

Jean Brittain Leslie

Feedback to Managers

**A Guide to Reviewing and Selecting
Multirater Instruments for Leadership
Development**

CENTER FOR CREATIVE LEADERSHIP

Table of Contents

Preface	viii
Acknowledgements	ix
Introduction	1
Purpose of This Book	2
Methods	3
Section 1: Steps in the Evaluation Process and Findings from the Field	8
Step 1: Find Out What Is Available	8
Step 2: Collect a Complete Set of Materials	8
Step 3: Look for a Good Fit with Your Intended Audience	9
Step 4: Determine Whether Customization Is Needed	12
Step 5: Familiarize Yourself with the Instrument Development Process	15
Step 6: Learn How Items and Feedback Scales Were Developed	15
Step 7: Find Out How Consistent Scores Tend to Be	21
Step 8: Assess Basic Aspects of Validity	26
Step 9: Examine the Response Scale	35
Step 10: Evaluate the Feedback Display	40
Step 11: Understand How Breakout of Rater Responses Is Handled	50
Step 12: Learn What Strategies Are Used to Facilitate Interpretation of Scores	54
Step 13: Consider Development Materials, Support Materials, and Scoring Process	63
Step 14: Compare Value for the Price	76
Step 15: Consider Length	78
Bibliography	80
Section 2: Instrument Summaries	82
360 By Design	84
ACUMEN Leadership WorkStyles	105
Benchmarks	117

Campbell Leadership Index	131
Emotional and Social Competency Inventory	142
Emotional Competency Inventory	152
Emotional Intelligence Skills Assessment	164
Emotional Intelligence View360.....	172
Everything DiSC 363 for Leaders.....	185
Executive Dimensions	199
Executive Leadership Survey	214
Global Executive Leadership Inventory	224
Leader Behavior Analysis II	234
Leadership Archetype Questionnaire.....	245
Leadership Competencies for Managers.....	254
Leadership Effectiveness Analysis 360.....	264
Leadership Navigator for Corporate Leaders	279
Leadership Practices Inventory.....	289
Leadership Versatility Index	299
Leadership/Impact.....	312
Life Styles Inventory.....	328
Linking Leader Profile	339
Management Effectiveness Profile System.....	349
Management/Impact	359
Manager View 360	377
Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire	388
Prospector	399
Social Style and Enhanced Versatility Profile.....	412
Survey of Leadership Practices.....	424
Survey of Management Practices.....	434
System for the Multiple-Level Observation of Groups	445
The Leadership Circle Profile	472

Tilt 360 Leadership Predictor	485
Types of Work Profile	495
VOICES	505
In Conclusion	515
Instrument Evaluation Checklist	518
Glossary of Terms	525
Permissions	529

Preface

Feedback is a rare commodity in day-to-day organizational life, but it is a key to managerial effectiveness. One increasingly popular vehicle for getting feedback from one's boss, peers, subordinates, and customers is the multiple-perspective, or 360-degree, feedback instrument. Taken as part of a management-development course or used as a stand-alone device, this kind of tool can enhance self-awareness by highlighting individual strengths and can facilitate greater growth by pointing out areas in need of further development.

Almost 34 years ago, the Center for Creative Leadership published *Feedback to Managers: A Comprehensive Review of Twenty-four Instruments* (Morrison, McCall, & DeVries, 1978). A popular publication among a long line of Center technical reports, it covered virtually all multiple-perspective instruments available at the time.

Thirteen years later, a revision of *Feedback to Managers* (Van Velsor & Leslie, 1991) was published as a two-volume report. Volume I presented a simple but comprehensive process for evaluating instruments designed to compare self-view to the views of others on multiple domains of managerial behavior. Volume II contained a comparison of 16 of the better feedback instruments. Volume I has since been updated and retitled, *Choosing 360: A Guide to Evaluating Multi-rater Feedback Instruments for Management Development* (Van Velsor, Leslie, & Fleenor, 1997).

As the field of management assessment instruments continued to grow and expand, giving potential users of these products more choices than ever before, an updated volume II was published, *Feedback to Managers: A Review and Comparison of Multi-rater Instruments for Management Development* (Leslie & Fleenor, 1998).

This newest version of *Feedback to Managers: A Guide to Reviewing and Selecting Multirater Instruments for Leadership Development* brings the two volumes back together again. It is our hope that this approach will be of enduring benefit, in that readers will be able to use these summaries to get an overview of the field today and to learn a process by which to evaluate any feedback instrument that comes across their desks today or in the foreseeable future.

Purpose of This Book

Reviewing and selecting an instrument can be very confusing to a buyer. There are a lot of professional standards an instrument should meet (American Educational Research Association [AERA], American Psychological Association [APA], National Council of Measurement on Education [NCME], International Test Commission, British Psychological Society), yet there is no review board or committee to tell you which ones are the best for your use. For a successful 360-degree feedback process, much more is needed from the vendor than the instrument itself. A good instrument is one that meets professional standards, fits with your intended audience and use, and is accompanied with materials and services that support its use. The responsibility falls on both the instrument vendor or developers and the professional selecting the instrument.

