

PERCEIVED LIFE-STYLE ORIENTATIONS
AMONG PARTICIPANTS IN AN URBAN
LEADERSHIP PROGRAM

By

SUSAN J. BATES ALDRICH

Bachelor of Arts

Western Michigan University

Kalamazoo, Michigan

1974

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
May, 1983

Thesis

1983

A365p

copy 2



PERCEIVED LIFE-STYLE ORIENTATIONS
AMONG PARTICIPANTS IN AN URBAN
LEADERSHIP PROGRAM

Thesis Approved:

Wayne B. James

Thesis Adviser

John H. Bays

James L. Davis

Norman N. Durham

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to express her appreciation to all who have helped to make this study possible. Many thanks to Dr. Wayne James, major adviser; her keen perception, positive attitude, and continuing support were especially helpful in completing this study. Thanks also to committee members Dr. John Baird and Dr. Jerry Davis for their time and expert critiques.

Appreciation is extended to those in Leadership Tulsa who granted permission for this study and to those who participated. Special thanks to Ms. Shirley Scott, the program administrator, for her interest in the study and her assistance in implementing it.

Finally, special gratitude is expressed to my husband, Jontie Aldrich, and our sons, Chad and Matthew, for their understanding and support throughout this project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Problem	3
Purpose	4
Research Questions	4
Scope and Limitations	4
Assumptions	5
Definitions of Terms	5
Organization of the Study	6
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	8
The Concept of Leadership	8
Leadership Theories	9
Leader-Member Interaction	14
The Contemporary Context of Leadership	16
The New Social Character	21
New Leaders	29
Summary	31
III. METHODOLOGY	33
Population	33
Instrumentation	35
Administration of the Instrument	36
Data Analysis	37
Summary	38
IV. PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS	39
Response Rate	39
Demographic Characteristics	40
Personalistic Statement Responses	40
Sociocentric Statement Responses	46
Formalistic Statement Responses	52
Overall Mean Values of Statement Responses	57
Life-Style Orientation Scores	60
Summary	71

Chapter	Page
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	75
Summary	75
Conclusions	77
Recommendations	78
A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	80
APPENDIXES	83
APPENDIX A - FRIEDLANDER QUESTIONNAIRE	84
APPENDIX B - LIFE-STYLE ORIENTATION INVENTORY . .	87
APPENDIX C - COVER LETTER	90
APPENDIX D - FOLLOW-UP LETTER	92

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
I.	Frequency and Percentages of Respondents Classified by Demographic Characteristics . . .	41
II.	Mean Values for Personalistic Orientation Statements by Sex and Age Groups	43
III.	Mean Values for Sociocentric Orientation Statements by Sex and Age Groups	49
IV.	Mean Values for Formalistic Orientation Statements by Sex and Age Groups	54
V.	Mean Values for Responses to Statements of Life-Style Orientation Groups	58
VI.	Life-Style Orientation Scores and Friedman Two Way Analysis of Variance Test for Male and Female Respondents	61
VII.	Life-Style Orientation Scores and Friedman Two Way Analysis of Variance Test for Members of Age Groups	65
VIII.	Mean Values for Life-Style Orientation Scores by Sex and Age Groups	69

FIGURE

Figure		Page
1.	Characteristics of Personalistic, Sociocentric, and Formalistic Life-Style Orientations	25

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Leaders have a significant role in creating the state of mind that is society. They can serve as symbols of the moral unity of the society. They can express the values that hold the society together. Most important, they can conceive and articulate goals that lift people out of their petty preoccupations, carry them above the conflicts that tear a society apart, and unite them in the pursuit of objectives worthy of their best efforts (Gardner, cited in Bennis, 1976, p. 142).

Toffler (1980) pointed out that the "lack of leadership" is a lament heard often in today's society. Discontent with elected leaders, feelings of powerlessness, and attitudes of apathy are widely discussed. As a familiar world changes and the environment grows more unpredictable, a preoccupation for order, structure, and predictability sets in.

Change has become the new constant. Studies show that great shifts in the psychoculture as well as the economy have taken place in the last 10 to 20 years (Yankelovich, 1981). One of the sharpest shifts has been in American attitudes toward government and other institutions--"falling from a peak of trust and confidence in the late fifties to a trough of mistrust in the early eighties" (Yankelovich, 1981, p. 184).

The challenges to traditional leadership are many.

Friedlander (1975) reported that a study of emergent and contemporary life-styles reflected changes in values that would create conflicts in families, work places, churches, and communities. Maccoby (1981) asserted that a new "social character" has developed and that a new model of leadership is needed. Varney (1976, p. 141) posited that "leadership in organizations of the future should be a series of functions that emerge from the nature of the people found in those organizations." Yankelovich (1981) documented changes he believed may lead to a new "social ethic" and noted that, for this to occur, people must receive clear, distinct signals from political, institutional, and intellectual leaders. Toffler (1980) noted that the economic and psychosocial transformation of society raises it to a much higher level of diversity and complexity, with leaders becoming dependent on increasing numbers of people for help in making and implementing decisions.

The effects of rapid change in the society on people's lives and life-styles clearly have implications for the subject of leadership. Bass (1981) noted that continuing social change--and possible revolutionary shifts in thinking--will be determinants in the course leadership research charts in the future.

This study was prompted by a growing awareness of these issues and an interest in the nature of leadership. Consideration was given to a reference by Bass (1981) that

. . .there is a scarcity of research that tests

the interaction of leader personality, values, and behavior with follower personality, values, and behaviors and the effect of such interaction upon the group (p. 605).

Friedlander (1975) has surveyed the life-style orientations of non-specific groups, relating life-style orientations to factors such as age, sex, religion, occupation, and education. Other studies have examined individual values and life-styles in the organizational context. Among these have been measures of interpersonal values, leadership attitudes, and managerial "success" (Fleishman and Peters, 1962); impacts of organizational climate and individual value systems on job satisfaction (Friedlander and Margulies, 1969; DiMarco and Norton, 1974); relationship of individuals' attitudes toward others and congruence in life-style (DiMarco, 1974a, 1974b); and impact of educational environment on authoritarian attitude, leadership style, interpersonal need, and life-style orientation (DiMarco and Pearlmutter, 1976). However, there is a lack of information available on the life-style orientations of specific groups of emerging leaders. Before considering the interaction of leaders and followers, it seemed appropriate to survey populations that might be identified as emerging leaders to collect information on their perceived life-style orientations.

Problem

The problem giving rise to this study was a lack of information available on the life-style orientations of emerging leaders.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to describe perceived life-style orientations among participants in an urban leadership program.

Research Questions

The specific objectives of this study were to gather data to answer the following questions:

1. How do participants in an urban leadership program perceive their personal life-style orientation?
2. Do these perceptions of life-style orientation vary with the sex of respondents?
3. Do these perceptions of life-style orientation vary with age groups of respondents?
4. Is there a significant difference in the ranking of life-style orientation scores of males or of females?
5. Is there a significant difference in the ranking of life-style orientation scores within age groups included in the study?

Scope and Limitations

The scope and limitations under which this study was conducted were:

1. Information was gathered from current participants in an urban leadership program in Tulsa, Oklahoma, and results of the study should only be generalized to this population.

2. Limitations inherent in the questionnaire technique.

Assumptions

For the purpose of this study, assumptions accepted by the investigator were that:

1. Participants in a leadership program may be classified as emerging leaders.
2. The respondents answered the questionnaire as honestly as possible.

Definitions of Terms

The following definitions of terms are provided to furnish, as nearly as possible, clear and concise meanings of terms as they were used in this study:

Leaders - "agents of change, persons whose acts affect other people more than other people's acts affect them" (Bass, 1981, p. 16).

Leadership - "an interaction between members of a group," . . . occurring "when one group member modifies the motivation or competencies of others in the group" (Bass, 1981, p. 16).

Leadership Program - a program providing experiences that in turn develops skills necessary to accomplish contributions to the community (Lionberger, 1981).

Life-style orientation - an individual and cultural phenomenon depicting an "individual's pattern of preferences, values, and beliefs about himself in regard to the world around him" (Friedlander, 1975, p. 331). Not necessarily

reflected in behavior, but part of the interaction with situation that may affect behavior.

Personalistic life-style - a life-style in which an individual looks within himself and his own set of experiences and feelings for guidance and direction. There is a high need for personal freedom and a sense of responsibility to self (Friedlander, 1975).

Sociocentric life-style - a life-style that "looks toward close intimate relationships for guidance and direction" (Friedlander, 1975, p. 335). For reaching important decisions, for establishing working relationships, for sharing feelings, or for learning, the individual with a sociocentric life-style looks toward friends and colleagues.

Formalistic life-style - a life-style placing "heavy reliance on higher authority for guidance in life," . . . tending "to look upward and outward for guidance, direction, success criteria, and rewards" (Friedlander, 1975, p. 334). Higher authority is represented by law and order, precedent, and people in positions of higher responsibility.

Organization of the Study

Chapter I introduced the study and presented the problem, purpose, research questions, scope and limitations, assumptions, and definitions of terms. Chapter II includes a review of related literature concerning the concept of leadership, leadership theories, leader-member interaction, the contemporary context of leadership, the new social

character, and new leaders. Chapter III explains the methodology used in this study by describing the population; instrumentation; administration; and the data analysis. The findings of the study are presented in Chapter IV. Chapter V contains a summary of the study, conclusions, and recommendations for research and practice.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter reviews the literature in the following areas: (1) the concept of leadership, (2) leadership theories, (3) leader-member interaction, (4) the contemporary context of leadership, (5) the new social character, and (6) new leaders.

The Concept of Leadership

Researchers and philosophers have struggled with the concept of leadership and degrees of leadership effectiveness for a long time. Discussions on the subject may be found in classical literature of almost any culture and era. In various ways, people have attempted to define what it is that prompts people to follow a given person at a given time.

Defined as "an interaction between members of a group" that "occurs when one group member modifies the motivation or competencies of others in the group" (Bass, 1981, p. 16), leadership is socially earned in a process and should not be confused with authority and power, which may be appointed. Without followers, one is not a leader. Today, managers and others in appointed positions are frequently identified as leaders; many current theories of management and leadership

use the terms interchangeably. However, McMaster (1981) pointed out that management and leadership can be two completely different things, and he asserted that leadership is an art, not a skill or science. Burns (1979) stated:

Leadership has a moral dimension that power does not have. Power is manipulative. It is the exploitation of other people's motives in order to realize the power holder's objectives. . . . The leader differs from the power holder in that he engages with or relates to the genuine wants, needs, and aspirations of his followers rather than manipulating them for his own ends (p. 32).

Bennis (1976) explained the difference in a more practical manner:

Lead, not manage. There is an important difference. Many an institution is very well managed and very poorly led. It may excel in the ability to handle each day all the routine inputs--yet may never ask whether the routine should be done at all (p. 27).

Leadership Theories

Bass (1981) identified leadership theorists as falling into three groups--the leader/task-centered approach, the follower/human relations approach, and those who will argue that it "just depends" (on environment, organization, task, the leader, or the followers). Aspects of those approaches may be noted in a review of prevalent theories.

Early Theories

The earliest theories of leadership supported the idea of the "great man" or "the times" and conflicting evidence

exists on the effects of these factors. Bass (1981) identified theorists in the 1920s to 1940s who explained leadership in terms of personality traits and character. He noted others of that period who placed great emphasis on the environment and the idea that situations will produce and mold leaders. Both types of theorists attempted to explain leadership as a single set of forces. Interactive effects of individual and situational factors were not considered (Bass, 1981).

Situational Leadership

The concept of situational leadership gained popularity in the 1950s and placed great emphasis on accomplishing the group's task while attaining leadership status through effective interpersonal communication (Hollander, 1978). Models of situational leadership recognize differences in situational structure and individual followers but are largely based on diagnosis of a group by the leader (Hersey and Blanchard, 1981; Tannenbaum and Schmidt, 1973).

Models of situational leadership seem to neglect the interactive aspects of relationships over time. The emphasis is on attaining rather than maintaining status. Hollander (1978, p. 152) noted that situational theory overlooks the fact that "the leader is part of the situation for followers."

Contingency Models

Contingency models consider situational factors that

make certain leader qualities more effective (Fiedler, 1974; Hollander, 1978). An extension of the situational approach, contingency models begin to recognize the roles of interaction and expectation by identifying leader behaviors as well as contingency factors--such as task structure, availability of information, follower motivations and perceptions, or authority systems--that affect the outcome of the leadership process (Hollander, 1978). Bass (1981) noted that Fiedler's contingency model is the most widely researched leadership theory, and, at the same time, the most widely debated.

