiences</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>7.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Development Experiences</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>5.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As would be expected, based on a review of other studies on the subject such as those by Weiner (1984), Barton (1984), Baugher and Kellett (1983), Daloz (1983), Smith (1981), and many others, experiences with mentors, role models, nurturers, and supporters were among the most frequently identified leadership development experiences in the backgrounds of the leaders in this study (frequency = 244 [20.08%], and n = 162 [16.28%]). Parental influence was most frequently identified as important by the leaders in this category (frequency = 73 [5.99%], and n = 72 [6.23%]). Having mentors, role models, or other supporters in a general sense was the next most frequently listed group of experiences in this category (frequency = 52 [4.27%], and n = 42 [3.64%]). Having a strong family or family support was listed 36 times (2.96%) by 33 individuals (2.86%), while family activities and projects were mentioned eight times (0.66%) by seven (0.61%) of the leaders, and sibling relations and birth order were mentioned 14 times (1.15%) by 13 individuals (1.13%). This finding supports those described by Biddie et. al. (1980), Davey and Paolucci (1980), and Hall (1980).

Of the specific mentors and role models other than family members who were identified as important, teachers or professors were listed the most often (frequency = 32 [2.63%], and n = 30 [2.60%]). These were followed in frequency by friends and co-workers (frequency = 13 [1.07%], and n = 13 [1.13%]), employers and supervisors (frequency = 10 [0.82%], and n = 9 [0.78%]), clergy or religious leaders (frequency = 4 [0.33%], and n = 4 [0.35%]),
and group or organization leaders (frequency - 2 [0.16%], and n - 2 [0.17%]).

Significant life and background experiences were the next most frequently identified category of experiences listed by the leaders (frequency - 211 [17.28%], and n - 162 [16.28%]). These included a wide variety of situations and incidents, from the backgrounds of the leaders which they felt significantly influenced their lives and their development of leadership. For example, military experience was listed 44 times (3.61%) by 42 people (3.64%), and military officer experience was listed 29 times (2.38%) by 26 individuals (2.25%). Experiences in relationships with significant others such as dating, marriage, divorce, and family responsibilities were identified as important 24 times (1.97%) by 21 individuals (1.82%). Religious training or church involvement was listed 23 times (1.89%) by 23 of the leaders (1.99%), and faith was listed 8 times (0.66%) by 8 people (0.69%). Financial experiences including family poverty or wealth were listed 19 times (1.56%) by 19 of the leaders (1.65%). Death of someone close to the leader including spouse, other family members, or friends, or other tragedies in which the leader survived while others perished or were hurt was similarly listed 19 times (1.56%) by 19 of the leaders (1.65%), and saving someone's life or significantly influencing someone else was mentioned 4 times (0.33%) by 4 individuals (0.35%). Simply being in the right place at the right time, luck, chance, or circumstance was identified 15 times (1.23%) by 15 of the participants (1.30%) as being
important to their leadership development. Finally, a number of other significant life experiences were mentioned ten or fewer times. These included leaving home at an early age and establishing independence (frequency = 10 [0.82%], and n = 10 [0.87%]); being fit, healthy, or taller than others (frequency = 7 [0.58%], and n = 7 [0.61%]); being from a certain area such as a farm, the suburbs, or a city (frequency = 6 [0.49%], and n = 6 [0.52%]); natural maturation (frequency = 2 [1.16%], and n = 2 [0.17%]); and being older than other group members (frequency = 1 [0.08%], and n = 1 [0.09%]).

The importance of such significant life experiences for leadership development was supported by the findings of environmental theorists and those of the personal-situational scholars cited by Bass and Stogdill (1981). They similarly found that leadership emerges as a result of time, place, and circumstance, and as a result of interaction between individual and situational factors.

Experiences in actual group leadership was the third most frequently identified category of experiences which contributed to the development of leadership by the leaders in the study (frequency = 162 [13.33%], and n = 129 [12.97%]). The specific experiences listed included holding offices or other positions of leadership in a group (frequency = 98 [8.41%], and n = 82 [7.10%]), general group or individual leadership such as influencing, persuading, and motivating others (frequency = 60 [4.93%], and n = 57 [4.94%]), and supervising others (frequency = 4 [0.33%].
and \( n = 4 \) \( [0.35\%] \)). These findings support the importance of "hands-on", real-life experiences in leadership as provided in programs such as those described by Black (1984), Hohman (1982), VICA (1980), and McDiarmid (1982).

The fourth most identified category of personal leadership development experiences by the leaders was collaborative experiences. Of the leaders who mentioned experiences in this category as being important in their personal leadership development, most identified either participation in youth programs and organizations (frequency = 45 \( [3.70\%] \), and \( n = 41 \) \( [3.55\%] \)), or participation in team sports or athletics (frequency = 39 \( [3.20\%] \), and \( n = 38 \) \( [3.29\%] \)). This finding also provides support for the kinds of collaborative experiences outlined by authors such as Cantrell, Doebler, and Heinsohn (1985), Gamon (1984), the Family Community Leadership Board (1984), Kanter (1983), Katz (1975), and others. Finally, participation in professional organizations and societies was listed as important for the development of personal leadership nine times \( (0.74\%) \) by nine of the leaders \( (0.779\%) \), and camping experience was listed four times \( (0.33\%) \) by four individuals \( (0.35\%) \).

Formal education was the next most frequently identified category of personal experiences the leaders in the study believed to be important in their development of leadership (frequency = 92 \( [7.49\%] \), and \( n = 88 \) \( [8.84\%] \)). Getting a good education in general or going to good schools was listed 56 times \( (4.60\%) \) by 53 individuals \( (4.60\%) \). Education for a specific field or in a specific
subject was listed 28 times (2.30%) by 28 of the leaders (2.42%). Of these, eight specifically mentioned training in leadership and management theory and practice. Conversely, eight individuals (0.69%) identified having a broad or liberal education as being important for their personal leadership development. Although this finding was in contrast to Ortyoyande's (1984) finding that educational level was related leadership in educators, and to Hearson's (1983) finding that academic achievement was unrelated to leadership ability, the importance of such formal education for leadership development was supported by other scholars such as Fiedler (1969), Ollila (1983), and others.

As might have been predicted as a result of Hearson's (1983) study which indicated that prior experience was positively related to leadership, employment and internship experiences were considered as important for their leadership development by a number of the leaders (frequency - 84 [6.91%], and n - 74 [7.44%]). Specific experiences listed included employment in a paying job (frequency - 63 [5.17%], and n - 58 [5.00%]), internships or on the job training for a specific field (frequency - 12 [0.99%], and n - 12 [1.040%]), volunteer work (frequency - 7 [0.58%], and n - 7 [0.61%]), and entrepreneurial experiences (frequency - 2 [0.16%], and n - 2 [0.17%]).

The seventh most listed category of personal leadership development experiences identified by the leaders was experience in personal development and initiative. These included experiences to develop personal beliefs and attitudes such as
desire, sense of humor, enthusiasm, integrity, morals, creativity, 
enthusiasm, and so forth (frequency - 48 [3.94%), and n - 42 
[3.64%]), experiences to develop personal performance 
characteristics such as hard work, persistence, perseverance, and 
energy (frequency - 10 [0.82%], and n - 10 [0.87%]), and 
experiences in personal development and initiative such as seeing 
courses of action and taking actions without the need for 
stimulation or support from others (frequency - 5 [0.41%], and 
n=5 [0.43%]). The importance of personal development and 
initiative was supported by Zaleznik (1977), Watts (1984), Engel 
(1976), and others who focused on the importance of personal 
characteristics of leaders.

Although mentioned by fewer than five percent of the leaders 
in the study, several other types of personal leadership 
development experiences were identified. These included cultural 
and citizenship experiences, communications experiences, 
experiences to develop assertiveness and self-confidence, 
management control experiences, experiences in teaching and 
helping others develop, evaluation experiences, experiences in 
organizational sensitivity, experiences in behavioral flexibility, 
planning and organization experiences, decision making and 
problem solving, and experiences to develop sensitivity. Since the 
importance of cultural and citizenship experiences was discussed 
by Kleinfeld and Shinkwin (1983), and each of the others was 
identified as important by Smith, Hakel, and others (1984), these 
experiences merit discussion here.
Cultural and citizenship experiences were identified as important in the development of leadership by the participants in the study 51 times (4.20%) (n=48 or 4.82%). Specific experiences mentioned included travel and cross cultural experiences (frequency = 14 [1.15%], and n = 14 [1.21%]), community service and involvement (frequency = 13 [1.07%], and n = 13 [1.13%]), involvement in politics and government (frequency = 13 [1.07%], and n = 13 [1.13%]), being well-read, broadly informed, aware of current events (frequency = 10 [0.82%], and n = 10 [0.87%]), and learning other languages (frequency = 1 [0.08%], and n = 1 [0.09%]).

Communications experiences were the ninth most mentioned category of personal leadership development experiences by the leaders in the study (frequency = 39 [3.21%], and n = 37 [3.32%]). Experiences in public speaking were the most identified experiences identified in this category (frequency = 16 [1.31%], and n = 16 [1.39%]), followed by experiences in oral communications abilities in general (frequency = 13 [1.07%], and n = 13 [1.13%]). Experiences in written communications were listed five times (0.41%) by five individuals (0.43%), listening experiences three times (0.25%) by three people (0.26%), and communications experiences in general twice by two of the leaders (0.17%).

Experiences which developed assertiveness and self-confidence were identified 33 times (2.63%) by 33 different leaders (3.32%) as important in their personal leadership development. Of these, 23 (1.89%) were identified by 23 different leaders (1.99%) as being experiences which developed self-confidence, self-worth, and
self-esteem. Ten other individuals (0.87%) listed experiences in which they asserted positions without being hostile or counterproductive, expressed themselves forcefully, and showed confidence in challenging or supporting positions.

Management control experiences were the next most frequently identified as important for the leaders' personal leadership development (frequency - 30 [2.47%], and n - 29 [2.92%]). Experiences in which the leaders had much responsibility which required self-discipline were the most frequently identified of these (frequency - 14 [1.15%], and n - 14 [1.21%]). Experiences in using resources efficiently to obtain the best outcomes were listed nine times (0.74%) by nine different leaders (0.78%), followed by people management experiences (frequency - 4 [0.33%], and n - 4 [0.35%]), and time management experiences (frequency - 3 [0.25%], and n - 2 [0.17%]).

Teaching experiences and experiences in helping others develop were identified 26 times (2.06%) by 26 individuals (2.61%). These included group teaching experiences and one-on-one development of others.

The leaders in the study listed evaluation experiences as being important in their development of leadership a total of 18 times (1.48%, n - 16 or 1.61%). The specific experiences identified included assessing, judging, and learning from mistakes (frequency - 8 [0.66%], and n - 8 [0.69%]), recognition experiences (frequency - 7 [0.58%], and n - 7 [0.61%]), and competitive experiences (frequency - 3 [0.25%], and n - 3 [0.35%]).
Experiences in organizational sensitivity were the fourteenth most frequently listed category of experiences identified as important by the leaders' in their development of leadership (frequency - 15 [1.24%, and n - 14 [1.41%]). These included experiences in developing vision and a long range focus (frequency - 12 [0.99%, and n - 12 [1.04%]), as well as experiences in understanding policies and procedures and using them appropriately (frequency - 3 [0.25], and n - 3 [0.26%]).

Behavioral flexibility experiences were the next most often listed. These included experiences in being adaptable, compromising, and working with many different people in different situations (frequency - 9 [0.74%, and n - 9 [0.78%]).

Behavioral flexibility was followed by experiences in planning and organization in frequency of response. The leaders who identified planning and organization experiences as being important to their leadership development (frequency - 8 [0.66%, and n - 8 [0.69%]) specifically listed such experiences as systematically approaching problems, establishing a course of action, and outlining steps.

The final two categories of experiences identified by the leaders as important for their development were experiences in decision making and judgment (frequency - 7 [0.58%, and n - 7 [0.70%]), and experiences that develop sensitivity to others (frequency - 3 [0.25%], and n - 2 [0.20%]). The respondents who identified experiences in this category, along with several others, indicated the importance of "hands-on, real-life" experiences in
which they were involved in doing something such as making real decisions, or actually showing consideration for others' feelings and needs.

Other Factors In The Leaders' Backgrounds and Experiences Which May Have Influenced Their Leadership Development

A variety of kinds of other factors have been considered to be important for leadership development, as shown in several of the studies and cited in the review of literature. For example, socio-economic status, childhood family structure, childhood residence, religion, participation in youth programs and organizations, and mentors and role models have all been identified as important for leadership development by various researchers. Therefore, the participants in this study were asked to respond to items on the questionnaire which provided data related to these factors.

Socio-economic Status

The adolescent socio-economic status of the leaders in the study was determined through two items. One of these related to adolescent family income, and the other related to the degree of family influence in each of the sectors outlined by Lasswell (Cunningham, 1983).

When asked at which level their family income seemed to be most often when they were adolescents, most of the 398 respondents indicated that their families either had just enough income, but no more (n = 155, or 38.95%), or enough income with a little extra sometimes (n = 131, or 32.92%). Seventy-nine of the
respondents (19.85%) said when they were adolescents their families usually seemed to have money left over after meeting expenses, and only 33 (8.29%) said their families usually could not make ends meet.

When asked to what degree their families were influential when they were adolescents in the societal sectors identified by Lasswell (Cunningham, 1983), most of the respondents indicated a fairly low level of influence in every sector. Table 11 illustrates that respondents identified their families as being more influential in the rectitude and affection sectors than in the other six sectors.

Childhood Family Structure

To determine the structures of the families of the leaders during their childhoods and adolescent years, participants were asked to indicate whether they lived at home with both parents, at home with one parent, with another relative or guardian, or in another situation for each of the following age ranges: 2-7 (early childhood), 8-10 (late childhood), 11-15 (early adolescence), and 16-19 (late adolescence). As shown in Table 12, most of the respondents lived at home with both their parents during each of the age ranges. Although the number who marked "other" increased for the 16 to 19 age range, most of those were specified as boarding school or college, rather than a change in family structure. Although this finding cannot be interpreted as a cause-and-effect relationship, the fact that the large majority of leaders in the study lived at home with both their parents during their childhood and adolescence may be important in light of the
conclusions by Biddle et al (1980), Davey and Paolucci (1980), and Hall (1980) that strong and supportive family relationships are important for leadership development.

Table 11
Degree of Adolescent Family Influence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Not Influential (value-1)</th>
<th>Somewhat Influential (value-2)</th>
<th>Fairly Influential (value-3)</th>
<th>Very Influential (value-4)</th>
<th>Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>n=264</td>
<td>n=63</td>
<td>n=37</td>
<td>n=13</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Power)</td>
<td>70.03%</td>
<td>16.71%</td>
<td>9.81%</td>
<td>3.45%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
<td>n=75</td>
<td>n=139</td>
<td>n=113</td>
<td>n=52</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Affection)</td>
<td>19.79%</td>
<td>36.68%</td>
<td>29.82%</td>
<td>13.72%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Schools</td>
<td>n=182</td>
<td>n=95</td>
<td>n=63</td>
<td>n=37</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Skills)</td>
<td>48.28%</td>
<td>25.20%</td>
<td>16.71%</td>
<td>9.81%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Educ.</td>
<td>n=262</td>
<td>n=51</td>
<td>n=36</td>
<td>n=25</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Enlightenment)</td>
<td>70.05%</td>
<td>13.64%</td>
<td>9.63%</td>
<td>6.68%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>n=196</td>
<td>n=91</td>
<td>n=60</td>
<td>n=32</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Wealth)</td>
<td>51.72%</td>
<td>24.01%</td>
<td>15.83%</td>
<td>8.44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pub. Health</td>
<td>n=248</td>
<td>n=77</td>
<td>n=36</td>
<td>n=9</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Well-being)</td>
<td>67.03%</td>
<td>20.81%</td>
<td>9.73%</td>
<td>2.43%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assocs. &amp; Civic</td>
<td>n=168</td>
<td>n=97</td>
<td>n=73</td>
<td>n=43</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Respect)</td>
<td>44.09%</td>
<td>25.46%</td>
<td>19.16%</td>
<td>11.29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church &amp; Rel.</td>
<td>n=109</td>
<td>n=89</td>
<td>n=95</td>
<td>n=92</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Rectitude)</td>
<td>28.31%</td>
<td>23.12%</td>
<td>24.68%</td>
<td>23.90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12

Childhood Family Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Structure</th>
<th>Age 2-7</th>
<th>8-10</th>
<th>11-15</th>
<th>16-19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home with Both Parents</td>
<td>n=369</td>
<td>n=356</td>
<td>n=335</td>
<td>n=287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95.84%</td>
<td>91.99%</td>
<td>86.79%</td>
<td>73.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home with One Parent</td>
<td>n=8</td>
<td>n=22</td>
<td>n=27</td>
<td>n=34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.08%</td>
<td>5.69%</td>
<td>6.99%</td>
<td>8.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Another Relative or Guardian</td>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>n=6</td>
<td>n=11</td>
<td>n=10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.30%</td>
<td>1.55%</td>
<td>2.85%</td>
<td>2.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>n=13</td>
<td>n=61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.78%</td>
<td>0.78%</td>
<td>3.37%</td>
<td>15.56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Childhood Residence

The leaders in this study came from a variety of locations of residences during their childhood and adolescent years. Although more leaders (approximately one-third of the total) lived in cities of more than 50,000 during their youth than in other locations such as suburbs, smaller cities and towns, or in rural areas and farms, the proportion was similar to what might be expected from census data from the years in which the majority of them were children. Table 13 summarizes the childhood residences of the respondents, and Table 14 shows the percentages of population distribution during the childhood years of most of respondents.
Table 13

**Childhood Residence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Age 2-7</th>
<th>8-10</th>
<th>11-15</th>
<th>16-19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On a Farm</td>
<td>n=61</td>
<td>n=56</td>
<td>n=56</td>
<td>n=41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.97%</td>
<td>14.55%</td>
<td>14.55%</td>
<td>10.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a Rural Area, Non-Farm</td>
<td>n=32</td>
<td>n=29</td>
<td>n=27</td>
<td>n=19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.34%</td>
<td>7.53%</td>
<td>7.01%</td>
<td>4.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a Small Town</td>
<td>n=84</td>
<td>n=91</td>
<td>n=88</td>
<td>n=91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.99%</td>
<td>23.64%</td>
<td>22.86%</td>
<td>23.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a City of Less Than 50,000</td>
<td>n=42</td>
<td>n=45</td>
<td>n=44</td>
<td>n=48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.99%</td>
<td>11.69%</td>
<td>11.43%</td>
<td>12.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Area Around a City of More Than 50,000</td>
<td>n=36</td>
<td>n=40</td>
<td>n=42</td>
<td>n=46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.42%</td>
<td>10.39%</td>
<td>10.91%</td>
<td>11.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a City of More Than 50,000</td>
<td>n=127</td>
<td>n=124</td>
<td>n=128</td>
<td>n=141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.25%</td>
<td>32.21%</td>
<td>33.25%</td>
<td>36.53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14

**Percentage Distribution of US Population 1910-1950**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of USA Population</th>
<th>1950</th>
<th>1940</th>
<th>1930</th>
<th>1920</th>
<th>1910</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On a Farm</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>36.40</td>
<td>36.40</td>
<td>40.60</td>
<td>46.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a Rural Area, Non-Farm</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a Small Town</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a City of Less Than 50,000</td>
<td>19.10</td>
<td>18.30</td>
<td>17.40</td>
<td>16.30</td>
<td>15.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Area Around a City</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>(1910-40 data unavailable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a City of More Than 50,000</td>
<td>35.30</td>
<td>34.40</td>
<td>34.90</td>
<td>31.20</td>
<td>27.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Religion

Respondents identified a variety of religious denominations in answering the item which asked their religious preferences. As Table 15 shows, more than half of the respondents were Protestants. Although there were more Catholic than Jewish respondents, the respondents included a smaller percentage of Catholics than the most recent national population census, and a larger percentage who were Jewish or "other".

Table 15

Religious Preferences Indicated By Leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denomination</th>
<th>Age 2-7</th>
<th>8-10</th>
<th>11-19</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>1985 % Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>n=218</td>
<td>n=235</td>
<td>n=222</td>
<td>n=214</td>
<td>57.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60.89%</td>
<td>62.83%</td>
<td>58.73%</td>
<td>55.88%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>n=61</td>
<td>n=64</td>
<td>n=65</td>
<td>n=53</td>
<td>28.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.04%</td>
<td>17.11%</td>
<td>16.97%</td>
<td>13.84%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>n=31</td>
<td>n=32</td>
<td>n=28</td>
<td>n=31</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.66%</td>
<td>8.56%</td>
<td>7.31%</td>
<td>8.09%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>n=38</td>
<td>n=35</td>
<td>n=45</td>
<td>n=58</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.61%</td>
<td>9.36%</td>
<td>11.91%</td>
<td>15.14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>n=10</td>
<td>n=8</td>
<td>n=18</td>
<td>n=27</td>
<td>9.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.79%</td>
<td>2.14%</td>
<td>4.76%</td>
<td>7.05%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>n=358</td>
<td>n=374</td>
<td>n=378</td>
<td>n=383</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participation in Youth Programs and Organizations

Most of the leaders who responded to the study participated in at least one youth program or organization as a teenager, and of those who had participated, 82.87% participated on the local level, 13.35% on the local and state levels, and 3.78% on the local, state, and national levels. The leaders who responded to the item which asked them to indicate the programs in which they had been involved most frequently indicated church involvement (n-267, or 19.06%). This was followed by athletics (n-264, or 18.84%), school organizations (n-245, or 17.49%), chorus or other singing groups (n-163, or 11.64%), Scouts (n-157, or 11.21%), band (n-96, or 6.85%), YMCA or YWCA groups (n-58, or 4.14%), 4-H (n-44, or 3.14%), Future Farmers of America (n-13, or 0.93%), Junior Achievement (n-14, or 1.00%), Future Homemakers of America (n-13, or 0.93%), and Big Brothers/Big Sisters (n-11, or 0.79%). Other programs and organizations, such as Grange, VICA, and others were identified a total of 53 times (3.78%), but no other individual program was identified by more than ten of the leaders.

Mentors and Role Models

Most of the leaders who responded to the survey identified at least one mentor or role model who had been important to their leadership development in response to item 22. The fact that "experiences with mentors and nurturers" was identified as having been important for their leadership development by more leaders than was any other experience also highlighted the importance of the mentors and role models listed in response to item 12.
These findings lend further support to the studies by Baugher and Kellett (1983), Daloz (1983), Barton (1984), and others who cited mentorship as important for leadership development. The mentors and role models were most frequently employers or supervisors (frequency = 172 [20.87%], and n = 124 [17.66%]), followed by elementary or high school teachers (frequency = 150 [18.20%], and n = 126 [17.95%]), university teachers (frequency = 123 [14.93%], and n = 102 [14.53%]), fathers (frequency = 79 [9.58%], and n = 79 [11.25%]), friends (frequency = 74 [8.98%], and n = 60 [8.55%]), mothers (frequency = 47 [5.70%], and n = 47 [6.70%]), clergypersons (frequency = 47 [5.70%], and n = 44 [6.27%]), birth family members other than parents (frequency = 40 [4.85%], and n = 36 [5.13%]), university advisors (frequency = 31 [3.76%], and n = 28 [3.99%]), youth group leaders (frequency = 26 [3.16%], and n = 23 [3.28%]), co-workers (frequency = 22 [2.67%], and n = 20 [2.85%]), godparents (frequency = 7 [0.85%], and n = 7 [1.00%]), and spouses (frequency = 6 [0.73%], and n = 6 [0.86%]).