In selecting and interpreting a test, the test user is expected to have a clear understanding of purposes of the testing and the probable consequences. The user should know the procedures necessary to facilitate effectiveness and to reduce bias in test use. Although the test developer, publisher, or vendor should provide information on the strengths and weaknesses of the test, the ultimate responsibility for appropriate test use lies with the test user. The user should become knowledgeable about the test and its appropriate use and also communicate this information, as appropriate, to others (AERA, APA, & NCME, 1999, p. 112).

This publication presents a step-by-step process that managers, human resource professionals, and even researchers can use to evaluate any 360-degree feedback instrument intended for management or leadership development. Although I have simplified this process as much as possible, it still will require some effort on your part—but the effort will pay off in terms of your having a high-quality instrument that best meets your needs.

This book also compares some of the most frequently used multiple-perspective management-assessment instruments. The review focuses on a subset of all publicly available instruments that relate self-view to the views of others on multiple management or leadership domains. In addition to being publicly available, these instruments have in common an assessment-for-development focus, a scaling method that permits assessment of a manager along a continuum, sound psychometric properties, and some of the “best practices” for management development. The purpose in comparing these instruments is to describe the current state of the art, to clarify what you can expect in terms of quality, and to highlight ideas for future research and development in this field.

Methods

Identifying Instruments

To identify published instruments, I conducted an online computer literature search of social and behavioral science and business databases, including *Mental Measurements Yearbook with Tests in Print* (Buros Institute of Mental Measurements, 1938–2010), using keywords such as *360-degree*, *multirater*, *multisource*, *management*, *leadership*, *feedback*, *survey*, *questionnaire*, *instrument*, *assessment*, and *evaluation*.

Trainers and coaches at the Center for Creative Leadership recommended instruments they knew or had heard about. I also contacted authors and vendors concerning their knowledge of instruments that fit the description. Finally, external colleagues who heard about the project through the grapevine made recommendations.

Collection Documentation

I requested three kinds of information for each instrument:

Descriptive information, including author(s), vendor, copyright date(s), statement of purpose, target audience, cost, scoring process, certification process, instrument length, item-response format, customization options, and type(s) of raters.

Research information, including item origins, feedback scales, scale definitions and sample items, cautionary statement about misinterpretations, and written reports or papers from studies of the instrument's reliability and validity.

Training information, including sample copy of the instrument, sample feedback report, and any support materials (instructional or developmental) provided for trainers or participants.

If I did not receive the essential information, I contacted the author at least once more, by mail or by phone. If information was subsequently not forthcoming, I removed the instrument from the list for review.

Instrument Selection Criteria

After reviewing the data, I decided to limit the comparison to the instruments that reflected both accepted standards of instrument development—that is, standards set by AERA, APA, and NCME as reflected in *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing* (1999) and reasoned principles and techniques for enhancing performance development as a result of feedback. A total of 35 instruments met these criteria, 17 of which were reviewed in the third edition of *Feedback to Managers* (Leslie & Fleenor, 1998). It is important to note that test development and revision extend beyond the initial development of items, scales, scores, normative data, and interpretation. Many of the instruments reviewed in 1998 have undergone further development and refinement.

Summaries of these instruments appear in the second section of this book (see the list of instruments reviewed below). Although the inclusion or discussion of a particular instrument in this

book signifies that it meets relatively high standards for development, it does not mean that it is one of the best for your use, or that there are no other instruments that meet these same standards. Only a portion of all available instruments have been reviewed, and the reviews do not incorporate a critical part of the equation—your specific needs and situation.

Instruments Reviewed

<i>Instrument</i>	<i>Vendor</i>	<i>Author(s)</i>
360 By Design	Center for Creative Leadership www.ccl.org	Center for Creative Leadership
ACUMEN Leadership WorkStyles (LWS)	Human Synergistics, Inc. www.humansynergistics.com	Ronald A. Warren, Ph.D. Peter D. Gratzinger, Ph.D.
Benchmarks	Center for Creative Leadership www.ccl.org	Center for Creative Leadership
Campbell Leadership Index (CLI)	Vangent, Inc. HCM.info@vangent.com	David Campbell, Ph.D.
Emotional and Social Competency Inventory (ESCI)	Hay Group, Inc. haygroup.com	Daniel Goleman, Ph.D. Richard Boyatzis, Ph.D. Hay Group, Inc.
Emotional Competency Inventory (ECI)	Hay Group, Inc. haygroup.com	Daniel Goleman, Ph.D. Richard Boyatzis, Ph.D.
Emotional Intelligence Skills Assessment (EISA)	Pfeiffer www.pfeiffer.com	Steven J. Stein Derek Mann Peter Pagadogiannis Wendy Gordon
Emotional Intelligence View360 (EIV360)	Envisia Learning, Inc. www.envisialearning.com	Kenneth Nowack, Ph.D. Envisia Learning, Inc.
Everything DiSC 363 for Leaders	Inscape Publishing customerrelations@inscapublishing.com	Inscape Publishing Research and Development
Executive Dimensions	Center for Creative Leadership www.ccl.org	Center for Creative Leadership