Humanistic Theories

Humanistic theories are concerned with building effective and cohesive organizations through application of "principles of leadership, as these are emerging in the behavioral sciences" (Blake and Mouton, 1982, p. 39). Unlike contingency models that stress awareness of a given individual style in assessing and dealing with situations, humanistic theory stresses "one best" style based on principles such as participation, candor, commitment, conflict resolution, goals and objectives, and teamwork.

Whether based on principles of learning theory (Argyris, 1976); concern for people versus concern for production (Blake and Mouton, 1978, 1982); or optimistic assumptions regarding human nature (McGregor, Likert, in Bass, 1981); humanistic theories of leadership suggest that individuals learn to change situations through consistent behavior

based on humanistic principles rather than change their behavior to fit situations. Humanistic theorists acknowledge that this type of change is a time consuming process but suggest that with new data, better understanding, and active feedback, a thinking society--which is also thoughtful--can be achieved (Blake and Mouton, 1978).

Maccoby (1976, p. 230) noted that "a system that 'fits' and stimulates one character type (not to speak of temperament and talents) may be frustrating for another." He suggested that some humanistic theory ends up supporting values such as hierarchy, mechanistic thought, idealization of success, and careerism that can block essential emotional development in the individual.

Transactional Leadership

Hollander (1978, p. 38) proposed a theory of effective leadership as a transactional process, in which "there is a dynamic relationship with followers who perceive and evaluate the leader in the context of situational demands." He addressed the corresponding influences of followers in the relationship and the leader's need to maintain legitimacy after attaining it. Hollander (1978) called this a theory of "social exchange" in which the leader and followers give and receive benefits.

Burns (1979) identified transactional leadership as a level of leadership. He defined it as an exchange of goods, votes, money, or whatever, but he noted that it leaves the

essential social structure unchanged.

Transforming Leadership

Burns (1979) recognized transforming leadership as a higher level of leadership that brings about fundamental changes. He considered it an adaptation of Maslow's concept of the hierarchy of wants and traced in its development a growth to the presence of demands and conflict. Tension generated by these factors is not considered a major crisis if the right of free speech is recognized as a fundamental need of all people.

Burns (1978, p. 40) said that the fundamental process of leadership is "to make conscious what lies unconscious among followers." He identified the most important force shaping leaders as the capacity for learning, and he followed this force to the conclusion that transforming leaders have the ability to lead by being led. By interacting with their followers, leaders change others and are themselves changed.

Authoritarian or Democratic?

Leadership theories can generally be identified on a continuum between authoritarian and democratic philosophy. Gouldner (1965) contended that leadership is a value choice between democratic and authoritarian rule and must be considered in the context of social structure. Bass (1981) pointed out that duality in leadership theory has been seen through history and springs from opposing doctrines about

human nature.

Either human nature was cursed by original sin or human nature was blessed with the inherent ability to find salvation. If humankind was essentially bad, it had to be controlled, directed, and uplifted by authority. If humankind was essentially good, it must be given the freedom in which to learn, to grow, and to overcome (Bass, 1981, p. 292).

Bass (1981) reported results of a test--the F Scale--used to measure degrees of authoritarianism. One study concluded that scores on the F Scale were negatively correlated with intelligence. Another found that those scoring highest on authoritarianism were laborers and those with the least education. Lowest scores on authoritarianism were made by managers, officials, and clerical and sales people; professionals, semiprofessionals, and university students scored between the two other groups. Leaders who scored low on the F Scale were found to be more sensitive to others, more effective in groups, and more submissive in attitudes toward other group members.

Leader-Member Interaction

Regardless of the theory of leadership that one adopts or formulates, followers--members of the group--will be part of it. Someone acts, another reacts. One responds, one is responsible.

Followers are not merely a background against which leaders emerge (Fiedler and Chemers, 1974). Members of a group are the ones who will accept or reject individuals for

the position of leadership--if not overtly, then covertly. Formal leadership (authority) may be undermined by informal leadership (influence) if members of a group do not legitimize the formal leadership. Likert (1961) pointed out that the personalities of the members of a group help to determine characteristics of the group, as well as characteristics of the group tending to alter and shape the personalities of the members over time.

Fiedler and Chemers (1974, p. 31) posited that considerable research has shown "that the authoritarian or democratic values of group members strongly affect the type of leader who is likely to emerge." They reported that authoritarians prefer status-laden leadership with strong authority and direction on the part of the boss. Equalitarians are able to accept strong leadership if the situation demands it, but they do not prefer this type of leadership, and perhaps they need it less.

Other studies have found that member behavior significantly affected leader behavior. Bass (1981) reported that, in an experiment where students played the role of leader, they were confronted with accomplices of the experimenters serving as democratic or submissive subordinates.

Democratic subordinates showed initiative by putting forth ideas and trying to set their own goals. Submissive subordinates avoided taking any initiative and asked for detailed instructions which they followed without question. The leaders' behavior was affected accordingly. For example, they were more autocratic with the submissive subordinates and more democratic with the democratic ones (Bass, 1981, p. 269).

Burns (1978) noted that there are no sharp boundaries between leaders and followers. Good leaders are also good followers; leaders and followers exchange roles at different times, in different settings.

Bass (1981, p. 266) appropriately asked, "If not the followers, then who are the opposites to the leader?" He identified the opposite of leaders as those who are excluded by rules from participation and those who exclude themselves from participation--the apathetic, the alienated, the anomic.

The Contemporary Context of Leadership

People without leadership, leaders who follow. Yet the more we lack for leadership, the more we hunger for it. Bewildered, we wander through a world that seems to have become morally dead, where everything, including the government, seems up for sale and where, looking for the real villain of Watergate, we confront everywhere ourselves (Bennis, 1976, p. 125).

Given that leadership seems to depend to some degree on followership, one wonders what conditions in society lend themselves to the lament for leadership. Why is a "lack of leadership" expressed today?

Social Influences

Gouldner (1965, p. 5) sketched development of the interest in leadership as a social problem, "conditioned by and formulated in terms of specific values." He traced it from the Western World's rejection of the feudal notion of hereditary aristocracy and support of ". . . a conception of

leadership as a learnable behavior which, through thought, discussion, and rational organization, could master the social process" (Gouldner, 1965, p. 5).

Nisbet (1965) pointed out that, today, people experience a conflict in values, prizing the "liberating impersonalities" of modern, industrial life, and also still prizing tradition, morality, close personal involvement, and secure status--values that were part of the rural, individualistic heritage. He felt that "moral purpose has been sacrificed to technical excellence and power" (Nisbet, 1965, p. 703).

Change has become the new constant. The past quarter century has brought jet planes, computers, missiles, satellites, space travel, and thermonuclear power.

In the past hundred years we have increased our communication by a factor of ten to the seventh power, our speed of travel by ten squared, our speed of data handling by ten to the sixth power, our energy resources by ten to the third power, our power of weapons by ten to the sixth power, our ability to control diseases by ten squared, our rate of population growth by ten to the third power (Bennis, 1976, p. 127-128).

A world turned upside down finds 90 percent of all Americans today working for someone else, when a century ago, 90 percent of all Americans were self-employed (Bennis, 1976).

Yankelovich (1981) pointed out that postwar America assumed problems of production were solved. The national task became consumption and the ultimate object of consumer values inevitably became the "self." In this era of self-fulfillment, Americans consumed mightily and struggled against a culture that had previously preached self-denial.

The "psychology of affluence" was great while affluence lasted, but now the economy is less productive and the culture still expanding. The national task changes. Now the challenge is to build a more productive economy and, at the same time, try to satisfy the cravings of the spirit as well as material well-being (Yankelovich, 1981).

Social Repercussions

The phenomenon of alienation is widely recognized today and refers to the feeling of control by, and dependence on, forces which people are unable to recognize (Gouldner, 1965). In an age where people have more choices, individuals may feel a lack of choice and not be able to identify why. The alienated may reject participation, not seeing its relevance to their situation.

Closely related to the alienated are the apathetic and the anomic. The apathetic may be "too busy"--with other things or with just surviving--to actively participate. The anomic lacks feelings of self-efficacy, possibly overwhelmed by change, and also rejects participation (Burns, 1978).

Yankelovich (1981) detailed the changes in values and attitudes--society's "rules"--that indicate great shifts in culture. He also addressed the changes in the world economy and pointed out the influence of the psychoculture and the economy on each other. He noted the mood of "pessimism and foreboding" that, by the late 1970s, had replaced traditional American optimism. This mood was demonstrated in findings

such as:

1. A Gallup poll showed that while only 21 percent of Americans in the early 1970s believed "next year will be worse than this year," by the end of the decade a 55 percent majority held this pessimistic outlook;
2. Survey findings from Yankelovich, Skelly and White showed that Americans who believe we are entering an era of enduring rather than temporary shortages increased from 40 percent in the mid-70s to 62 percent by 1980;
3. Between 1975 and 1979, the Roper Organization found that Americans who feared high inflation was "here to stay" had grown from 38 percent to 87 percent;
4. A survey technique developed by psychologist Hadley Cantril and used subsequently by various polling organizations showed that from the 1950s to the late 1960s Americans believed the present to be superior to the past and expected the future to improve on the present; by 1978 this pattern had wholly reversed itself--to the majority the past now looked better than the present and the present better than the future (Yankelovich, 1981).

Equally interesting are statistics documenting a move from trust to mistrust in Americans' attitudes toward government and institutions. Between the late 1950s and early 1980s:

1. The level of trust that government will do what is right most of the time had been cut in half, from 56 percent to 29 percent;
2. Confidence that those running the government are "smart people who know what they are doing" dropped from 69 percent to 29 percent;
3. The attitude that the government is run for the benefit of a few big interests rather than for the benefit of all the people jumped from 28 percent to 65 percent;
4. The conviction that the government wastes tax dollars grew from 42 percent to 77 percent;
5. The number of people expressing at least a mild form of political alienation--"what I think doesn't count," "those in power don't care what people like me think," "they try to take advantage of people like me"--rose from 33 percent to 67 percent (Yankelovich, 1981).

Herzberg (1980) traced this "psychological depression" and its effect on leadership in business from the pre-1950s. Then the leader as patron signified values of inequality, personal blame, and provider status; and that style was accepted well by a largely immigrant population who were used to inequality. In the 50s, he identified the belief in the equality of the rat race, and in the 60s, the populist movement of blaming everyone else for one's plight. The 70s brought a latent depression at the injustice of attempts

to establish equality. The 80s have brought a period of psychological depression, grounded in a realization that economic life and life styles have limits.

Herzberg (1980) asserted that people see themselves as captives and may escape to mindless activities, or they may turn to internal evaluation. If they turn to internal evaluation, he commented that they will be difficult for business to manage with external rewards. Gordon (1977, p. 9) pointed out that people are already "rebellious against inhuman working environments in very human ways--by job-hopping, absenteeism, apathetic attitudes, antagonism, and malicious mischief."

The New Social Character

Fromm (cited in Maccoby, 1981) developed the concept of "social character" as a prominent cluster of traits shared by group members. These character traits "spring from the tension that exists between the inner drives or desires of many individuals and the outer drives or pressures of the society" (Toffler, 1980, p. 382). In discussing today's environment, Maccoby (1981) named new technology, modes of work, and government policies as forces transforming the United States and other industrial democracies--changing the social character. He called for new models of leadership and described the new self-oriented character as one who, in effect, says:

I can contribute more, if they listen to my ideas, if I am treated as an individual,

neither as a child nor a machine, and the rewards are fair. Otherwise, I'll look out for myself (Maccoby, 1981, p. 49).

Maccoby concluded that positive traits of the new social character are: (1) flexibility, willingness to experiment, and tolerance; (2) self-development and playfulness; (3) fairness and participativeness. He identified negative traits as: (1) alienation, detachment, and disloyalty--a tendency to trade integrity for status; (2) undisciplined self-indulgence (rationalized as self-fulfillment) and escapism; (3) cynical rebelliousness (rationalized in terms of rights and entitlements) and manipulation.

Bennis (1976, p. 57) noted that "the new culture treasures smallness, human scale, and cultural pluralism." But he noted that qualities missing in today's society included integrity, dedication, magnanimity, humility, openness, and creativity.

Yankelovich (1981) documented that about 80 percent of Americans are now committed to some degree to the search for self-fulfillment. "Traditional concepts of right and wrong have been replaced by norms of 'harmful' or 'harmless'" (Yankelovich, 1981, p. 88). Major normative changes have taken place in how Americans feel about marriage, sex roles and sexual behavior, childbearing and rearing children, religion, government, and work. The "giving/getting compact"--the unwritten rules governing what people give in marriage, work, community, and sacrifice for others, and what they expect in return--is being rewritten.