Experiences Identified By Established Leaders As Most Important for Leadership Development By Teenagers

Responses to item 11 on the questionnaire, "What experiences do you believe are most important for the development of leadership by today's teenagers?", resulted in recommendations for 60 specific experiences. Since many of these experiences were closely related, they were organized into 20 leadership experience categories. A complete outline of the frequency of respondents in each of the categories is included in Appendix K.
As illustrated in Table 16, experiences in the category "collaborative experiences" were most frequently recommended and identified as important by respondents. Experiences to develop personal characteristics, experiences with mentors/role models/nurturers, cultural and citizenship experiences, communications experiences, management control experiences, employment and internship experiences, experiences in leading groups, formal education and significant life experiences were also mentioned more frequently than were the remaining categories, with more than five percent of the respondents identifying each as important.

Collaborative Experiences

Collaborative experiences included experiences identified and recommended by the respondents related to working with others. Specifically, respondents recommended such experiences as teen participation in youth groups and organizations, experiences in working cooperatively with others on a variety of projects, participation in team sports and athletics, and camping experiences.

Participation in youth programs, groups, and organizations was recommended most often (frequency = 94 [7.48%], and n = 81 [6.86%]). The respondents who identified specific youth organizations listed participation in Scouts most often, followed by participation in school organizations, music related experiences, 4-H, FFA, church groups, and other groups such as Junior Achievement, FHA, and others.
Table 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiences</th>
<th>Freq</th>
<th>Freq %</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Experiences</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>19.89</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>16.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Characteristic Development</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>9.23</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>7.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors/Role Models/Nurturers</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>8.99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>9.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural &amp; Citizenship Experiences</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>8.35</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>7.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications Experiences</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>6.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Control Experiences</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>7.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment or Internship Experiences</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>7.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Leadership Experiences</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>7.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Education</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>6.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant Life Experiences</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General collaborative group experiences related to working cooperatively with others were identified and recommended 89 times (7.08%) by 78 leaders (6.61%) as important for the development of leadership by teenagers. Although six of these respondents identified the specific experience of "working together on class projects" as important, the responses of most others were
simply listed "working with other people", "any kind of experience in which they have to be involved with others", and so forth.

Participation in team sports and athletics was identified and recommended 67 times (5.33%) by 67 leaders (5.76%). Although specific sports such as football, tennis, and so forth were mentioned by a few of the respondents, by and large most of the respondents who recommended team sports made no such differentiation.

Although mentioned fewer than five times, camping was also specifically identified as important for the development of leadership. Depending on each other for basic survival and having to work with others to meet most needs in a camping situation was identified as important for leadership by these respondents.

The work of several other researchers has similarly supported collaborative experiences for leadership development. For example, Gamon's (1984) and Cantrell, Doebler, and Heinsohn's (1985) findings indicated that participation in club activities with other members enhanced leadership and life skills of youth. The Family Community Leadership Board's (1984) teaching package included a variety of collaborative types of experiences which the authors believed to be helpful in developing leadership. Similarly, the works by Kanter (1983) and Katz (1975) provided similar support for leadership development through experiences in which participants worked together collaboratively.

**Personal Characteristic Development**

It was interesting to note that although only seven of the respondents defined leadership in terms of personality and
personal characteristics, experiences to develop personal characteristics were identified as important for the development of leadership more than any other category of experiences with the exception of experiences in collaboration. The development of personal beliefs and attitudes, the development of personal performance characteristics, and the development of initiative and related personal leadership abilities were most often identified as especially important. Such characteristics were similarly emphasized as important in literature in works such as those by Zaleznik (1977), Watts (1984), and Engel (1976).

Experiences to develop personal beliefs and attitudes were identified and recommended 78 times (6.21%) by 57 different leaders (4.83%). Specifically, respondents identified and recommended experiences that enhance such personal characteristics as desire, a sense of humor, enthusiasm, integrity, honesty, fairness, morals, self-reliance, creativity, inspiration, humility, and good character.

Experiences to develop personal performance characteristics were recommended 27 times (2.15%) by 27 individuals (2.29%). Specific experiences identified and recommended included experiences to develop habits of hard work, persistence, perseverance, drive, energy, and a work ethic. In addition, experiences in seeing what needs to be done and taking action without the need for stimulation from others was recommended 12 times (0.95%) by 12 different leaders (1.02%).
Experiences With Mentors, Role Models, Nurturers, and Supporters

Having mentors, good role models, nurturers, and other supporters was the third most recommended experience for developing leadership, with experiences in this category being recommended 113 times (9.00%) by 99 leaders (9.59%). Of these, 58 (4.61%) recommendations made by 57 people (4.83%) related to having strong mentors and role models in general.

Fifteen recommendations (1.19%) made by 15 respondents (1.27%) identified the importance of strong families and family support, and another 15 (1.19%), also made by 15 individuals (1.27%) emphasized the importance of being involved in family activities and projects during the teen years as important for leadership development. Fourteen recommendations (1.11%) were made by 14 leaders (1.19%) who specifically cited having strong parental influence during the teen years as important for leadership development. Finally, having teachers or professors as good role models or mentors was identified and recommended eight times (0.64%) by eight leaders (0.68%), while having supportive friends and co-workers was recommended once (0.08%).

This finding related to the importance of mentors for leadership development was well documented in related literature. For example, Weiner (1985), Barton (1984), Baugher and Kellett (1983), Daloz (1983), and Smith (1981) all discussed having mentors and other supportive relationships as important for leadership development.
Cultural and Citizenship Experiences

As illustrated in Table 18, cultural and citizenship experiences were identified and recommended as important for leadership development 105 times (8.35%) by 81 different leaders (7.85%). Knowing what is going on and understanding others appeared to be regarded by the leaders who responded as especially important for leadership development. The importance of such knowledge and understanding was also supported by Kleinfeld and Shinkwin's (1983) findings that such cultural and citizenship experiences enable youth to become civic-minded, responsible adults.

Of the specific experiences identified and recommended as important, travel and cross cultural experiences were listed 39 times (3.10%) by 36 of the leaders (3.05%). Being well-read, broadly informed, and up on current events was the next most identified experience specified in this category, with 31 responses (2.47%) made by 30 individuals (2.54%) relating to this area. Twenty-five responses (1.99%) made by 24 respondents (2.03%) related to the importance of community service and involvement for teen leadership development. Finally, six (0.48%) recommendations were made by six leaders (0.51%) for involvement in politics and government as a means to develop leadership, while four recommendations (0.32%) were made by four leaders (0.34%) for experiences in learning other languages.

Communications Experiences

Ninety-five (7.56%) of the experiences the leaders (n=67, or 6.49%) in the study recommended for leadership development by
teenagers involved experiences in communications. Experiences in public speaking were recommended most often, with 25 (1.99%) of the responses made by 22 of the leaders (1.86%) related to the importance of developing public speaking abilities as a part of leadership development. Twenty-one (1.67%) recommendations made by 20 of the respondents (1.69%) related to developing oral communications and speaking abilities, and 22 others (1.75%) made by 22 leaders (1.86%) identified developing general communications skills and abilities as important for leadership. Fifteen (1.19%) recommendations which were made by 15 different respondents (1.27%) specified experiences to develop listening skills as important, and 11 (0.88%) by 11 leaders (0.93%) identified the importance of developing skills in written communications. In addition, developing interpersonal communications skills was identified once (0.08%) as important for leadership development.

Such experiences to develop communications skills were identified as leadership development experiences by other authors. For example, Horton’s (1983) study revealed that public speaking, demonstrations, and other such experiences in communications were important methods used for leadership development in the 4-H program, and the participants in Rockwell’s (1981) survey identified public speaking opportunities to have been especially helpful in preparing them for adult leadership roles. In addition, the works by White (1984), Millar and Yerby (1982), and Sergiovanni (1981) all illustrated the importance of effective communications skills for leadership.
Management Control Experiences

Eighty-nine (7.08%) of the recommendations were made by 75 leaders (7.27%) for the development of leadership by teenagers related to experiences in managing and controlling. Of these, 62 (4.93%) were made by 56 leaders (4.74%) who recommended that teens be involved in activities to develop responsibility and self-discipline. While some leaders responded that teens should generally "always have as much responsibility as possible in whatever they do", others listed such specific activities for developing this responsibility and self-discipline as being "in charge" of projects where others depend on them, having animals to care for, mowing lawns, being responsible for household chores, doing independent projects, and taking music lessons.

Twenty-one other responses (1.67%) were identified by 20 leaders (1.69%) who recommended management experiences in general related to efficiently using resources to obtain the most effective outcomes, and running activities and programs for leadership development. Finally, five (0.40%) recommendations were made by five leaders (0.42%) for teens to be involved experiences to develop time management skills and abilities.

Experiences in management control were also supported by literature by such authors as McDiarmid (1982), Peterson (1984), and Culler et al (1984). In addition, although they did not specifically identify how management control might best be developed, authors such as Bass and Stogdill (1981), Jones (1983), Hersey and Blanchard (1983), Myers and Briggs (1980), Bates and
Kiersey (1984), and many others did argue that it was an important part of effective leadership.

Employment or Internship Experiences

Working in "real life" situations in employment and internship experiences was identified as important for teen leadership development 85 times (6.76%) by 81 individuals (7.85%). Of these, 58 recommendations (4.61%) were made by 57 of the leaders (4.83%) for employment in general and working in a paid job. Fourteen other recommendations (1.11%) made by 13 individuals (1.10%) suggested internship and work experiences in the specific job or career in which the teen wished to work as an adult, and 13 (1.03%) recommendations made by 13 people (1.10%) identified volunteer work as important.

Group Leadership Experiences

Actually leading groups was identified in 83 responses (6.60%) made by 76 leaders (7.36%) as an important means by which teens could develop their leadership abilities. Sixty (4.77%) of the responses made by 57 individuals (4.83%) suggested general group leadership experiences in which teens would influence, persuade, encourage, motivate, sell, and otherwise lead others in a certain direction. Twenty-one (1.67%) other responses made by 21 different respondents (1.78%) identified holding offices, chairing groups, supervising others, and otherwise serving in leadership positions as important leadership development experiences, while two respondents (0.17%) suggested directly supervising others as important.
Experiences in actually leading groups was similarly identified throughout the literature as important for leadership development. For example, studies by such researchers as Black (1984), Hohman (1982), and McDairmid (1982) all supported the "learn by doing" approach in which participants actually served in leadership roles.

Formal Education

In contrast to the findings of Ortyoyande (1984) and Hearson (1983), but in support of the findings of other researchers such as Fiedler (1969) and Ollila (1983), formal education was identified and recommended for leadership development in 73 responses (5.81%) by 72 leaders (6.98%). Of these, most (frequency - 41 [3.26%], and n - 41 [3.47%]) simply listed "getting a good education" or "going to a good school" as important. Twenty (1.59%) responses made by 19 leaders (1.61%) identified and recommended education for a specific field, and 12 (0.96%) made by 12 different leaders (1.02%) recommended that teens obtain a broad or liberal education.

Significant Life Experiences

Sixty-four responses (5.09%) were made by 57 leaders (5.52%) who identified the importance of significant life experiences for leadership development by teenagers. For example, 27 responses (2.15%) made by 27 individuals (2.29%) identified religious training or church involvement as important for leadership development, and nine (0.72%) made by seven leaders (0.59%) identified having faith or a belief in God or a higher being as important. Eight other recommendations (0.64%) made by
eight leaders (0.68%) identified having good health, a fit body, and so forth as being important for leadership development, and six each (0.48% each) were made by six leaders each (0.51% each) who recommended military experience, and financial experiences as means by which leadership could be developed. Other less frequently identified experiences in this category included leaving home early and establishing independence as soon as possible (frequency = 3 [0.24%], and n = 3 [0.25%]), being "lucky" by being in the right place at the right time (frequency = 2 [0.16%], and n = 2 [0.17%]), significantly influencing another person (frequency = 1 [0.08%], and n = 1 [0.09%]), and natural maturation (frequency = 2 [0.16%], and n = 1 [0.09%]).

Bass and Stogdill (1981) cited a variety of authors who similarly believed that leadership was developed through such significant life experiences. These included Mumford (1909), Bogardus (1918), Hocking (1924), Person (1928), Schneider (1937), and Murphy (1941). Although the life experiences Watts (1984) listed were not as specific as those identified by the respondents in this study, they still supported the notion that leadership develops as a result of time, place, and circumstance.

Experiences to Develop Assertiveness and Self Confidence

Experiences to develop assertiveness and self-confidence were identified as important for leadership development by teenagers in 43 responses (3.42%) by 40 leaders (3.88%). Of these 35 (2.78%) of the responses made by 34 individuals (2.88%) identified the importance of experiences to develop self-confidence, self-worth,
self-confidence, self-worth, and self-esteem, while the remainder (frequency = 8 [0.64%), and n = 8 [0.68%]) suggested such experiences as asserting positions in groups, being forceful, challenging and supporting others' views, displaying confidence when working with others, and so forth.

Although Hearson’s (1983) study revealed that student teaching had a negative effect on the self-confidence of the student teachers but a positive effect on their leadership abilities, the importance of assertiveness and self-confidence experiences for leadership development was supported by other studies. For example, Biddie et al. (1980), Hall (1980), Black (1984), Bass and Stogdill (1981), and others noted the importance of the development of assertiveness and self-confidence for effective leadership.

Experiences In Decision-Making and Judgment

Forty (3.18%) responses were given by 39 leaders (3.78%) who identified experiences in decision-making, judgment, and related problem solving processes as important for leadership development by teenagers. Included in this category were such experiences as securing information, analysis, developing and considering alternatives, and making decisions. These experiences were similar in nature to the decision-making and judgment experiences identified by such authors as Vroom (1977), Black (1984), McDairmid (1982), Weiner (1984), Phipps (1986) and Raiola (1986) as important.
Evaluation Experiences

Thirty-three (2.62%) responses made by 29 different leaders (2.81%) reflected the importance of experiences in evaluation for adolescent leadership development. Of these, 23 (1.83%) were made by 21 individuals (1.78%) who suggested experiences such as assessing and judging, learning from mistakes, and learning consequences. The remainder suggested experiences in earning and giving recognition, and participating in competitive events and programs as means by which leadership could be developed.

Similar experiences in evaluation were discussed in literature related to leadership development. For example, the exchange theorists cited by Bass and Stogdill (1981) believed that rewards and recognition played an important part in group leadership, and that leaders should evaluate and recognize group members effectively. Studies by Geller (1983), Culler et al. (1984), Cleveland and Saari (1980), Johnson and Snyder (1980), and many others also documented the importance of evaluation for leadership effectiveness, and provided support for such experiences in leadership development.

Experiences to Develop Organizational Sensitivity

Of the 19 responses (1.51%) by 19 leaders (1.84%) which identified experiences for the development of organizational sensitivity as important for leadership development, 17 (1.35%) were made by 17 leaders (1.44%) who listed experiences which enable young people to develop a sense of mission, vision, and long-range focus as being means by which such development
would be enhanced. The remainder identified experiences related to knowing and using policies and procedures appropriately. The importance of the development of organizational sensitivity for leadership was supported throughout the literature, by such scholars as Cunningham (1983), Scott (1981), and Mintzberg.

Experiences To Develop Personal Sensitivity

Twenty (1.59%) responses made by 19 leaders (1.84%) suggested experiences to develop personal sensitivity as important for leadership development. Each response in this category identified experiences to require consideration of the feelings, emotions, and needs of others. The development of personal sensitivity was also highlighted as an important leadership development experience by a variety of authors including Cleveland (1980), Peters and Austin (1985), Bennis and Nanus (1985), Maccoby (1981), and many others who argued that in order for leaders to lead, they must be sensitive to the needs and interests of those with whom they work.

Planning And Organization Experiences

Each of the 16 responses (1.27%) made by 15 respondents (1.45%) in this category related to experiences in planning and organizing as important for leadership development. Approaching problems systematically, establishing courses of action, taking things in a step-by-step fashion, using deadlines, and identifying follow-up procedures and other such experiences were among the suggested experiences identified by leaders making responses related to this category. These experiences were similar in nature
to the planning and organization experiences outlined by such authors as McDairmid (1982), Culler et al. (1984), and Johnson and Snyder (1980).

Experiences To Develop Objectivity, Flexibility & Patience, and Perception, and Experiences In Teaching & Development

Only four (0.32%) of the responses made by four leaders (0.39%) suggested experiences to develop objectivity, four (0.32%) made by three leaders (0.29%) suggested experiences to develop flexibility and patience, three (0.24%) were made by three leaders (0.29%) who suggested teaching experiences, and two (0.16%) made by two individuals (0.19%) suggested experiences to develop perception. It should be noted, however, that experiences in the other categories may in fact enable youth to develop abilities in these areas. Therefore, even though fewer respondents identified specific experiences to develop these abilities than other types of abilities, they may not in fact be less important.

Confirmation of the Importance of the Recommended Experiences As Indicated By Results From The Interview Nomitive Group Ranking Process

The results of the 25 telephone interviews conducted in mid-December, 1986 further substantiated the importance of the experiences the leaders recommended. As Table 17 illustrates, the interviewees rated each of the experiences as being between "important" and "very important" for teen leadership development. Although the rank order results of the items were somewhat different from the rank order results obtained from the analysis of
the mailed survey, the fact that each of the items was rated above the mid-point on a scale ranging from not important to very important confirmed the reasonableness of including each of the items in the findings, and the importance of the items themselves as leadership development experiences for teenagers.

Relationships Between The Backgrounds And Experiences Of The Leaders And Their Recommendations

Findings related to the experiences identified by established leaders as most important for leadership development by teenagers were tested with the backgrounds and experiences of those leaders to determine if relationships existed between the two. Twenty-one separate sets of chi-square tests were performed using the SAS statistical program to determine whether the recommendations for teen leadership development experiences were independent of the 21 items related to the leaders' backgrounds and experiences, or whether relationships between the recommendations and the other items existed.

When chi-square tests were conducted to test the independence of all 20 recommended leadership development experiences in relation to all of the backgrounds and experiences identified by the leaders, so many cells in the computations had expected counts of less than five that neither the chi-square nor any other statistical test could be viewed with absolute confidence as to its validity. This problem was alleviated somewhat by considering in the final chi-square analyses only those recommended leadership development experiences which were
Table 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiences</th>
<th>Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communications Experiences</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Characteristic Development</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences In Decision-Making</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences To Develop Perception</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Experiences</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity Development Experiences</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences To Develop Flexibility &amp; Patience</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Control Experiences</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness &amp; Self-Confidence Experiences</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences To Develop Objectivity</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors/Role Models/Nurturers</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Leadership Experiences</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Education</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences In Teaching &amp; Development</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment or Internship Experiences</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Organization Experiences</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Sensitivity Development Exp.</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant Life Experiences</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Experiences</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural &amp; Citizenship Experiences</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n-25

Note. Means were computed on a three point scale with three meaning very important, two meaning somewhat important, and one meaning not important.
identified by more than five percent of the respondents (collaborative experiences, personal characteristic development, mentors and role models, cultural and citizenship experiences, management control experiences, employment or internship experiences, group leadership experiences, formal education, and significant life experiences). The chi-square tests were then again performed to determine whether these ten recommended leadership development experiences were independent of the demographic factors and backgrounds of the leaders, their most frequently identified leadership strengths, leadership weaknesses, and personal leadership development experiences. When these results were analyzed, frequencies proved to be great enough when relationships were found to be significant that the chi-square test could be considered valid.

As Table 18 shows, the recommendations for teen leadership development experiences were found to be independent of most of the demographic characteristics of the leaders, and few significant relationships were found. Similarly, no significant relationships were discovered between the experiences the leaders recommended and their definitions of leadership, self-descriptions of leadership styles and types, leadership strengths, socio-economic status, childhood family structure, childhood residence, religion, or participation in youth programs and organizations. None of these factors in the backgrounds and experiences of the leaders appeared to be related to the kinds of leadership development experiences they recommended for today's teenagers.
However, significance at the .01 level was indicated in the relationships between the recommended experiences and the Lasswell (in Cunningham, 1983) leadership categories of the leaders as well as the leadership categories and relationships to their mentors and role models. In addition, the relationships

Table 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background or Experience Factor Related To The Recommendations</th>
<th>Chi-Square Value</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Sector Category</td>
<td>96.991</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.004*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>6.885</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Definition</td>
<td>112.936</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Description by Merrill’s Classification</td>
<td>39.486</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Description by Hersey-Blanchard Cat.</td>
<td>31.639</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Description by Kiersey-Bates Category</td>
<td>40.093</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Description by Myers-Briggs Typology</td>
<td>157.917</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>0.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>31.569</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>111.420</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Level</td>
<td>63.785</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescent Family Economic Status</td>
<td>24.843</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood Family Structure...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Age 2-7</td>
<td>34.751</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Age 8-10</td>
<td>39.968</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Age 11-15</td>
<td>34.586</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Age 16-19</td>
<td>45.092</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood Residence...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Age 2-7</td>
<td>42.937</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Age 8-10</td>
<td>47.328</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Age 11-15</td>
<td>52.419</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Age 16-19</td>
<td>53.427</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18 continued...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background or Experience Factor Related To The Recommendations</th>
<th>Chi-Square Value</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adolescent Family Influence By Sector...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Government (Power)</td>
<td>24.187</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Families (Affection)</td>
<td>41.226</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Public Schools (Skills)</td>
<td>32.212</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Higher Education (Enlightenment)</td>
<td>29.053</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Business (Wealth/Poverty)</td>
<td>19.390</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Public Health &amp; Safety (Well-Being)</td>
<td>25.017</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Assoc. &amp; Civic Groups (Respect)</td>
<td>33.061</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Church &amp; Religious Groups (Rectitude)</td>
<td>32.709</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Age 2-7</td>
<td>103.703</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>0.979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Age 8-10</td>
<td>98.575</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>0.992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Age 11-19</td>
<td>109.353</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>0.949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Current</td>
<td>127.229</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>0.671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescent Participation In Youth Programs...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Athletics</td>
<td>30.028</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Band</td>
<td>22.589</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Big Brothers/Sisters</td>
<td>6.893</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Chorus/Singing</td>
<td>26.358</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Church Groups</td>
<td>12.868</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...4-H</td>
<td>15.837</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...FFA</td>
<td>10.057</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...FHA</td>
<td>21.534</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Grange</td>
<td>9.657</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Junior Achievement</td>
<td>15.699</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...School Organizations</td>
<td>24.567</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Scouts</td>
<td>21.608</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...YMCA/YWCA</td>
<td>11.687</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Category of Mentors</td>
<td>150.727</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>&lt;0.0004*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor Relationship To Leader</td>
<td>167.062</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>&lt;0.0004*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Leadership Strengths</td>
<td>103.246</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Leadership Weaknesses</td>
<td>116.655</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>&lt;0.0004*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Leadership Development Exp.</td>
<td>210.992</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>&lt;0.0004*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<0.01
between recommended experiences and categories of personal leadership development experiences, and personal leadership weaknesses were found to be significant at the $p < .01$ level.

When the chi-square test was performed to test the independence of the leadership development experiences leaders recommended for teenagers to the leadership categories of the leaders, significance was indicated at the 0.004 level. Examination of the data showed that leaders in the power sector were more likely to recommend communications and collaborative experiences than was the total group of respondents. Leaders in the affection sector recommended cultural and citizenship experiences more frequently, and communications experiences less frequently than did other leaders. Leaders in the skills sector more frequently identified experiences in collaboration as important than did the total population of respondents. Respondents in the enlightenment sector made recommendations more frequently related to group leadership experiences, and less frequently related to personal development experiences than did leaders in the other sectors. Leaders from the well-being sector more frequently recommended experiences in assertiveness and self-confidence development than did respondents in the other categories, while those from the respect sector were more likely to recommend experiences in personal development and management control. Finally leaders in the rectitude sector more frequently recommended experiences in personal development, with mentors and role models, and
significant life experiences, and less frequently recommended experiences in collaboration than did the total group.