Instruments Reviewed (continued)

<i>Instrument</i>	<i>Vendor</i>	<i>Author(s)</i>
Executive Leadership Survey (EXEC)	The Clark Wilson Group, Inc. www.clarkwilsongroup.com	Clark L. Wilson, Ph.D. Clark Wilson Group Publishing Company
Global Executive Leadership Inventory (GELI)	Pfeiffer www.pfeiffer.com	Manfred F. R. Kets de Vries
Leader Behavior Analysis II (LBAIL)	The Ken Blanchard Companies www.kenblanchard.com	Kenneth H. Blanchard, Ph.D. Ronald K. Hambleton Drea Zigarmi, Ed.D. Douglas Forsyth
Leadership Archetype Questionnaire (LAQ)	INSEAD Global Leadership Centre	Manfred Kets de Vries
Leadership Competencies for Managers	The Clark Wilson Group, Inc. www.clarkwilsongroup.com	Clark L. Wilson, Ph.D. Clark Wilson Group Publishing Company
Leadership Effectiveness Analysis 360 (LEA 360)	Management Research Group www.mrg.com	Management Research Group
Leadership Navigator for Corporate Leaders	3D Group www.3DGroup.net	Dale Rose, Ph.D. Mark Healey
Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI)	Pfeiffer www.pfeiffer.com	James M. Kouzes, Ph.D. Barry Z. Posner, Ph.D.
Leadership Versatility Index (LVI)	Kaplan DeVries Inc. www.kaplandevries.com	Robert E. Kaplan Robert B. Kaiser
Leadership/Impact (L/I)	Human Synergistics, Inc. www.humansynergistics.com	Human Synergistics International
Life Styles Inventory (LSI)	Human Synergistics, Inc. www.humansynergistics.com	Human Synergistics International

Instruments Reviewed (continued)

<i>Instrument</i>	<i>Vendor</i>	<i>Author(s)</i>
Linking Leader Profile	Team Management Systems www.tms.com.au	Dick McCann, Ph.D.
Management Effectiveness Profile System (MEPS)	Human Synergetics, Inc. www.humansynergetics.com	Human Synergetics International
Management/Impact	Human Synergetics, Inc. www.humansynergetics.com	Janet L. Szumal, Ph.D. Robert A. Cooke, Ph.D.
Manager View 360	Envisia Learning, Inc. www.envisialearning.com	Kenneth Nowack, Ph.D. Envisia Learning, Inc.
Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ)	Mind Garden, Inc. www.mindgarden.com	Bernard M. Bass, Ph.D. Bruce J. Avolio, Ph.D.
Prospector	Center for Creative Leadership www.ccl.org	Center for Creative Leadership
Social Style and Enhanced Versatility Profile	The TRACOM Group www.tracomcorp.com	David Merrill, Ph.D. Roger Reid Casey Mulqueen, Ph.D.
Survey of Leadership Practices (SLP)	The Clark Wilson Group, Inc. www.clarkwilsongroup.com	Clark L. Wilson, Ph.D. Paul M. Connolly, Ph.D.
Survey of Management Practices (SMP)	The Clark Wilson Group, Inc. www.clarkwilsongroup.com	Clark L. Wilson, Ph.D. Clark Wilson Group Publishing Company
System for the Multiple-Level Observation of Groups (SYMLOG)	SYMLOG Consulting Group www.symlog.com	Robert F. Bales, Ph.D.
The Leadership Circle Profile	The Leadership Circle, LLC www.theleadershipcircle.com	Bob Anderson

Instruments Reviewed (continued)

<i>Instrument</i>	<i>Vendor</i>	<i>Author(s)</i>
Tilt 360 Leadership Predictor	Tilt, Inc. http://tilt360leaders.com	Pam Boney Tilt, Inc.
Types of Work Profile	Team Management Systems www.tms.com.au	Charles Margerison, Ph.D. Dick McCann, Ph.D.
VOICES	Lominger Limited, Inc. www.lominger.com	Michael M. Lombardo, Ed.D. Robert W. Eichinger, Ph.D.

Limitations of the Review

Although I initially intended to compare all multirater instruments, I quickly realized that the field had grown to such proportions that some potentially good ones would remain undiscovered by even our most comprehensive search. These include instruments used in organizations but not available externally, promising instruments in early developmental stages (and, therefore, not quite ready to market), instruments about which I was unable to obtain sufficient information, instruments authored by individuals who declined to have their work considered, and instruments that our search, for other reasons, failed to reveal.

The information contained in this report does not cover recent changes or additional documents released since the publication date. Please check with the vendors for updated information.