Yankelovich (1981) noted that Bell pointed out

. . . the contradictory tendency of our economy to seek as workers people who are ideal 'producers' and at the same time to seek as customers people who are ideal 'consumers,' though the two types conflict with each other (p. 230).

The social bond is being recast. Yankelovich (1981) theorized that by the mid-1970s the American people had reached a conclusion comparable to that reached by intellectual critics years earlier,

. . . that our civilization is unbalanced, with excessive emphasis on the instrumental, and insufficient concern with the values of community, expressiveness, caring and with the domain of the sacred (p. 232).

Changing Life-Styles

Friedlander (1975, p. 331) defined life-style as "a relatively enduring pattern of preferences, values, and beliefs." A cultural as well as individual phenomenon, no single life-style can define an individual; people are a complex blend of different life-style patterns. Friedlander believed behavior is a function of the interaction of life-style patterns with situation. Bass (1981) said that evidence cannot be ignored that suggests people bring to their work some semblance of a life-style that interacts with their success in an organization.

Friedlander (1975) reported results of a study that attempted to identify the characteristics of various life-styles and further an understanding of them by noting their demographic and biographical correlates. A factor analysis

of data collected from nearly 1200 people from three different countries and from a wide variety of religious, occupational, age and socio-economic backgrounds indicated the existence of three basic types of life-styles: formalistic, sociocentric, and personalistic. A comparison of characteristics of the three life-styles is made in Figure 1.

The formalistic life-style places "heavy reliance on higher authority for guidance in life" . . . tending "to look upward and outward for guidance, direction, success criteria, and rewards" (Friedlander, 1975, p. 334). Higher authority is represented by law and order, precedent, and people in positions of higher responsibility. A sense of fulfillment comes from upward mobility and from institutional symbols of success--advancement, security, comfort, and prestige. Friedlander found that the formalistic life-style dimension:

1. Was higher as individuals became older;
2. Increased with education to the undergraduate degree level;
3. Was most typical of those employed in sales, business, and technology;
4. Was higher in men than in women; and
5. Was greatest in those of the Protestant religions (Friedlander and Green, 1977).

The sociocentric life-style relies on close, intimate relationships for guidance and direction (Friedlander, 1975). For reaching important decisions, for establishing working

Characteristic	Orientation		
	Personalistic	Sociocentric	Formalistic
Basis of action	Direction from within	Discussion, agreement with others	Direction from authorities
Form of control	Individual's beliefs concerning what is right or necessary	Interpersonal commitments	Established rules, laws, policies, and procedures
Source of responsibility	Self	Peers and colleagues	Superordinate powers
Desired outcome of action	Actualization of individual	Consensus, agreement	Compliance
Avoided behavior	Action contrary to individual's nature	Failure to reach agreement	Deviation from authoritative direction
Course of action to acquire material goods	(Taken for granted that material goods will be provided)	Collaboration	Competition
Basis for growth	Self-awareness	Interaction	Adherence to the established order
Position in relation to others	Separate individual	Peer-group member	Member of hierarchy
Object of loyalty	Self	Peer group	Organization
Time focus	Present	Near future	Future

Source: Adams, 1980, p. 35.

Figure 1. Characteristics of Personalistic, Sociocentric, and Formalistic Life-Style Orientations

relationships, for sharing feelings, or for learning, the individual with a sociocentric life-style looks toward friends and colleagues. The sociocentric life-style:

1. Showed a drop with age until 25 years, then increased to a peak at about 40 years of age;
2. Was most typical of those in social service and science occupations; and
3. Was higher in women than in men (Friedlander and Green, 1977).

The personalistic life-style is one in which the individual looks to himself for guidance and direction. There is a high need for personal freedom and a sense of responsibility to self (Friedlander, 1975). Friedlander's study indicated that the personalistic life-style:

1. Started at its highest level in the early teens and declined steadily for the next 40 years, reaching a low in the mid-50s;
2. Was characteristic of those in artistic, entertainment, cultural, and student occupations;
3. Was higher in women than in men; and
4. Was characteristic of Jews and agnostics (Friedlander and Green, 1977).

Adams (1980), in discussing the personalistic, sociocentric, and formalistic life-styles, noted that individuals with relatively high scores in the personalistic and formalistic orientations and relatively low scores in the sociocentric orientation were likely to have clear standards,

goals, and sources of authority. Such individuals may prefer to be left alone to complete tasks and assignments and be frustrated by attempts to impose participative management. Adams also reported that a study of stress related to life-styles found that people with highest sociocentric scores felt stress relatively more than others and those with higher formalistic scores felt stress relatively less than others.

Friedlander (1975) noted a strong preference among the younger generation for self guidance and self discovery and asked what the effects would be on future organizational structures if the younger generation maintained even a residual of these values. He prophesized that organizational and institutional frameworks will, of necessity, move away from bureaucracy toward more loosely structured organizations to accomodate this newly predominant character. And he said that these value conflicts "will continue to be played out in all organizational settings--families, work places, churches, and communities" (Friedlander, 1975, p. 345).

Varney (1976) discussed the frequency of high degrees of incongruity between the needs of people and the demands of their organizations, with resulting losses in productivity and effectiveness. He noted the emergence of the personalistic and sociocentric life-styles in addition to the more traditional formalistic orientation and asserted his conviction that the ability of bureaucratic structures to provide growth for individuals would decrease.

Yankelovich (1981) characterized the prominent features of increasing self expression and highly personalized lifestyles as a "we-expect-more-of-everything" outlook. However, he noted that economic realities are forcing people to start an adaptive process, a "working through" process, that will eventually yield to a new social ethic. In the meantime, tense and bitter conflict can be expected.

A New Social Ethic?

Yankelovich (1981) inferred that the pendulum has swung from an extreme that instrumentalism is destiny to one that self-fulfillment is supreme. A new shared meaning is emerging that insists personal freedom can coexist with the instrumentalism of modern technological society and, in fact, civilize it. Yankelovich pointed out that the changes ahead for American society will be more easily made if people see them as having a positive ethical meaning. He proposed an "ethic of commitment"--shifting emphasis from self-denial or self-fulfillment--and observed that such an ethic is now gathering around a desire for closer and deeper relationships and more sacred/expressive values.

Others share the optimistic views that have arisen from the mood of pessimism. People are being forced together in new ways by the mutual problems they all face--coping with technology, an unstable economy, an uncertain future (McCormack, 1981). A spirit of cooperation and innovation may be rising from this search for synthesis between the

group and the individual--between social and personal needs.

Yankelovich (1981) believed that Americans are becoming prepared to take this first step toward an ethic of commitment.

For this to occur people must receive clear and distinct signals from the larger society--from political leadership, the mass media, institutional leadership (business, religion, education, labor, artists and scientists, the intellectual community) and from informal interchange of views with friends and neighbors (Yankelovich, 1981, p. 259-260).

The signals must help people link their aspirations to new and acceptable realities.

New Leaders

Inundated by segments, fragments, and caucuses of a split society, leadership that has been based on simple values becomes "very complex and difficult, full of moral dilemmas and shifting values. It is a fragmentation yet an interdependent mosaic" (Bennis, 1976, p. 129). "Leaders have to define the issues, not aggravate the problems" (Bennis, 1976, p. 173). "To determine what kind of leader we need, we must also understand how we are changing and why old models of leadership no longer serve" (Maccoby, 1981, p. 17).

Where to from here? Some may say what has been lacking is the proper education of leaders; others may say what has been lacking are responsible and/or responsive followers. Many say, "Surely, something is lacking."

Toffler (1980, p. 399) identified the "Messiah Complex" as the "illusion that we can somehow save ourselves by

changing the man (or woman) on top." He noted that the transformation of society raises it to a much higher level of diversity and complexity. Leaders become dependent on increasing numbers of people for help in making and implementing decisions.

Toffler (1980) said the "intensifying cry" for leadership is based on three misconceptions:

1. "The myth of authoritarian efficiency" (p. 401).
So many institutions are breaking down that many people are willing to trade some freedom (but preferably someone else's) to "make the trains run on time."
2. An "unspoken assumption that a style of leadership that worked in the past will work in the present or future" (p. 402). Few stop to consider that the strong leader in one instance may be a weak leader in another.
3. Leaders "are crippled because the institutions they must work through are obsolete" (p. 404). The repercussions of local decisions at the global level are here to stay in an increasingly "small world."

Bennis (1976), Toffler (1980), Maccoby (1981) and Yankelovich (1981) are among those who have recognized the reality of change and the challenges for leaders. Unrelenting change takes its toll. The speed with which people are being thrust into the future prompts a search for answers when

there is no assurance that the right questions are being asked. Toffler (1980) noted that widespread disillusionment, anger, and bitterness can become fanatic frenzy or it can be mobilized for processes of reconstruction.

What has been learned from the past? What is the role of leaders? Of followers? What are the effects on organizations? What should be done first? And what, after all, prompts people to follow a given person at a given time?

Bass (1981) noted that continuing social change, and possible revolutionary shifts in thinking, will be determinants in the course leadership research charts in the future. Although no answers are proposed, this review serves as a starting point for questions. Continuing social change is certain. Can shifts in thinking keep up with it? How will emerging leaders be defined? And perhaps more importantly, how will emerging leaders define themselves?

Summary

A review of literature has highlighted developments in: (1) the concept of leadership, (2) leadership theories, (3) leader-member interaction, (4) the contemporary context of leadership, (5) the new social character, and (6) new leaders. A distinction was made between leadership and management; leadership is socially earned in a process of influence, rather than appointed through the use of power. Theories of leadership have moved from early consideration of single forces to complex interactive theories. Early

trait and environmental theories; situational, contingency, and humanistic theories; transactional and transforming leadership; as well as the authoritarian to democratic continuum were briefly reviewed. Studies were cited that addressed the interactive aspects of leadership. Followers--members of a group--accept or reject leaders, and member characteristics and behavior apparently affect the type of leader who is likely to emerge. The contemporary question concerning lack of leadership was considered in the context of conflicts arising from constant change in the societal environment. The depressing effects on people and the impact of a new self-oriented social character on the concept of leadership were reviewed.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to describe perceived life-style orientations among participants in an urban leadership program. This chapter explains the methodology used in the study by describing: (1) the population, (2) instrumentation, (3) administration of the instrument, and (4) data analysis.

Population

Leadership Tulsa in Tulsa, Oklahoma is a nonprofit educational organization that sponsors annual leadership programs. It was originally sponsored by the Junior League of Tulsa and the Metropolitan Tulsa Chamber of Commerce in 1973 for the purpose of expanding voluntary leadership in the community. Leadership Tulsa became an independent organization in 1978 and now operates under the auspices of a 30-member Board of Directors that includes 25 past participants in the program.

Leadership Tulsa's purpose is to:

1. Identify potential leaders from various sectors of the community.
2. Create an awareness of community problems and the

various perspectives from which these problems are viewed.

3. Develop leadership skills and relate those skills to community service needs.
4. Bring together the people and resources of the business and civic communities.
5. Open a significant dialogue among emerging and present community leaders.
6. Identify opportunities for community involvement and assist in the placement of the participants.
7. Provide past Leadership Tulsa participants the opportunity for contact with the program (Leadership Tulsa, 1982).

Participants in Leadership Tulsa are drawn from as many sectors of the community and non-related business interests as possible. A mix of philosophical perspectives and backgrounds is considered desirable for constructive conflict and intergroup processes (Scott, cited in Lionberger, 1981).

One of the considerations for selection of participants in Leadership Tulsa is their potential as community leaders. They are people who are emerging as those most likely to use leadership skills in the community. It was thought that a study of perceived life-style orientations in this population would be of interest and might indicate areas of interest for future leadership studies.

The 61 current participants in Leadership Tulsa were surveyed for this study. This included 59 members of

Leadership Tulsa IX and two members of Leadership Tulsa VIII who were making up sessions.

Instrumentation

Friedlander's (1972) untitled life-style orientation questionnaire was used in this study as the Life-Style Orientation Inventory. A copy of Friedlander's questionnaire is displayed in Appendix A. The questionnaire allows computation of a score on each of three life-style orientations representing sets of values, preferences, and beliefs--personalistic, sociocentric, and formalistic.