Table 18 also shows that significance was indicated at the $p < 0.0004$ level for the relationship between the leadership categories of the mentors the leaders identified as important to them, and the experiences they recommended for the development of leadership by teenagers. Leaders who identified mentors in the power sector more frequently recommended experiences in decision-making and judgment. Those who listed mentors from the affection category were more likely to recommend formal education and personal development experiences for teenagers who aspire to be leaders, and less likely to recommend experiences in communications. Those with mentors from the skills sector more frequently recommended collaborative experiences, and employment, and less frequently recommended experiences in assertiveness and self-confidence, and cultural and citizenship experiences. Leaders with mentors in the enlightenment category more frequently recommended experiences with mentors and role models, as well as cultural and citizenship experiences, and less frequently recommended personal development and collaborative experiences than did the total group of leaders. Respondents who identified mentors in the wealth sector more frequently recommended collaborative and communications experiences, and less frequently recommended management control experiences, than would be expected if no relationship existed. Leaders who identified mentors in the respect sector more frequently
recommended experiences in personal development, and those with mentors in the rectitude sector less frequently recommended collaborative experiences than normally would be expected.

The leaders' perceived leadership weaknesses and personal leadership development experiences were also indicated to relate to their recommendations for teen leadership development experiences, with significance at the \( p < 0.0004 \) levels respectively on the chi-square tests. Recommendations related to group leadership experiences were more frequently mentioned by leaders who perceived their greatest leadership weaknesses to be in the areas of personal characteristics and abilities, planning and organization, and sensitivity, and less frequently recommended with those with weaknesses in behavioral flexibility and patience. Recommendations for experiences in personal development and initiative were more frequently mentioned by those with weaknesses in personal characteristics and abilities, and less frequently identified by those with weaknesses in management control. Experiences in decision-making were more frequently recommended by leaders who felt they were weaker in assertiveness and self-confidence, than would be expected from the total. Recommendations were more frequently made for management control experiences by leaders who perceived themselves as having weaknesses in the areas of communications abilities, flexibility and patience, and evaluation abilities, and less frequently by those with weaknesses in management control. Collaborative experiences were recommended more often by
leaders with weaknesses in the area of flexibility and patience, and employment skills than would normally be expected.

Recommendations related to formal education experiences were more frequently given by individuals with weaknesses in personal characteristics and abilities, and less frequently by those with weaknesses in management control. Those with weaknesses in behavioral flexibility and patience less frequently recommended cultural and citizenship experiences, and those with weaknesses in management control more frequently recommended experiences with mentors, role models, and significant life experiences than would be expected if no relationships existed.

There appeared to be a relationship, with significance indicated at the p<0.0004 level on the chi-square test, between the kinds of experiences the leaders in the study identified as being important to their personal leadership development, and the kinds of recommendations they made for experiences to help teenagers develop leadership. For example, leaders who identified personal experiences in communications as important for their leadership development more frequently recommended communications experiences for teenagers, those who identified group leadership experiences more frequently recommended group leadership experiences for teenagers, those with collaborative experiences recommended collaborative experiences, those with cultural and citizenship experiences recommended the same for teenagers, those with mentors and role models recommended establishing those relationships as important for teens, and so forth, than would
be expected if no relationship between personal leadership development experiences and recommendations existed.

These findings were similar to those of Ortyoyande (1984) who found that among educational leaders there was no relationship between leadership and age, gender, educational background, marital status, social status, career path, or other such factors, but that prior leadership experience was predictive of leadership performance. However, the findings of studies related to gender and leadership by such scholars as Hopponen and Anderson (1986), Gilligan (1982), Golub and Canty (1982), Smith (1982), and others were not supported by the findings of this study. No significant relationship between gender and leadership recommendations was found.

In summary, for the most part the recommendations for the development of leadership by today’s teenagers were not related to most of the areas of background and experience indicated by the leaders. However, there did appear to be relationships between those recommendations and the leadership categories and the personal leadership development experiences of the leaders, as well as with the categories of their mentors and the relationships the leaders had with them, and with the personal leadership weaknesses of the leaders. Therefore, these relationships need to be considered as the results of the study are used.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, LIMITATIONS, AND
RECOMMENDATIONS

One of the most pressing issues facing the United States and its youth-serving programs and organizations is how to best facilitate the development of leadership by our youth. The importance of this issue is widely understood, accepted, and documented throughout literature related to leadership. However, no clear answers can be found in current literature to the question of how such leadership can in fact best be developed. In addition, little research has been done with current leaders to determine how they developed their leadership abilities, and what experiences they would recommend for the development of future leaders.

Therefore, this study was designed to answer three research questions. These included (a) What leadership development experiences are identified by established leaders as most important for leadership development by adolescents?, (b) What, if any, commonalities exist among the backgrounds and adolescent experiences of these leaders?, and (c) Is there a relationship between the leaders' backgrounds and experiences and their recommendations?. The descriptive research design was chosen for the study.

A stratified sample of 1,000 established leaders was randomly chosen from 70 directories of public and private sector leaders in
the United States to participate in this national study. One hundred twenty-five (125) leaders were selected from each of the eight value and institution categories outlined by Lasswell (in Cunningham, 1983). The sample included participants from every state, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and American Samoa. Sixty-nine percent were male and 31% were female.

Data were collected through the use of two instruments: a written questionnaire, and a telephone interview schedule. Both were developed from the concepts, research findings, and theories identified through a review of literature, and tested for validity and reliability before they were administered.

Four hundred ten (410) of the leaders returned usable questionnaires for a response rate of 41%. Twenty-five of the respondents were randomly chosen to participate in a follow-up telephone interview to confirm the results obtained from the questionnaire. The respondents were generally representative of the sample in terms of leadership categories, residence, gender, and other known factors. In addition, the responses from the late respondents did not vary significantly from the responses obtained from early respondents. Therefore, the results can be viewed with confidence with regard to their generalizability.

The data resulting from the survey were analyzed using the SAS statistical program package to determine frequency distributions, and chi-squares of interactions for each of the categories studied, as outlined by Kennedy (1978). Data resulting from the telephone surveys were analyzed using nomitive group
prioritizing techniques and qualitative modified analytic induction
techniques as outlined by Bogdan and Biklen (1982) and Guba and
Lincoln (1983). All of the data and syntheses generated from the
study were analyzed to answer the original research questions and
to achieve the identified objectives.

Findings related to the objectives and research questions of the
study included the following:

**Objective I** - To identify experiences recommended by established
leaders in the United States as important for the development of
leadership by adolescents.

The major experiences recommended and identified by
established leaders in the United States as important for the
development of leadership by adolescents were collaborative
experiences, personal characteristic development, having mentors
and other nurturers, cultural and citizenship experiences,
communications experiences, management control experiences,
employment or internship experiences, experiences in group
leadership, formal education, and significant life experiences.

**Objective II** - To identify backgrounds and experiences of these
leaders which may have contributed to their leadership
development.

There were several commonalities in the backgrounds and
experiences of the leaders in the study. Examples of these
commonalities included: (a) self-perceptions of leadership style and
type with the majority classifying themselves as expressive, high
directive/high supportive, catalytic, extroverted, sensing, thinking,
perceiving kinds of leaders, (b) marital status with the large majority being married, (c) age with the majority being between the ages of 40 and 64, (d) high levels of education with the majority holding earned doctorates or master's degrees, (e) family origins with the majority being from middle-class traditional families with both parents present during the leaders' childhoods, (f) religion with the majority being Protestant, followed in number by those of the Catholic and Jewish faiths, (g) high levels of participation in organizations and activities during adolescence, and (h) having mentors, role models, or other nurturers. In addition, seven experiences (collaborative experiences, personal characteristic development experiences, having mentors and other nurturers, employment or internship experiences, group leadership experiences, formal education, and significant life experiences) were identified by more than five percent of the leaders as important for their personal leadership development.

**Objective III** - To discern whether there are relationships between the recommendations of these leaders and their backgrounds and experiences.

Except for the relationships found with the leadership categories of the leaders and their mentors, the relationship of the leaders with their mentors, and the relationships with personal leadership development experiences and personal leadership weaknesses, no significant relationships were found between the leaders' backgrounds and demographic factors and the recommendations of these leaders for important adolescent leadership development experiences.
Objective IV - To discover what, if any similarities existed between the recommendations the leaders identified as important for today's teenagers in the development of leadership, and the actual experiences and backgrounds of the leaders themselves.

Backgrounds and experiences of these leaders which they identified as having contributed to their leadership development were very similar to the experiences they recommended for leadership development by teenagers. The seven experiences (collaborative experiences, personal characteristic development experiences, having mentors and other nurturers, employment or internship experiences, group leadership experiences, formal education, and significant life experiences) identified by more than five percent of the leaders as important for their personal leadership development were also each recommended by more than five percent of the leaders for leadership development by today's teenagers.

Conclusions

As a result of review and synthesis of the findings from this study, several conclusions can be drawn. These include:

(a) Adolescent leadership development can be facilitated.

(b) A variety of well-rounded experiences are necessary for adolescents to become leaders. Attention must be paid to the development of a strong foundation of support through family, mentors, and other nurturers; to the development of positive personal character; to the development of intellect and cultural understanding; and to the development of strong, practical interpersonal and organizational abilities.
(c) The recommendations made by current leaders for the development of leadership by adolescents were similar to the personal life experiences of the leaders. Thus it can be concluded that leaders believe what worked for them in developing leadership will continue to work for future generations of leaders.

(d) Leaders tend to be more highly educated than the general population; to have strong family origins both in terms of spending their childhoods in traditional families with both parents and in terms of their current marital status; to have been active in organizations and their communities as youth; and to have mentors, role models, and other nurturers. It can be inferred from the findings that such backgounds enhance the development of leadership, and will continue to be important for the development of future leaders.

Implications

As noted in the introduction, one of the most pressing strategic issues facing the United States and its youth-serving organizations today is how to best facilitate the development of leadership by our youth. The results of this study provide clear indications from our current leaders as to how such development might best be facilitated. By considering these results and developing programs which provide today's teenagers with collaborative experience, experience to enhance personal characteristic development, mentors and other nurturers, cultural and citizenship experience, communications experience, management control experience,
employment or internship experience, group leadership experience, formal education, and significant life experiences, those who work with adolescents can help assure that today's adolescents can develop the leadership they will need as adults.

Limitations

The fact that this study is descriptive in nature and the results are drawn from the perceptions and opinions of the leaders in the national sample is a limitation. Although the results are an accurate reflection of what the leaders believed to be important for leadership development, and related literature has been found which lends support to the findings, the recommended experiences have not yet been experimentally tested. Therefore, program development based on the results of this study alone, without consideration of experimental results, should be done with caution.

In addition, the sample of leaders surveyed in the study was randomly drawn from 70 directories of formal leaders who hold positions in each of the eight value and institution categories identified by Lasswell (in Cunningham, 1983). While many of these directories were lists of all individuals in particular positions, others were compiled through nomination processes and included self-nominations. It must be recognized that the leaders selected for the study were individuals who have succeeded in the American societal system. They were predominately males from traditional, middle-class, two-parent families, and their views may or may not be representative of those of the total population of the United States. No attempt was made to include non-formal leaders
or opinion leaders who might have been identified through other sampling methods. Therefore, although the results are generalizable to the population of current formal leaders in the United States, they may or may not be generalizable to other populations, cultures, or generations.

Furthermore, no attempt was made in this study to address the morality of leadership, the social responsibility of leadership development, or related issues such as the future leadership needs and interests (or lack thereof) of the people, cultures, and political organizations of the world. Caution should be exercised in using the results, recommendations, and implications of this study without consideration of such philosophical questions.

Recommendations

Two major recommendations directly related to this study are suggested. First, it is suggested that youth serving organizations consider the results of this research as they design teen leadership development programs. By incorporating into programs experiences such as those recommended by the leaders in this study, the facilitation of leadership development could be enhanced. Secondly, it is recommended that further experimental research be done to determine whether or not the experiences recommended in this study do, in fact, facilitate the development of leadership by adolescents.

In addition, it is recommended that further analyses and additional studies be done with the rich bank of data which was collected during this research project. For example, the many
variables such as gender, family backgrounds, adolescent experiences in youth groups and organizations, and perceptions of leadership styles were only analyzed in terms of their frequency distributions and relationships with the leaders' recommendations for adolescent leadership development experiences. A multitude of studies could be conducted with the data to examine the relationships of such variables with each other and to answer other kinds of research questions which were addressed since they were not a part of this research project, but which could be answered through other analyses of the data. Examples of such research which could be done include:

(a) Although no significant differences were found in the relationships of the recommendations for leadership development experiences and the gender and family background of the leaders (as had been indicated and expected from other research), these two variables might be further analyzed to determine if they are related to any of the other variables in the study.

(b) Further studies could be done with the data to determine the answers to such questions as, "Did the kinds of youth organizations that the leaders participated in during their childhood make a difference in their leadership as adults?", "Were the leaders who grew up on farms different from those who were raised in cities?", "Did protestants respond differently from catholics to items related to family influence?", and many other questions of interest to researchers.
A variety of other studies could also be done to answer questions raised by the findings of this research which, although not related to the particular research questions under investigation and not pursued in this study, merit further investigation. For example:

(a) Since the results of this study indicated some differences in self-perceptions of leadership style and type from what had been found through testing in other studies, further investigation of the differences in self-perception and results from objective testing should be done.

(b) Since preliminary analyses of the data in this study indicated that leader self-descriptions on one leadership style classification system were highly related to self-descriptions on other leadership style classification systems, additional studies should be done to determine whether the category into which a leader falls in one system can be used to predict into which category he or she would fall on another system.
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APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE, RETURN POST CARD, AND INTERVIEW SCHEDULE
Leadership Development

A National Survey Of
Established Public and Private Sector Leaders
To Identify Important Adolescent
Leadership Development Experiences

The Ohio State University
Q-1 There are many definitions of leadership. Please check (✓) the one definition that most closely matches your personal definition of the concept.

Leadership is ....

___1) the result of being in a central position in a group, where it is possible to control communication and facilitate progress

___2) strong personality and charisma

___3) directing others and inducing obedience, respect, loyalty, and cooperation in accomplishing a task

___4) influencing others as they do a job, reach a goal, or change their behavior

___5) behaviors such as structuring work, managing people and things, showing consideration, and so forth

___6) a form of persuasion

___7) a power relationship in which leaders accumulate and use power in working with others

___8) enabling groups to achieve goals efficiently and effectively

___9) a natural result of human interaction in which people acknowledge the leadership of the person who takes charge, coordinates things, and so forth

___10) a definite role such as an office or formal position in a group

___11) the initiation and maintenance of structure

___12) other (please give your personal definition of leadership here if it is different from any of the above)
Some scholars explain the concept of leadership by describing types, styles, and characteristics of leaders and the situations in which they function. Please check (√) the one description in each of statements two through eight that most accurately describes you as a leader.

Q-2 Please check the one description that most accurately describes you:
   ____ 1) an analytical leader who tends to keep opinions private and control personal feelings
   ____ 2) a driver who tends to control personal feelings and state opinions openly
   ____ 3) an expressive leader who tends to state opinions and display feelings openly
   ____ 4) an amiable leader who tends to display feelings openly and keep opinions private

Q-3 Please check the one description that most accurately describes you:
   ____ 1) a leader who pays a great deal of attention equally to the task to be done and to the people doing it
   ____ 2) a leader who generally gives more attention to the task to be done than to the people doing it
   ____ 3) a leader who generally gives the people in the group more attention than is given to the task to be done
   ____ 4) a leader who believes that neither the task to be done nor the people doing it need much attention

Q-4 Please check the one description that most accurately describes you:
   ____ 1) a traditional manager who efficiently runs the organization
   ____ 2) a catalyst who motivates and works well with others
   ____ 3) a visionary who shows particular strength in making strategic decisions from a long-term perspective
   ____ 4) a troubleshooter who deals methodically with challenges and pays attention to detail
Q-5 Please check the description that most accurately describes you:
   ___1) an introvert
   ___2) an extrovert

Q-6 Please check the description that most accurately describes you:
   ___1) an intuitive person who prefers theories, the overall, invention, and new ideas
   ___2) a sensing person who prefers things to be factual, real, structured, tangible, and here-and-now

Q-7 Please check the description that most accurately describes you:
   ___1) a feeling person who usually makes judgments based on empathy, warmth, and personal values
   ___2) a thinking person who usually makes judgments based on logic, analysis, and evidence

Q-8 Please check the description that most accurately describes you:
   ___1) a leader who gathers as much information as possible before making a decision, and is flexible and willing to change later
   ___2) a leader who is usually decisive, firm, and sure in setting goals and sticking to them
Please answer questions 9-12 as appropriate for each item.

Q-9 What do you believe are your greatest strengths as a leader? Please list what you consider to be your three greatest strengths in rank order, beginning with your most important strength.

1.

2.

3.

Q-10 What do you feel are your three greatest leadership weaknesses or the things you would most like to improve related to your personal leadership? Please list them here in rank order, beginning the characteristic you would most like to improve.

1.

2.

3.
Q-11 What experiences (specific activities) do you believe are most important for the development of leadership by today's teenagers? Please list as many as you wish here.

Q-12 What kinds of situations or special incidents occurred in your life that helped you become a leader? Please list up to three such experiences that most contributed to your leadership development.

1.

2.

3.
Some theorists believe that one's approach to leadership is in part influenced by one's personal background and experiences. Please indicate the characteristics that apply to you in questions 13-22.

Q-13 I am now (please check one):

1) married
2) single
3) divorced
4) widowed

Q-14 My age is (please check one):

1) under 25
2) 25-29
3) 30-34
4) 35-39
5) 40-44
6) 45-49
7) 50-54
8) 55-59
9) 60-64
10) 65-69
11) 70-75
12) over 75

Q-15 I have completed the following level of education (please check the highest level you completed):

1) elementary or high school non-diploma (list highest grade completed ________)
2) high school diploma or equivalent
3) technical or associate degree beyond high school diploma
4) bachelor's degree
5) master's degree
6) doctorate
7) other (please specify) __________________________

Q-16 When I was an adolescent, my family's income most often seemed to be at the following level (please check one):

1) We usually had money left over after meeting expenses.
2) We usually had enough, with a little extra sometimes.
3) We usually had just enough, but no more.
4) We usually couldn't make ends meet.
Q-17 When I was an adolescent, my family was influential to the
degree indicated in the following (please check the degree
to which your family was influential in each of the sectors
listed):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Not Influential</th>
<th>Somewhat Influential</th>
<th>Fairly Influential</th>
<th>Very Influential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) In government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Among other families</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) In the public school system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) In higher education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) In business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) In public health &amp; safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) In associations &amp; civic groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) In church &amp; religious groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q-18 When I was a child, I lived:
(Please check the appropriate category for each age range)
2-7  8-10  11-15  16-19
1) at home with both my parents
2) home with one parent
3) with another relative or guardian
4) other (specify)

Q-19 When I was a child, I lived:
(Please check the closest appropriate category for each age range)
2-7  8-10  11-15  16-19
1) on a farm
2) in a rural area, but not on a farm
3) in a small town
4) in a city of less than 50,000 people
5) in a metropolitan area around a city
   of more than 50,000
6) in a city of more than 50,000 people
Q-20 My religious preference was/is:
(Please check the appropriate category for each age range)
2-7 8-10 11-19 current
___________________ 1) Anglican
___________________ 2) Baptist
___________________ 3) Buddist
___________________ 4) Catholic
___________________ 6) E. Orthodox
___________________ 7) Jewish
___________________ 8) Jehovah Wit.
___________________ 9) Fundamentalist,(Assembly of God)
___________________ 10) L.D.S.
___________________ 11) Lutheran
___________________ 12) Methodist
___________________ 13) Presbyterian
___________________ 14) U.C.C.
___________________ 15) Non-denom. Prot.
___________________ 16) Atheist
___________________ 17) Agnostic
___________________ 18) other (list) _______________________

Q-21 I was active in the following organizations at the indicated levels of participation as a teenager (Please check all that apply):
organization: level: local state national
___________________ 1) athletics .........................
___________________ 2) band ..........................
___________________ 3) big brothers/big sisters ....
___________________ 4) chorus or other singing groups.
___________________ 5) church ..........................
___________________ 6) 4-H ................................
___________________ 7) Future Farmers of America ...
___________________ 8) Future Homemakers of America
___________________ 9) Grange ..........................
___________________ 10) Junior Achievement ..........
___________________ 11) school organizations ........
___________________ 12) Scouts ........................
___________________ 13) VICA ..........................
___________________ 14) YMCA or YWCA Groups ....
___________________ 15) others (list) _______________________.


Q-22 Other scholars believe one's mentors and role models are important in the development of leadership. Please identify the position of up to three of your most significant mentors at the time the mentoring relationship began, and describe their relationship to you:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Model/Mentor's Position or Job When He/She Became My Mentor</th>
<th>This Person's Relationship To Me When She/He Became My Mentor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q-23 Quotes from established leaders to clarify the meanings and implications from research findings are very helpful. Would you be willing for your responses to questions 11 and 12 to be quoted?

1) yes
2) no

If yes, please sign your name here ____________
If no, please be assured that your confidentiality will be respected.

Thank you very much for your participation in this research project!
Please feel free to offer additional comments on the space provided here and on the next page.

Please return within the next two weeks to:
Kathryn J. Cox
The Ohio State University
2120 Fyffe Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210-1084

Thank you.
Please return by June 15, 1986. Thank you.

A sample of those participating in this study will also be chosen to participate in a fifteen-minute telephone interview to further verify and prioritize important teen leadership development experiences. Would you be willing to participate in such an interview? _______yes _______no

If yes, please list a convenient time and phone number where you can be reached between June 25 and July 5, 1986. If your are chosen for the interview, you will be contacted before June 20 to confirm the date and time.