Leadership/Impact

Vendor: Human Synergistics, Inc.
39819 Plymouth Road
Plymouth, MI 48170-4200
(734) 459-1030
(800) 622-7584
www.humansynergistics.com

Author: Human Synergistics International

Copyright Dates: 1996, 2000

Statement of Purpose

Leadership/Impact (L/I) is designed to provide leaders with otherwise unavailable feedback on their effect on others as well as the strategies and techniques that account for this impact. More specifically, L/I focuses on three major areas: (1) Leadership Strategies (the extent to which the leader personally behaves in prescriptive versus restrictive ways); (2) Impact on Others (the extent to which the leader motivates or drives other people to behave in constructive versus defensive ways); and (3) Effectiveness (the leader's current performance along personal as well as organizational leadership criteria).

Target Audience

L/I is relevant to and appropriate for executives, managers, and others with leadership responsibilities.

Feedback Scales

L/I includes 35 scales that are organized into three major areas:

Leadership Strategies

Prescriptive Strategies

Prescriptive Envisioning (3 items)

Defines a desired state of future affairs and shares this vision with others. Sample item: Communicating a clear vision of how things should be.

Prescriptive Role Modeling (3 items)

Exemplifies a set of behaviors and reactions that reflect the values and standards desired for the organization. Sample item: Behaving in ways that set a standard for others.

Prescriptive Mentoring (3 items)

Uses active approaches to mentoring, which provide direction and create an environment that is “safe” for learning. Sample item: Helping people to “learn the ropes” and understand the system.

Prescriptive Approaches to Stimulation to Thinking (3 items)

Encourages lateral thinking or looking at things in new ways. Sample item: Encouraging people to challenge assumptions and look at things in new ways.

Prescriptive Referring (3 items)

Uses positive referents in remarks and stories about people who could serve as models. Sample item: Telling stories about organizational “stars” and “heroes.”

Prescriptive Monitoring (3 items)

Manages by excellence and focuses on what is being done right. Sample item: Showing an interest when people improve work processes or procedures.

Prescriptive Feedback (3 items)

Communicates positive evaluations of people’s activities and performance when they are, in fact, performing well. Sample item: Complimenting others for handling problems in the right way.

Prescriptive Reinforcing (3 items)

Uses rewards to recognize and increase the frequency of desired behaviors. Sample item: Celebrating others’ successes.

Prescriptive Influencing (3 items)

Uses reciprocal control and influence strategies. Sample item: Gaining the cooperation of others by treating them with respect and dignity.

Prescriptive Approaches to Creating a Setting (3 items)

Facilitates the work performance and growth and development of others. Sample item: Enriching projects to better prepare team members for advancement.

Restrictive Strategies*Restrictive Envisioning (3 items)*

Identifies the undesired state of future affairs and emphasizes this vision to others. Sample item: Being clear about what you don’t like.

Restrictive Role Modeling (3 items)

Circumscribes certain behaviors by avoiding (or actively refusing) to do things that should not be emulated by others. Sample item: Refusing to do things that could set an undesired precedent.

Restrictive Mentoring (3 items)

Uses more passive approaches to the development of others. Sample item: Knowingly allowing people to make mistakes.

Restrictive Approaches to Stimulation of Thinking (3 items)

Emphasizes more traditional vertical thinking based on logical, mathematical, or rational processes. Sample item: Emphasizing sequential (linear) thinking and the need to justify each step.

Restrictive Referring (3 items)

Uses negative referents in remarks and stories about people whose decisions, actions, and characteristics should not be modeled. Sample item: Referring to mistakes made by people in the past.

Restrictive Monitoring (3 items)

Manages by exception and focuses on what is being done wrong. Sample item: Noticing when people act in ways that differ from what's expected.

Restrictive Feedback (3 items)

Communicates negative evaluations of people's activities and performance when they are not meeting standards. Sample item: Becoming visibly annoyed or impatient when things are not as you would like.

Restrictive Reinforcing (3 items)

Uses punishment or the administration of negatively valued outcomes. Sample item: Excluding from your team those who have not met standards.

Restrictive Influencing (3 items)

Uses unilateral influence strategies. Sample item: Using your position to limit people's discretion.

Restrictive Approaches to Creating a Setting (3 items)

Constrains the behaviors and developmental experiences of others. Sample item: Structuring situations in ways that preclude certain strategies or practices.

Impact on Others

Constructive Impact

Achievement (8 items)

Motivates and encourages others to set challenging but realistic goals, establish plans to meet those goals, and pursue them with enthusiasm. Sample item: Take reasonable risks to attain better results.

Self-Actualizing (8 items)

Motivates and encourages others to gain enjoyment from their work, develop themselves professionally, and approach problems with interest, creativity, and integrity. Sample item: Think in unique and independent ways.

Humanistic-Encouraging (8 items)

Motivates and encourages others to be supportive of people, help those around them to grow and develop, and provide others with positive feedback. Sample item: Train new people.

Affiliative (8 items)

Motivates and encourages others to treat people as members of the team, be sensitive to the needs of others, and interact in friendly and cooperative ways. Sample item: Emphasize the importance of the team.

Passive/Defensive Impact

Approval (8 items)

Motivates and requires others to gain the approval of those around them, “go along” with people, and maintain (superficially) pleasant interpersonal relationships. Sample item: Put forth only those ideas and suggestions that are likely to “please” others.