Friedlander originally used a 78-item questionnaire that was constructed by drawing from authors concerned with youth values, human relations theory, and classical organization theory. That questionnaire was administered to nearly 1200 people in small groups of 10 to 40. The questionnaire was self-scored, and discussion in sub-groups of three to five indicated that participants considered their scores an accurate reflection of their perceived value system. Additionally, when administered to work groups that had worked together for extended periods of time, perceptions of working peers often were corroborated by the life-style dimension scores. As a result of that study, the questionnaire was reduced to 24 items, including the eight highest loadings on each of the three life-style factors from the original 78-item questionnaire. Kuder-Richardson reliability coefficients for the three sets of factor scores were .70

for personalistic scores, .72 for sociocentric scores, and .78 for formalistic scores. Intercorrelations among the three life styles were all low, ranging from .12 between the formalistic and sociocentric orientations to -.17 between the formalistic and personalistic orientations (Friedlander, 1975).

The Life-Style Orientation Inventory used in this study includes the 24 items from Friedlander's questionnaire in a slightly different format. The content of the instrument was not affected. Permission to use the questionnaire was stated on a copy of the instrument received from Friedlander and was confirmed in a telephone conversation with him. Respondents were asked to rate the extent to which a statement represented their own attitude on a scale ranging from "not at all" (rating 1) to "completely" (rating 5). Demographic information was also collected from participants, including age, sex, and occupational group (social service, sales, business, technology, science, cultural, arts/entertainment, or other). A sample of the Life-Style Orientation Inventory is included in Appendix B.

Administration of the Instrument

A cover letter was prepared by the researcher explaining the purpose of the questionnaire and the method for returning it. A copy of the letter is included in Appendix C.

The cover letter and the Life-Style Orientation Inventory were distributed to participants attending a Leadership Tulsa meeting on February 8, 1983. The same information was

mailed the next day to participants not present at that meeting. A stamped, self-addressed return envelope was included with this material for the respondents' convenience.

A follow-up letter was sent to all participants--other than those who had voluntarily included their name on the returned questionnaires--on March 2, 1983. A copy of the follow-up letter is included in Appendix D. A final reminder was made verbally by the Leadership Tulsa program administrator at a class meeting on March 9, 1983.

Data Analysis

Frequencies and percentages were calculated for demographic information. Responses to each item of the questionnaire were reviewed and analyzed using arithmetic means. Individual orientation scores were calculated and also reviewed and analyzed using arithmetic means.

The Friedman two-way analysis of variance, a non-parametric statistical test, was calculated for the orientation score rankings of males, females, and age groups included in the study. This test was selected because it enabled the researcher to look at differences within groups based on individual rank order of life-style orientation scores. The formula employed was the following:

$$X_r^2 = \frac{12}{Nk(k+1)} \sum (R_j)^2 - 3N(k+1)$$

where

N=the number of rows

k=the number of columns

$(R_j)^2$ directs one to first square, then sum all column rank totals
(Popham and Sirotnik, 1973, p. 298-299).

Summary

This chapter explained the methodology used in the study by describing: (1) the population, (2) instrumentation, (3) administration of the instrument, and (4) data analysis. Current participants in Leadership Tulsa, an annual urban leadership program, were surveyed for this study. The Life-Style Orientation Inventory was administered to 61 participants. Chapter IV presents the findings of the study in both chart and narrative form, using appropriate statistics.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to describe perceived life-style orientations among participants in an urban leadership program. This chapter presents the findings of the study in the following order: (1) response rate; (2) demographic characteristics; (3) personalistic statement responses; (4) sociocentric statement responses; (5) formalistic statement responses; (6) overall mean values of statement responses; and (7) life-style orientation scores.

Response Rate

The Life-Style Orientation Inventory (LSOI) was distributed to 61 participants in Leadership Tulsa in February, 1983. Of the 61 distributed, 36 were returned. A follow-up letter was sent in March and a verbal reminder was made at a Leadership Tulsa meeting. An additional 14 questionnaires were received as a result of these efforts.

The total response was 50 questionnaires. One incomplete response was not used for the study. The completed questionnaires used for the purpose of the study then numbered 49, or 80 percent of the 61 distributed.

Demographic Characteristics

Frequencies and percentages were calculated for the demographic data collected in this study. The results are shown in Table I.

Of the 49 Leadership Tulsa participants responding in this study, 38 were male (78%) and 11 were female (22%). Respondents ranged in age from 24 to 51 years, with nine ages 24-29 (18%); 14 ages 30-34 (29%); 18 ages 35-39 (37%); and eight ages 40-51 (16%).

Given seven occupational groups, the majority of respondents--32 in number (65%)--classified themselves as business people. Four classified their occupational group as social service (8%); one as sales (2%); one as technology (2%); and 11 as "other" (22%). "Other" occupational groups included four attorneys (8%); one representative of the fire department (2%); one higher education administrator (2%); one physician (2%); one political press aide (2%); one public administrator (2%); one service worker (2%); and one utility worker (2%).

Personalistic Statement Responses

Eight of the 24 statements on the LSOI were characteristic of the personalistic life-style orientation. This orientation is characterized as an individual who looks within himself and his own set of experiences and feelings for guidance and direction. The individual has a high need

TABLE I
 FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGES OF RESPONDENTS
 CLASSIFIED BY DEMOGRAPHIC
 CHARACTERISTICS

Characteristic	Frequency	Percent
SEX:		
Male	38	78
Female	11	22
AGE (YEARS):		
24-29	9	18
30-34	14	29
35-39	18	37
40-51	8	16
OCCUPATIONAL GROUP:		
Social Service	4	8
Sales	1	2
Business	32	65
Technology	1	2
Other		
Attorney	4	8
Fire Department	1	2
Higher Education Administration	1	2
Physician	1	2
Political Press Aide	1	2
Public Administration	1	2
Service	1	2
Utility	1	2

for personal freedom and a sense of responsibility to self (Friedlander, 1975). The eight statements characteristic of this orientation were:

1. In deciding how I want to live and act, I am most satisfied if I am completely free to make this decision by myself.
4. I believe that my life will be most satisfying to me if I am completely free to choose how I want to live.
7. I can only get the really important things in life by doing what I want to do.
10. What is important is that I experiment and discover who and what I am.
13. I prefer that my actions be guided by my own knowledge of what I want to do.
16. I find myself striving for greater freedom and independence.
19. I believe that my feelings and emotions should be experienced by me to the fullest.
22. For my actions I am responsible only to myself.

Respondents were asked to rate the extent to which the statement represented their attitude, ranging from "not at all" (rating 1) to "completely" (rating 5).

The mean value for responses to each of the personalistic statements was calculated for males, females, and members of age groups 24-29, 30-34, 35-39, and 40-51, as well as the overall mean value. The results are shown in Table II.

In response to Statement 1, concerning freedom to make own decisions, the mean value of female responses, 4.00, was slightly higher than male responses, 3.92; the range (R), or difference between the two values, was .08. Mean

TABLE II
MEAN VALUES FOR PERSONALISTIC ORIENTATION
STATEMENTS BY SEX AND AGE GROUPS

Statement Number	SEX		24-29	30-34	AGE GROUP		Overall
	Male N=38 \bar{X}	Female N=11 \bar{X}			35-39 N=18 \bar{X}	40-51 N=8 \bar{X}	
1. Free to make own decisions	3.92	4.00	3.56	4.00	3.94	4.25	3.94
4. Free to choose how I want to live	3.74	4.09	3.67	3.93	3.56	4.38	3.82
7. Important things come from doing what I want to do	3.08	3.18	2.89	3.29	2.94	3.38	3.10
10. Important to experiment and discover self	3.29	3.64	3.22	3.29	3.50	3.38	3.37
13. Actions guided by own knowledge	3.82	4.00	3.78	3.71	3.94	4.00	3.86
16. Striving for greater independence & freedom	3.66	3.82	3.44	3.57	3.83	3.88	3.69
19. Feelings & emotions should be experienced to fullest	3.26	3.82	3.33	3.36	3.50	3.25	3.39
22. Responsible to self for actions	2.58	3.45	2.33	3.00	2.72	3.00	2.78

responses among age groups ranged from a high of 4.25 for ages 40-51 to a low of 3.56 for ages 24-29 ($R=.69$), with an overall mean of 3.94.

Responses to Statement 4, concerning freedom to choose one's own way to live, also showed a higher mean value for females of 4.09 compared to the males' mean value of 3.74 ($R=.35$). Mean responses among age groups ranged from a high of 4.38 for ages 40-51 to a low of 3.56 for ages 35-39 ($R=.82$). The overall mean response was 3.82.

Statement 7 expressed an attitude that really important things in life are gotten by doing what the individual wants to do, and the mean value of responses from females, 3.18, was slightly higher than that of males, 3.08 ($R=.10$). The highest mean value response was from ages 40-51, 3.38, and ranged to a low for ages 24-29 of 2.89 ($R=.49$), with an overall mean response of 3.10.

Responding to Statement 10, expressing the importance of experimenting and discovering one's self, the mean response of females, 3.64, was higher than that of males, 3.29 ($R=.35$). Responses among age groups ranged from a high mean of 3.50 for ages 35-39 to a low of 3.22 for ages 24-29 ($R=.28$), with the overall mean 3.37.

In response to Statement 13--preferring that actions be guided by one's own knowledge--the mean value of female responses, 4.00, was higher than that of males, 3.82 ($R=.18$). Mean responses among age groups ranged from a high of 4.00 for ages 40-51 to a low of 3.71 for ages 30-34 ($R=.29$),

with an overall mean response of 3.86.

The mean value of responses to Statement 16--finding oneself striving for greater independence and freedom--was higher for females, 3.82, than for males, 3.66 ($R=.16$). Ages 40-51 again expressed the highest mean value of 3.88, ranging to a low among ages 24-29 of 3.44 ($R=.44$). The overall mean response was 3.69.

Statement 19 expressed a belief that feelings and emotions should be experienced by the individual to the fullest, and the mean value of female responses of 3.82 was higher than the mean of male responses of 3.26 ($R=.56$). Mean responses among age groups ranged from a high of 3.50 for ages 35-39 to a low of 3.25 for ages 40-51 ($R=.25$), with an overall mean of 3.39.

Responding to Statement 22, concerning responsibility to one's self for actions, the mean response of females, 3.45, was quite a bit higher than males, 2.58 ($R=.87$). The highest mean value responses were from ages 30-34 and 40-51, 3.00, and ranged to a low for ages 24-29 of 2.33 ($R=.67$), with an overall mean of 2.78.

The range was greatest between male and female mean responses to Statement 22 ($R=.87$). The greatest variation of mean responses among age groups was to Statement 4 ($R=.82$). The least variable mean response between males and females was to Statement 1 ($R=.08$). The lowest range of mean responses among age groups was to Statement 19 ($R=.25$).

Overall, the value of responses from females was higher on all eight statements. On six of the eight statements, the highest mean value was among ages 40-51; on two of the eight, it was highest among ages 35-39; and on one statement, the highest mean value was among ages 30-34. On five of the eight statements, the lowest mean value was among ages 24-29; on one of the eight, it was lowest among ages 30-34; once among ages 35-39; and once it was lowest among ages 40-51.

The strongest overall response among personalistic statements (3.94) was to Statement 1; this was the highest mean value response for males (3.92) and for ages 30-34 (4.00). Statement 1 tied with Statement 13 for the highest mean value responses for ages 35-39 (3.94). Statement 13 brought the highest mean value response for ages 24-29 (3.78). The highest mean value response for females (4.09) and ages 40-51 (4.38) was to Statement 4.

The lowest overall response among personalistic statements (2.78) was to Statement 22. This was the lowest mean value response for males (2.58) and all age groups: 24-29 (2.33); 30-34 (3.00); 35-39 (2.72); and 40-51 (3.00). The lowest mean value response for females (3.18) was to Statement 7.

Sociocentric Statement Responses

Of the 24 statements on the LSOI, eight were considered characteristic of the sociocentric life-style orientation. This orientation is characterized as a life-style that "looks

toward close intimate relationships for guidance and direction" (Friedlander, 1975, p. 335). For reaching important decisions, for establishing working relationships, for sharing feelings, or for learning, the individual with a sociocentric life-style looks toward friends and colleagues.

The eight statements characteristic of this orientation were:

2. In deciding how I want to live and act, I am most satisfied if I have some close friends or colleagues who will help me reach this decision.
5. I place a great deal of faith in what my close friends say.
8. I can only get the really important things in life by working closely with friends and colleagues.
11. I will do what is right when I am guided by the close relationships I have made with others.
14. I prefer that my actions be guided by discussion with others who are close to me.
17. I believe the world would be a better place if my colleagues and I were clearer on where we stand.
20. I believe that my feelings and emotions should be shared with others close to me.
23. I can grow and progress best in this world by learning and sharing with others.

Respondents rated the extent to which each statement represented their attitude, ranging from "not at all" (rating 1) to "completely" (rating 5).

