

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.

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 Synergetics, Inc. www.humansynergetics.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.

ACUMEN Leadership WorkStyles

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

Authors: Ronald A. Warren, Ph.D.
Peter D. Gratzinger, Ph.D.
Acumen International
Human Synergistics International

Copyright Dates: 1985, 1987, 1997, 2007, 2012

Statement of Purpose

ACUMEN Leadership WorkStyles (LWS) is an instrument developed by ACUMEN International to measure thinking and behavioral styles that impact leadership effectiveness. First released in 1985 as ACUMEN Insight for Managers, LWS measures personal styles (attitudes and behaviors rather than skills and competencies) that affect a manager's performance and effectiveness. LWS feedback then addresses how these styles influence performance in managing tasks, managing people, managing conflict, and leading others.

Target Audience

LWS is designed to be administered to people in leadership and managerial positions at various organizational levels and across a variety of industries.

Feedback Scales

There are three major groupings of styles: Constructive Styles, Passive/Defensive Styles, and Aggressive/Defensive Styles. Within these groupings, LWS measures 12 thinking and behavioral styles, with each style scale composed of seven to nine items. The instrument provides an indication as to how closely each thinking or behavioral style describes a manager, based on self-descriptions and descriptions by others to the associated items.

Constructive

Achievement

Based on the need to attain high-quality results on challenging projects, the belief that outcomes are linked to one's effort rather than chance, and the tendency to personally set challenging yet realistic goals. Sample item: Enjoys a challenge.

Self-Actualizing

Based on needs for personal growth, self-fulfillment, and the realization of one's potential. Sample item: Optimistic and realistic.

Humanistic-Encouraging

Reflects an interest in the growth and development of people, a high positive regard for them, and sensitivity to their needs. Sample item: Encourages others.

Affiliative

Reflects an interest in developing and sustaining meaningful relationships with others. Sample item: Genuine concern for people.

Passive/Defensive

Approval

Reflects a need to be accepted and a tendency to tie one's self-worth to being liked by others. Sample item: Tries to please everyone.

Conventional

Reflects a preoccupation with conforming and "blending in" with the environment to avoid calling attention to oneself. Sample item: Tends to accept the status quo.

Dependent

Reflects a need for self-protection coupled with the belief that one has little direct or personal control over important events. Sample item: Looks to others for direction.

Avoidance

Reflects apprehension, a strong need for self-protection, and a propensity to withdraw from threatening situations. Sample item: Lacks self-confidence.

Aggressive/Defensive*Oppositional*

Reflects a need for security that manifests itself in a questioning, critical, and even cynical manner. Sample item: Looks for the flaws in other people’s ideas.

Power

Reflects needs for prestige and influence and the tendency to equate self-worth with controlling others. Sample item: Impatient with others’ efforts.

Competitive

Based on a need to protect one’s status by comparing oneself to others, outperforming them, and never appearing to lose. Sample item: Tries to maintain a sense of superiority.

Perfectionistic

Based on the need to attain flawless results, avoid failure, and involves the tendency to equate self-worth with the attainment of unreasonably high standards. Sample item: Needs to appear perfect and flawless.

Response Scale

Respondents indicate the extent to which each item characterizes the person being rated using a five-point scale, ranging from 1 (not at all) to 5 (to a great extent).

Customization Option: Not Available**INSTRUMENT DEVELOPMENT****Origin of Items: Theory, Research**

LWS was developed based on a series of research studies on how personal characteristics influence human behavior in general, and management effectiveness in particular. The series of studies focused on early personality theory, “Big Five” personality literature, theories of motivation, and management and leadership behavior. LWS is based on circumplex models of personality and interpersonal styles, as exemplified by Leary (1957), Lafferty (1973), Wiggins (1979), and Conte and Plutchik (1981). LWS most directly builds on Lafferty’s adaptation of personality measurement for application in business environments.

According to Warren and Gratzinger (1990), professional managers face numerous challenges, including the ability to increase both personal productivity and employee effectiveness and

efficiency. The way managers confront these challenges and meet their management responsibilities is a function of their personal characteristics and management style.

Because people spend a significant percentage of their lives at work, LWS emphasizes the aspects of individual thinking and behavior that can change and grow within the workplace (Gratzinger, Warren, & Cooke, 1990). Some thinking styles are associated with behaviors that are productive in achieving organizational results and, according to Gratzinger et al., there is a relationship between these styles and success in management.