Conventional (8 items)

Motivates and requires others to conform, fit into the “mold,” and follow rules, policies, and standard operating procedures. Sample item: Refer to rules and procedures to justify their actions.

Dependent (8 items)

Motivates and requires others to do only what they are told, clear all decisions with superiors, and please those in positions of authority. Sample item: Delay taking action until receiving clearances or approvals.

Avoidance (8 items)

Motivates and requires others to avoid any possibility of being blamed for a mistake, shift responsibilities to others, and maintain a low profile. Sample item: Take few chances.

Aggressive/Defensive Impact*Oppositional* (8 items)

Motivates and drives others to point out mistakes, gain status by being critical, and dismiss even good ideas due to minor flaws. Sample item: Be critical and hard to impress.

Power (8 items)

Motivates and drives others to act forceful and aggressive, control the people around them, and build up their power base. Sample item: Provide information to others on a “need-to-know” basis only.

Competitive (8 items)

Motivates and drives others to operate in a “win/lose” framework, outperform their peers, and do anything necessary to look good. Sample item: Manipulate situations to enhance their own position.

Perfectionistic (8 items)

Motivates and drives others to set unrealistically high goals, stay on top of every detail, and work long hours to attain narrowly defined objectives. Sample item: Give the impression they always have the answer or the necessary information.

Effectiveness*Organizational Effectiveness* (6 items)

Viewed by others as visionary and future-oriented, promoting empowerment and productivity, bringing out the best in people, and concerned with long-term performance. Sample item: Enhances others’ productivity *versus* reduces others’ productivity.

Personal Effectiveness (4 items)

Viewed by others as relaxed and at ease, ready for promotion to a higher level, accepting of feedback, and interested in self-development. Sample item: Relaxed and at ease *versus* tense and stressed-out.

Balance (3 items)

Viewed by others as being properly valued by the organization, exercising an appropriate amount of authority, and having advanced the success of his/her organization to at least the same extent as having advanced his/her own success. Sample item: Undervalued by organization *versus* over-rated by organization.

Response Scales

L/I uses both seven-point semantic differentials and five-point summated rating scales.

Five-point summated rating scales are used for the items measuring leadership strategies. Respondents use the following response options to describe how frequently the focal manager uses various leadership methods or approaches:

- 1 = Never
- 2 = Rarely
- 3 = Sometimes
- 4 = Often
- 5 = Always

Respondents also describe managers' impact on others along a five-point summated rating scale. The following response options are used to describe the extent to which the focal manager drives or motivates people to behave in certain ways:

- 1 = Not at all
- 2 = To a slight extent
- 3 = To a moderate extent
- 4 = To a great extent
- 5 = To a very great extent

Finally, seven-point semantic differentials are used by respondents to describe the focal manager's effectiveness. Respondents record their assessments along 13 continuums, each of which is defined by a pair of polar terms. For example:

Relaxed and at ease 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Tensed and stressed out

The response options for the leadership strategies and the impact on others items are the same on the Self Report and Description by Others inventories (the effectiveness items appear only on the Description by Others inventory).

Customization Options: Not Available

INSTRUMENT DEVELOPMENT

Origin of Items: Theory, Research

L/I Theoretical Model

The theoretical model underpinning the three major areas measured by L/I was derived based on theory and research in the areas of leadership and organizational culture. An extensive review of the leadership literature by Yukl (1989) led to the conclusion that the only consensus among definitions of leadership was that it had something to do with influence. Yet existing assessments of leadership focus on managers' personal styles or behaviors rather than the way in which they

affect the behavior of others. Thus, a manager's influence or impact on the behavior of others became the focus of L/I.

Research conducted by Human Synergetics (1986) lent support to the contention made by Edgar Schein (1983) and others that leaders have a profound impact on shaping, directing, and reinforcing the culture of an organization or subunit, particularly at the level of behavioral norms or expectations for behavior. In turn, Cooke and Szumal (1993), Klein (1992), Masi (1994) and others found that the behaviors expected and reinforced by managers have implications for unit as well as organizational effectiveness.

The L/I Theoretical Model suggests that the leadership strategies used by a manager have an impact on the behavior of others. In turn, both the strategies used by the manager and the impact that he or she has on the behavior of others have implications for his or her leadership effectiveness.

Leadership Strategies

At a very general level, modes of leadership can be prescriptive versus restrictive. Prescriptive leadership strategies are those which guide or direct the activities and behaviors of others toward goals, opportunities, and methods. Restrictive strategies are those which constrain or prohibit activities or behaviors with respect to goals, opportunities, and methods.

It is proposed that prescriptive strategies have a more constructive impact on people than do restrictive strategies and, because constructive behaviors are more effective than defensive behaviors, prescriptive strategies are generally more appropriate and desirable. This approach to leadership has its roots in the classic work of Rensis Likert (1961) and Douglas McGregor (1960), the latter proposing that the assumptions managers make about employees translate into management styles which, in turn, have an impact on the behavior and performance of those employees. This approach to leadership is also consistent with the more contemporary writings of theorists such as Bennis and Nanus (1985) and O'Toole (1995), who propose that certain types of leadership actions are consistently appropriate across different situations.