The mean value for responses to each statement was calculated for males, females, and members of age groups 24-29, 30-34, 35-39, and 40-51, as well as the overall mean

value. The results are shown in Table III.

In response to Statement 2, desiring help from friends or colleagues in making decisions about life and actions, the mean value response of males, 2.63, was higher than females, 2.45 ($R=.18$). Mean responses among age groups ranged from a high of 2.89 for ages 24-29 to a low of 2.38 for ages 40-51 ($R=.51$), with an overall mean of 2.59.

Responses to Statement 5, expressing a great deal of faith in what close friends say, showed a higher mean value for males of 2.95 compared to the females' mean value of 2.73 ($R=.22$). Mean responses among age groups ranged from a high of 3.00 for ages 24-29 and 30-34 to a low of 2.75 for ages 40-51 ($R=.25$). The overall mean response was 2.90.

Statement 8 expressed an attitude that really important things in life come from working closely with others, and the mean value of responses from females, 3.18, was slightly higher than that of males, 3.11 ($R=.07$). The highest mean value response was again from ages 24-29, 3.44, and ranged to a low for ages 40-51 of 2.88 ($R=.56$), with an overall mean response of 3.12.

Responding to Statement 11, expressing a belief that the individual will do what is right when guided by close relationships with others, the mean response of males, 2.63, was higher than that of females, 2.45 ($R=.18$). Responses among age groups ranged from a high mean of 2.78 for ages 24-29 to a low of 2.25 for ages 40-51 ($R=.53$), with the overall mean 2.59.

TABLE III
MEAN VALUES FOR SOCIOCENTRIC ORIENTATION
STATEMENTS BY SEX AND AGE GROUP

Statement Number	SEX		24-29	30-34	AGE GROUP		Overall
	Male N=38 \bar{X}	Female N=11 \bar{X}			35-39 N=18 \bar{X}	40-51 N=8 \bar{X}	
2. Help from close others in making decisions about life & actions	2.63	2.45	2.89	2.71	2.44	2.38	2.59
5. Have faith in what friends say	2.95	2.73	3.00	3.00	2.83	2.75	2.90
8. Important things come from working closely with others	3.11	3.18	3.44	3.29	2.94	2.88	3.12
11. Will do right when guided by close relationships	2.63	2.45	2.78	2.71	2.56	2.25	2.59
14. Actions guided by discussion with others	2.76	2.73	2.78	2.79	2.72	2.75	2.76
17. World would be better if others & I had clearer stands	2.92	3.40	3.22	3.00	3.00	2.88	3.02
20. Feelings & emotions should be shared with others	3.34	3.45	3.44	3.43	3.50	2.88	3.37
23. Growth & progress comes from learning & sharing with others	4.00	3.73	4.00	3.79	3.89	4.25	3.94

In response to Statement 14--preferring that actions be guided by discussions with others close to the individual--the mean value of male responses, 2.76, was only slightly higher than that of females, 2.73 ($R=.03$). Mean responses among age groups ranged from a high of 2.79 for ages 30-34 to a low of 2.72 for ages 35-39 ($R=.07$), with an overall mean of 2.76.

The mean value of responses to Statement 17--believing the world would be a better place if the individual and colleagues had clearer stands--was higher for females, 3.40, than for males, 2.92 ($R=.48$). Ages 24-29 again expressed the highest mean value at 3.22, ranging to a low among ages 40-51 of 2.88 ($R=.34$). The overall mean response was 3.02.

Statement 20 expressed the belief that feelings and emotions should be shared with others close to the individual, and a mean value of female responses of 3.45 was higher than that of male responses of 3.34 ($R=.11$). Mean responses among age groups ranged from a high of 3.50 for ages 35-39 to a low of 2.88 for ages 40-51 ($R=.62$), with an overall mean of 3.37.

Responding to Statement 23, expressing a belief that personal growth and progress comes from learning and sharing with others, the mean value response of males, 4.00, was higher than females, 3.73 ($R=.27$). The highest mean value response was from ages 40-51, 4.25, and ranged to a low for ages 30-34 of 3.79 ($R=.46$), with an overall mean of 3.94.

The range was greatest between male and female mean

responses to Statement 17 ($R=.48$). The greatest variation of mean responses among age groups was to Statement 20 ($R=.62$). The least variable mean response between males and females was to Statement 14 ($R=.03$). The lowest range of mean responses among age groups was also to Statement 14 ($R=.07$).

Overall, the mean value of responses from males was higher on five of the eight statements, and the mean value of female responses was higher on three of the eight statements. On five of the eight statements, the highest mean value was among ages 24-29; twice it was highest among ages 30-34; once among ages 35-39; and once it was highest among ages 40-51. On six of the eight statements, the lowest mean value was among ages 40-51; on one of the eight, it was lowest among ages 35-39; once it was lowest among ages 30-34.

The strongest overall response among sociocentric statements (3.94) was to Statement 23. This was the highest mean value response for all groups--males (4.00); females (3.73); and age groups 24-29 (4.00), 30-34 (3.79), 35-39 (3.89), and 40-51 (4.25).

The lowest overall response among sociocentric statements (2.59) was tied between Statement 2 and Statement 11. These statements tied as the lowest mean value responses for males (2.63), females (2.45), and ages 30-34 (2.71). Statement 2 was the lowest mean response for ages 35-39 (2.44), and Statement 11 was the lowest mean response for ages 40-51 (2.25). Statement 11 tied with Statement 14

for the lowest mean responses for ages 24-29 (2.78).

Formalistic Statement Responses

The remaining eight statements on the 24-item LSOI were considered characteristic of the formalistic life-style orientation. This orientation is characterized as a life-style placing "heavy reliance on higher authority for guidance in life" . . . tending "to look upward and outward for guidance, direction, success criteria, and rewards" (Friedlander, 1975, p. 334). Higher authority is represented by law and order, precedent, and people in positions of higher responsibility. The eight statements characteristic of this orientation were:

3. I believe that my life will be most satisfying to me if there are some clear pathways for advancing and being rewarded.
6. I place a great deal of faith in law and order.
9. What is important is that I have a secure job and a comfortable house.
12. I will do what is right when I am guided by the precedents and policies that have been established over the years.
15. I find myself striving for greater advancement and prestige.
18. I believe the world would be a better place if more people respected and abided by the law.
21. For my actions I am responsible to those in positions of higher responsibility.
24. I can grow and progress best in this world by finding out the way things ought to be done.

Respondents rated the extent to which each statement represented their attitude, ranging from "not at all" (rating 1) to "completely" (rating 5).

The mean value for responses to each statement was calculated for males, females, and members of age groups 24-29, 30-34, 35-39, and 40-51, as well as the overall mean value. The results are shown in Table IV.

In response to Statement 3, wanting clear pathways for advancing and being rewarded, the mean value response of females, 4.00, was slightly higher than males, 3.97 ($R=.03$). Mean responses among age groups ranged from a high of 4.22 for ages 24-29 to a low of 3.83 for ages 35-39 ($R=.39$), with an overall mean of 3.98.

Responses to Statement 6, expressing a great deal of faith in law and order, showed a higher mean value for males of 3.49 compared to the females' mean value of 3.09 ($R=.40$). Mean responses among age groups ranged from a high of 3.67 for ages 24-29 to a low of 3.18 for ages 35-39 ($R=.49$). The overall mean response was 3.40.

Statement 9 expressed the importance of having a secure job and comfortable house, and the mean value of responses from females, 3.18, was higher than that of males, 2.95 ($R=.23$). The highest mean value response was from ages 35-39, 3.17, and ranged to a low for ages 24-29 of 2.78 ($R=.39$), with an overall mean response of 3.00.

Responding to Statement 12, expressing a belief that the individual will do what is right when guided by

TABLE IV
MEAN VALUES FOR FORMALISTIC ORIENTATION
STATEMENTS BY SEX AND AGE GROUP

Statement Number	SEX		24-29 N=9 \bar{X}	30-34 N=14 \bar{X}	AGE GROUP		Overall N=49 \bar{X}
	Male	Female			35-39	40-51	
	N=38 \bar{X}	N=11 \bar{X}			N=18 \bar{X}	N=8 \bar{X}	
3. Want clear pathways for advancing & being rewarded	3.97	4.00	4.22	4.00	3.83	4.00	3.98
6. Great faith in law & order	3.49	3.09	3.67	3.29	3.18	3.63	3.40
9. Important that I have a secure job & comfortable house	2.95	3.18	2.78	3.00	3.17	2.88	3.00
12. Will do right when guided by policies & procedures	2.82	2.73	2.78	2.93	2.72	2.75	2.80
15. Striving for greater advancement & prestige	3.87	4.09	4.11	3.79	3.94	3.88	3.92
18. World would be better if more people respected & abided law	3.66	3.82	3.89	3.86	3.39	3.88	3.69
21. Responsible to those in positions of higher responsibility for actions	3.21	3.45	3.56	3.14	3.44	2.75	3.27
24. Growth & progress comes from finding out way things ought to be done	3.47	3.09	3.78	3.21	3.22	3.63	3.39

established policies and precedents, the mean response of males of 2.82 was slightly higher than that of females, 2.73 ($R=.09$). Responses among age groups ranged from a high mean of 2.93 for ages 30-34 to a low of 2.72 for ages 35-39 ($R=.21$), with the overall mean 2.80.

In response to Statement 15--finding oneself striving for greater advancement and prestige--the mean value of female responses, 4.09, was higher than that of males, 3.87 ($R=.22$). Mean responses among age groups ranged from a high of 4.11 for ages 24-29 to a low of 3.79 for ages 30-34 ($R=.32$), with an overall mean of 3.92.

The mean value of responses to Statement 18--believing the world would be a better place if more people respected and abided by the law--was higher for females, 3.82, than for males, 3.66 ($R=.16$). Ages 24-29 again expressed the highest mean value, 3.89, ranging to a low among ages 35-39 of 3.39 ($R=.50$). The overall mean response was 3.69.

Statement 21 concerned responsibility to those in positions of higher responsibility for actions, and the mean value of female responses of 3.45 was higher than the mean value of male responses of 3.21 ($R=.24$). Mean responses among age groups ranged from a high of 3.56 for ages 24-29 to a low of 2.75 for ages 40-51 ($R=.81$), with an overall mean of 3.27.

Responding to Statement 24, expressing a belief that personal growth and progress comes from finding out the way things ought to be done, the mean response of males, 3.47,

was higher than females, 3.09 ($R=.38$). The highest mean value response was again from ages 24-29, 3.78, and ranged to a low for ages 30-34 of 3.21 ($R=.57$), with an overall mean of 3.39.

The range between male and female scores was greatest for mean responses to Statement 6 ($R=.40$). The greatest variation of mean responses among age groups was to Statement 21 ($R=.81$). The least variable mean response between males and females was to Statement 3 ($R=.03$), and the lowest range of mean responses among age groups was to Statement 12 ($R=.21$).

Overall, the mean value of responses from females was higher on five of the eight statements, and the mean value of male responses was higher on three of the eight statements. On six of the eight statements, the highest mean value was among ages 24-29; once it was highest among ages 30-34; and on one of the eight statements it was highest among ages 35-39. On four of the eight statements, the lowest mean value was among ages 35-39; on two of the eight, it was lowest among ages 30-34; once among ages 24-29; and once it was lowest among ages 40-51.

The strongest overall response among formalistic statements (3.98) was to Statement 3; this was the highest mean value response for males (3.97) and for age groups 24-29 (4.22), 30-34 (4.00), and 40-51 (4.00). The highest mean value response for females (4.09) and ages 35-39 (3.94) was to Statement 15.

The lowest overall response among formalistic statements (2.80) was to Statement 12, with the lowest mean value response for males (2.82); females (2.73); and age groups 30-34 (2.93) and 35-39 (2.72). Statement 12 tied with Statement 21 for the lowest mean responses for ages 40-51 (2.75). Statement 12 tied with Statement 9 for the lowest mean value responses for ages 24-29 (2.78).

Overall Mean Values of Statement Responses

The mean values for responses to each statement on the LSOI were calculated as well as the mean value of respondents' total orientation scores. The results for each orientation group--personalistic, sociocentric, and formalistic--are shown in Table V.

Mean responses to personalistic orientation statements ranged from a high of 3.94 to a low of 2.78 ($R=1.16$). The mean value of personalistic orientation totals was 27.94. The mean value of responses to sociocentric orientation statements ranged from a high of 3.94 to a low of 2.59 ($R=1.35$), with the mean value of sociocentric orientation totals 24.22. Formalistic orientation statements brought mean value responses ranging from a high of 3.98 to a low of 2.80 ($R=1.18$). The mean value of formalistic orientation totals was 27.37. Responses to statements characterized as sociocentric were more variable than responses to those statements characterized as personalistic and formalistic.