Phone number (_____) _______________________________

Date and time I can be reached _____/____/86 at ______AM/PM

An abstract of the research results will be sent in August, 1986 to respondents who request a copy. Would you like to receive such an abstract? _______yes _______no

Your signature ______________________________________

Kathryn J. Cox
The Ohio State University
2120 Fyffe Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210-1084
## Interview: Nomitive Group Ranking of Recommended Experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiences</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communications Experiences (oral, public speaking, writing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Leadership Experiences (position or other leadership)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Characteristic Development (beliefs, sense of humor, friendliness, work ethic, integrity)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Organization Experiences (approaching systematically, planning course of action, outlining steps)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences in Decision Making (defining goals, securing information, developing alternatives, making decisions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences in Teaching &amp; Helping Others Learn (teaching, helping others learn, setting an example)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences to Develop Flexibility &amp; Patience (experiences which require adaptability, open-mindedness, flexibility, patience)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences to Develop Organizational Sensitivity (using policies &amp; procedures, following rules)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness &amp; Self-Confidence Experiences (experiences which require confidence, assertiveness, independence)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences to Develop Objectivity (approaching things without regard to personal opinions &amp; biases)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences to Develop Perception (seeing the real picture, recognizing problems or potential problems)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity Development Experiences (showing consideration for others and their feelings)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences in Managing &amp; Control (using resources wisely, time management, people management)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Experiences (working with other people, being part of a team)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Experiences (judging, competition, learning from mistakes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Education (broad, liberal, or specific, technical)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural &amp; Citizenship Experiences (being well read, travel, learning other languages, community service)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Experiences (having a job or volunteer work)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having Mentors/Role Models/Other Nurturers (having others who help teens along)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant Life Experiences (religious experience or training, luck, military experience, stature or health, etc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B
NATIONAL SAMPLE OF LEADERS
Robert J. Vollen  
401 N. Michigan Ave  
Chicago  
Illinois 60611

Deborah C. Green  
NASA Wage Committee  
400 Maryland Ave, SW  
Rm 5123  
Washington, DC 20546

Ann Aldrich  
212 US Court House  
Cleveland  
Ohio  44114

Beverly F. White  
400 Maryland Ave SW  
Washington, DC 20202

David M. Abshire, Ch.  
Naval Operations Advisory Comm  
The Pentagon  
Washington, DC 20350

JoAnn Chandler  
Cstl Zn Mgt, Ocn & Cstl Res Mgt  
3300 Whitehaven St NW  
Washington, DC 20235

Emil Mrak  
Council on Env. Qual.  
722 Jackson Place  
Washington, DC 20006

Albert J Henderson  
Eleventh Judicial Court  
US Court of Appeals  
Atlanta, GA  30331

Theodore H. Drews  
Nat Center for Educ Statistics  
Dept of Education  
Washington, DC 20202

Terry Murray, Lt. Col.  
Navy Marine Liaison, Senate  
USMC, 1710 Dryden Way  
Crofton, MD 21114

Dr. Mary E. Clutter  
Nat Sci. Foundation  
1800 G Street NW  
Washington, DC 20550

Lt. Gen. Keith A. Smith  
Headquarters, Marine Corps  
Arlington Annex  
Washington, DC 20380

Robert Honig  
Fed. Govt. Service Task Force  
House Annex 2  
Washington, DC 20515

The Hon. Glenn M. Anderson  
2329 Rayburn Building  
Washington, DC  
20515

John B. Wolff  
Biophysical Chem, Nat. Sci Found  
1800 G Street NW  
Washington, DC 20550

Phyllis Schlafly  
2120 L Street, Suite 500  
Washington, DC  
20037

Edwin P. Marcus  
Fed Coun. On Aging, Dept Hlth & Hm  
330 Independence Ave SW  
Washington, DC 20201

The Hon. David Dreier  
410 Cannon Building  
Washington, DC  
20515
G. William Thomas, Jr., Mgr
Field Offices, HUD
701 E Franklin St
Richmond, VA 23219
The Honorable Rod Chandler
216 Cannon House Building
Washington, DC
20515

Larry Krebs
White House News Photog. Assoc.
PO Box 7119 Ben Franklin Sta.
Washington, DC 20044
The Honorable Marilyn Lloyd
2266 Rayburn Building
Washington, DC
20515

Shirley Wyatt Mundle
DC Bd of Elections & Ethics
6401 16th St
Washington, DC 20012
The Honorable Alan Cranston
112 Hart Office Building
Washington, DC
20510

Carl McGowan
US Court of Appeals
4717 Quebec St
Washington, DC 20016
The Honorable Bill Nelson
307 Cannon Office Building
Washington, DC
20515

The Honorable Sid Morrison
1434 Longworth Hse Office Bldg
Washington, DC
20515
The Honorable Pete Wilson
720 Hart Office Building
Washington, DC
20510

The Honorable Ed Zschau
429 Cannon Hse Office Bldg
Washington, DC
20515
Lorraine Colville
Rm 3954, 26 Federal Plaza
New York, NY 10278

Mari Masenghe
Asst Sec. Pub. Affrs., Transp
10414 Nassif Bldg, 400 7th SW
Washington, DC 20590

The Hon. Virginia Smith
2202 Rayburn Hse Office Bldg
Washington, DC
20515
Howard Eugene Douglas, Refugee Aff.
7525 Main State Dept Bldg
2201 C Street NW
Washington, DC 20520

The Honorable Tom Bevill
2302 Rayburn Building
Washington, DC
20515
Adm. Robert J. Hays
V. Chief, Naval Operations
4E644 The Pentagon
Washington, DC 20350
Madeline B. Harwood, Nat. Comm.
Vermont Republican State Comm.
PO Box 904
Manchester Center, VT 05255

Fred Daugherty
US District Judge
Room 3321 Federal Courthouse
Oklahoma City, OK 74127

Julias C. Michaelson
RI Attorney General
250 Benefit St
Providence, RI 02903

Sarah Wilson Hodgkins
Dept of Cultural Resources
915 E Indiana Ave
Southern Pines, NC 28387

George D. Salerno, Comm.
NY State Bd of Elections
PO Box 4, One Commerce Plaza
Albany, NY 12260

Governor Richard W Riley
1st Floor, State House, West Wing
Box 11450
Columbia, SC 29211

C. Louis Bassano
377 Foxwood Rd
Union
New Jersey 07083

Cecil Barber
Clinch County Sheriff
Sheriff’s Office
Homerville, GA 31634

The Honorable John Heinz
443 Russell Bldg
Washington, DC
20510

Phillip M. Waltrip
Escambia County Commissioner
PO Box 1591
Pensacola, FL 32597

Louis V. Cavallaro
324 Lowe Bldg
Annapolis
Maryland 21401

Jayne Ashworth
Adm., AL Special Sch. for Deaf
PO Box 698
Talladega, AL 35160

Gwendalyn F Cody
VA House of Representatives
3703 King Arthur Rd
Annandale, VA 22003

George Mann
Caldwell Parish Bd of Elections
PO Box 926
Columbia, Louisana 71418

Charles T. Manatt
Democratic National Committee
1625 Massachusetts Ave NW
Washington, DC 20036

William R. Snodgrass
Comptroller of the Treasury
First Floor, State Capitol
Nashville, TN 37219

James B. Hunt, Jr.
Governor
State Capitol
Raleigh, NC 27611

Robert W. Hodges
District Engineer
Box 3010 Ky Dam Rd
Paducah, Ky 42001
The Honorable Mary C. Kasten  
1209 Sailer Circle  
Cape Girardeau  
Missouri 63701

Richard O. Freeman  
825 J Street  
Lincoln  
Nebraska

Louis C. Damiani, Dir.  
Supreme Court of Ohio  
30 E Broad Street  
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Ed Herschler, Governor  
Capitol Building  
Cheyenne  
Wyoming 82002

Max C Milks  
1200 West Quincy  
Garrett  
Indiana 46738

Dennis M. Olsen  
Idaho Republican Party  
Box 2267  
Boise, Idaho 83701

The Hon. Robert W. Kustra  
1004 Stratton Bldg  
Springfield  
Illinois 62706

Louise Greene  
Eddy County Treasurer  
Box 158  
Carlsbad, NM 88221

Deloris Armstrong  
State Board of Plumbing  
Box 30015, 7150 Harris Dr  
Lansing, MI 48909

Bill D. Brady  
6480 Darby Ave  
Las Vegas  
Nevada 89102

John T. Manske  
509 Golden Lane  
Milton  
Wisconsin 53563

Martin J. Nichols  
Butte County Administrator  
25 County Center Drive  
Oroville, California 95965

Joe Bertram, Sr.  
328 State Capitol  
St Paul  
Minnesota 55155

Jewel Goddard, Adm  
Children Services Division  
198 Commercial St SE  
Salem, Oregon 97310

W.W. Reynoldson  
Iowa Supreme Court  
State Capitol Building  
Des Moines, Iowa 50319

Ellen Craswell  
8066 Chico Way NW  
Bremerton  
Washington 98312

Linda Schreppel  
Labette County Clerk  
Oswego  
Kansas 67356

John S Herrington  
Dept of Energy  
1000 Independence Ave SW  
Washington, DC 20585
Adm. Kinnaird R. McKee
Dep. Asst Sec., Naval Reactors
2521 Jefferson Davis Hwy
Arlington, VA 20362

William P. Clark
Secretary of the Interior
C Street Btwn.18th and 19th NW
Washington, DC 20240

William Kristol
Sec. Office, Dept of Educ.
400 Maryland Ave SW
Washington, DC 20201

Bonnie B. Whyte, Dir
Pub. Affrs., Urban Mass Tran Adm
400 Seventh Street SW
Washington, DC 20590

Judith L. Tardy, Asst Sec
Housing & Urban Development
451 7th St SW
Washington, DC 20410

The Honorable Larry Pressler
407A Russell Office Building
Delaware & Constitution
Washington, DC 20510

Thomas M. Stewart, Asst Dir
Dept of Justice, Attorney Gen.
10th and Constitution Ave NW
Washington, DC 20530

Lynn M. Edwards, Prg Dir
Career Pl & Dev., USDA Grd Sch.
14th & Independence SW
Washington, DC 20250

Paula Stern, Chairperson
US Int. Trade Commission
701 E Street NW
Washington, DC 20436

Craig L. Fuller, Asst. to the Pres.
The White House Office
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington, DC 20200

William A Dorsey, Dir. Plg & Res
Energy Information Admin.
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington, DC 20585

Phyllis Bonanno, Director
600 Seventh Street NW
Washington, DC 20506

John A Svahn
Asst to the President
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20500

Paul A Volcker
Federal Reserve System
20th & Constitution Ave NW
Washington, DC 20551

W. Lawrence Wallace, Ast Atty Gen.
Justice Dept., Dep Atty Gen
10th and Constitution NW
Washington, DC 20530

Philip Abrams, Undersec.
Housing & Urban Development
451 Seventh Street SW
Washington, DC 20410

William H. Satterfield, Gen Coun.
Fed Energy Regulatory Commission
825 N. Capitol Street NE
Washington, DC 20426
Andrew Vaughn Smith
1600 Bell Plaza
Room 3101
Seattle, WA 98191

Harper Johnston Elam III
1201 Maple St
Greensboro
North Carolina 27405

Merrill Shepard
69 W Washington St
Chicago
Illinois 60602

Gloria Morgan Vanderbilt
c/o Murjani USA
498 7th Ave
New York, NY 10018

Thomas Joseph Lee, Jr.
Extex Inc
1200 Milan St
Houston, TX 77002

Richard Horton Frank Jr.
13th Fl., Third Nat. Bank
Nashville
Tennessee 37219

Jesse William Curtis, Jr
305 Evening Star Lane
Newport Beach
California 92660

Patricia Ewasco Klinck
111 State St
Montpelier
Vermont 05602

Margaret Cousins
Box 1626
San Antonio
Texas 78296

John Homjak Jr
Hawkes Hosp. of Mt Carmel
793 W State St
Columbus, Ohio 43222

Gordon Peter Getty
LSB Foundation
1201 E California Blvd
Pasadena, CA 91106

Betty Bloomer Ford
Rancho Mirage
California
92262

Barbara Pierce Bush
The Vice President's House
Washington, DC
20501

Joan Adams Mondale
3421 Lowell St NW
Washington, DC
20016

Nancy Davis Reagan
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Ave
Washington, DC 20500

Rosalynn Smith Carter
Plains
Georgia
31780

Joseph Meyerhoff
28 S Charles St
Baltimore
Maryland 21201

Rose Fitzgerald Kennedy
Hyannis
Massachusetts
02647
William Jennings Bryan Dorn
RFD 1
Greenwood
South Carolina  29646

Julian W. Harvey
1209 N Astor St
Chicago
Illinois 60610

Lady Bird Johnson
LBJ Library
2313 Red River
Austin, TX 78705

Brooks J. Bowen
8308 Bells Mill Rd
Potomac
Maryland 20854

Nancy Johnston
1111 18th Ave, NW
Washington, DC 20207

Gioia W. Zwack deWahl
125 E 63rd St
New York,
New York  10021

Sara O. Meara
International Orphans
22311 Ventura Blvd, Ste 119
Woodland, CA 91364

Cass Canfield
960 Park Ave
New York
New York  10021

Kevin Langdon
Four Sigma Society
PO Box 795
Berkeley, CA 94701

F. Morgan Palmer, Jr
315 E 88th St
New York
New York  10128

Sara Catron
Couples for Marriage Enrichment
459 S Church St
Winston-Salem, NC 27108

Helen R. Turnbull Gardiner
"Appletrees" Claremont Rd
Bernardsville
New Jersey 07924

Austin H. Kutscher
Foundation of Thanatology
630 W 168th St
New York, NY 10032

Catherine Van S. Dugan Swift
31 Canton Ave
Milton
Massachusetts  02187

Arnold I Miller
Children's Rights Inc
3443 17th St NW
Washington, DC 20010

Milton G Nichols
1794 Summit Lane
Mendota Heights
Minnesota 55118

Cameron Brown
600 S Ridge Rd
Lake Forest
Illinois  60045

Charles L. Rithchie
Box 38A, Star Route
Saranac Lake
New York  12983
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James B. Young</td>
<td>4403 Keswick Rd</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>21210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gayle Evans Brookfield</td>
<td>61 Country Club Rd</td>
<td>Waterbury</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>06708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary L. Coster Busch</td>
<td>&quot;Geranium Cottage&quot;</td>
<td>Tuxedo Park</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>10987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Wallace</td>
<td>309 N Tillotson St</td>
<td>Muncie</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>47304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva C. Stewart</td>
<td>33 Captain's Neck Lane</td>
<td>Southampton</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>11968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin V. Skewes-Cox</td>
<td>2576 Green St</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>94123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorin H. Tryon Jr.</td>
<td>133 Sugarloaf</td>
<td>Tiburon</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>94920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Sewall Janeway</td>
<td>1150 Fifth Ave</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>10128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig R. Williamson</td>
<td>20 Devon Rd</td>
<td>Darien</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>06820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth F. Cameron</td>
<td>555 Apache Dr</td>
<td>Batavia</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>60510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise Parsons Ott</td>
<td>515 Glenview Rd</td>
<td>Bryn Mawr</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>19010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert L. Nickerson</td>
<td>3 Lexington Rd</td>
<td>Lincoln Center</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>01773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Simpson</td>
<td>14 Cherrywood Rd</td>
<td>Locust Valley</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>11560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George M. Moriarty</td>
<td>179 School Street</td>
<td>Milton</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>02187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Robinson</td>
<td>South St</td>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>06069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forrester A. Clark Jr.</td>
<td>308 Sycamore St</td>
<td>South Hamilton</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>01982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry H. Porter Jr</td>
<td>3720 Hillside Rd</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne V. White Whitman</td>
<td>5B Regalia Ct</td>
<td>Owings Mills</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>21117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. Britton Hume  
5409 Blackistone Rd  
Bethesda  
Maryland 20816

Jay W. Collins, Pres  
Early Settlers of W. Res.  
PO Box 14301 Public Sq Station  
Cleveland, Ohio 44144

Alfred L. Donovan  
59 Randolph Rd  
Chestnut Hill  
Massachusetts 02167

Grover Boydston, Chairman  
Neurotics Anonymous  
Box 4886 Cleveland Pk Sta  
Washington, DC 20008

John D. Bartley  
46 Kingsbury Place  
St Louis  
Missouri 63112

Thomas P. Nally, Exec Sec  
Research in Growth Rel.  
32 Linden Dr  
Kingston, RI 02881

Virginia Downes Addis  
"Bonfield III" 544 Avonwood  
Haverford  
Pennsylvania 19041

Gwendoline M. Gliha, Gen Sec  
Assoc of Polish Women  
7526 Broadway  
Cleveland, Ohio 44105

William D. Hamill  
1 Juniper Dr  
Yarmouth  
ME 04096

Neall Mitchell, Contact  
Women In The Mainstream  
PO Box 66941  
Baton Rouge, LA 70896

Robert Cunning  
993 W. Cook Rd  
Mansfield  
Ohio 44903

Charlotte Schwab, Exec Dir  
Fem Ctr for Human Growth Dev  
300 E 75th St  
New York, NY 10021

Roy E. Christen  
7935 Greenwood View  
Parma  
Ohio 44129

Paul Stuart  
Soc. Welfare Hist. Group  
U of Wisc Dept of Social Work  
Eau Claire, Wisconsin 45701

Dana R. Dorsey  
Box 783  
Logan  
West Virginia 25601

John N. LaCorte  
111 Columbia Heights  
Brooklyn  
New York 11201

Beatrice W. Seitz  
214 W Van Buren St  
Janesville  
Wisconsin  53545

Lee Campbell, President  
Concerned U. Birthparents  
595 Central Ave  
Dover, NH 03820
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Keating-Edh, Pres.</td>
<td>Consumer Alert 1024 J St, Suite 425</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modesto, CA 95354</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Morgan</td>
<td>Friendship Ambassadors 273 Upper Mountain Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper Montclair, NJ 07043</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvin A Mottet</td>
<td>Campaign for Human Dev 1312 Massachusetts NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, DC 20005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priscilla Prutzman</td>
<td>Fellowship of Reconciliation Box 271</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nyack, NY 10960</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula Hajar</td>
<td>Pris. &amp; Missing in Leb. 308 W 107th St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York, NY 10025</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlene Kalke</td>
<td>Ctr for Immigrants Rights 48 St Marks Pl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York, NY 10003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Russell Spann</td>
<td>Def. of Trad, Fam., &amp; Prop. PO Box 121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pleasantville, NY 10570</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger David Carlson</td>
<td>Am. College of Heraldry Drawer CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University, AL 35486</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David H. Kim</td>
<td>Holt Int Children's Services PO Box 2880</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eugene, Oregon 97402</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther M. Schenck</td>
<td>Human Ecology Action League PO Box 1369</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evanston, Illinois 60204</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John P. Cosgrove</td>
<td>Am Historic &amp; Cultural Soc 520 Pennsylvania Bldg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington DC 20005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John R. McHugh</td>
<td>Retired Persons Services 510 King St, Suite 420</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alexandria, VA 22314</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eunice Kennedy Shriver</td>
<td>Special Olympics 1350 New York Ave NW, Ste 500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, DC 20004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie Friedel</td>
<td>Gifted &amp; Creative Children 395 Diamond Hill Rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warwick, RI 02886</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve West</td>
<td>Impact on Hunger 145 E 49th St #3D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York, NY 10017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernest W. Holz</td>
<td>Salvation Army 120 W. 14th St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York, NY 10011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James R. Whipple</td>
<td>Newborn Rights Society PO Box 48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St Peters, PA 19470</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven B. Potter</td>
<td>Nat Org of Victim Assistance 700 N Fairfax St, Suite 260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alexandria, VA 22314</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pauline Brown
American Ex-Prisoners of War
2620 Dundee St
Tampa, FL 33609

Felton Mark Wyatt
3310 P. Street NW
Washington, DC 20007

Steven Unger
Assoc for Am Indian Affairs
432 Park Ave S
New York, NY 10016

Kilbourn Gordon, Jr
13-8 James F Byrnes Rd
Beaufort
South Carolina 29902

Gordon Millsbaugh
40 Overleigh Rd
Bernardsville
New Jersey 07924

Frank E Smith
"Salisbury House"
Salisbury
Connecticut 06068

Francis C. Keil
1552 Laurel Hollow Rd
Syosset
New York 11791

Alexina Shufeldt
21 Gramercy Park S
New York
New York 10003

Helen A Homans Gilbert
84 Strawberry Hill St
Dover
MA 02030

Howard R. Craig Jr
RD 1 Millbrook Rd
Bedford Village
NY 10506

David W. Pitou
20 Edgewood Rd
Staten Island
New York 10506

Howard H. Roberts
1319 Wendover Rd
Rosemont
Pennsylvania 19010

Robert L. Cummings
Appleby Drive
Bedford
New York 10506

Gwynne C.G. McDevitt
Coverbridge Farm House
4111 Goshen Rd
Newton Square, Penn 19073

Donald C. Jones
3600 Mound Way
Cincinnati
Ohio 45227

Natalie Rudolph Burr
Beverly Manor, 809 Freemont
Los Altos
California 94022

Barbara Weaver Whittlesey
"Holly House"
Londonderry
Vermont 05148

R. Julian Koenig
340 Cove Neck Rd
Oyster Bay
New York 11771
Edward B. Pile  
3224 S 13th St  
Arlington  
Virginia 22204

Ruby Peccia  
Lewistown Geneal. Soc.  
312 Cook St  
Lewistown, Montana 59457

Mrs. Lyman F. Barry, Pres  
Livingston Co Geneal. Soc  
Rt 1, Box 313  
Nunda, NY 14517

Lt Co Oscar H. Stroh  
Rt 4, Box 295  
Harrisburg  
Pennsylvania 17112

Eloise Thomsen  
5843 Grant St  
Omaha  
Nebraska 68104

Mrs. Richard G. Champ  
9411 Hunters Creek Dr  
Dallas  
Texas 75243

Shirley Martin  
460 Morrow  
Batesville, Arkansas 72501

Adam S. Eterovich  
4843 Mission St  
San Francisco  
California 94112

Mary V. Humphrey  
Yell Co Hist & Geneal Soc  
Box 356  
Russellville, Arkansas 72801

Theo Henderson  
Miami V Ch, Idaho Geneal. Soc.  
Rt 2, 770 S River Dr  
Heyburn, Idaho 83336

Dwight Cushman  
San Fernando Co Geneal Soc  
8009 Lena Ave  
Canoga Park, CA 91304

Rev Earl Underwood  
809 Twelfth  
Marysville  
Kansas 66508

Mrs. K.M. Williams  
Mendocino Coast Geneal Soc  
19751 Myrtel St  
Fort Bragg, CA 95437

Mrs. V.L. Barker  
Box 187  
Washington  
Mississippi 39190

Betty Bettencourt  
Los Banos Geneal. Soc.  
Box 1106  
Los Banos, CA 93635

Mrs. Kent Williamson  
Box 388  
Belvidere  
Nebraska 68315

Agatha Burkett  
Ouichita Geneal. Soc.  
106 Laurd St  
West Monore, Louisana 71291
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ervin James Gaines</td>
<td>325 Superior Ave</td>
<td>Bassett MaGuire</td>
<td>120-24 Dreiser Loop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bronx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ohio 44114</td>
<td></td>
<td>New York 10475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann E. Prentice</td>
<td>804 Volunteer Blvd</td>
<td>Glenn Andrews</td>
<td>Andrews Adv Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knoxville</td>
<td></td>
<td>PO Box 1589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tennessee 37996</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anniston, AL 36201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Kathryn Oller</td>
<td>105 Garfield St</td>
<td>Adele Lloyd Faulkner</td>
<td>Box 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waynesboro</td>
<td></td>
<td>North Hollywood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pennsylvania 17268</td>
<td></td>
<td>California 91603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfred Christian Zuck</td>
<td>Edwards &amp; Zuck, PC</td>
<td>Saul Fenster</td>
<td>524 Bernita Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>330 W 42nd St</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rivervale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York, NY 10036</td>
<td></td>
<td>New Jersey 07675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2727 Ponce de Leon Blvd</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coral Gables, FL 33134</td>
<td></td>
<td>College Park, Maryland 20742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond Anthony Pigozzi</td>
<td>O'Donnell Wicklund Pigozzi Arch.</td>
<td></td>
<td>John George Babbitt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3239 Arnold Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td>12 E Aspen St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northbrook, Ill 60062</td>
<td></td>
<td>Flagstaff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arizona 86002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Dwight Prater</td>
<td>7160 Gilespie St</td>
<td>Binnie Henrietta Kramer</td>
<td>2892 NW Upshur Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td></td>
<td>Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nevada 89119</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oregon 97210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty J. Meggars</td>
<td>1227 30th Street NW</td>
<td>Paul Warren Briggs</td>
<td>1380 E 6th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DC 20560</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ohio 44114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Dustin Mirick</td>
<td>3 Parkway</td>
<td>Jose Bejar Cruz</td>
<td>2014 Silver Ct W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Urbana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pennsylvania 19103</td>
<td></td>
<td>Illinois 61801</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wofford Benjamin Camp
701 Oleander Ave
Bakersfield
California 93304

David W. Veno, Dean of Stu.
NH Voc. Tech. College
277R Portsmouth Ave
Stratham, NH 03885

Adele Frisbie Schrag
305 Longfield Rd
Philadelphia
Pennsylvania 19122

Thomas R Plough, Exec. Dean
Rochester Inst. of Technology
1 Lomb Memorial Dr
Rochester, NY 14623

Marty Pautz, Dean
Learning Res., Greenville Tech.
PO Box 5616 Station B
Greenville, SC 29606

Barbara Guthrie-Morse
Dean of Leadership Center
Bethany College
Bethany, WV 26032