Impact on Others

The basic framework developed for the Life Styles Inventory (Lafferty, 1973) and the Organizational Culture Inventory (Cooke & Lafferty, 1983) was used to define 12 sets of behaviors that a leader can encourage or promote. These 12 sets of behaviors are described by two underlying dimensions. The first dimension is based on Maslow's (1954) distinction between behaviors directed toward the fulfillment of higher-order growth needs versus those directed toward protecting and maintaining one's security. The second dimension distinguishes between task-oriented and people-oriented behaviors. This latter distinction has been highlighted by many leadership theorists, including Stogdill (1963) and Blake and Mouton (1964).

Consistent with the security-satisfaction and task-people distinctions, the 12 sets of behaviors measured by L/I can be categorized into three general types of impact that a leader can have on the behavior of others: constructive, passive/defensive, and aggressive/defensive.

Leaders that have a constructive impact encourage and motivate others to relate to people and approach their work in ways that help them personally to meet their higher-order needs for growth

and satisfaction. The specific constructive behaviors that can be promoted by leaders are achievement, self-actualizing, humanistic-encouraging, and affiliative.

Leaders that have a passive/defensive impact drive and reinforce others to interact with the people around them in self-protective ways that will not threaten their own security. The specific passive/defensive behaviors that can be attributed to leaders are approval, conventional, dependent, and avoidance.

Leaders that have an aggressive/defensive impact drive and motivate others to approach their task-related activities in forceful ways to protect their status and security. The specific aggressive/defensive behaviors that can be promoted by leaders are oppositional, power, competitive, and perfectionistic.

Finally, the theoretical model underlying L/I focuses not only on the actual impact of leaders but also the impact that they ideally would like to have on others. Their ideal impact can partly explain the impact they are currently having and can provide an important benchmark against which that impact can be compared (Cooke & Sharkey, 2006; Fuda, 2010).

Development of Feedback Scales

The 20 specific leadership strategy scales load on two factors which explain approximately 57 percent of the variance in the scales. These factors reflect prescriptive and restrictive leadership strategies. All of the scales load on the proper factor with the exception of Restrictive Role Modeling, which loads on the Prescriptive factor. Restrictive Envisioning loads on both factors; however, the higher loading is on the correct factor.

The 12 Impact on Others scales load on three factors that explain approximately 80 percent of the variance in the scales. These factors reflect constructive, passive/defensive, and aggressive/defensive behaviors. All of the scales load on the proper factor.

Reliability

Internal consistency

Alpha coefficients were computed for all scales based on a sample of approximately 2,220 respondents who completed the L/I Descriptions by Others Inventory. The alpha coefficients for the composite Prescriptive and Restrictive strategy scales (consisting of 30 items each) are .91 and .84, respectively. For the 20 Leadership Strategy scales (3 items each), alpha coefficients range from .45 for Restrictive Monitoring to .85 for Prescriptive Feedback (alpha coefficients are above .65 for 12 of the 20 scales). Alpha coefficients for the impact on others scales range from .75 for Perfectionistic to .88 for Humanistic. Finally, the internal consistency of the three leadership effectiveness scales is supported by alpha coefficients that range from .67 for Personal Effectiveness to .84 for Organizational Effectiveness.

Interrater reliability

The same sample used to test the internal consistency of the L/I scales was also used to test their interrater reliability. Approximately 320 managers were the focus of the reports. Interrater reliability was examined using a series of Oneway Analyses of Variance (ANOVA) with the focal manager as the independent variable and the L/I scales as the dependent variables.

The F statistics for the composite Prescriptive and Restrictive leadership strategy scales are significant at the .0001 level. The eta-squared statistics for the composite Prescriptive and Restrictive leadership strategy scales are .32 and .34 respectively. The F statistics for the 20 specific leadership scales are significant at the .0001 level. Eta-squared statistics for the specific leadership strategy scales range from .20 for Restrictive Role Modeling to .35 for Prescriptive Referring.

For the 12 Impact on Others scales, all F statistics are significant at the .0001 level. Eta-squared statistics range from .26 for Avoidance to .35 for Power.

Finally, the F statistics for all three of the leadership effectiveness scales are significant at the .0001 level. Eta-squared statistics are .25 for Balance to .31 for Personal Effectiveness and Organizational Effectiveness.

Test-retest reliability

Not available.

Validity

Validation studies were conducted using a sample of 849 managers and 5,746 of their raters. The inventories were administered in Australia, Canada, China, New Zealand, Russia, Sweden, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

Construct validity

Convergent

Discriminant

Construct validity on the impact scales is supported by a three-factor solution where all of the scales associated with various types of impact showed loadings greater than .40 on a single factor, and loadings less than .40 on the factors represent the other types of impact.

Validity of the 20 strategies and 12 impact scales was estimated for the Self-Report and Description by Others forms using principle components analysis with varimax rotation. For the strategies scales, convergent validity is supported by a two-factor solution with the Prescriptive scales all showing loadings greater than .40 on one factor, and the Restrictive scales all showing loadings greater than .40 on the other factor. One exception: items on the Circumscribing scale do not load on the first or second factor. Discriminant validity is supported as the Prescriptive scales showed loadings less than .40 on the Restrictive factor.