In April 2004, Acumen International, the publisher of ACUMEN Leadership WorkStyles, entered into an exclusive licensing agreement with Human Synergistics International, its original partner in creating the Acumen instruments. After 20 years, the agreement reunited LWS with the instrument on which it is based, the Life Styles Inventory, and other Human Synergistics products including the Organizational Culture Inventory (Cooke & Lafferty, 1987). This reunion permitted the updating of LWS and its realignment with the Life Styles Inventory circumplex, which had been modified and improved over the previous two decades.

Development of Feedback Scales

The initial goal of instrument development back in the mid 1980s was to adapt the 12 styles measured by the Life Styles Inventory for an assessment and feedback program that could be run on personal computers. The main objectives were to reduce the number of items, improve the homogeneity within scales, restandardize with new managerial-based norms, and develop a typology of thinking styles for use in reporting results.

The measures of the 12 styles were reduced from the original 20 items per scale to 10 (and later to 7 to 9) items per scale by cluster- and factor-analyzing items measuring each style. In selecting items, those that contributed only marginally to the replication of the scales were excluded. Internal-consistency reliability analyses were run using a stepwise program that systematically and sequentially deleted items contributing the least to the overall reliability of the scales. Additionally, correlations were computed between each item and all 12 scales to identify the items that performed most effectively from a convergent/discriminant validity perspective. Item-level interrater-reliability results were used as criteria for item selection as well, with a minimum eta-squared of .30 required for inclusion. These analyses led to the identification of 10 items per scale for the original 120-item computerized instrument (Gratzinger et al., 1990); the subsequent development and testing of some new and slightly revised items led to the identification of 7 to 9 items per style for the current 94-item instrument.

Three factors emerge from principal components analyses of both the self-assessment and coworker feedback LWS scales: Constructive Orientation, Passive/Defensive Orientation, and Aggressive/Defensive Orientation. For the current 94-item version of the instrument, these three factors together explain 71 percent and 78 percent of the variance, respectively, of the self-assessment and coworker feedback scales. The same sets of four styles load on the three factors for both the self-assessment and the coworker feedback instruments. The pattern of factor loadings provides some evidence of the circumplial nature of the scales. This same factor structure underlies the Life Styles Inventory Self Description and Description-by-Others forms, the original

120-item version of the ACUMEN instrument, and another version of LWS standardized on individual contributors.

Finally, the more socially desirable scales (for example, Humanistic-Encouraging, Achievement) tend to have higher mean scores, whereas the less socially desirable scales (for example, Oppositional, Dependent) have lower means. The correlations among the scales reveal the pattern of the circumplex. In the circular profile—like a clock face numbered 1 through 12—scale location is proportionate to the correlations between scales. Thus, the scales near each other correlate more strongly than scales farther apart. For example, Conventional behavior frequently occurs in conjunction with Approval or Dependent behaviors, and these styles are placed close to one another on the profile.

Reliability

Internal consistency

From a sample of 2,500 individuals, Cronbach's (1951) alpha coefficients range from .78 (Dependent) to .87 (Affiliative) for the self-assessment scales; from a sample of 14,370 individuals, Cronbach's (1951) alpha coefficients range from .81 (Approval) to .92 (Affiliative) for the coworker feedback scales.

Interrater reliability

Interrater reliability was assessed using intraclass correlation coefficients. The scale-level intraclass correlation coefficients range from .58 to .77 (based on a mean of 5.75 raters per participant), indicating that the coworkers describing each manager exhibit moderately high agreement.

Test-retest reliability

Not available.

Validity

Validity studies were carried out during the development of the initial version of LWS in 1985 (see Guest & Blucher, 1997) and subsequently replicated through the analyses of large data sets.

Construct validity

Convergent

Discriminant

Construct validity of WorkStyles is supported by factor analytic studies which show a three-factor structure characterized by distinct psychological features. The factorial structure of WorkStyles is based on personality theories and works which have already established high factorial validity.