Jim Yandle, Dean
Stu. Serv., Stanly Tech
Rt 4 Box 55
Albemarle, NC 28001

Roger H. Plothow, Dean
Extended Day and Cont. Educ.
PO Box 1009
Provo, Utah 84601

Leon Englebart, Dean
Instr. Services, NE Tech.
801 Benjamin Ave
Norfolk, NE 68701

David C Levy, Exec Dean
Parsons School of Design
66 W 12th St
New York, NY 10011

Neil Stern, Dean
Cont. Educ., NY Chiropractic Coll
PO Box 167
Glen Head, NY 11454

Baxter M. Hood, Pres.
York Technical College
Rock Hill
South Carolina 29730

Stephen D Rowe, Dean
Arts & Sci, Ind. Inst. of Tech.
1600 E Washington Blvd
Fort Wayne, IN 46803

Martha C. Hickey, Dean
Dev. & Special Programs
Guilford Tech. Inst Box 309
Jamestown, NC 27282

Maxine Zwiebel, Dean
Sec. Stds., Katherine Gibbs Sch.
535 Broad Hollow Rd
Melville, NY 11747

Jack Fajans, Dean
Grad. Studies, Stevens Inst.
Castle Point Station
Hoboken, NJ 07030

Charles D. Voncannon, Dean
Cont. Educ., Trident Tech.
Box 10367
North Charleston, SC 29411

Richard V. Fuller, Jr., VP
Bus. & Fin., Georgia Inst. of Tech.
225 North Ave, NW
Atlanta, GA 30332
James E. Newton  
Dean of Instruction  
Texas State Tech. Inst.  
Waco, TX 76705

William F. Covington, Supt.  
Henry County Schools  
Box 635  
Abbeville, AL 36310

Edwin R. Chapman, Pres.  
Anson Technical College  
Box 68  
Ansonville, NC 28007

Richard Smith, Supt.  
312 West Point  
Postville, IA 52162

Dick L. Chappell, VP  
Development, Utah Tech. College  
PO Box 1609  
Provo, Utah 84603

Owen V. McNulty, Supt.  
Whiteford Agric. Schools  
6655 Consear Rd  
Ottawa Lake, MI 49267

Richard D Snook, Asst Supt  
Lakeland School District 272  
PO Box 39  
Rathdrum, ID 83858

Roberta J. Dinsmore, Supt.  
N. Vermillion Comm. School  
Perrysville  
Indiana 47974

Thomas King, Superintendent  
Falls School District 31  
Route 4  
Norman, OK 73071

John T. Holliday, Supt.  
Montague Elem. Schools  
PO Box 308  
Montague, CA 96064

Mary Jo Washington, Supt.  
Clay County School District  
Box 759  
West Point, MS 39773

Leroy Corbett, Supt.  
Foyil School District  
Foyil  
Oklahoma 74031

Jeanne Meiggs, Supt.  
Currituck County Schools  
Box 40  
Currituck, NC 27929

William E. Stubbs, Pers. Dir.  
Kettering City School Dist.  
3490 Farhills Ave  
Kettering, Ohio 45429

Patricia Zyber, Supt.  
Essex Town School District  
Box 329  
Essex Town, VT 05451

Joan M. Kenny, Supt.  
Queens School District 250  
70-30 164th Street  
Flushing, NY 11365

Phyllis Loe, Principal  
West Station School District 61  
11463 W. Stayton Rd  
Aumsville, OR 97325

Sam Yarbrough, Supt.  
Bolivar 3 Co. School Dist.  
PO Box 28  
Shelby, MS 38774
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City, State, Zip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Darrell Hill</td>
<td>Supt.</td>
<td>Yukon School District</td>
<td>1025 S 11th St</td>
<td>Yukon, OK 73099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth P. Alexander</td>
<td>Pers. Dir.</td>
<td>Sherman Ind. School Dist.</td>
<td>PO Box 1156</td>
<td>Sherman, TX 75090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Devine</td>
<td>Supt.</td>
<td>Pike Valley Uni School Dist.</td>
<td>PO Box 291</td>
<td>Scandia, KS 66966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim E. Pahlau</td>
<td></td>
<td>Canon City School Dist RE-1</td>
<td>1104 Royal Gorge Blvd</td>
<td>Canon City, CO 81212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Cromer</td>
<td>Pers. Dir.</td>
<td>Barrow County Schools</td>
<td>PO Box 767</td>
<td>Winder, GA 30680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvin Marchbanks</td>
<td>Supt.</td>
<td>Lyon County School Dist.</td>
<td>25 E Goldfield Ave</td>
<td>Yerington, NV 89447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Smiley</td>
<td>Supt.</td>
<td>Polk County Public Schools</td>
<td>PO Drawer A</td>
<td>Benton, TN 37307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reba Clark</td>
<td>Supt.</td>
<td>Vestavia Hills City Schools</td>
<td>1204 Montgomery Highway</td>
<td>Vestavia Hills, AL 35216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darrell K Evans</td>
<td>Supt.</td>
<td>Chino Valley School District</td>
<td>PO Box 225</td>
<td>Chino Valley, AZ 86323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Costner</td>
<td>Supt.</td>
<td>Zillah School District</td>
<td>Box 225</td>
<td>Zillah, WA 98953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonia Price</td>
<td></td>
<td>State Office Building</td>
<td>Room 907</td>
<td>65 South Front Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick A. Colley</td>
<td>Manpower Project Director</td>
<td></td>
<td>915 Stahlman Bldg.</td>
<td>Nashville, TN 37201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Baroudi</td>
<td>Adult Education Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>State Office Building</td>
<td>Montpelier, VT 05602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloria Williams</td>
<td>Prof Dev. for Voc Educ</td>
<td>State Dept of Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hartford, CT 06145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark Jones</td>
<td>Adult Ed., State Dept. of Ed.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gold Belt Place, Pouch F</td>
<td>Juneau, AL 99811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jose Montanez</td>
<td>Voc Industrial Ed Program</td>
<td>Dept of Education</td>
<td>Box 818</td>
<td>Hato Rey, PR 00919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifton Hutton</td>
<td>Guidance and Pers. Serv.</td>
<td>PO Box 1402 Townsend Bldg</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dover, DE 19901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlene Grady</td>
<td>State Dept of Education</td>
<td>Capitol Complex, State Capitol Rm 346</td>
<td></td>
<td>Charleston, WV 25305</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Paul Peterson  
Utah St. Office of Edu.  
250 E 5th, South  
Salt Lake City, UT 84111

Sam Puletasi  
Trade & Industrial Educ.  
Tafuna Skill Center  
Pago Pago, American Samoa 96799

Douglas Richardson  
Vocational-Technical Unit  
New Mexico Dept of Educ.  
Sante Fe NM 87501-2786

Harley Staver  
Ind. Op., State Dept of Educ  
State Office Building West  
Cheyenne, WY 82002

Annie L Winstead  
Rutledge Bldg Room 912 C  
1429 Senate Street  
Columbia, SC 29201

Kathy Brophy  
Div. of Voc. & Adult Educ.  
PO Box 2219  
Hartford, CT 06145

Douglas Richardson  
Vocational-Technical Unit  
New Mexico Dept of Educ.  
Sante Fe NM 87501-2786

Harley Staver  
Ind. Op., State Dept of Educ  
State Office Building West  
Cheyenne, WY 82002

Annie L Winstead  
Rutledge Bldg Room 912 C  
1429 Senate Street  
Columbia, SC 29201

Kathy Brophy  
Div. of Voc. & Adult Educ.  
PO Box 2219  
Hartford, CT 06145

Dunbar Semans  
Agribusiness and Nat. Res.  
Dept of Educ. & Cultural Serv.  
Augusta, ME 04333

Robert Barnett  
Athens Area Voc. Tech. School  
PO Box 848  
Athens, TN 37303

Harlan Giese  
Voc Educ Advisory Council  
1209 E. Court, Room 305  
Des Moines, IA 50319

Billy R. McGehee  
Oil Belt Voc. Tech. School  
PO Box 1777  
El Dorado, AR 71730

Charles Lebo  
333 Market St., 6th Floor  
Harrisburg, PA 17108

Stuart Steiner  
Genessee Community College  
College Road  
Batavia, NY 14020

David Merrill  
Richard F. Kneip Bldg.  
Pierre, SD 57501

Joyce J. Zerangue  
River Parishes Voc. Tech. Sch.  
PO Drawer AQ  
Reserve, LA 70084

Ann Silver  
JTPA Director  
111 W Telegraph St  
Carson City, NV 89710

John O. Hunter  
Lake County College  
19351 West Washington St  
Gray Slake, Ill 60030

George Sanders  
400 Maryland Ave SW, ROB #3  
Washington, DC 20202

William Koehnline  
Oakton Community College  
1600 E Golf Road  
Des Plaines, Ill 60016
Richard A. Drew  
Kent Denver Co. Day School  
4000 E Quincy Ave  
Englewood, CO 80110

James A. Bellew  
St. Michaels Reg. HS  
1501 New York Ave  
Union City, NJ 07087

Joseph E. Wandke  
Robert Louis Stevenson Sch.  
PO Box 657  
Pebble Beach, CA 93953

Dennis O'Brien  
Logos  
9137 Old Bonhomme  
St Louis, Missouri 63162

Richard G. Peirce  
The Forman School  
Norfolk Rd  
Litchfield, CT 06759

Marian Leland  
Ashley Hall School  
PO Box 248, 172 Rutledge Ave  
Charleston, SC 29402

Sr. Margaret Stallmeyer  
Our Lady of Providence Acad.  
Sixth and Linden Avenues  
Newport, KY 41071

Charles F. Zimmer  
Virginia Episcopal School  
PO Box 408  
Lynchburg, VA 24505

Miles Bryant  
Marello Preparatory HS  
126 Eucalyptus Ave  
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Ivan L. Hutton  
Gonzaga Preparatory School  
1224 E Euclid Ave  
Spokane, WA 99207

Henry M. Littlefield  
The York School  
9501 Salinas Highway  
Monterey, CA 93940

William W. Jablon  
Alfred B. Maclay Jr Day Sch.  
3737 North Meridian Rd  
Tallahassee, FL 32312

Frances R. O'Connor  
Montclair Kimberley Academy  
201 Valley Road  
Montclair, NJ 07042

Gloria Martineau  
Joseph Kershaw School  
50 Springdale Dr  
Camden, SC 29020

Elizabeth C. Ely  
The Field School  
2126 Wyoming Ave, NW  
Washington, DC 20008

C Thomas Kaesemeyer  
Westtown School  
Westtown  
Pennsylvania 19395

J. Gardiner Dodd  
King School  
1450 Newfield Ave  
Stamford, CT 06905
Edmund Janzen, President
Fresno Pacific College
1717 S Chestnut Ave
Fresno, CA 93702

Aloys A. Michel, Dean
Graduate School
Univ of RI
Kingston, RI 02881

Thomas J. Tighe, Dean
Human Development, U of Texas
PO Box 688
Richardson, TX 75080

Charles E. Hess, Dean
Ag & Env Sci
Univ of California
Davis, CA 95616

William McCormick Jr.
Dean of Academic Affairs
Western Maryland College
Westminster, MD 21157

Brooke E. Sheldon, Dean
Library Sci, TX Womans Univ
Box 22905
Denton, TX 76204

Juliet Y. Garcia, Dean
Arts & Sciences, TX Southmost
83 Port Brown
Brownsville, TX 78520

Kenneth R. Venters, Dean
Human Ser, Univ. of Tenn.
615 McCallie Ave
Chattanooga, TN 37402

Edward T. Dowling, Dean
Fordham University
Rosehill
Bronx, NY 10458

E.K. Fretwell, Chancellor
University of North Carolina
University Station
Charlotte, NC 28223

Bruce Wilson, Dean
Continuing Ed., TSU
3500 Centennial Blvd.
Nashville, TN 37203

David A. Vose, Dean
Econ & Business, U. of Minn.
2400 Oakland Ave
Duluth, Minnesota 55812

Richard H. Moore
Dean of Sci, Coastal Carolina
PO Box 1954
Conway, SC 29526

Mary D. Griffin, Dean
Educ, Boston College
140 Commonwealth Ave
Chestnut Hill, MA 02167

Joan M Schumaker, Dean
Undergraduate Studies
Sung College at Geneseo
Geneseo, NY 14454

William F. Massy, VP
Business & Finance
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305

Lewie C. Roache, Dean
Arts & Sciences
SC State College
Orangeburg, SC 29117

Harvey Sterns, Dean
Academic Administration
Lock Haven State College
Lock Haven, PA 17745
Rebecca R. Dixon, Dean  
Admissions & Fin. Aid, American U  
4400 Massachusetts Ave NW  
Washington, DC 20016

Addessa E Lewis  
Dean, Academic Affairs  
Benedict College  
Columbia, SC 29204

David J. Rowland, Pres.  
Walker College  
Jasper  
Alabama 35501

Alexander Pocetto  
Academic Dean  
Allentown College  
Center Valley, PA 18034

Nayan McNeill, Dean  
Lang. Arts, Foothill College  
12345 El Monte Rd  
Los Altos, CA 94022

Samuel A. Davis  
Acad. Dean, Rutledge College  
603 Country Club Drive  
Fayetteville, NC 28301

Fred Benton Goodwin  
Dean of Humanities  
SE Missouri State U.  
Cape Girardeau, MO 63701

James H. Zumberge, Pres.  
U. of So. California  
University Park  
Los Angeles, CA 90089

Harry S. Jones, Dean  
Sch of Medicine, U. of Missouri  
2411 Holmes  
Kansas City, MO 64108

Virginia Radley  
President  
Suny College at Oswego  
Oswego, NY 13126

Norma B Zoffman  
Instr Dean, Mission College  
3000 Mission College Blvd  
Santa Clara, CA 95045

Gerald Senecal  
President  
Benedictine College  
Atchison, KS 66002

Walter A. Brower  
Dean of Educ., Rider College  
2083 Lawrenceville Rd  
Lawrenceville, NJ 08648

George B. Hibbard, Dean of Stu.  
California State College  
9001 Stockdale Highway  
Bakersfield, CA 93309

Melvin J. Uzee, Dean  
Voc Trades, Delgado College  
615 City Park Ave  
New Orleans, LA 70119

Paul T. Medici, Dean  
Grd Sch., St Johns Univ.  
Grand Central & Utopia Pkwy  
Jamaica, NY 11439

Vijay Chauhan, Dean of Stu.  
Southeastern University  
501 Eye St SW  
Washington, DC 20024

Sister Cathleen Real  
Pres., College of St Mary  
1901 S 72nd Street  
Omaha, NE 68124
David Osher, Dean
Sch of Human Ser., NH College
2500 N. River Road
Manchester, NH 03104

Guenter E. Salter, Dean
Arts & Sci., Bob Jones U.
Wade Hampton Blvd
Greenville, SC 29614

J. Thomas Johnson
Dean of Stu., Pikeville Coll.
Sycamore Street
Pikeville, KY 41501

Dennis W. Frodsham, VP
Queens College
1900 Salwyn Ave
Charlotte, NC 28274

Rosemary G. Ashby, Pres.
Pine Manor College
400 Heath Street
Chestnut Hill, MA 02167

Mary Laverty, Dean of Stu.
College of Notre Dame
4701 North Charles St
Baltimore, MD 21210

Ben Franckowiak, Dean
Grd Sch., Lib Inf. Management
University of Denver
Denver, CO 80208

Keith Scott, VP for Dev.
California State Univ.
18111 Nordhoff St
Northridge, CA 91330

Bradford L. Crain
Academic Dean
Lincoln Memorial Univ
Harrogate, TN 37752

Byron Fullerton
Dean, School of Law
Texas Tech University
Lubbock, TX 79409

Donna Hunter
Dean of Students
Cornell College
Mount Vernon, IA 52314

David H Bauer
VP for Dev. & PR
Andrews University
Berrien Springs, MI 49104

Leonard Meiselas, Dean
Biomed Educ, College of NY
Convent at 138th St
New York, NY 10031

Caroline L. Lattimore
Dean of Minority Affairs
107 Union, Duke University
Durham, NC 27706

Charles E. Hood, Jr.
Dean, School of Journalism
University of Montana
Missoula, MT 59812

Martin Anisman, Dean
Arts & Sci, S Conn St College
501 Crescent St
New Haven, CT 06515

John Vinton, Dean of Stu.
HamLine University
1536 Hewitt Ave
St Paul, MN 55104

Harvey A. Larson
Dean of Business
Montana State University
Bozeman, MT 59717
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maria Falco</td>
<td>Dean, Arts &amp; Sci, Loyola Univ</td>
<td></td>
<td>6363 St Charles Ave, New Orleans, LA 70118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald C Plughoft</td>
<td>VP, Univ. Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fort Hays State University, Hays, KS 67601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merton Johnson</td>
<td>Dean, Fine Arts, Del Mar College</td>
<td></td>
<td>Baldwin &amp; Ayers, Corpus Christi, TX 78404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Swenson</td>
<td>Dean of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td>U. of Wisco at River Falls, River Falls, WI 54022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyndon E. Goodridge</td>
<td>Dean, Alfred U. Business Coll.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Main Street, Alfred, NY 14802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Koffler</td>
<td>President</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona 85721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard H. Galloway</td>
<td>Dean, College of Basic Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td>Northwestern State University, Natchitoches, LA 71497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard J. Nichols</td>
<td>Dean, Kean Coll. of NJ, Adv. Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td>Morris Avenue, Union, NJ 07803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles E. Malone</td>
<td>Dean, Adm &amp; Recored, U. of Tulsa</td>
<td></td>
<td>600 S College Ave, Tulsa, OK 74104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Metz</td>
<td>President</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mills College, MacArthur Blvd &amp; Sem Ave, Oakland, CA 94613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeannette Spero</td>
<td>Dean of Nursing &amp; Health</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio 45221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent T. Adair</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen F Austin S.U. Sch Frstry., Nacogdoches, TX 75962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John R. Watts</td>
<td>Dean, Depaul U. Goodman Sch of Drama</td>
<td></td>
<td>804 W Belden, Chicago, Ill 60614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John L. Schroder</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mineral &amp; Energy Resources, West Virginia University, Morgantown, WVa 26506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anya P. Royce</td>
<td>Dean of Faculties</td>
<td></td>
<td>Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind 47405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly A Varga</td>
<td>Dean, 3rd Coll.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Univ. of Calif. San Diego, Box 109, La Jolla, CA 92093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon V. Moulton</td>
<td>Dean, Adm Ser, U. of South Alabama</td>
<td></td>
<td>307 University Blvd, Mobile, AL 36688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliver M. Littlejohn</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pharmacy, Mercer Univ., 345 Blvd NE, Atlanta, GA 30312</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sister M. Anne Vonderahe  
Mount St Marys College  
12001 Chalon Rd  
Los Angeles, CA 90049

Oscar Prater  
Dean for Admin. Services  
Hampton Institute  
Hampton, VA 23668

Ursula Sybille Colby, Dean  
Russell Sage College  
45 Ferry St  
Troy, NY 12180

Jacqueline Powers Doud  
Dean, U. of LaVerne  
1950 3rd Street  
Laverne, CA 91750

Edward T. Foote, Pres.  
University of Miami  
University Station  
Coral Gables, Florida 33124

Madelyn M. Healy  
Dean of Educ, Kean College  
Morris Ave  
Union, NJ 07083

Richard A. Peterson, Dean  
Stu. Serv., Augustana College  
29th St & S Summit  
Sioux Falls, SD 57197

Winfred L. Thompson  
Dean of Continuing Educ  
Arkansas State University  
State University, AR 72467

John R. West, Dean  
Stu. Serv., Santa Ana Coll.  
17th at Bristol St  
Santa Ana, CA 92706

Thomas H. Meikle, Jr., Dean  
Cornell U. Medical College  
1300 York Ave  
New York, NY 10021

Clair D. Rowe, Dean  
Business & Public Admin.  
University of North Dakota  
Grand Forks, ND 58202

John Charles Gordon, Dean  
Forestry & Env. Studies  
Yale University  
New Haven, CT 06520

Walter McCarthy  
VP for Financial Affairs  
College of New Rochelle  
New Rochelle, NY 10801

Ward H. Dennis, Dean  
Columbia U. Fac. of G. Studies  
Broadway & West 116th St  
New York, NY 10027

Karen Johnson Walters  
Dean, School of Fine Arts  
Texas Wesleyan College  
Fort Worth, TX 76105

David H. Lambert, VP for Dev.  
Hahnemann Medical College  
85320 N Broad St  
Philadelphia, PA 19102

Theodore J. Clements, Dean  
Gonzaga University Law School  
East 502 Boone Ave  
Spokane, WA 99258

Norma J. Tucker, President  
Merritt College  
12500 Campus Drive  
Oakland, CA 94619
Carlton W. Molette, Dean  
Texas So. U., Dept of Comm.  
3201 Wheeler St  
Houston, TX 94619

Glenn F. Knoll, Ch.  
119 Cooley Bldg  
Ann Arbor, MI 48109

John Mertz  
Dean of Academic Affairs  
Del Valley Coll of Sci & Agr  
Doyllestown, PA 18901

Alton Fletcher Baker, Jr.  
975 High St, PO Box 10188  
Eugene  
Oregon 97401

Herman C. Kissiah  
Dean of Students  
Lafayette College  
Easton, PA 18042

Seymour Benzer  
2075 Robin Road  
San Marino  
California 91108

Charles A. Zuzak, Dean  
Arts & Sci, TSU  
10th & Charlotte  
Nashville, TN 37203

Elizabeth Edrop Bohning  
Dept of Language & Lit.  
Univ of Delaware  
Newark, DE 19711

James T. Closson  
Dean of Admissions  
Graceland College  
Lamoni, IA 50140

Neil Steven Hayden  
The Herald Examiner  
1111 S Broadway  
Los Angeles, CA 90015

Tomeine I Tjelta, Dean  
Nursing, Oral Roberts Univ  
7777 S Lewis Ave  
Tulsa, Oklahoma

Milan Ernest Hapala  
Box S  
Sweet Briar  
Virginia 24595

Jesse H. Choper  
Dean of Law  
University of California  
Berkeley, CA 94720

James Walter Nordyke  
NM State U. Dept of Economics  
Box 3511 University Park  
Las Cruces, NM 88003

Sister Mary V. Hickey  
Acad. Dean, Felician College  
260 S Main St  
Lodi, NJ 07644

Virginia Minnich  
Dept of Medicine  
Washington U. Medical School  
St Louis, MO 63110

Richard L Morrill, President  
Centre College  
Walnut Avenue  
Danville, KY 40422

Paul Eugene Sigmund  
8 Evelyn Place  
Princeton  
New Jersey 08540
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>ZIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luciano Bruno Ronca</td>
<td>Dept of Geology</td>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>48202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Russell Hitchcock</td>
<td>152 E 62nd Street</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>10021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleni Salces Epstein</td>
<td>2807 Cathedral Ave NW</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>20008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Frances Willerding</td>
<td>San Diego St. Coll. Math Dept.</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>92085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Anthony Kirsoopp Lake</td>
<td>Dept of Political Science</td>
<td>Amherst</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John T. Yantis</td>
<td>Dean of Extended Learning</td>
<td>Central Michigan University</td>
<td>Mount Pleasant, MI</td>
<td>48859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelly Schargo Hoyt</td>
<td>89 Maynard Rd</td>
<td>North Hampton</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>01060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter J. Daly, Dean of Med.</td>
<td>1100 West Michigan St</td>
<td>Indianapolis, IN</td>
<td>46223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Earl Goheen</td>
<td>1300 NW Grant St</td>
<td>Corvallis</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>97330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friedhelm K. Radandt, Pres.</td>
<td>Northwestern College</td>
<td>Orange City</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>51041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolfgang Epstein</td>
<td>920 E 58th St</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>60637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley Sidney Ulmer</td>
<td>1701 Williamsburg Rd</td>
<td>Lexington</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James D. Baker, Dean</td>
<td>Oceans/Fisheries Science</td>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td>Seattle, WA</td>
<td>98195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall Bolton Frady</td>
<td>ABC News</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>10023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William H. Danforth, Chanc.</td>
<td>Washington University</td>
<td>St Louis</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>63130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnar Pytte</td>
<td>Office of the Provost</td>
<td>Hanover</td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>03755</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PAUL FREDERICK DEISLER, JR  
P. O. BOX 2463  
HOUSTON  
TEXAS 77001