TABLE V
MEAN VALUES FOR RESPONSES TO
STATEMENTS OF LIFE-STYLE
ORIENTATION GROUPS

Personalistic Orientation N=49		Sociocentric Orientation N=49		Formalistic Orientation N=49	
Statement Number	Mean Value	Statement Number	Mean Value	Statement Number	Mean Value
1	3.94	2	2.59	3	3.98
4	3.82	5	2.90	6	3.40
7	3.10	8	3.12	9	3.00
10	3.37	11	2.59	12	2.80
13	3.86	14	2.76	15	3.92
16	3.69	17	3.02	18	3.69
19	3.39	20	3.37	21	3.27
22	2.78	23	3.94	24	3.39
$\bar{X}=27.94$		$\bar{X}=24.22$		$\bar{X}=27.37$	

The mean value of orientation totals was highest for the personalistic orientation, 27.94, and lowest for the sociocentric orientation, 24.22 ($R=3.72$).

The strongest mean value response overall, 3.98, was to Statement 3, a formalistic statement reflecting a desire for clear pathways for advancing and being rewarded. Statement 1, a personalistic statement concerning freedom to make one's own decisions, and Statement 23, a sociocentric statement expressing a belief that personal growth and progress comes from learning and sharing with others, both brought mean value responses of 3.94. The next strongest responses were to Statement 13, a personalistic statement preferring that actions be guided by one's own knowledge, with a mean value of 3.86, and Statement 4, a personalistic statement concerning freedom to choose one's own way to live, with a mean value of 3.82.

The lowest mean value responses overall, 2.59, were to Statement 2, a sociocentric statement desiring help from friends or colleagues in making decisions about life and actions, and to Statement 11, a sociocentric statement expressing a belief that the individual will do what is right when guided by close relationships with others. Statement 14, a sociocentric statement indicating a preference that actions be guided by discussions with others close to the individual, brought a mean value response of 2.76. The next lowest responses were to Statement 22, a personalistic statement concerning responsibility to oneself

for actions, with a mean value of 2.78, and Statement 12, a formalistic statement expressing a belief that the individual will do what is right when guided by established policies and precedents, with a mean value of 2.80.

Life-Style Orientation Scores

The respondents' total scores in each orientation group--personalistic, sociocentric, and formalistic--were calculated and individually ranked for males and females. The Friedman two-way analysis of variance--an ordinal, non-parametric statistical test--was calculated for the orientation score rankings of males and of females. The results are displayed in Table VI.

For males, total scores in the personalistic orientation ranged from a high of 36 to a low of 11 ($R=25$). Female scores ranged from a high of 37 to a low of 20 ($R=17$). Male scores in the personalistic orientation ranked first 16 times and tied for first one time; ranked second 11 times and tied for second two times; and ranked third eight times. Female scores in the personalistic orientation ranked first 10 times and second one time.

Total scores in the sociocentric orientation for males ranged from a high of 33 to a low of 16 ($R=17$). Female total scores ranged from a high of 29 to a low of 16 ($R=13$). Scores in the sociocentric orientation ranked first five times and tied for first one time; ranked second seven times and tied for second one time; and ranked third 24 times for

TABLE VI

LIFE-STYLE ORIENTATION SCORES AND
FRIEDMAN TWO WAY ANALYSIS OF
VARIANCE TEST FOR
MALE AND FEMALE
RESPONDENTS

Respondent	Personalistic Orientation		Sociocentric Orientation		Formalistic Orientation	
	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank
Male:						
1	11	3	32	1	26	2
2	30	3	31	2	35	1
3	26	1	21	3	22	2
4	23	3	33	1	30	2
5	29	2.5	29	2.5	35	1
6	30	2	26	3	32	1
7	30	2	21	3	32	1
8	29	1	20	3	23	2
9	28	1	17	3	24	2
10	27	3	29	1.5	29	1.5
11	27	2	24	3	28	1
12	24	2.5	28	1	24	2.5
13	36	1	26	2	23	3
14	21	3	25	1	24	2
15	25	2	23	3	30	1
16	25	2	24	3	30	1
17	28	1	22	3	25	2
18	31	1	16	3	19	2
19	30	2	29	3	32	1
20	25	1	24	2	21	3
21	30	1.5	22	3	30	1.5
22	30	1	26	2	25	3
23	25	2	19	3	28	1
24	17	3	26	2	32	1
25	34	1	23	3	28	2
26	24	2	22	3	27	1
27	26	2	32	1	25	3
28	28	1	20	3	21	2
29	30	1	27	3	28	2
30	27	2	24	3	30	1
31	35	1	27	3	28	2
32	30	1	19	3	20	2
33	27	3	29	2	36	1
34	30	1	20	3	25	2
35	30	1	19	3	24	2
36	32	1	18	3	26	2
37	24	2	21	3	26	1
38	28	3	31	2	35	1
$R^2=14.45^*$	$R_1=68.50$		$R_2=95$		$R_3=64.50$	

TABLE VI (Continued)

Respondent	Personalistic Orientation		Sociocentric Orientation		Formalistic Orientation	
	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank
Female:						
1	30	1	22	3	27	2
2	31	1	23	3	28	2
3	27	1	20	3	25	2
4	30	1	28	2.5	28	2.5
5	32	1	24	3	31	2
6	33	1	25	3	30	2
7	26	1	25	2	24	3
8	37	1	27	3	33	2
9	31	1	29	2	27	3
10	30	1	23	2.5	23	2.5
11	20	2	16	3	26	1
$\chi^2=15.27^*$	$R_1=12$		$R_2=30$		$R_3=24$	

df=2

Critical Value=13.815

*Significant at .001 level

males. Female sociocentric scores ranked second two times, tied for second two times, and ranked third seven times.

Male scores in the formalistic orientation ranged from a high of 36 to a low of 19 ($R=17$). Female scores ranged from a high of 33 to a low of 23 ($R=10$). Male formalistic scores ranked first 15 times and tied for first two times; ranked second 16 times and tied for second one time; and ranked third four times. Female formalistic scores ranked first one time; ranked second six times and tied for second two times; and ranked third two times.

Scores for males on the personalistic orientation were the most variable and female formalistic scores were the least variable. Male scores in the personalistic and formalistic orientations ranked first most frequently and an equal number of times. Female scores ranked first in the personalistic orientation almost unanimously. Male and female scores both ranked third in the sociocentric orientation most frequently.

A null hypothesis that there would be no significant difference in the rankings of life-style orientation scores of males or of females was tested using the Friedman two-way analysis of variance. The result of the test on male rankings rejected the null hypothesis, as did the result of the test on female rankings. The difference in male life-style orientation score rankings was significant at the .001 level. The difference in female life-style orientation score rankings was also significant at the .001 level. An

examination of the data revealed that the sum of ranks for the male sociocentric orientation scores was much higher than the sum of ranks for the personalistic or formalistic orientation scores. The sum of ranks for the female personalistic orientation scores was much lower than the sum of ranks for the sociocentric or formalistic scores.

The respondents' total scores in each of the three orientation groups were calculated and individually ranked for members of age groups 24-29, 30-34, 35-39, and 40-51. The Friedman two-way analysis of variance test was calculated for the orientation score rankings of each age group. Results are displayed in Table VII.

Total scores in the personalistic orientation for ages 24-29 ranged from a high of 30 to a low of 11 ($R=19$). Total personalistic scores ranged from a high of 36 to a low of 21 for ages 30-34 ($R=15$); from a high of 37 to a low of 17 for ages 35-39 ($R=20$); and from a high of 35 to a low of 24 for ages 40-51 ($R=11$). For ages 24-29, the personalistic score ranked first three times; ranked second two times and tied for second one time; and ranked third three times. Personalistic scores for members of age group 30-34 ranked first eight times; ranked second three times and tied for second one time; and ranked third two times. Among ages 35-39, the personalistic score ranked first 10 times; tied for first one time; ranked second six times and third one time. For ages 40-51, the personalistic score ranked first five times, second one time, and third two times.

TABLE VII
LIFE-STYLE ORIENTATION SCORES AND
FRIEDMAN TWO WAY ANALYSIS OF
VARIANCE TEST FOR MEMBERS
OF AGE GROUPS

	Personalistic Orientation		Sociocentric Orientation		Formalistic Orientation	
Respondent	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank
Ages 24-29:						
1	11	3	32	1	26	2
2	30	3	31	2	35	1
3	26	1	21	3	22	2
4	23	3	33	1	30	2
5	29	2.5	29	2.5	35	1
6	30	2	26	3	32	1
7	30	2	21	3	32	1
8	29	1	20	3	23	2
9	28	1	17	3	24	2
$Xr^2=3.17$	$R_1=18.5$		$R_2=21.5$		$R_3=14$	
Ages 30-34:						
1	27	3	29	1.5	29	1.5
2	27	2	24	3	28	1
3	24	2.5	28	1	24	2.5
4	36	1	26	2	23	3
5	21	3	25	1	24	2
6	24	2	23	3	30	1
7	25	2	24	3	30	1
8	30	1	22	3	27	2
9	31	1	23	3	28	2
10	27	1	20	3	25	2
11	30	1	28	2.5	28	2.5
12	32	1	24	3	31	2
13	33	1	25	3	30	2
14	26	1	25	2	24	3
$Xr^2=4.75$	$R_1=22.5$		$R_2=34$		$R_3=27.5$	
Ages 35-39:						
1	28	1	22	3	25	2
2	31	1	16	3	19	2
3	30	2	29	3	32	1
4	25	1	24	2	21	3
5	30	1.5	22	3	30	1.5
6	30	1	26	2	25	3
7	25	2	19	3	28	1
8	17	3	26	2	32	1
9	34	1	23	3	28	2

TABLE VII (Continued)

Respondent	Personalistic Orientation		Sociocentric Orientation		Formalistic Orientation	
	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank
10	24	2	22	3	27	1
11	26	2	32	1	25	3
12	28	1	20	3	21	2
13	30	1	27	3	28	2
14	27	2	24	3	31	1
15	37	1	27	3	33	2
16	31	1	29	2	27	3
17	30	1	23	2.5	23	2.5
18	20	2	16	3	26	1
$X_r^2=12.58^*$						
		$R_1=26.5$	$R_2=47.5$		$R_3=34$	
Ages 40-51						
1	35	1	27	3	28	2
2	30	1	19	3	20	2
3	27	3	29	2	36	1
4	30	1	20	3	25	2
5	30	1	19	3	24	2
6	32	1	18	3	26	2
7	24	2	21	3	26	1
8	28	3	31	2	35	1
$X_r^2=6.75^*$						
		$R_1=13$	$R_2=22$		$R_3=13$	

df=2

Critical Value=5.991

*Significant at .05

Total scores in the sociocentric orientation ranged from a high of 33 to a low of 17 for ages 24-29 ($R=16$); from a high of 29 to a low of 20 for ages 30-34 ($R=9$); from a high of 32 to a low of 16 for ages 35-39 ($R=16$); and from a high of 31 to a low of 18 for ages 40-51 ($R=13$). Among ages 24-29, the sociocentric score ranked first two times; second one time, tied for second one time; and ranked third five times. Sociocentric scores for ages 30-34 ranked first two times and tied for first one time; ranked second two times and tied for second one time; and ranked third eight times. Among ages 35-39, the sociocentric score ranked first one time; second four times; tied for second one time; and ranked third 12 times. For ages 40-51, the sociocentric score ranked second two times and ranked third six times.

Formalistic orientation scores ranged from a high of 35 to a low of 22 for ages 24-29 ($R=13$); from a high of 31 to a low of 23 for ages 30-34 ($R=8$); from a high of 33 to a low of 19 for ages 35-39 ($R=14$); and from a high of 36 to a low of 20 for ages 40-51 ($R=16$). Among ages 24-29, the formalistic score ranked first four times and second five times. Formalistic scores for ages 30-34 ranked first three times; tied for first one time; ranked second six times and tied for second two times; and ranked third two times. Among ages 35-39, the formalistic score ranked first six times; tied for first one time; ranked second six times and tied for second one time; and ranked third four times. For ages 40-51, the formalistic score ranked first three times

and second five times.

Scores for ages 35-39 on the personalistic orientation were most variable and formalistic scores for ages 30-34 were least variable. Formalistic orientation scores ranked first most frequently for ages 24-29, and personalistic orientation scores ranked first most frequently for ages 30-34, 35-39, and 40-51. All age groups' scores ranked third in the sociocentric orientation most frequently.