Criterion-related validity

Concurrent

Predictive

Descriptions by others for approximately 320 focal managers were aggregated to the manager level by computing the average scale scores received by each manager. Correlations were then carried out between the leadership strategy and impact scales, the impact scales and effectiveness scales, and the strategy scales and effectiveness scales.

Consistent with predictions, all of the Prescriptive strategy scales are significantly and positively correlated with the Constructive impact scales and most are significantly and negatively correlated with the Defensive impact scales. Most of the Restrictive strategy scales are significantly and negatively correlated with the Constructive impact scales and significantly and positively correlated with the Defensive impact scales, also consistent with predictions.

The predicted relationship between impact on others and leadership effectiveness is fully supported by the correlational results. All of the Constructive impact scales are significantly and positively related to the Personal and Organizational Effectiveness scales and all of the Defensive impact scales are significantly and negatively related to the effectiveness measures.

With respect to the relationship between leadership strategies and effectiveness, all of the Prescriptive strategies are significantly and positively correlated with Personal and Organizational Effectiveness. All of the Restrictive strategies are significantly and negatively correlated with the effectiveness measures. Both sets of findings are consistent with predictions.

Other Research

Not available.

A Cautionary Statement on Misinterpretations

The manager's impact results represent how the manager motivates or drives others to behave and should not be interpreted to directly represent the focal manager's personal thinking and behavioral styles. Though the manager's personal styles can partly determine his or her impact on others, these personal styles are more directly and properly measured by the Life Styles Inventory or ACUMEN Leadership WorkStyles. Additionally, when managers self-select those who describe them, the L/I results tend to be more favorable than when others are randomly selected from the population of those who work for or with the manager.

International Use

Translations

The L/I instrument is available in many languages, including Bulgarian, Chinese (Traditional and Simplified), Dutch, French (Canadian and European), German, Hungarian, Japanese, Polish, Romanian, Serbian, Spanish (Latin American and Castilian), and Swedish.

International norms

A set of international norms were developed for the impact section of L/I based on client data collected by Human Synergistics offices located in the United States, Canada, the Netherlands, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom. The self-reports of 4,950 leaders from around the world, along with the descriptions by 32,470 others, enabled the organization to not only develop this second set of norms but also to examine the inventory's psychometric properties as well as compare its reliability and validity across different countries. While the new norms do not differ substantially from the original (which were based on approximately 500 leaders), they enable recipients of feedback to compare their results to a larger and more diverse sample.

The data are based on the English version of the inventory, except for the data from the Netherlands office (where the Dutch translation was exclusively used) and the U.S. offices (where some Dutch, Swedish, and German translations were used for multinational clients). Details on this sample, including the number of cases provided by each of the offices, are provided in a report by Szumal (2002).

Internationally tested for validity/reliability

The self-reports of the 4,950 leaders from around the world, along with the descriptions by others, enabled Human Synergistics to compare its reliability and validity across different countries.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE FEEDBACK REPORT

Types of Feedback Display: Grids/Plots, Bar Graph, Circumplex, Narrative

Participants receive a confidential feedback report that includes explanations of the L/I measures; the theoretical model linking leadership strategies, impact, and effectiveness; item- and scale-level results; bar charts and circumplacial profiles; a development and planning guide; and a list of recommended resources.

Feedback on the composite restrictive and prescriptive leadership strategies is provided in bar chart form. Feedback on specific leadership strategies is presented in bar charts that compare the restrictive and prescriptive versions of a particular strategy and compare the reports of self, immediate superior(s), peers, and direct reports. Item-level feedback is reported in tables that also show the discrepancies between others' reports and self-reports.

Results for impact on others are presented on a circumplex, a circular diagram that organizes the 12 sets of behaviors measures by the L/I in terms of their degree of similarity to one another (that is, styles that are located next to one another are more similar than styles that are located further apart). The greater the extension from the center of the circumplex, the more a manager is viewed as encouraging and promoting the particular set of behaviors. Item-level results are presented in tables that also show the gaps between others' reports of the manager's impact and the manager's self-reported ideal impact.

Breakout of Rater Responses

Results along the Impact on Others and the specific leadership strategy scales can be reported for superiors, peers, and direct reports separately or together as a single group. In either case, results based on self-report are provided separately.

Feedback Delivery Strategies

Comparison to norms

Results along the Impact on Others items and scales are compared to the international sample of leaders which, as noted above, consists of approximately 4,950 focal managers who were described by 32,470 others.

Highlighting largest self-rater discrepancies

The largest discrepancies between the focal manager's impact as reported by others and his or her self-reported ideal impact are highlighted by comparative profiles as well as by narrative descriptions. Self-rater discrepancies along the leadership strategies are highlighted by bar charts.

Item-level feedback

Item-level results along all of the L/I scales are reported in tables. Item-level results for the effectiveness scales are also presented in grid/plot form.