ROBERT DENISON SCHUMACHER  
1 WALL STREET  
NEW YORK, NY  
10015

PETE KNOWLES  
GENESCO INC.  
P. O. BOX 67  
UVALDE, TEXAS 78801

DENNIS EUGENE YOUNG  
207 9TH STREET  
DES MOINES, IA  
50307

ALLEN CHASE  
MARINA CITY CLUB, PH 38  
4337 MARINA CITY DR.  
MARINA DEL REY, CA 90291

HAROLD ANDREW DULAN  
1500 CLARK ST  
FAYETTEVILLE, AR  
72701

AUDREY TRADGOTT DEARING  
TRACOR INC.  
6500 TRACOR LANE  
AUSTIN, TX 78721

PHYLLIS ANN CELLA  
JOHN HANCOCK PLACE  
BOSTON, MA  
02117

NORMAN ERNEST FRIEDMANN  
CORDURA CORP.  
2029 CENTURY PK E., STE 3210  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90067

IAN BRUCE DAVIDSON  
DAVIDSON BLDG  
GREAT FALLS, MT  
59401

MARVIN MATTOX DEUPREE  
1345 AVE. OF AMERICAS  
NEW YORK, NY  
10019

WILLIAM GARRETT BAKER, JR.  
ONE HILLSHIRE BLDG  
SUITE 2900  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90017

SHIRLEY FLORENCE LORD ANDERSON  
350 MADISON AVE.  
NEW YORK, NY  
10017

DONNA WOLF STEIGERWALDT  
2300 60TH ST.  
KENOSHA, WI  
53140

OSCAR O'NEIL GRIFFIN, JR.  
2004 N WHARTON ST.  
EL CAMPO, TX  
77437

JOHN JAQUETTE  
P.O. BOX 4283  
HONOLULU, HI  
96813

THOMAS OLIVER MATHUES  
GEN. MOTORS TECH. CENTER  
12 MILE AND MOUNDS RDS.  
WARREN, MI 48090

Daniel Davis  
6610 Norwood Street  
Lubbock  
Texas 79413
STEVEN GEORGE ROTHMEIER
MINNEAPOLIS-ST. PAUL
INT. AIRPORT
ST. PAUL, MN 55111

OLIVE H. DAUBE, PRESIDENT
DAUBE CO.
5 S. COMMERCE
ARDMORE, OK 73401

LILLIAN MENZIES BARKER
818 KANSAS ST.
TOPEKA, KS
66612

J. BURLEIGH ARNOLD, CH.
INT. MERCANTILE CORP.
2103 MISSOURI BLVD.
JEFFERSON CITY, MO 65101

ROBERT J. ROELS, PRES.
SANDBERG MFG CO
1959 FULTON ST.
CHICAGO, ILL 60612

PAUL C. SMITH, PRESIDENT
CHESTER A. SMITH, INC.
1330 NORTON AVE.
COLUMBUS, OH 43212

M. F. BAKER, PRES
BURNS INT SECURITY SERVICES
320 OLD BRIARCLIFF RD.
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

W. GEOFFREY CLINE, PRES.
RESERVE EXPLORATION CO.
5200 S. YALE AVE.
TULSA, OK 74135

CHARLES MUELLER, PRES.
KERSHER METAL SERVICE CO.
100 E MASON ST.
GREEN BAY, WISC 54305

JUNE EDDINGTON, CH.
DIVERSIFIED ELECTRICAL SERV. CO
P. O. BOX 1792
BEAUMONT, TX 77704

GERTRUDE P. REESE
PRESIDENT
SCIO POTTERY CO.
SCIO, OH 43988

THOMAS B. PETERSON, PRES
CHR INDUSTRIES, INC.
407 EAST ST.
NEW HAVEN, CT 06509

WESLEY D. SEARS, CH.
AMERICAN LUBRICANTS CO.
1227 DEEDS AVE.
DAYTON, OH 45404

MICHAEL P. AMANN, CH. & PRES.
WRECKING CORP. OF AMERICA
3680 WHEELER AVE.
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22304

W. H. CULVER, CH. & CEO
OPTELECOM, INC.
15940 LUANNE DR.
GAITHERSBERG, MD 20877

JOSEPH K. HALL, III, PRES
CAROLINA PAD & PAPER CO.
11707 STEELE CREEK RD.
CHARLOTTE, NC 28210

WILLIAM G. LAMBACHER, CH.
SOCIETY BANK, N. A.
1 S. FOUNTAIN AVE.
SPRINGFIELD, OH 45501

ADELE KENYON, CH. & TREAS.
PROJECT INC.
65 SEQUIN DR.
GLASTONBURY, CT 06033
GLENN F. IHRRIG, CH.
WELLMAN DYNAMICS CORP.
P. O. BOX 147, HWY 34
CRESTON, IOWA 50801

DAVID FEINBERG, PRES.
EMC CORPORATION
300 YORK AVE.
ST. PAUL, MN 55101

JEFFERSON E. WILLIAMS, CH.
JOHNSON & BASSETT, INC.
95 HIGGINS ST.
WORCESTER, MA 01606

MARY H. WINTERS, PRES.
SOUTHWEST RESEARCH, INC.
8200 BROOKRIVER DR.
DALLAS, TX 75247

GEORGE A. POWELL, PRES.
CONTINENTAL INVESTORS LIFE INS.
6780 S. EMPIORIA ST.
ENGLEWOOD, CO 80112

C. RAYMOND BRANDT
PRESIDENT & TREASURER
OVER THE COUNTER SEC. FUND
ORELAND, PA 19075

KEVAN M. GREEN, PRES.
POLYMER APPLICATIONS, INC.
3445 RIVER RD.
TONAWANDA, NY 14150

DELORES ALDRIDGE, PRES.
SPRINGFIELD TOOL & DIE INC.
P. O. BOX 6787
GREENVILLE, SC 29606

RAYMOND BEELEY, PRES.
DIXIE PIPE SALES, INC.
P. O. BOX 540207
HOUSTON, TX 77254

GEORGE KONHEIM, PRES. & TREAS.
BUCKEYE CONSTRUCTION CO., INC.
8500 WILSHIRE BLVD.
BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90211

DONALD G. O'BRIEN, CH. & PRES.
D. G. O'BRIEN, INC.
1 CHASE PARK
SEABROOK, NH 03874

GRACE CARNEY, PRESIDENT
UNITED TOOL & DIE CO.
1 CARNEY RD.
WEST HARTFORD, CT 06110

FREDERICK H. REULING, PRES
FIRST NATIONAL BANK
80 E. JEFFERSON, PO BOX 216
MORTON, IL 61550

F. M. STERN, CHAIRMAN
GRUNTAL FINANCIAL CORP
14 WALL ST.
NEW YORK, NY 10005

GARY W. KRIMMEL, VP
LITTON MICROWAVE COOKING
1405 XENIUM LANE
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55441

LEA ANNE ARGIRIS, EXEC VP & DIR
ALPHA CAST INC.
520 N. JEFFERSON ST.
WHITESTRAIN, WI 53190

BARRY JAMES MALONE, VP, CLAIMS
SERVICE LIFE OF OMAHA
1904 FARNAM
OMAHA, NE 68102

WILLIAM E. PIKE, CHAIRPERSON
MORGAN GRMTY TRST POL. COMM
23 WALL ST.
NEW YORK, NY 10015
ROBERT E. BRIEFEI, CH
THE DMC CORPORATION
107 TRUMBULL ST.
ELIZABETH, NJ 07206

MADELINE DAVENPORT DISARIO, VP
DATA RESOURCES, INC.
1750 K. ST., NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

LAURIAN SEAVERSON HARSHMAN, VP
FIRST NATIONWIDE SAVINGS
700 MARKET ST.
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

JAMES TRAVER LYON, V.P.
CSX CORPORATION
701 E. BYRD ST.
RICHMOND, VA 23219

LYNWOOD CHANDLER SMITH, CH
CONCHEMCO, INC.
5250 W. 94 TERR.
OVERLAND PARK, KS 66207

SHERMON O. LYON, PRESIDENT
COPOLYMER RUBBER & CHEMICAL CORP.
5955 SCENIC HWY
BATON ROUGE, LA 70821

ARTHUR A. HOUGHTON, JR, CH
STEUBEN GLASS
715 FIFTH AVE.
NEW YORK, NY 10022

ROBERT MAX SONTHEIMER, PRES
RESOURCE PLANNING SYSTEMS
50 CHURCH ST.
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138

LAWRENCE R. BURNS, VP & G MGR
BREUER ELECTRIC MANUF. CO.
7401 W. LAWRENCE
CHICAGO, IL 60656

HARRIETTE F. WITMER, CH & CEO
DEEPWATER CHEMICAL CO.
BOX 17599
IRVING, CA 92713

ELIZABETH SARAH REIS, VICE PRES.
REIS OF NEW HAVEN
YORK INDUSTRIAL CENTER
WEST HAVEN, CT 06516- R

BILL BURKE BETZ, PRES. & DIR.
MONOLITH PORTLAND CEMENT CO.
1025 N. BRAND BLVD
GLENDALE, CA 91202

GUIDO DAVID IACOVELLI, CH
CHEF ITALIA, INC.
2317 VESTAL PKWY E.
VESTAL, NY 13850

RICHARD F. SCHMIDT, EXEC. V.P.
THE DUN & BRADSTREET CORP.
299 PARK AVE.
NEW YORK, NY 10171

TIBOR HAMOR, COMPTROLLER
SAM ALLEN & SON, INC.
500 COLLIER RD.
PONTIAC, MI 48076

RICHARD KYLE CLEEK, PROJ DIR
FISH ENG & CONST, INC.
PO BOX 22535
HOUSTON, TX 77027

THOMAS B. UNGER, VP & DIR
CUNNINGHAM & WALSH
875 N. MICHIGAN
CHICAGO, IL 60621

JOYCE A. THOMPSen, V.P.
E. F. JOHNSON CO.
299 JOHNSON AVE.
WASECA, MN 56093
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT D HUNSUCKER</td>
<td>PANHANDLE EASTERN CORP.</td>
<td>P. O. BOX 1642 HOUSTON, TX 77251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Parker Holfstad</td>
<td>Land O'Lakes Inc</td>
<td>PO Box 116 Minneapolis, Minnesota 55440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASQUALE A. VERONA</td>
<td>P. A. VERONA REALTY</td>
<td>1851 KENWOOD LANE FORT MEYERS, FL 33907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Smith Kennerly</td>
<td>Blosam Contractors Inc</td>
<td>8130 Baymeadows, PO Box 17157 Jacksonville, Florida 32245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JACK HELLMAN</td>
<td>C &amp; K COAL CO.</td>
<td>P. O. BOX 69 CLARION, PA 16214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy Anne Johnson</td>
<td>City Relation Services Inc</td>
<td>Bridgewater Plaza II 245 Rt 22 Bridgewater, NJ 08807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roselle H Slayton</td>
<td>Pioneer Mutual Life Ins.</td>
<td>203 N Tenth St. Fargo, North Dakota 58102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alessandro Fusina</td>
<td>Morgan Guaranty Trust Co</td>
<td>9 W 57th St New York, NY 10019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard Harris</td>
<td>Newmount Mining Corporation</td>
<td>200 Park Ave. New York, NY 10166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Frank Mallon</td>
<td>First Nat Bank of Cen. Jersey</td>
<td>1125 Route 22 W Bridgewater, NJ 08807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter John Schementi</td>
<td>CBS</td>
<td>51 W 52nd Street New York, NY 10019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Israel Levenson</td>
<td>Levenson &amp; Klein Inc</td>
<td>Monument &amp; Chester Streets Baltimore, MD 21205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Brownell McGough</td>
<td>Howe Richardson Company</td>
<td>680 Van Houten Avenue Clifton, NJ 07015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Roberta Minniear</td>
<td>BMW Advertising Inc</td>
<td>2699 E 28th St #418 Longbeach, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathlene Macechak Glapa</td>
<td>Mark Products, Inc</td>
<td>10502 Fallstone Road Houston, TX 77068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William H. Bruett, Jr.</td>
<td>Chittendon Corporation</td>
<td>2 Burlington Square Burlington, VT 05401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Valentine Murphy</td>
<td>Suite 1000</td>
<td>33 W. Higgins Rd. South Barrington, Ill. 60010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Leon Jules Level  
Burroughs Corporation  
Burroughs Place  
Detroit, Michigan 48232

Judith Ann Staublin  
Southern Thrift  
5 Executive Drive NE  
Atlanta, Georgia 30329

Corinne Silverman Kyle  
141 Spruce Street  
Princeton  
New Jersey 08542

Gene Paul Leporiere  
Eastview  
150 E 58th Street  
New York, NY 10155

John J. Gobel, VP  
Standard Oil of Indiana  
200 E Randolph Drive  
Chicago, Ill 60601

John Douglas Beckett  
R.W. Beckett Corp.  
PO Box 1289  
Elyria, OH 44036

Herbert James Bachelor  
Drexel Burnham Lambert Inc  
55 Broad Street  
New York, NY 10004

James Robert Campbell  
Norwest Bank Minneapolis  
8th & Marquette  
Minneapolis, Minn. 55479

Riad Nassif Yammine  
Marathon Oil Company  
539 S Main Street  
Findlay, Ohio 45840

Norma Kaye Shebester Lohmann  
1701 Brookhaven St  
Norman  
Oklahoma 73069

Joyce N Fenderstock, Sr VP  
Paine Webber Inc.  
1285 Ave of the Americas  
New York, NY 10019

John Caven Wilcox  
With Georgeson & Co, Inc  
Wall Street Plaza  
New York, NY 10005

Joseph Oren  
Nelson Res and Dev Co  
19712 MacArthur Blvd  
Irvine, CA 92715

Charles Payton Waller  
Dixilyn Field Drilling Co.  
5005 Riverway  
Houston, TX 77056

Will M. Caldwell, Exec VP  
Ford Motor Company  
The American Road  
Dearborn, MI 48121

Barry Lee Cliff  
Am. Financial Consultants  
8555 16th Street, Suite 701  
Silver Spring, MD 20910

C. Eugene Coke  
Coke & Associates  
Ormond By The Sea  
Florida 32074

Linn Hedwig Downs  
Burroughs Corporation  
1 Burroughs Place  
Detroit, MI 48232
Edgar Carlton Heeseler  
Shearson Lehman Am Express  
2 World Trade Center  
New York, NY 10048

Harry H. Kessler, Ch  
Meehanite Metal Corp  
9909 Clayton Rd  
St Louis, MO 63124

Paul Lamar Bupp  
8655 Juanita Drive NE  
Kirkland  
Washington 98034

John M Hauck, President  
Tubular Steel, Inc.  
1031 Executive Parkway  
St. Louis, MO 63141

Harry Rossi, Pres & CEO  
Union Central Life Ins Co  
Mill & Waycross Road  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45201

Marie Cont-Drum, Cont.  
Carter Hawley Hale Stores  
550 S Flower  
Los Angeles, CA 90071

Janet Peters  
VF Corporation  
1047 N Park Road  
Wyomissing, PA 19610

Charles A. Vose, V-Ch  
First OK Bancorp Inc  
120 N. Robinson  
Oklahoma City, OK 73125

Donald K Ross, Ch & CEO  
New York Life Insurance Co  
51 Madison Ave  
New York, NY 10010

Wayne G. Rolf, Pres  
LaGloria Oil & Gas Co  
1 Houston Ctr  
Houston, TX 77252

Marian U. Day, Ch & CEO  
Day Cecil B. Companies  
2751 Buford Hwy  
Atlanta, Georgia 30324

K.H. Landsberg, Ch  
Landsberg Kent H Co Inc  
1640 S Greenwood Ave  
Montebello, CA 90640

Charles Lazarus, Ch & CEO  
Toys R Us Inc  
395 W Passaic St  
Rochelle Park, NJ 07662

Dorothy Hulseman, VP  
SOLO Cup Company  
1505 E. Main Street  
Urbana, IL 61801

Mari Ann Blatch, VP  
Readers Digest Assoc Inc  
Bedford Road  
Chappaqua, NY 10514

Leonard Perlmutter, Pres  
Stanley Structures, Inc.  
3 Park Central  
Denver, CO 80202

Arthur Garson Jr, Chair  
Lovable Co Inc  
6855 Jimmy Carter Blve NW  
Norcross, GA 30071
Joseph Henry French
1050 Forest Hill Road
Staten Island
New York 10314

Henry Freeman Allen
200 Beacon Street
Boston
Massachusetts 02116

Laird Gray Jackson
1025 Walnut Street
Philadelphia
Pennsylvania 19107

Enso Victor Bighinatti
American Red Cross HQ
17th & D Streets NW
Washington, DC 20006

Stephen David Litwin
Guthrie Foundation
Sayre
Pennsylvania 18840

Mary Ann Tuft
10 Columbus Circle
New York
NY 10019

Natalie Heinemen
180 E Pearson St
Chicago
Illinois 60611

Dale Morrell Atkins
2005 Franklin St
Denver
Colorado 80205

Max Wilbur Nash
Qtrs 16A
Jackson Ave
Ft Myer, Virginia 22211

Eileen Grace Hasselmeyer
7910 Woodmont Ave Rm C608
Bethesda
Maryland 20205

James Edward Bowman
950 E 59th St
Chicago
Illinois 60637

Stuart Holmes Sherman, Jr.
5th QRMC 5201 Leesburg Pike
Suite 1511
Falls Church, VA 22041

Jenelle Vandevort Moorhead
2683 Potter Street
Eugene
Oregon 97405

Alice Bourke Hayes
810 N. Michigan Avenue
Chicago
Illinois 60611

Janet Collins MacClarence
8631 Delmar St Suite 204
St Louis
Missouri 63130

Russell Elliott Dougherty
Forrest Hills 2359 S Queen St
Arlington
Virginia 22202

Richard Simmons
c/o Anatomy Asylum
9306 Santa Monica Blvd
Beverly Hills, CA 90210

Elbert Enrico Allen
1004 Sprague St
Shreveport
LA 71101
Joseph Edward Murray  
721 Huntington Avenue  
Boston  
MA 02115

Beverly Kobeissi  
Radiation Oncology Admin.  
925 Chestnut St, 7th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19107

Eva Juliet Salber  
PO Box 2914  
Durham, NC 27710

William McLin  
Epilepsy Found. of America  
4351 Garden City Drive  
Landover, MD 20785

Robert T. Strudwick  
Reserve Enlisted Association  
12 E. Eager St  
Baltimore, MD 21202

Cecil Manewal  
Christian Chiropractors Assoc.  
2224 S College Ave  
Ft Collins, CO 80525

Rodney T. Martin  
Presbyterian HEM Assoc.  
475 Riverside Dr, Rm 1268  
New York, NY 10115

Roy Harrison  
Am. Inst. of Food Dist.  
28-12 Broadway  
Fairlawn, NJ 07410

Donald S. Gann  
Am. Assoc. Surgery of Trauma  
Rhode Island Hosp., 593 Eddy St.  
Providence, RI 02902

Becky Neal  
Nat. Assoc. of Rehab. Secs.  
633 S Washington St  
Alexandria, VA 22314

Kathleen Griffin, MD  
Better Hearing & Speech  
10801 Rockville Pike  
Rockville, MD 20852

Milton Jacobson  
Nat. Assoc. for Speech & Hearing  
10801 Rockville Pike  
Rockville, MD 20852

Lawrence O. Aasen  
Better Vision Institute  
230 Park Avenue  
New York, NY 10169

Paul J. Weisner  
Int. Union Against VD  
Center for Disease Control  
Atlanta, GA 30333

John Steinbacher  
Cancer Federation, Inc.  
10932 Magnolia Ave  
Riverdale, CA 92505

Walter Purcell  
Assoc. of Fire Equipment Dist.  
111 E. Wacker Dr.  
Chicago, Ill. 60601

William D. Katz  
Assoc. for App. Psychoanalysis  
116 Village Walk Drive  
Royal Palm Beach, FL 33411

Helen Fischer  
Am. Psychoanalytic Assoc.  
309 E 49th St.  
New York, NY 10022
Joni Fritz
6269 Leesburg Pike, Suite B-5
Falls Church
Virginia 22044

Carolyn Del Polito
Am. Soc. of Allied Health Prof.
1101 Connecticut Ave NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036

Rita McGaughey
Easter Seal Research Found.
2023 W Ogden Ave
Chicago, Ill 60612

Michael Bromberg
Fed. of American Hospitals
1405 N. Pierce, No. 311
Little Rock, Arkansas 72207

Edward Doudera
Am. Soc. of Law & Medicine
765 Commonwealth, 16th Floor
Boston, MA 02215

Rose Kushner
Breast Cancer Adv. Ctr
PO Box 224
Kensington, MD 20895

Fred T. Mahaffey
Nat. Assoc. of Bds. of Pharmacy
One E Wacker Dr, Suite 2210
Chicago, Ill 60601

Evgueni Chazov, MD
225 Longwood Ave
Boston
Massachusetts 02115

Jeanne Smith, MD
Assoc. for Adv. of Psychoanalysis
329 E 62nd St
New York, NY 10021

Eugene Kennedy
Optical Manu. Assoc.
6055 Arlington Blvd.
Falls Church, VA 22044

Mary Ann Schropp
Univ. Assoc. for Emergency Med.
900 E Ottawa
Lansing, MI 48915

Richard Young
Am. Soc. for Cell Biology
9650 Rockville Pike
Bethesda, MD 20814

Dr. Thomas E. Walker
Medical Center Suite 16-B
300 Joppa Rd
Baltimore, MD 21204

Joy Mayes Brown
Children’s Cancer Fund
PO Box 374
Manhasset, NY 11030

Denham Harmon, MD
College of Medicine
University of Nebraska
Omaha, NE 68105’R

Saul Kamen, DDS
Scc. for Geriatric Dentistry
1121 W Michigan Street
Indianapolis, Indiana 46202

Richard Nelson
535 N. Dearborn St
Chicago, Ill 60610

Wilma T. Donahue
Center for Gerontology
425 13th St NW Suite 840
Washington, DC 20004
Herbert Shore  
NAJHA  
2525 Centerville Rd  
Dallas, TX 75228

Mark Kozak  
Atlantic County Day Program  
Manor Woods, RGC, Rt 3, Box 259  
Mays Landing, NJ 08330

Jack Ossofsky  
National Council On The Aging  
600 Maryland SW, West Wing 100  
Washington, DC 20024

A.V. Dodrill, Jr.  
West Va Dept of Corrections  
112 California Ave, Bldg 4  
Charleston, WV 25305

Louise M. Kamikawa  
NP/ARCA  
618 Second Ave, Suite 243  
Seattle, WA 98104

Cynthia Morse  
Conn. Dept. of Corrections  
340 Capitol Ave.  
Hartford, CT 06106-1494

Sheila M. Blume, MD  
Am. Med. Soc. on Alcoholism  
733 Third Ave  
New York, NY 10017

Norman A Carlson  
Director, US Bureau of Prisons  
320 First Street NW  
Washington, DC 20534

W. Mark Clark  
Do It Now Foundation  
PO Box 5115  
Phoenix, Arizona 85010

Marjorie S. Garfield  
2 Hansen Ct  
Narbeth  
Pennsylvania 19072

Beatrice Gray Jorgenson  
Friendly Hand Foundation  
347 Normandie  
Los Angeles, CA 90020