A null hypothesis that there would be no significant difference in the rankings of life-style orientation scores for members of the four age groups was tested using the Friedman two-way analysis of variance. The result of the test on members of the age groups 24-29 and 30-34 failed to reject the null hypothesis. The result of the test on members of the age group 35-39 rejected the null hypothesis, as did the result of the test on the age group 40-51. The differences in life-style orientation score rankings for age groups 35-39 and 40-51 were both significant at the .05 level. An examination of the data showed that the sum of ranks for both age groups was significantly higher for the sociocentric orientation than for the personalistic or formalistic orientation scores.

The mean values for the three life-style orientation scores were calculated for males, females, and members of age groups 24-29, 30-34, 35-39, and 40-51. The results appear in Table VIII.

The mean value of personalistic orientation scores

TABLE VIII

MEAN VALUES FOR LIFE-STYLE ORIENTATION
SCORES BY SEX AND AGE GROUPS

Group	N	Personalistic Orientation	Sociocentric Orientation	Formalistic Orientation
Males	38	27.42	24.34	27.34
Females	11	29.73	23.82	27.45
Ages				
24-29	9	26.22	25.56	28.78
30-34	14	28.14	24.71	27.21
35-39	18	27.94	23.72	26.72
40-51	8	29.50	23.00	27.50
Overall	49	27.94	24.22	27.37

was higher for females, 29.73, than for males, 27.42 ($R=2.31$). Mean sociocentric scores were higher for males, 24.34, than for females, 23.82 ($R=.52$). The formalistic score mean value of 27.45 for females was slightly higher than that for males of 27.34 ($R=.11$). The greatest range between males and females was in personalistic score means; the lowest range was in formalistic score mean values.

The mean value of male orientation scores ranged from a high on the personalistic orientation of 27.42 to a low on the sociocentric orientation of 24.34 ($R=3.08$). Female orientation scores ranged from a high mean value on the personalistic orientation of 29.73 to a low on the sociocentric orientation of 23.82 ($R=5.91$). There was greater variation among female scores than among male scores. Both males' and females' highest overall mean scores were highest on the personalistic orientation and lowest on the sociocentric orientation.

Among age groups, the mean value of personalistic orientation scores was highest among ages 40-51, 29.50, and lowest among ages 24-29, 26.22 ($R=3.28$). Ages 24-29 had the highest mean value sociocentric orientation score, 25.56, and ages 40-51 the lowest, 23.00 ($R=2.56$). The formalistic orientation scores' mean value was highest among ages 24-29, 28.78, and lowest among ages 35-39, 26.72 ($R=2.06$). The greatest range between age groups was in personalistic score means; the lowest range was in formalistic score means.

The mean value of scores for ages 24-29 ranged from a high on the formalistic orientation of 28.78 to a low on the sociocentric orientation of 25.56 ($R=3.22$). The mean value of personalistic scores was highest and sociocentric scores lowest for the other age groups: 28.14 ranging to 24.71 for ages 30-34 ($R=3.43$); 27.94 ranging to 23.72 for ages 35-39 ($R=4.22$); and a high personalistic mean of 29.50 ranging to a low sociocentric mean of 23.00 for ages 40-51 ($R=6.50$). The greatest variation was among orientation scores for ages 40-51, decreasing in ages 35-39 and 30-34 to the least variation in scores among ages 24-29.

Overall, the mean value of personalistic orientation scores, 27.94, was highest, ranging to a low mean sociocentric orientation score of 24.22 ($R=3.72$). The personalistic orientation ranked first; the formalistic orientation ranked second; and the sociocentric orientation ranked third.

Summary

This chapter has presented the findings of the study, including: (1) response rate; (2) demographic characteristics; (3) personalistic statement responses; (4) sociocentric statement responses; (5) formalistic statement responses; (6) overall mean values of statement responses; and (7) life-style orientation scores. Chapter V will present a summary of the study and conclusions made from the findings, as well as recommendations for further study and practice.

The Life-Style Orientation Inventory was distributed to 61 participants in Leadership Tulsa, with a return of 49 completed questionnaires, or 80 percent. Of the 49 respondents, 38 were male (78%); 11 were female (22%); and they ranged in age from 24-51, with the greatest distribution of respondents ages 35-39. The majority classified their occupational group as business, with 11 other occupational groups represented.

Overall, mean responses to sociocentric statements were more variable than responses to personalistic and formalistic statements. Females responded more strongly than males to all the personalistic statements. Males responded more strongly on the majority of sociocentric statements, and females responded more strongly on the majority of formalistic statements. Members of the age group 40-51 responded more strongly on the majority of personalistic statements, with ages 24-29 displaying the lowest mean value responses on the majority of those statements. Ages 24-29 responded most strongly to a majority of the sociocentric statements; ages 40-51 had the lowest responses on a majority of sociocentric statements. Ages 24-29 also responded most strongly to a majority of the formalistic statements, with ages 35-39 displaying the lowest mean value responses on half of those statements.

The strongest mean value response overall was to Formalistic Statement 3. The strongest male response was to Sociocentric Statement 23. The strongest female responses

were to Personalistic Statement 4 and to Formalistic Statement 15. The strongest response for ages 24-29 was to Formalistic Statement 3; for ages 30-34, it was tied between Formalistic Statement 3 and Personalistic Statement 1. Ages 35-39 registered the strongest responses to three statements: Personalistic Statement 1, Personalistic Statement 13, and Formalistic Statement 15. The strongest response for ages 40-51 was to Personalistic Statement 4.

The lowest overall mean value responses were to Sociocentric Statements 2 and 11. The lowest mean value response for males was to Personalistic Statement 22. Female responses were lowest to Sociocentric Statements 2 and 11. Ages 24-29 lowest mean value response was to Personalistic Statement 22; ages 30-34 lowest responses were to Sociocentric Statements 2 and 11. Ages 35-39 lowest response was to Sociocentric Statement 2; for ages 40-51, the lowest mean value response was to Sociocentric Statement 11.

Male life-style orientation scores ranked first most frequently and an equal number of times in the personalistic and formalistic orientations. Female scores ranked first in the personalistic orientation almost unanimously. Both males and females ranked third in the sociocentric orientation most frequently. The Friedman two-way analysis of variance test showed that differences in life-style orientation score rankings for males and for females were both significant at the .001 level.

Formalistic orientation scores ranked first most

frequently for ages 24-29; personalistic orientation scores ranked first most frequently for ages 30-34, 35-39, and 40-51. All age groups ranked third in the sociocentric orientation most frequently. The Friedman two-way analysis of variance test showed that differences in life-style orientation score rankings for age groups 35-39 and 40-51 were both significant at the .05 level.

The mean value of orientation scores was highest for the personalistic orientation and lowest for the sociocentric orientation. The mean value of scores was higher for females than males in the personalistic and formalistic orientations and higher for males in the sociocentric orientation. Both males' and females' overall mean scores were highest on the personalistic orientation and lowest on the sociocentric orientation, with females exhibiting a greater range. The mean value of scores was higher for ages 40-51 than other age groups in the personalistic orientation and higher for ages 24-29 in the sociocentric and formalistic orientations. The highest overall mean score for ages 24-29 was in the formalistic orientation; ages 30-34, 35-39, and 40-51 highest mean value scores were in the personalistic orientation. All age groups lowest mean scores were in the sociocentric orientation. Ranges between high and low scores increased with each age group to a high for ages 40-51. Overall, the personalistic orientation ranked first most frequently, the formalistic orientation ranked second most frequently, and the sociocentric orientation ranked third most frequently.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter concludes the study by offering a summary of the purpose of the study and its findings. The researcher's conclusions are presented, as well as recommendations for further research and for practice.

Summary

This study was prompted by a growing awareness of the effects of rapid change in the society on people's lives and life-styles and possible implications for the subject of leadership. Previous studies have surveyed life-style orientations of non-specific groups. The problem giving rise to this study was a lack of information available on the life-style orientations of emerging leaders. The purpose of the study was to describe perceived life-style orientations among participants in an urban leadership program. Specific objectives were to determine if perceptions of personal life-style orientation varied by sex or age groups.

Current participants in Leadership Tulsa, an annual urban leadership program, were surveyed for the study. Forty-nine (80%) responded by completing the Life-Style

Orientation Inventory, a 24-item questionnaire with a 5-point relevance scale for each statement. Scores were computed on each of three life-style orientations--personalistic, sociocentric, and formalistic--representing sets of values, preferences, and beliefs. Responses were reviewed and analyzed using arithmetic means. The Friedman two-way analysis of variance test was calculated on orientation score rankings for males, females, and age groups 24-29, 30-34, 35-39, and 40-51.

Overall, the mean value of life-style orientation scores was highest in the personalistic orientation, followed closely by the formalistic orientation, and was lowest in the sociocentric orientation. The mean value of scores for males, females, and age groups 30-34, 35-39, and 40-51 was highest in the personalistic orientation; the mean value for ages 24-29 was highest in the formalistic orientation. All groups scored lowest in the sociocentric orientation. Significant differences were found in the life-style orientation score rankings within the male and female groups and within age groups 35-39 and 40-51.

The strongest response to individual statements overall was to a formalistic statement indicating a desire for clear pathways for advancing and being rewarded. Strongest responses by sex and age groups varied. The lowest responses overall were to sociocentric statements concerning help from close others in making decisions and confidence that one will do right when guided by close relationships. Females

and ages 30-34, 35-39, and 40-51 had lowest responses to one or both of those sociocentric statements, and males and ages 24-29 had lowest responses to a personalistic statement regarding responsibility to self for actions.

Conclusions

The conclusions drawn from this study were the following:

1. Respondents in this study seemed to have clear sources of direction. Most tended to look to themselves and their own set of experiences and feelings for guidance and direction. They also looked toward higher authority such as law and order, precedent, and people in positions of higher responsibility for guidance in life. They were most hesitant to look toward close intimate relationships for guidance and direction.
2. Perceptions of life-style orientation did vary with the sex of respondents, but both females and males tended to look to themselves first, higher authority next, and be hesitant about looking to close intimate relationships for guidance and direction in their lives.
3. Perceptions of life-style orientation did vary with the age groups of respondents. Members of the youngest age group, 24-29, tended to look toward higher authority for direction while the older age

groups looked increasingly toward themselves and their own experiences and feelings for direction. All age groups were most hesitant to look toward close intimate relationships for guidance.

4. The ranking of life-style orientation scores among males and among females was significantly different than might be expected by chance, indicating a pattern in their response.
5. The ranking of life-style orientation scores within the age groups 35-39 and 40-51 was significantly different than might be expected by chance, but there was no significant difference in the ranking of life-style orientation scores within age groups 24-29 and 30-34.

Recommendations

Further Study

Recommendations for further study based on results of this study are:

1. Descriptive studies of other groups, specific and non-specific, should be conducted to determine if other populations follow similar patterns in life-style orientation.
2. A comparison study of groups in different organizational environments (e.g. profit versus nonprofit organizations) would be of interest.

3. A study should be conducted relating the life-style orientation of respondents to their attitudes toward leadership.
4. Studies concerning the interactive aspects of leader and follower life-style orientations and their effects on groups should be conducted.
5. A study should be conducted of the implications for organizational structures of emerging personal-istic leaders.

Practice

Recommendations for practice based on the results of this study are:

1. A summary of this study should be prepared for distribution to Leadership Tulsa through their newsletter.
2. Leadership programs should be made aware of the results of this study for their consideration in structuring programs.
3. The information collected in this study should be used to design a presentation for groups interested in the topic of leadership and/or attitudes of emerging leaders.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, John D. Understanding and Managing Stress: A Workbook in Changing Life Styles. San Diego, California: University Associates, Inc., 1980.
- Argyris, Chris. Increasing Leadership Effectiveness. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1976.
- Bass, Bernard M. Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership. New York: The Free Press, 1981.
- Bennis, Warren. The Unconscious Conspiracy: Why Leaders Can't Lead. New York: AMACOM, 1976.
- Blake, Robert R. and Jane Srygley Mouton. "How to Choose a Leadership Style." Training and Development Journal, February, 1982, pp. 39-47.
- Blake, Robert R. and Jane S. Mouton. The New Managerial Grid. Houston, Texas: Gulf Publishing Company, 1978.
- Burns, James MacGregor. Leadership. New York: Harper and Row, 1978.
- Burns, James MacGregor. "What Makes You a Leader?" Leadership, May, 1979, pp. 31-35.
- DiMarco, Nicholas. "Life Style, Learning Structure, Congruence and Student Attitudes." American Educational Research Journal, 11, 2, Spring, 1974, pp. 203-209.
- DiMarco, Nicholas. "Supervisor-Subordinate Life Style and Interpersonal Need Compatibilities as Determinants of Subordinate's Attitude Toward the Supervisor." Academy of Management Journal, 17, 3, 1974, pp. 575-578.
- DiMarco, Nicholas. "Life Style, Work Group Structure, Compatibility, and Job Satisfaction." Academy of Management Journal, 18, 2, 1975, pp. 313-322.
- DiMarco, Nicholas and Steven Norton. "Life Style, Organization Structure, Congruity and Job Satisfaction." Personnel Psychology, 27, 1974, pp. 581-591.