Highlighting high and low items and scales

The top two highest scores along the 12 Impact on Others scales are identified in the feedback report as primary and secondary behavioral impact.

Comparison to ideal

Not available.

Importance to job or success

Not available.

Do more/do less feedback

Not available.

Narrative interpretation of results

Not available.

Open-ended questions

Not available.

SUPPORT AND DEVELOPMENTAL MATERIALS

Support for Participant

Development planning guide

Included in the feedback report received by participants.

Workshop

Not available.

Post-assessment

Not available.

Vendor hotline

Participants can contact any office of Human Synergistics for supplemental information and assistance—in the United States by telephone (800-622-7584) or e-mail (info@humansynergistics.com).

Cards

Not available.

Support for Trainer

Trainer's guide/manual

The *Leadership/Impact Facilitator's Guide* is available to help trainers lead a development initiative using L/I feedback. It serves as a technical guide, an administrative guide, and a leader guide. The facilitator's guide is fully scripted, includes presentation slides, and offers all required instructional material for leading a workshop or individual debrief.

Workshops

Human Synergistics offers workshops and on-site consulting to customize workshops to fit specific customer needs. If desired, Human Synergistics can also deliver workshops to participants (for example, Executive Team Building).

Supplemental norms

Not available.

Supplemental materials from the vendor

Other materials that would be useful to trainers include the *Organizational Culture Inventory Leader's Guide* and the *Life Styles Inventory Leader's Guide*.

Video

Not available.

Internet

Not available.

PowerPoint presentation

PowerPoint CD of overheads used in the workshop is included in the facilitator's guide.

Group profile/report

Not available.

Certification Requirement

Certification is required or workshops are recommended for L/I depending on geographical location. In the United States, accreditation is required to purchase and debrief L/I. The Human Synergistics Accreditation Program for L/I consist of four steps: attending a workshop, passing an accreditation exam, completing an L/I project, and participating in a debrief webinar to share project results. Accreditation is granted to the individual and follows the person if he or she moves to another organization or into private practice. Accreditation is maintained through the purchase of at least one circumplex-based instrument every two years. Human Synergistics reserves the right to require re-accreditation training or refresher courses and to update and revise accreditation requirements as needed.

Scoring Process

L/I uses web-based or paper forms to collect and analyze information from leaders and coworkers in an organization.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Cost

Cost varies depending on geographical location, volume, and reporting options. The L/I basic assessment package, in the United States, includes one Self-Report Inventory, 12 Description by Others Inventories, administrative support, and a Personalized Feedback Report.

Please contact your local office for more information.

Length of Instrument

The L/I Self-Report Inventory consists of 156 items and takes approximately 20 to 25 minutes to complete. The L/I Description by Others Inventory consists of 169 items and takes approximately 20 to 30 minutes to complete.

Leadership/Impact Bibliography

- Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1964). *The managerial grid*. Houston, TX: Gulf.
- Cooke, R. A., & Lafferty, J. C. (1983). *Level V: Organizational Culture Inventory (Form I)*. Plymouth, MI: Human Synergistics.
- Cooke, R. A., & Sharkey, L. (2006). Developing constructive leader impact. *Consulting Today*. http://www.humansynergistics.com/Files/ResearchAndPublications/Consulting_Today_Cooke_Sharkey_Constructive_Leader_Impact.pdf
- Cooke, R. A., & Szumal, J. L. (1993). Measuring normative beliefs and shared behavioral expectations in organizations: The reliability and validity of the Organizational Culture Inventory. *Psychological Reports*, 72, 1299–1330.
- Fuda, P. A. (2010). Leadership transformation: What does it take for a traditional manager to transform into a contemporary leader? Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Macquarie University, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia.
- Human Synergistics. (1986). *Improving store management effectiveness*. Atlanta, GA: Coca Cola Retailers' Research Council.
- Klein, M. I. (1992). Corporate culture and store performance: Differences among high performance and low performance stores. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA.
- Lafferty, J. C. (1973). *Level I: Life Styles Inventory*. Plymouth, MI: Human Synergistics.
- Likert, R. (1961). *New patterns of management*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

- Masi, R. J. (1994). Transformational leadership and its roles in empowerment, productivity, and commitment to quality. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Chicago.
- Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- McGregor, D. (1960). *The human side of enterprise*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- O'Toole, J. (1995). *Leading change: Overcoming the ideology of comfort and the tyranny of custom*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Schein, E. (1983). The role of the founder in creating organizational culture. *Organizational Dynamics*, 12, 13–28.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1963). *Manual for the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire - Form XII*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research.
- Szumal, J. L. (2002). *An international study of the reliability and validity of Leadership/Impact (L/I)*. <http://www.humansynergistics.com/Files/ResearchAndPublications/LIValidity.PDF>
- Yukl, G. (1989). Managerial leadership: A review of theory and research. *Journal of Management*, 15, 251–289.

Purchase Information

For more information or to purchase a copy of *Feedback to Managers*, please visit the Center for Creative Leadership website at <http://solutions.ccl.org/feedback-to-managers>.