Howard B. Hurt  
3516 Circle Lake Dr.  
Knoxville  
Tennessee 37920

Tom Christensen  
Halfway House Association  
500 N Washington  
Alexandria, VA 22314

Lestina M. Grant  
927 Gorgas Lane  
Philadelphia  
Pennsylvania 19150

James Powderly  
Clergy Council on Alcoholism  
3112 7th St NE  
Washington, DC 20017

Christine Anne Currey  
Psychiatric Annex  
363 12th Ave  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84103

Mike Parsons  
Enid Comm. Treatment Center  
PO Box 2097 Univ. Station  
Enid, OK 73701

William Rickman  
733 South Leggett  
Abilene  
Texas 79605
Sarah Acland
2120 Newburg Rd, Suite 415
Louisville
Kentucky 40222

William Edwards McCarron
Box 4975
Austin
Texas 78765

Elia S Toueg
65 Central Park W
New York
New York 10023

Carol A O'Neil
Greater Roslindale Med & Dent Ctr
6 Cummins Hwy
Roslindale, MA 02131

Kurt Frantz
Box 1226
Enid
Oklahoma 73701

John Roger Pellett
Univ Hosps. - Thoracic Surgery
600 Highland Ave
Madison, WI 53792

Kent H. Thayer, Jr.
108 S Thurmond St
Sheridan
Wyoming 82801

Lynne Lipton Levitsky
Michael Reese Med Center
31st & Lake Shore Drive
Chicago, IL 60616

Robert Grant Parke
5900 N Burdick St
East Syracuse
New York 13057

Allen Stanley Glushakow
175 Prospect Street, Suite 18J
East Orange
New Jersey 07017

William Wesley Mark, Jr.
Fitsimmons Army Med Center
Aurora
Colorado 80013

Jacquelyne Holdcraft
4631 Orville St Suite 203
Kansas City
Kansas 66102

Claudio Renjifo
Dept. Int. Medicine
San Juan City Hospital
San Juan, Puerto Rico 00935

David Zakim
4150 Clement St
San Francisco
California 94121

Robert Becker
3077 W Jefferson, Suite 204
Joliet
Illinois 60435

Wendy Goodrich Cropper
210 Ridgeway Road
Lexington
Kentucky 40502

Joseph H. Smith
4705 Locust Hill Ct.
Bethesda
Maryland 20014
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City, State, Zip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Franco Harris</td>
<td>400 W North Ave</td>
<td>Pittsburgh, PA 15212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Totenberg</td>
<td>329 Waverley Ave</td>
<td>Newton, MA 02185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John David Gidwitz</td>
<td>16 5th Avenue</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA 94118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Joseph Nolan</td>
<td>Dept of Theatre</td>
<td>Villanova University Villanova, PA 19085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy Peters Wilson Benson</td>
<td>Benson &amp; Assocs, Inc, Ste 511 1611 N. Kent St Arlington, VA 22209</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Ophelia Colley Cannon</td>
<td>c/o Jim Halsey Co Inc 3225 S Norwood St Tulsa, OK 74135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Reardon</td>
<td>PO Box 2424</td>
<td>Santa Fe, NM 87501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Armen Stasack</td>
<td>2535 The Mall</td>
<td>Honolulu Hawaii 96822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiros George Zodhiates</td>
<td>6815 Shallowford Rd</td>
<td>Chattanooga, TN 37421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Edwards Finks</td>
<td>Wrigley Field</td>
<td>Chicago Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alton Franklin Miller</td>
<td>223 Eric Street</td>
<td>Chicago, Ill 60611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Frambach Berlitz</td>
<td>Doubleday 245 Park Ave</td>
<td>New York, NY 10017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Stefano</td>
<td>10216 Cielo Dr</td>
<td>Beverly Hills California 90210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca McMullan Green</td>
<td>607 McAlpin St 15</td>
<td>Cincinnati Ohio 45220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion Burt Wilder</td>
<td>200 E 66th St</td>
<td>New York, NY 10021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Von Schlegell</td>
<td>115 New Quarry Rd</td>
<td>Guilford Connecticut 06437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Kennedy</td>
<td>c/o Charter Management 9000 Sunset Blvd</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA 90069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nolan Neil Cromwell</td>
<td>c/o Los Angeles Rams</td>
<td>Anaheim, CA 92801</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bernard Asbell  
265 College St  
New Haven  
Connecticut 06510

Betsy Houston, Exec Dir  
Farm Labor Research Committee  
1901 L Street NW, Suite 804  
Washington, DC 20036

Margaret Hillis  
Am Choral Foundation  
130 W 56th St  
New York, NY 10019

Audrey Mackiewicz, Sec-Treas  
Newspaper Farm Editors  
Sandusky Register, 312 Valley Wv  
Huron, Ohio 44839

Orlie Long, Sec-Treas  
Frat Field Mgrs Assoc  
C/K & L of I, 123 W Washington  
Belleville, Illinois 62220

Larry Wegener, Manager  
Woodmen Rangers  
Woodmen Tower, 1700 Farnam St  
Omaha, NE 68102

Joe Cockerhan, Director  
National Tennis Academy  
PO Box N-104  
Waxahachie, TX 75165

Charles Gibson  
Senate Radio TV Gallery  
RM S 312 US Capitol  
Washington, DC 20510

Jeennie I. Rosoff, President  
Alan Guttmacher Institute  
111 Fifth Avenue  
New York, NY 10013

Mona Mangan, Exec Dir  
Writers Guild of Am., E  
555 W 57th St  
New York, NY 10019

Richard K.C. Wu, Secretary  
Chinese Cons. Benevolent Assoc.  
62 Mott St  
New York, NY 10013

Sonja Karschau-Lowenfish, Pres  
American Holstein Horse Assoc  
Box 7013  
Ardsley-on-Hudson, NY 10503

Loyd Hackler, President  
Americal Retail Federation  
1616 H St NW  
Washington, DC 20006

Graham W. Whitehead, Pres  
St George's Society  
71 W 23rd St, Rm 1609  
New York, NY 10010

John C. Love, Secretary  
Rolls-Royce Owners' Club  
Green Oak Farm  
Kingsville, MD 21087

Willard H. Porter, Dir  
Rodeo Historical Soc.  
1700 NE 63rd St  
Oklahoma City, OK 73111

James D. Gates, Exec Dir  
Teachers of Mathematics  
1906 Association Dr  
Reston, VA 22091

Betty Revits Rundback, Dir.  
Tourist House Association  
RD 2, Box 355A  
Greentown, PA 18426
Emily E. Robertson, Sec-Treas
Philosophy of Educ Soc.
258 Huntington, Syracuse U
Syracuse, NY 13210

Lt Gen William Yarborough, Ch.
American-African Affairs Assoc
1735 DeSales St NW
Washington, DC 20036

Judy Harris, Admin Asst
Nat Assoc of Rehab. Instrs.
633 S Washington
Alexandria, VA 22314

Thomas A. Martens, Jr., Exec Dir
League To Save Lake Tahoe
Box 10110
South Lake Tahoe, CA 95731

Susan A. Stephens, Sec-Treas
American Soc of Papyrologists
Dept of Classics, Stanford Univ.
Stanford, CA 94305

Eleanor McKinsey, Exec Sec
International Sunshine Society
105 Marsh Road
Wilmington, DE 19809

Joyce L. Rue, Director
Abundanly Yours
PO Box 151134
San Diego, CA 92115

George Hotten, Pres, Music Ind Coun
Music Educators National Conf.
1902 Association Dr
Reston, VA 22091

Cal Conniff, President
National Ski Areas Assoc
PO Box 2883, 20 Maple St
Springfield, MA 01101

Loryce Heisel, Sec
Am Bouvier Des Flanders Club
RD 1, Box 214C
New Egypt, NJ 08533

Peter N. Chumbris, Sec
American Hellenic Congress
4200 Cathedral Ave NW
Washington, DC 20016

Pierre C. Haber, Exec Dir
Psychology Society
100 Beekman St
New York, NY 10038

H. Guyford Stever, Pres
Universities Research Assoc.
1100 Connecticut Ave, Ste 430
Washington, DC 20016

Peggy Landon, Coordinator
Inquiry IV / IMS User Group
21050 Vanowen St
Canoga Park, CA 91304

Virginia C. Patterson, Pres
Pioneer Clubs
Box 788, 27 W 130th, Charles Rd
Wheaton, IL 60187

James J. Harford, Exec Dir
Aeronautics & Astronautics
1633 Broadway
New York, NY 10019

William Dotson, Ch
Automotive Cooling Systems Inst.
222 Cedar Lane
Teaneck, NJ 07666

Diana Darling-Lewis, Exec Dir
Am Inst of Building Design
1412 19th St
Sacramento, CA 95814
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title/Position</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brian D. Davis</td>
<td>Exec Dir, Fund For Animal Welfare</td>
<td>PO Box 193, Yarmouth Port, MA 02675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Early</td>
<td>Exec VP, Am Soc of Business Press Eds</td>
<td>4196 Porter Rd, North Olmstead, Ohio 44070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenore Loveman</td>
<td>Pres, Save the Theatres</td>
<td>165 W 46th St, New York, NY 10036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Cartier</td>
<td>Sec &amp; Ed, Fairy Tale-Folklore Unit</td>
<td>2509 Buffalo Dr, Arlington, TX 76013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Savarin</td>
<td>Exec Dir, Blues Foundation</td>
<td>PO Box 161272, Memphis, TN 38186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Casey</td>
<td>President, Constr Fin Mgt Assoc.</td>
<td>PO Box 780, Newark, NJ 07101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Jo Cusack</td>
<td>President, Nat Assoc of Woman Lawyers</td>
<td>750 N Lakeshore Dr, Chicago, Ill 60611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben H Love</td>
<td>Chief Exec, Boy Scouts of America</td>
<td>1325 Walnut Hill Lane, Irving, TX 75038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John M. Barry</td>
<td>President, Am Holistic Health Sci Assoc</td>
<td>1766 Cumberland Green, Ste 208, St Charles, Ill 60611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol J. McGlinchey</td>
<td>Admin, N.A. Soc. of Pacing &amp; Electrophys</td>
<td>13 Eaton St, Wellesley Hills, MA 02181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Vollinger</td>
<td>Dir, Nat Committee for Full Emp.</td>
<td>815 16th St NW, Washington, DC 20006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Batkin</td>
<td>Board Mgr, California Melon Research Bd</td>
<td>531-D A AltoAve, Dinuba, CA 93618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James L. McDowell, Jr.</td>
<td>Exec Dir, Nat Football Hall of Fame</td>
<td>201 E 42nd St, Suite 1510, New York, NY 10017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron White</td>
<td>President, Young Actors Guild</td>
<td>Box 677, Connellsville, PA 15425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conrad Fisher</td>
<td>Sec, Int Soc. of Friendship &amp; Goodwill</td>
<td>PO Box 41606, St Petersburg, FL 33743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kleber Vielot</td>
<td>Confed. of Org. of Teaching Prof.</td>
<td>16601 SW-102 Place, Miami, FL 33157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Ryder</td>
<td>Sec, Nat Frat of the Franciscan Order</td>
<td>Rd 2, Box 203, Great Barrington, MA 01230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleanor Roberts</td>
<td></td>
<td>115 Wells Rd, Northport, Long Is., NY 11768</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jeno Platthy  
Fed. of Int. Poetry Assocs.  
4409 Brandywine NW, PO Bx 39072  
Washington, DC 20016

William O'Neill Sweeney  
Int Advertising Assoc  
475 Fifth Ave  
New York, NY 10017

Don M. Avedon  
Int Information Mgt Congress  
PO Box 34404  
Bethesda, MD 20817-0404

Donald F. Hull  
Int Amateur Boxing Assoc  
135 Westervelt Place  
Cresskill, NJ 07626

Satty Gill Keswani  
Medical Women's Int Assoc  
176 W Mount Pleasant Ave  
Livingston, NJ 07039

Louisa E. Jones  
Assoc. for the Study of Pain  
909 NE 43rd St, Rm 204  
Seattle, WA 98105-6020

P.J. Boatwright  
World Amateur Golf Council  
Golf House  
Far Hills, NJ 07931

R.J. Hildreth  
Assoc of Agricultural Librarians  
1211 W 22nd St, Suite 216  
Oak Brook, IL 60521

Donna B. Braden  
Altrusa International  
8 South Michigan Ave  
Chicago, IL 60603

Cherif Bassiouni  
Int Assoc of Penal Law  
DePaul Univ, 25 E Jackson  
Chicago, IL 60604

Lynn Van Housen  
Assoc of Young Pol. Leaders  
426 C Street NE  
Washington, DC 20002

William J. Stibravy  
Int Chamber of Commerce  
1212 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10036

Jeri J. Winger  
General Fed of Women's Clubs  
1734 N Street NW  
Washington, DC 20036

Patricia W. Cautley  
Int Council of Psychologists  
4805 Regent St  
Madison, WI 53705

Stanley C. Gross  
Inst. of Internal Auditors  
249 Maitland Ave  
Altamonte Springs, FL 32701

Claude A. Lancfot  
Fed for Family Life Promotion  
1511 K Street NW, Suite 333  
Washington, DC 20005

Oktay Ural  
Int Assoc for Housing Sci  
PO Box 340254  
Coral Gables, FL 33134
Roger Tessman  
American Bowling Congress  
5301 S 76th St  
Greendale, WI 53129

Marilyn Clement  
Ctr for Const. Rights  
853 Broadway, Suite 1401  
New York, NY 10003

Lorraine Lear  
Assoc of Inf Systems Profs  
1015 N York Rd  
Willow Grove, PA 19090

Betty Kaye Taylor  
Human Rts & Genocide Treaties Comm  
25 E 78th St  
New York, NY 10021

Sylvia A. Earle  
Int Phycological Society  
Acad of Sciences, Golden Gate Pk  
San Francisco, CA 94118

Jack Greenberg  
Legal Defense & Educ Fund  
Ten Columbus Circle  
New York, NY 10019

George M. Watts  
Western Dredging Assoc  
1911 Ft Myer Dr, Suite 601  
Arlington, VA 22209

Richard Lapchick  
PO Box 518  
New York, NY 10025

Arthur D. Goessel  
Indep. Accounting Firms  
2000 South Dixie Hwy, Ste 206  
Miami, FL 33133

Nancy Prichard  
Unitarian Univers. Women’s Fed.  
25 Beacon St  
Boston, MA 02108

John Foster Berlef  
Ctr for Rights of Campus Journ.  
1140 Delaware St, Suite 3  
Denver, CO 80204

Marvin Caplan  
Leadership Conf on Civil Rts  
2027 Massachusetts Ave NW  
Washington, DC 20036

C. Theodore Breslin  
St Martin DePorres Guild  
141 E 65th St  
New York, NY 10021

Joseph Rabianski  
Real Estate & Urban Econ Assoc  
Georgia State Univ  
Atlanta, GA 30303

Bertram H. Gold  
Inst of Human Relations  
165 E 56th St  
New York, NY 10022

Patricia Cole  
Brownstone Revival Committee  
65 Liberty St  
New York, NY 10017

Reed Larson  
Right To Work Def & Educ Found  
8001 Braddock Rd, Suite 600  
Springfield, VA 22160

Anthony Proscio  
Local Initiatives Support Corp  
666 3rd Ave  
New York, NY 10017
Delores DaLomba  
Comm Action Agcy Exec Dir Assoc  
815 15th St NW Suite 610  
Washington, DC 20005

Sam Waterson  
Agency for the Perf. Arts Inc  
9000 Sunset Blvd  
Los Angeles, CA 90069

David Raphael  
Rural Am Inc, Dupont Circle Bldg  
1346 Connecticut NW, Ste 51S  
Washington, DC 20036

Jane Brody  
c/o New York Times  
229 W 43rd St  
New York, NY 10036

Christoph von Dohnanyi  
Conductor, Cleveland Orchestra  
Severance Hall  
Cleveland, Ohio 44106

Peter Gay  
105 Blue Trail  
Hamden  
Connecticut 06518

Paula Hawkins  
Room 313 Hart Senate Building  
Washington, DC  
20510

John Jacob  
National Urban League  
500 E 62nd St  
New York, NY 10021

Governor Richard Lamm  
Colorado State Exec Residence  
400 8th Ave  
Denver, CO 80203

Mary Lou Retton  
c/o National Media Group, Inc  
250 W 57th St  
New York, NY 10107

Christopher Lasch  
University of Rochester  
Department of History  
Rochester, NY 14627

Subrahmanyan Chandrasekhar  
933 E 56th St  
Chicago  
Illinois 60637

Lucille Lortel, Prod.  
White Barn Theatre Found.  
Westport  
Connecticut 06880

Crystal Gayle  
c/o Paul Shefrin  
800 S Robertson Blvd  
Los Angeles, CA 90038

George Rochberg  
285 Aronimink Dr  
Newton Square  
Pennsylvania 19073

Paul Harvey  
360 Michigan Ave  
Chicago  
Illinois 60601

Larry Speakes  
The White House  
1600 Pennsylvania Ave  
Washington, DC 20500
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>ZIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hamel Hartford Brookins</td>
<td>4908 Crenshaw Blvd</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>90008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephriam Fischoff</td>
<td>Department of Humanities, Sangamon St U</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>Ill</td>
<td>62708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John C. Reiss</td>
<td>901 W. State St</td>
<td>Trenton</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>08618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladys Davis Lezeau</td>
<td>145 Palmer Rd</td>
<td>Yonkers</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>10701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Milton Smith</td>
<td>African Meth. Epis. Zion Church</td>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>36608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Kenneth Pope</td>
<td>Perkins Sch Theology</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>75202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Burgess</td>
<td>201 8th Ave S</td>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>37202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magdalen Coughlin</td>
<td>12001 Chalon Rd</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>90049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Laird Harris</td>
<td>9 Homewood Rd</td>
<td>Wilmington</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold R. Perry</td>
<td>Our Lady of Lourdes Rectory</td>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>70115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert L. Guffin</td>
<td>Kirkwood By The River</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>35210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemary Radford Ruether</td>
<td>1426 Hinman Ave</td>
<td>Evanston</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignatius J Strecker</td>
<td>PO Box 2328</td>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td>66110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifford Adair Cole</td>
<td>Reorg. Sch. Jesus Christ L.D.S.</td>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>64051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Lemacks Stokes II</td>
<td>UNC PO Box 2688</td>
<td>Chapel Hill</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>27514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marjorie Swank Matthews</td>
<td>750 Windsor Street, Ste 303</td>
<td>Sun Prairie</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>53590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerhard Claas</td>
<td>1628 16th St NW</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>20009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Dickson</td>
<td>50 Harbor View Lane</td>
<td>Belleair Bluffs</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>33540</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
John Christian Wenger
1300 Greencroft Dr Apt 1
Goshen
Illinois 46526

Elizabeth Bettenhausen
Boston Univ Sch Theology
745 Commonwealth Ave
Boston, MA

Terence E. Fretheim, Dean
Acad Affrs, Luther NW Theo. Sem.
2481 Como Ave
St Paul, Minn 55108

Harvey H. Guthrie, Jr., Dean
Episcopal Divinity School
99 Brattle St
Cambridge, MA 02138

Kenon B Osborne, Pres & Acad Dean
Franciscan School of Theology
1712 Euclid Ave
Berkeley, CA 94709

Elizabeth Littlejohn, Controller
Interdenom. Theological Center
671 Beckworth St SW
Atlanta, GA 30314

Dean Richard A Osebold
Sacred Heart Seminary
2701 Chicago Blvd
Detroit, MI 48206

Terry J. Johnson, President
Oklahoma Christian College
Rt 1 Box 141
Oklahoma City, OK 73111

I.E. McNeil, Dean
Bus. & Econ, Houston Baptist U.
7502 Fondren Rd
Houston, TX 77074

William H. Peterson, Dean
Colgate Rochester Divinity Sch.
1100 S Goodman St
Rochester, NY 14620

V. Charles Bachman, Pres.
Berean Christian College
2409 Pattie
Wichita, KS 67201

George K. Brushaber
Bethel Theological Seminary, W
Baptist General Conference
San Diego, CA 92115

Carl McIntire, President
Int. Coun. of Christian Churches
756 Haddon Ave
Collingswood, NJ 08108

Luella Johnson, Western VP
Advent Christian Church
4915 Samish Way - 43
Bellingham, WA 98226

John Hancock
Mod. of General Assembly
195 S Monroe
Bradley, Ill 60915

Allen F. Breed, Chairman
760 Market Street, Suite 433
San Francisco, CA 94102

Ruth A Schmidt
Agnes Scott College
Decatur
Georgia 30030
Wayne Foust
General Baptists
100 Stinson Dr.
Poplar Bluff, MO 63901

Chester Bowman
Baptist State Convention
1524 S Summit Ave
Sioux Falls, SD 57105

Richard L. Fisher
Eleventh Episcopal Area
8015 SDtanford Street
St Louis, MO 63130

Mary Jo Romberger
World Alliance of Reformed Churches
223 William Street
Scranton, PA 18505

Robert A Veitch
Sterling College
Sterling
Kansas 67579

Robert Kline
Ch. of Christ In Christian U.
Box 30
Circleville, Ohio 43113

Tom G. Grinder
Int. Pentecostal Ch. of Christ
PO Box 439
London, Ohio 43140

Henry C. Heagy
United Christian Church
2080 White Oak St
Lebanon, PA 17042

James E Annand
Berkeley Divinity Sch. at Yale
New Haven
Connecticut 06511

Mary Jo Romberger
World Alliance of Reformed Churches
223 William Street
Scranton, PA 18505

Barbara C. Green
Seventh Day Baptist Gen Conf
1328 Ruger St
Janesville, WI 53545

Dr. Louis L. King
Alliance World Fellowship
Box C
Nyack, NY 10960

Paul L. Minear
Church World Service
122 C Street NW, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20001

Robert Kline
Ch. of Christ In Christian U.
Box 30
Circleville, Ohio 43113

Gertrude P. Marshall
Friends General Conf.
1515 Cherry Street
Philadelphia, PA 19102

Joanna Fritz
Monroe Co. United Ministries
827 W 14th St
Bloomington, Indiana 47401

James L. McBride
Alliance Area Coun. of Churches
470 E Broadway
Alliance, Ohio 44601

Dr. Paul A Crow
Disciples Ecumenical Cons. Council
PO Box 1986
Indianapolis, IN 46206

William Boyd Grove
Board of Church & Society
100 Maryland Ave NE
Washington, DC 20002
A. Paul White
The Pilot
49 Franklin St
Boston, MA 02110

Connie W. Adams, Ed.
Searching The Scriptures
52 Yearling Dr
Brooks, KY 40109

Julia McNamara
Albertus Magnus College
New Haven
Connecticut 06511

Henry Jung
Interfaith Forum
1913 Architects Building
Philadelphia, PA 19103

Ross T. Bender
Mennonite World Conference
10480 C West Jewell Ave
Lakewood, CO 80226

James H. Provost
Canon Law Society of America
Catholic University
Washington, DC 20064

Everald H. Strom
Church of Lutheran Breth. of Am.
Box 655
Fergus Falls, MN 56537

James W. Malone
U.S Catholic Conference
1312 Massachusetts Ave NW
Washington, DC 20008

Edgar M. Bronfman, President
World Jewish Congress
1 Park Ave, Suite 418
New York, NY 10016

Norma Eby
Washington Assoc. of Churches
10805 SE 320th
Auburn, Washington 98002

Zipporah Liben
World Council of Synagogues
155 Fifth Ave
New York, NY 10010

John P. Ludwig, Jr.
United Christian Church
1350 Bricker Lane
Annville, PA 17003

David M. Howard
World Evangelical Fellowship
PO Box WEF
Wheaton, ILL 60189

Bernard J. Harrington
Sacred Heart Sem. College
Detroit
Michigan 48206

Jordan O'Brien
World Student Christian Fed.
641 Hudson St #5D
New York, NY 10014

Wallace Ford
NM Conference of Churches
124 Hermosa SE
Albuquerque, NM 87108

James Murdoch
World's Christian Endeavor Un.
1221 E Broad St, Box 1110
Columbus, Ohio 43216