- DiMarco, Nicholas and Karen Pearlmutter. "Impact of Class Environment on Machiavellianism and Leadership, Interpersonal Need, and Life-Style Orientations of Dental Students." Journal of Dental Education, 40, 6, 1976, pp. 340-344.
- Fiedler, Fred E. and Martin M. Chemers. Leadership and Effective Management. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1974.
- Fleishman, Edwin A. and David R. Peters. "Interpersonal Values, Leadership Attitudes, and Managerial 'Success'." Personnel Psychology, 15, 2, Summer, 1962, pp. 127-143.
- Friedlander, Frank. "Life-Style Orientation Questionnaire" (questionnaire developed by Friedlander, currently of Redwood City, California), 1972.
- Friedlander, Frank. "Emergent and Contemporary Life Styles: An Inter-Generational Issue." Human Relations, 28, 4, 1975, pp. 329-347.
- Friedlander, Frank and P. Toni Green. "Life Styles and Conflict-Coping Structures." Group and Organization Studies, 2, 1, March, 1977, pp. 101-112.
- Friedlander, Frank and Newton Margulies. "Multiple Impacts of Organizational Climate and Individual Value Systems Upon Job Satisfaction." Personnel Psychology, 22, 1969, pp. 171-183.
- Gordon, Thomas. Leader Effectiveness Training: L.E.T. Wyden Books, 1977.
- Gouldner, Alvin W., Ed. Studies in Leadership. New York: Russell and Russell, Inc., 1965.
- Hersey, Paul and Kenneth H. Blanchard. "So You Want to Know Your Leadership Style?" Training and Development Journal, June, 1981, pp. 34+.
- Herzberg, Frederick. "Leadership in a Period of Psychological Depression." Industry Week, September, 1980, pp. 55+.
- Hollander, Edwin P. Leadership Dynamics. New York: The Free Press, 1978.
- Leadership Tulsa. Leadership Tulsa, Tulsa, Oklahoma, n.d.
- Leadership Tulsa. Leadership Tulsa VIII, Tulsa, Oklahoma, 1982.

- Likert, Rensis. New Patterns of Management. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.
- Lionberger, Marcia. "Leadership Tulsa: Training Volunteers for the Future." Tulsa Home and Garden, March, 1981, pp. 44-45.
- Maccoby, Michael. The Gamesman. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1976.
- Maccoby, Michael. The Leader. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1981.
- McCormack, Patricia. "'Me First' Changing to 'We' Generation," Tulsa World, February 26, 1981, n.p.
- McMaster, Irvin. "A New Look at Leadership." Supervision, July, 1981, pp. 10-11.
- Nisbet, Robert A. "Leadership and Social Crisis." Studies in Leadership. Ed. Alvin W. Gouldner. New York: Russell and Russell, Inc., 1965.
- Peters, Thomas J. "Leadership: Sad Facts and Silver Linings." Harvard Business Review, November-December, 1979, pp. 164-172.
- Popham, W. James and Kenneth A. Sirotnik. Educational Statistics: Use and Interpretation. 2nd Ed. New York: Harper and Row, 1973.
- Tannenbaum, Robert and Warren H. Schmidt. "How to Choose a Leadership Pattern." Harvard Business Review, May-June, 1973, pp. 115-124.
- Toffler, Alvin. The Third Wave. New York: Bantam Books, 1980.
- Varney, Glenn H. An Organization Development Approach to Management Development. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1976.
- White, Ralph and Ronald Lippitt. "Leader Behavior and Member Reaction in Three 'Social Climates'." Group Dynamics. 3rd Ed. Eds. D. Cartwright and A. Zander. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.
- Yankelovich, Daniel. New Rules: Searching for Self-Fulfillment in a World Turned Upside Down. New York: Random House, 1981.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

FRIEDLANDER QUESTIONNAIRE

People obviously vary in their attitudes and preferences. The purpose of this questionnaire is to provide you with an opportunity to specify your preferences and attitudes. There are no right or wrong answers. Please indicate the extent to which each numbered statement reflects your own attitudes or preferences by placing the appropriate number in the blank to the right of the statement. Items are arranged in pairs to save space. But please consider each item separately from the other item in its pair.

TO WHAT EXTENT DOES THE STATEMENT REPRESENT YOUR OWN ATTITUDE?

- 5 - COMPLETELY
- 4 - TO A LARGE EXTENT
- 3 - TO A MODERATE EXTENT
- 2 - TO A SMALL EXTENT
- 1 - NOT AT ALL

In deciding how I want to live and act, I am most satisfied if:

- 1. I am completely free to make this decision by myself. _____
- 2. I have some close friends or colleagues who will help me reach this decision. _____

I believe that my life will be most satisfying to me if:

- 3. there are some clear pathways for advancing and being rewarded _____
- 4. I am completely free to choose how I want to live _____

I place a great deal of faith in:

- 5. what my close friends say _____
- 6. law and order _____

I can only get the really important things in life by:

- 7. doing what I want to do _____
- 8. working closely with friends and colleagues _____

What is important is that I:

- 9. have a secure job and a comfortable house _____
- 10. experiment and discover who and what I am _____

I will do what is right when I am guided by:

- 11. the close relationships I have made with others _____
- 12. the precedents and policies that have been established over the years _____

I prefer that my actions be guided by:

- 13. my own knowledge of what I want to do _____
- 14. discussion with others who are close to me _____

I find myself striving for greater:

- 15. advancement and prestige _____
- 16. freedom and independence _____

I believe the world would be a better place if:

- 17. my colleagues and I were clearer on where we stand _____
- 18. more people respected and abided by the law _____

C Frank Friedlander, 1972

Permission for use granted to any individual or organization for humanistic purposes - January 1975

-2-

I believe that my feelings and emotions:

19. should be experienced by me to the fullest _____
20. should be shared with others close to me _____

I am responsible to _____ for my actions:

21. those in positions of higher responsibility _____
22. only myself _____

I can grow and progress best in this world by:

23. learning and sharing with others _____
24. finding out the way things ought to be done _____

Age _____

Sex _____

Highest Educational Level _____

Occupation _____

What is the population of the metropolitan area or city you now live in? _____

What is the population of the metropolitan area or city you were brought up in? _____

I had _____ sisters and brothers, of which I was born _____ (e.g., 1st, 2nd, etc.)

Religion: I was brought up as a _____; I am currently a _____

APPENDIX B

LIFE-STYLE ORIENTATION INVENTORY

LIFE STYLE ORIENTATION INVENTORY*

People obviously vary in their attitudes and preferences. The purpose of this questionnaire is to provide you with an opportunity to specify your preferences and attitudes. There are no right or wrong answers.

Please indicate the extent to which each numbered statement reflects your own attitude by placing the appropriate number in the blank to the right of the statement. Try to classify your attitudes as they presently exist (rather than as you feel they should be).

TO WHAT EXTENT DOES THE STATEMENT REPRESENT YOUR OWN ATTITUDE?

- 5 - Completely
- 4 - To a large extent
- 3 - To a moderate extent
- 2 - To a small extent
- 1 - Not at all

1. In deciding how I want to live and act, I am most satisfied if I am completely free to make this decision by myself _____
2. In deciding how I want to live and act, I am most satisfied if I have some close friends or colleagues who will help me reach this decision _____
3. I believe that my life will be most satisfying to me if there are some clear pathways for advancing and being rewarded _____
4. I believe that my life will be most satisfying to me if I am completely free to choose how I want to live _____
5. I place a great deal of faith in what my close friends say. _____
6. I place a great deal of faith in law and order _____
7. I can only get the really important things in life by doing what I want to do _____
8. I can only get the really important things in life by working closely with friends and colleagues _____
9. What is important is that I have a secure job and a comfortable house. _____
10. What is important is that I experiment and discover who and what I am. _____

*Adapted from a questionnaire by Frank Friedlander, 1972. Used with permission of the author.

11. I will do what is right when I am guided by the close relationships I have made with others.
12. I will do what is right when I am guided by the precedents and policies that have been established over the years
13. I prefer that my actions be guided by my own knowledge of what I want to do
14. I prefer that my actions be guided by discussion with others who are close to me.
15. I find myself striving for greater advancement and prestige
16. I find myself striving for greater freedom and independence
17. I believe the world would be a better place if my colleagues and I were clearer on where we stand.
18. I believe the world would be a better place if more people respected and abided by the law
19. I believe that my feelings and emotions should be experienced by me to the fullest
20. I believe that my feelings and emotions should be shared with others close to me
21. For my actions I am responsible to those in positions of higher responsibility
22. For my actions I am responsible only to myself
23. I can grow and progress best in this world by learning and sharing with others
24. I can grow and progress best in this world by finding out the way things ought to be done.

Age _____

Female _____ Male _____

Occupational Group:

_____ Social Service	_____ Science
_____ Sales	_____ Cultural
_____ Business	_____ Arts/Entertainment
_____ Technology	_____ Other (please specify)

Name (optional) _____

APPENDIX C

COVER LETTER

Susan J. Aldrich
Route 3, Box 13
Coweta, Oklahoma 74429

February 7, 1983

TO: PARTICIPANTS IN LEADERSHIP TULSA

Hello....

Would you donate a few minutes of your time for a study concerning leadership and life-style?

As a student at Oklahoma State University, I am completing a master's thesis on these topics. Leadership Tulsa has permitted me to ask you to complete the attached "Life Style Orientation Inventory" as part of this study.

I'll really appreciate your help with this. The inventory should take no more than 10 minutes to complete, and a summary of results of the study will be passed on to you in Leadership Tulsa's newsletter later this spring.

It will be a big help to me if you will include your name at the end of the inventory so I can follow up to insure an adequate return. Also, if you include your name, I will keep a summary of your profile on this inventory for your information later, if you wish. All responses and profiles will be seen only by me and will be held in strict confidence.

Please take a few minutes now to complete the inventory, enclose it in the stamped envelope provided, and drop it in the mail.

Thanks for your help!

Sincerely,

Sue Aldrich

Susan J. Aldrich

Attachment

APPENDIX D

FOLLOW-UP LETTER

Susan J. Aldrich
Route 3, Box 13
Coweta, Oklahoma 74429

March 2, 1983

To: LEADERSHIP TULSA PARTICIPANTS

Hello again....

Remember the Life Style Orientation Inventory I asked you to help me with through Leadership Tulsa?

I'm happy to report I've received a fair number of responses to the survey. If you completed the inventory, thank you!

To increase the significance of the study, I need to receive additional responses. If you haven't completed the inventory yet, please take a few minutes now to consider the copy enclosed. You may return it directly to me in the addressed envelope provided earlier.... or give it to Shirley Scott at the Leadership Tulsa meeting next week and I'll pick it up.

I appreciate your help.

Sincerely,



Susan J. Aldrich

Enclosure

2
VITA

Susan J. Bates Aldrich

Candidate for the Degree of
Master of Science

Thesis: PERCEIVED LIFE-STYLE ORIENTATIONS AMONG
PARTICIPANTS IN AN URBAN LEADERSHIP PROGRAM

Major Field: Occupational and Adult Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Kalamazoo, Michigan, May 22, 1949, the daughter of Charles and Genevieve Bates. Married, 1969, to Jontie Aldrich. Two sons, Chad and Matthew Aldrich.

Education: Graduated from Schoolcraft High School, Schoolcraft, Michigan, in June, 1967; received Bachelor of Arts degree in Secondary Education from Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan, in June, 1974; completed requirements for the Master of Science degree at Oklahoma State University, in May, 1983.

Professional Experience: Executive Director, Michigan Chapter of the American College of Emergency Physicians, 1979-1980; Volunteer Coordinator and Public Information Officer, Nursing Service, Inc., Tulsa, Oklahoma, 1980-1981; Staff Assistant, Office of Administration and Finance, University of Oklahoma Tulsa Medical College, Tulsa, Oklahoma, 1981; Part-time Instructor, Communications Division, Tulsa Junior College, Tulsa, Oklahoma, 1982; Part-time Advisement Specialist, Counseling Services, Tulsa Junior College, Tulsa, Oklahoma, 1982-1983.

Professional Organizations: American Association for Adult and Continuing Education; American Society for Training and Development.