*Criterion-related validity**Concurrent**Predictive*

The earliest study, reported by Gratzinger, Warren, & Cooke (1990), compared effective and ineffective managers utilizing the ratings of 556 managers and their 2,922 coworkers. At the same time the coworkers used the original Feedback instrument to provide LWS ratings on the focal managers, they also provided ratings of the managers' Overall Effectiveness, Interest in Self-Improvement, Ability to Deal with Negative Feedback, and Quality of Interpersonal Relations. These four effectiveness ratings, which used seven-point scales, were factor-analyzed to obtain a weighted-effectiveness score. The 55 managers in the top 10 percent of the sample on the weighted-effectiveness scales were labeled effective; the 54 managers in the bottom 10 percent were labeled ineffective. The study then compared effective and ineffective managers on the LWS Self-Assessment scales. Effective managers showed a predominance of styles in the Constructive sector of Achievement, Self-Actualizing, Humanistic-Encouraging, and Affiliative scales, which is called a top-heavy profile. The ineffective managers showed the opposite, with the lowest scores in the Constructive sector and the highest scores on the Dependent, Avoidance, Oppositional, Power, and Competitive scales. This pattern of scores is called a bottom-heavy profile. The results of independent *t*-tests confirmed that 7 of the 12 scales were significantly different for the effective and ineffective managers.

A second study from the financial services industry involved a sample of nearly 500 managers that included both LWS data and independent measures of job performance. This study examined LWS profile differences between the top 10 percent and bottom 10 percent subgroups (in terms of job performance ratings) and found that the most effective performers had significantly higher feedback scores on the Humanistic-Encouraging, Affiliative, Perfectionistic, Achievement, and Self-Actualizing scales. The least effective performers had significantly higher feedback scores on the Approval, Conventional, Avoidance, Oppositional, and Competitive scales.

A third study examined the relationship between ACUMEN Leadership WorkStyles and ACUMEN Leadership Skills ("ACUMEN Skills"), a multirater competency assessment instrument developed by Acumen International. In this study, bosses and direct reports evaluated how a manager's style (as measured by Leadership WorkStyles) relates to his/her management competencies and overall effectiveness (as measured by ACUMEN Skills). The findings of this study support the earlier Leadership WorkStyles validation research on effective management styles. Managers who scored highest across the 16 competencies in ACUMEN Skills also had significantly higher Leadership WorkStyles scores on the Achievement, Self-Actualizing, Humanistic-Encouraging, and Affiliative scales. This same pattern emerged when the study used either boss ratings of effectiveness or direct report ratings of effectiveness as the criteria. Managers who scored lowest across the 16 ACUMEN Skills competencies had significantly higher LWS scores on the Avoidance, Oppositional, Power, and Competitive scales. Additionally, low overall effectiveness ratings by either boss or direct reports were correlated with lower scores on Achievement, Self-Actualizing, Humanistic-Encouraging, and Affiliative styles.

A fourth study placed 108 managers with Oppositional, Approval, and Dependent styles on teams to compete in a survival simulation against 102 managers with Achievement, Self-

Actualizing, and Humanistic-Encouraging styles. As predicted, the former teams were significantly less able than the latter teams to cooperate, pool resources, and perform effectively.

Other Research

Acumen International also developed a version of *WorkStyles* for individual contributors that is currently available through Human Synergistics. This multirater instrument, ACUMEN Team *WorkStyles*, uses the same 12-scale, circumplex-based model as the leadership version. Team *WorkStyles* was normed and validated on a sample of 2,057 individual contributors who were rated by 11,324 coworkers. Analyses of their data show that a similar top-heavy profile is associated with effective performance on the job: high scores on the Perfectionistic, Achievement, Self-Actualizing, Humanistic-Encouraging, and Affiliative scales. Individual contributors were rated on nine different job performance measures, and each of the style scales were found to be significantly related to at least one of these measures of effectiveness.

A Cautionary Statement on Misinterpretations

The purpose of LWS is to provide developmental feedback to participating individuals. Human Synergistics prescribes that LWS be used only for developmental purposes.

International Use

Translations

LWS has been translated into Swedish and German.

International norms

LWS contains an international norm base including 69 percent from the continental U.S. and Canada, 29 percent from Europe (primarily Romania, U.K., Sweden, Poland, and Germany), and 2 percent from Asian countries.

Internationally tested for validity/reliability

WorkStyles has been validated for use in France and Japan.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE FEEDBACK REPORT

Types of Feedback Display: Circumplex, Narrative

LWS presents the overall results on normed circumplexes accompanied by detailed and personalized narrative reports. The feedback report describes the productive and counterproductive aspects found in the profile, as well as providing suggestions for development. The graphic display

for the self-assessment shows scores as shaded areas in a circumplex. The longer the extension, the higher the percentile score. While the graphic profiles provide a useful summary of the assessment results, the key to LWS feedback is the extensive use of narrative reports.