Agnes Robinson
General Woman's Auxiliary
PO Box 12609
Oklahoma City, OK 73157
Andrew Kuyvenhoven
The Banner
2850 Kalamazoo Ave SE
Grand Rapids, MI 49560

Leonard J. Curreri
Sacred Heart of Jesus Chapel
1740 W 7th St
Brooklyn, NY 11223

William C. Brownson
Reformed Church In America
1347 Heather Dr
Holland, MI 49423

Hector Roa y Gonzalez
10 Stagg St
Brooklyn
NY 11206

Michael E. Menster
USO World Headquarters
601 Indiana Ave NW
Washington, DC 20004

J. Ralph Shotwell
Int. Council of Comm. Churches
900 Ridge Road, Suite LLI
Homewood, Ill 60430

Lydia Ann Talbot
Church Federation of Greater Chicago
111 E. Wacker Dr, Ste 510
Chicago, Ill 60601

Dadaji Vimalananda
Yoga House Ashram
Box 3391
San Rafael, CA 94902

Merne A. Harris
Vennard College
University Park
Iowa 52595

Dainen Katagiri-roshi
Minnesota Zen Mediation Center
3343 E Calhoun Parkway
Minneapolis, MN 55408

William Peckman
Contact Ministries of Springfield
318 S 6th
Springfield, Ill 62701

Owen Allred
Apostolic United Bretheren
1194 West 16600 South
Bluffsdale, Utah 84065

Randall E. Laakko
1025 Dettling Rd
Woodland Heights
Wilmington, DE 19805

Patricia duMont Ford
Servant Catholic Church
50 Coventry Lane
Central Islip, NY 11722

Charlotte Surprenant
Homebringing Miss. of Jesus Christ
Box 13
Pelham, NH 03076

James O. Mote
St Mary's Church
2290 South Clayton
Denver, CO 80210

Robin Stewart
SM Church Headquarters
Box 1407
San Francisco, CA 94101

Robert W. Lane
4416 North Malden
Chicago
Illinois 60640
Vivian Barcynski
Aurum Solis c/o The Adm. Gen
Box 43383-OSV
St Paul, Minnesota 55164

Francis A. Novak
Nat. Cath. Conf. for Ttl. Stewardship
3112 Seventh Street NE
Washington, DC 20017

Joseph J. Raffaele
Am. Orthodox Catholic Church
318 Express Drive South
Medford, Long Island, NY 11762

Richard Yao
Fundamentalists Anonymous
PO Box 654 Wall St. Sta.
New York, NY 10268

John Muhammad
Nation of Islam, Temple #1
19220 Connant St
Detroit, MI 48234

John J. Murphy
Ecu. Soc. of Blessed Virgin Mary
St. Joseph's on Capitol Hill
Washington, DC 20002

Satcha Krananda Bodhisattvaguru
Raj-Yoga Mathand Retreat
Box 547
Deming, Washington 98244

Mary Jane Saunders
Clergy Couples of the Presb. Fam.
29 State St E
Albion, NY 14411

Jan van der Linden
School for Esoteric Studies
40 E 49th St, Suite 1903
New York, NY 10017

Wendell Collins
Rutherford Inst., PO Box 510
9411-A Battle St
Manassas, VA 22110

Frank Ellsworth
New Order of Glastonbury
Box 324
Rialto, CA 92376

Win Arn
Inst. for Am. Church Growth
709 E Colorado, Suite 150
Pasadena, CA 91101

Anthony Zuccarello, Pres.
Holm Church of Divine Infl.
Box 25839
Prescott Valley, Arizona 86312

Andrew Kotchoubey
Russian Orth. Theol. Fund
PO Box 36, Bowling Green Sta.
New York, NY 10274

Sam Surratt
Assem., Called Out Ones of Yah
231 Cedar Street
Jackson, Tennessee 38301

Wilhelmina Lawrence
Women's Missionary Society
2311 M St, NW
Washington, DC 20037

Anne Nicol Gaynor
Freedom From Religion Found.
Box 750
Madison, WI 53701

Cecil Todd
Revival Fires
1200 N Main St
Joplin, MO 64802
John P. Bertolucci  
St Francis Assoc for Cath. Evnglsm. 
PO Box 8000 
Steubenville, Ohio 43952

Jay Van Andel  
Van Andel Foundation 
7186 Windy Hill Rd SE 
Grand Rapids, MI 49506

Frederick T. Weyerhaeuser  
Weyerhaeuser Foundation 
2100 First National Bank Bldg. 
St Paul, Minn 55101

Bernard Edison  
Edison Bros Stores Found. 
PO Box 14020 
St Louis, MO 63178

Larry Deason  
Jehovah Jireh, Inc  
12 Summit Park 
Ballston Lake, NY 12019

Frederick Cole  
Williams Foundation  
345 Union Ave, PO Box 665 
Framingham, Mass. 01701

Ruth T. Jinks  
Jinks Foundation  
Colquitt 
Georgia 31737

Chinn Ho  
Ho Foundation  
239 Merchant St, Box 2668 
Honolulu, Hawaii 96803

Alfred M. Frisch  
The Frisch Foundation 
1600 Parker Ave 
Fort Lee, NJ 07024

William C. Blanchard  
Wawabe Memorial Fund  
Seattle First Nat. Bank, Box 3586 
Seattle, WA 98124

Bruce E. McArthur  
TYF Foundation  
c/o Northern Trust Company 
Chicago, Ill 60675

Dorothy Dann Collins  
Collins Foundation  
10311 Gaywood Rd 
Dallas, TX 75229

Julie Greenough  
Morania Foundation  
Morgan Guar. Trust, 9 W 57th St 
New York, NY 10019

D. Charles Cook  
Cook Foundation  
850 N Grove Ave 
Elgin, Ill 60120

William Marquart  
Voelkerding Ch. Trust  
PO Box 81 
Dutzow, Missouri 63342

Louis Rones  
Geist Foundation  
c/o J.H. Cohn & Co, 810 Broad St 
Newark, NJ 07102

Mary E. Liddecoat  
Gospel Found. of Ca.  
1462 N Stanley Ave 
Hollywood, CA 90046
APPENDIX C
PILOT SAMPLE OF LEADERS
The Honorable Vern Riffe  
Speaker of the House  
State House  
Columbus, Ohio 43215

The Honorable Chalmers Wylie  
Representative to Congress  
200 N. High Street  
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Dorothy Teater  
286 W. Weisheimer  
Columbus, Ohio 43214

Mayor Dana Rinehart  
90 W. Broad Street  
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Preston Wolfe  
40 S Third St  
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Frank D. Celebreze  
175 S Third St  
Columbus, Ohio 43216

Katherine LeVeque  
LeVeque Enterprises  
50 W. Broad Street  
Columbus, Ohio 43215

James Hyre  
Columbus City Schools  
270 E State Street  
Columbus, Ohio 43215

JoAnna Kister  
1260 Windham Rd  
Columbus, Ohio 43220

Charles F. Hermann  
7035 Rieber Rd  
Worthington, Ohio 43085

Robert E. Taylor  
7213 Mills Rd  
Ostrander, Ohio 43061

Dr. Lena Bailey, Dean  
1787 Neil Avenue  
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Dr. Wayne Johnson  
1787 Neil Avenue  
Columbus, Ohio 43210

David H. Griner  
776 S Remington Rd  
Bexley, Ohio 43209

Marge McBurney  
1105 Columbus Circle South  
Ashland, Ohio 44805

Bob Evans  
Mt. Zion Road  
Gallipolis, Ohio 45631

Graydon Webb  
GD Ritzy's, Inc.  
1535 Bethel Road  
Columbus, Ohio 43220

R. David Thomas  
Wendy's International Inc.  
4288 W Dublin-Granville Rd  
Dublin, Ohio 43017
Lola Icaobone  
825 Bethel Road  
Columbus, Ohio 43214

John P. Minton  
2100 Pinebrook Rd  
Columbus, Ohio 43220

Gisela Rosenbaum  
Columbus Administrative Serv.  
90 W. Broad St  
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Warren Tyler  
Ohio EPA  
361 E. Broad St  
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Dwight Joseph  
Chief of Police  
120 W. Gay St  
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Mona Scott  
WCMH-TV  
3165 Olentangy River Rd  
Columbus, Ohio 43202

Jack Hanna  
9990 Riverside Drive  
Powell, Ohio 43065

Edith Martsolf  
545 W. Johnstown Rd  
Gahanna, Ohio 43230

Rev. Gabe Campbell  
292 E Market St  
Akron, Ohio 44308

Sydney Ryman  
5156 Tamarack Blvd  
Columbus, Ohio 43229

Harvey S. Goldman  
Temple Israel  
5419 E Broad St  
Columbus, Ohio 43213

Ronald Huff  
Ascension Lutheran Church  
1479 Morse Rd  
Columbus, Ohio 43229
APPENDIX D

INITIAL COVER LETTER
First Name Last Name

__________________________
__________________________
__________________________

Dear First Name:

Because of your leadership accomplishments, you have been chosen to be a part of an important study being conducted at The Ohio State University. As you know, if our country is to continue to grow and prosper, the development of leadership abilities by our youth is essential. There is very little agreement, however, as to how this leadership might best be developed.

Therefore, this research project involves 1,000 leaders chosen randomly from 70 directories of public and private leaders in the United States. You are being asked to help identify experiences most important for our youth to have in order to develop leadership abilities. Your responses will be extremely important for enabling those who work with young people to provide the best leadership experiences possible.

Please take about twenty minutes to personally complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it in the attached envelope before June 25. Enclosed is a pencil to use as you answer the questions, and to keep as a memento of your participation in this study.

As you can see, your questionnaire is coded so that we can check it off the mailing list when it is returned. Please be assured that your confidentiality will be completely respected. Answers will be reported only in a statistically analyzed form and no references will be made to individual responses. The only exception to this is that quotes from those who give permission on question twenty-three may be used to clarify meanings and implications as results are reported.

Also attached is a post card on which you are asked to indicate 1) your willingness to participate in a fifteen minute follow-up telephone interview, and 2) whether you would like an abstract of the research results when the project is completed. Please return both the post card and your completed questionnaire within the next two weeks. Thank you very much for your assistance and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Kathryn J. Cox
Extension Specialist, Older Youth
Principal Investigator
First Name Last Name

In early June you were sent a questionnaire as a part of a survey being conducted with our nation's most influential leaders. In it you were asked to help identify important youth leadership development experiences. Since we have not yet received your completed questionnaire, I am writing to let you know that your participation is very much needed, and to ask you to complete and return your questionnaire as soon as possible. Of course, if you have already done so, please disregard this letter and accept my thanks for your assistance and cooperation earlier.

However, if your busy schedule has not permitted you to complete the questionnaire, if it has been misplaced or did not reach you in the first mailing, or if there is another reason your questionnaire has not been returned, I hope you enjoy this example of the importance of your response and will return your questionnaire soon!

Just as every key of a typewriter is essential, so is the response of every individual in this study being conducted at The Ohio State University. As a leader, you are a key person who can provide important insights in identifying experiences for today's youth to develop leadership for the future. Just as every key of the typewriter is needed for this example to be clear, so too is every individual's response needed for the results of this study to be most useful. Your responses to the items on the questionnaire will be most helpful.

Attached is an additional copy of the questionnaire. Please take a few minutes to complete it and return it in the enclosed envelope before August 1. Thank you very much for your assistance and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Kathryn J. Cox
Extension Specialist, Older Youth
Principal Investigator
APPENDIX F

DISTRIBUTION OF SAMPLE AND RESPONDENTS BY STATE OF RESIDENCE
## Distribution of Sample Population and Respondents by Residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State/Terr.</th>
<th>1980 Pop.</th>
<th>No. in</th>
<th>% of</th>
<th>No. of</th>
<th>% of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of Residence</td>
<td>Ranking</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.973%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.243%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.730%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.973%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8.273%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.217%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.433%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.973%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.460%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.460%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.487%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.380%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.946%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.217%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.730%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.217%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.730%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.243%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.190%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.920%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.676%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.946%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.460%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.243%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.460%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.487%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Hampshire</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.487%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.650%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.730%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11.679%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued on next page)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State/Terr. of Residence</th>
<th>1980 Pop. Ranking</th>
<th>No. in Sample</th>
<th>% of Sample</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. Carolina</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.703%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Dakota</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.487%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.650%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.460%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.217%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.866%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.243%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Carolina</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.946%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Dakota</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.730%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.703%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.353%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.730%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.487%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.676%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.703%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Virginia</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.730%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.703%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.487%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington DC</td>
<td>(x)</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8.516%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>(x)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Samoa</td>
<td>(x)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G

CHI-SQUARE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN EARLY AND LATE RESPONDENTS IN RELATION TO THE TWENTY-TWO VARIABLES BEING STUDIED
Differences Between Early and Late Respondents' Answers In Relation To The Twenty-Two Variables Studied As Shown By Chi-Square Tests for Independence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables Studied</th>
<th>Chi-Square Value</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lasswell Leadership Sector</td>
<td>11.259</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Residence</td>
<td>44.966</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>3.892</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Leadership Definition</td>
<td>10.593</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrill's Category Self-Perception</td>
<td>0.488</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hersey-Blanchard Self-Perception</td>
<td>2.297</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bates-Kiersey Self-Perception</td>
<td>4.513</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myers-Briggs Self-Perception</td>
<td>11.212</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>4.667</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>6.480</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Level</td>
<td>11.637</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescent Family Income</td>
<td>1.363</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescent Family Influence By Sector...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Government (Power)</td>
<td>3.044</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Families (Affection)</td>
<td>1.332</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Public Schools (Skill)</td>
<td>4.264</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Higher Educ. (Enlightenment)</td>
<td>1.108</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Business (Wealth/Poverty)</td>
<td>0.753</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Public Health (Well-Being)</td>
<td>2.395</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Assocs. &amp; Civic (Respect)</td>
<td>11.489</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.009 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Church &amp; Religion (Rectitude)</td>
<td>4.140</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescent Family Structure</td>
<td>1.420</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescent Residence</td>
<td>0.828</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...During Adolescence</td>
<td>11.987</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Current</td>
<td>7.978</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.925</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued on next page)
(...Appendix G continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables Studied in Relation to Early and Late Responses</th>
<th>Chi-Square Value</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation In Youth Activities...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Athletics</td>
<td>3.545</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Band</td>
<td>3.515</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Big Brothers/Sisters</td>
<td>4.950</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Chorus/Singing</td>
<td>5.291</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Church</td>
<td>2.294</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...4-H</td>
<td>3.521</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...FFA</td>
<td>5.527</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...FHA</td>
<td>1.170</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Grange</td>
<td>0.278</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Junior Achievement</td>
<td>0.389</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...School Organizations</td>
<td>2.739</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Scouts</td>
<td>1.090</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...YMCA/YWCA</td>
<td>1.140</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor Category</td>
<td>18.542</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.010*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Leadership Strengths</td>
<td>17.165</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Leadership Weaknesses</td>
<td>8.779</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Leadership Dev. Exp.</td>
<td>21.770</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Leadership Dev. Exp.</td>
<td>9.597</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.384</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .01
APPENDIX H

PERSONAL LEADERSHIP STRENGTHS IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENTS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Leadership Strengths Identified By Leaders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strengths</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Characteristics &amp; Abilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications Abilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Control Abilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making and Judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Leadership Abilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Organization Abilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Sensitivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborativeness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Strengths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Abilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and Abilities to Help Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness and Self-Confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant Life Experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural and Citizenship Strengths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors, Role Models, and Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I

PERSONAL LEADERSHIP WEAKNESSES IDENTIFIED BY LEADERS
### Personal Leadership Weaknesses Identified By Leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weakness</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Freq.%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management Control</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ability to use resources for most</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>25.295</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>21.573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effective outcomes &amp; goals</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>8.432</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>8.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- time management abilities</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>6.800</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>6.950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- responsibility, self-discipline,</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>5.530</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5.309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toughness, firmness, reliability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- people management skills and</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4.533</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4.730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ability to delegate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behavioral Flexibility</strong></td>
<td>140</td>
<td>12.693</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>12.646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- intolerance, lack of patience,</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>9.973</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>9.459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temper, and cynicism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- adaptability, flexibility, &amp;</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.720</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ability to compromise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assertiveness &amp; Self-Confidence</strong></td>
<td>119</td>
<td>10.789</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>10.414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- lack of assertiveness, hesitation,</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>5.530</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>5.598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or aggressiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- lack of self-confidence, self-</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>5.258</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4.730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>esteem, or self-worth; reaction to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>criticism; and the need to be liked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Characteristics &amp; Abilities</strong></td>
<td>102</td>
<td>9.248</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>9.458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- workaholism, doing too much,</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.632</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doing other's work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- memory &amp; intelligence</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.632</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- friendliness, personality, humility</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.541</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- too much or too little drive, energy</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.997</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>desire, or ambition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- enthusiasm &amp; interest</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.907</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- lack of creativity, getting in ruts</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- loyalty, commitment, dedication</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.453</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.483</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued on next page...)
Appendix I continued...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weakness</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Freq.%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- initiative, ability to see courses of action &amp; take actions and risks without stimulation from others</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.363</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- integrity, fairness, hypocrisy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.363</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- sense of humor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.363</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- optimism, positivism</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.192</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communications Abilities</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Freq.%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- general communications abilities</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.901</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- oral communications abilities</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.360</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- public speaking abilities</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.269</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- listening abilities</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.907</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- written communications abilities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.363</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.386</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Freq.%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- sensitivity &amp; consideration for others feelings &amp; needs, compassion, and understanding</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>5.258</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>5.405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- lack of intuition</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Abilities</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Freq.%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- satisfaction, sense of proportion, realistic expectations</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.901</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- assessment skills, learning from mistakes, giving credit where due</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.176</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision-Making Abilities</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Freq.%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- abilities in defining goals, securing information, analyzing, developing alternatives, &amp; making decisions</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4.170</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.463</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued on next page...)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weakness</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Freq.%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Organization Abilities</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.264</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.264</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- abilities in approaching problems systematically &amp; logically, prioritizing, establishing courses of action, outlining steps, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Leadership Abilities</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.264</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.357</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- general group leadership, influence, encouragement, motivation, persuasiveness, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.907</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- supervisory abilities, consistency, discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectivity</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.173</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborativeness</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.085</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- abilities in working cooperatively</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.360</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- interpersonal skills</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.453</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- teamwork</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.272</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Sensitivity</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.995</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- vision, long range focus, idealism</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.360</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- understanding of policies &amp; procedures and using them appropriately</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Education</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.632</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- education for or in a specific field</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.360</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- broad enough education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.272</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.360</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- perception and seeing the big picture, recognizing problems &amp; potential problems, and foresight (continued on next page...)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 continued...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weakness</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Freq.%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment &amp; Job Abilities</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.088</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- specific work skills &amp; experiences,</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.907</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional expertise &amp; knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- general employment expertise,</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knowledge, and experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Abilities</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.907</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- teaching and helping others learn</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.907</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural &amp; Citizenship Weaknesses</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.907</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- not being well-read, up on current events,</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.453</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or broadly informed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- lack of political involvement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- no knowledge of other languages</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- lack of travel &amp; cross cultural exp.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaknesses From Background</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.725</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- lack of fitness, poor health</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.363</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- lack of financial experience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- age</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Relationships</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- lack of family support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.097</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX J

PERSONAL LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT EXPERIENCES OF LEADERS
### Personal Leadership Development Experiences in the Lives of Established Leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Leadership Experiences</th>
<th>Freq</th>
<th>Freq %</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experiences with mentors, role models, nurturers, and supporters</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>20.082</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>16.281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant life/background experiences</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>17.284</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>16.281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group leadership experiences</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>13.333</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>12.965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative experiences</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>10.206</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal education</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>7.490</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>8.844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment &amp; internship experiences</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>6.914</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>7.437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences in personal development and initiative</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>5.185</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>5.226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural &amp; citizenship experiences</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4.198</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4.824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications experiences</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.210</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences to develop assertiveness and self-confidence</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.634</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management control experiences</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.469</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences in teaching and helping others develop</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.058</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation experiences</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.481</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences in organizational sensitivity</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.235</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences in behavioral flexibility</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.741</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences in planning &amp; organization</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.658</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences in decision making &amp; problem solving</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.576</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences that develop sensitivity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.247</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX K
EXPERIENCES IDENTIFIED AND RECOMMENDED BY LEADERS AS IMPORTANT FOR LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT BY TEENAGERS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiences</th>
<th>Freq</th>
<th>Freq %</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Experiences</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>19.889</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>16.570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Characteristic Development</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>9.228</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>7.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors/Role Models/Nurturers</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>8.990</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>9.593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural &amp; Citizenship Experiences</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>8.353</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>7.849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications Experiences</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>7.558</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>6.492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Control Experiences</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>7.080</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>7.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment or Internship Experiences</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>6.762</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>7.849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Leadership Experiences</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>6.603</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>7.364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Education</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>5.807</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>6.977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant Life Experiences</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>5.091</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness &amp; Self-Confidence Experiences</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3.421</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences In Decision-Making</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.182</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Experiences</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.625</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Sensitivity Development Exp.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.512</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity Development Experiences</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.591</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Organization Experiences</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.273</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences To Develop Objectivity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.318</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences To Develop Flexibility &amp; Patience</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.318</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences In Teaching &amp; Development</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.239</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences To Develop Perception</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.194</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX L

LEADERS SELF-DESCRIPTIONS ON THE MYERS-BRIGGS AND BATES & KIERSEY TYPOLOGIES
Leaders Self-Descriptions on the Myers and Briggs Typologies and the Bates and Kiersey Descriptors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Myers/Briggs</th>
<th>Bates/Kiersey</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESTJ</td>
<td>Traditional/Judicial</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.836%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISFJ</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.822%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTJ</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.370%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESFJ</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.096%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Bates/Kiersey traditional-judicial leaders identified by combining Myers/Briggs descriptors from items 5-8 (Ranking -4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7.124%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders' actual self-rating as traditional leaders from Bates/Kiersey categories on item 4 (Ranking -4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>13.602%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENFJ</td>
<td>Catalytic</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.192%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFJ</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.644%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFP</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.658%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENFP</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8.219%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Bates/Kiersey catalytic leaders identified by combining Myers/Briggs descriptors from items 5-8 (Ranking -3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>16.713%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders' actual self-rating as catalysts from Bates/Kiersey categories on item 4 (Ranking -1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>154</td>
<td>38.791%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued on next page)
(Appendix L continued...)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Myers/Briggs</th>
<th>Bates/Kiersey</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESTP</td>
<td>Troubleshooter./Negot.</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>20.274%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESFP</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>18.630%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISFP</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.562%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTP</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10.959%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Bates/Kiersey troubleshooter-negotiator leaders identified by combining Myers/Briggs descriptors from items 5-8 (Ranking = 1)

Leaders' actual self-descriptions as troubleshooter-negotiators from Bates/Kiersey categories on item 4 (Ranking = 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Visionary</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENTJ</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.096%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTJ</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.822%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTP</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10.137%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTP</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10.685%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Bates/Kiersey visionary leaders identified by combining Myers/Briggs descriptors from items 5-8 (Ranking = 2)

Leaders' actual self-descriptions as visionaries from Bates/Kiersey categories on item 4 (Ranking = 2)

TOTAL 365 100.000%