Breakout of Rater Responses

LWS allows for breakout profiles for six different categories of respondents (bosses, peers, direct reports, internal customers, external customers, and others), including multiple boss breakout profiles.

Feedback Delivery Strategies

Comparison to norms

Percentile scores for the leader or manager are displayed graphically on the circumplex.

Current norms for LWS self-ratings are based on a sample of 4,500 leaders and managers. Each of the 4,500 leaders and managers completed a self-assessment and received feedback from at least four coworkers. The norm data were collected between 2002 and 2012 from leaders and managers in more than 100 organizations from a wide variety of industries, including banking, insurance, pharmaceuticals, public education, publishing, retail groceries, semiconductor, software, telecommunications, transportation, and utilities. The level of management ranged from supervisor to CEO, and a wide range of functional areas were represented. The majority of managers (about 67 percent) had more than 10 years of work experience, although about 35 percent had been in their current job more than 5 years.

The norms for feedback from others are based on results of 44,297 raters. Of the raters, 9 percent were the manager's boss, 38 percent were peers, 30 percent were direct reports, 7 percent were internal customers, 2 percent were external customers, and 14 percent did not indicate their relationship to the person being rated.

Highlighting largest self-rater discrepancies

The LWS highlights differences between self-ratings and rater feedback by displaying the self and others profile results side by side for comparison, and the narrative discusses the potential strengths and counterproductive tendencies of each in detail.

Item-level feedback

Not available. Item-level feedback is available on a custom basis for the self-ratings and others' ratings.

Highlighting high and low items and scales

LWS includes scale highlights in the narrative report.

Comparison to ideal

Not available.

The LWS workbook includes an exercise in which the participants fill in a blank profile describing the style of a highly effective manager or leader. The exercise can be completed individually or as part of a leadership workshop. The *ACUMEN Leadership WorkStyles Facilitator Guide* provides graphic profiles of the most effective (top 10 percent) and least effective (bottom 10 percent) managers in terms of job performance ratings.

Importance to job or success

Not available.

Do more/do less feedback

Not available.

Narrative interpretation of results

The Individual Feedback Reports include several detailed sections:

- **Self and Others' Perceptions: Summary:** The 2-page narrative overview summarizes the manager's potential strengths and development needs based on how his or her predominant styles influence the person's effectiveness in the areas of accomplishing tasks and engaging in teamwork—based on both self-reports and others' perceptions.
- **Others' Perceptions: A Closer Look:** This 4-to-5-page section provides a detailed analysis of others' perceptions of the individual's predominant styles and effectiveness in managing tasks, managing people, managing conflict, and leadership. The section also includes a personalized outline of potential developmental areas and suggestions for improvement.
- **Spread of Opinion:** Indicates the degree of agreement across respondents in describing the leader's work style. This section displays the amount of variation in respondents' descriptions of the leader along each style based on standard deviation.
- **Suggestions for Development:** Provides a personalized, detailed selection of ideas, actions, and activities intended to stimulate a manager's thinking about ways to enhance leadership effectiveness.
- **Comments from Respondents:** Respondents have the opportunity to provide developmental comments and suggestions that will be displayed unedited and in random order.

Open-ended questions

Not available.

SUPPORT AND DEVELOPMENTAL MATERIALS

Support for Participant

Development planning guide

The LWS workbook provides a formalized Action Planning Process. The Workbook contains a guide for evaluating and working with results and outlines a personalized developmental plan for change.

Workshop

Not available.

Post-assessment

Not available.

Vendor hotline

(800) 622-7584.

Cards

Not available.

Support for Trainer

Trainer's guide/manual

The *ACUMEN Leadership WorkStyles Facilitator Guide* is an administrative support guide available to help trainers lead a development course using LWS feedback. It serves as a technical guide, an administrative guide, and a leader guide. The leader guide is fully scripted, includes presentation slides, and offers all required instructional material for leading a workshop.

Workshop

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

Human Synergistics can provide complete workshop materials, including how to administer LWS, and numerous research papers on LWS validity and reliability.

Video

Not available.

Internet

LWS assessments are easily completed online.

PowerPoint presentation

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

Group profile/report

These composite reports compile the participants' results to create group averages for self and others ratings and provide an overall profile for a particular group. A minimum of three participants is required to produce a composite report.

Certification Requirement

Certification is not required to use LWS.

Scoring Process

LWS uses web-based or paper forms to collect and analyze data from managers and raters in an organization.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Cost

Cost varies depending on geographical location, volume, and reporting options. The LWS feedback package, in the U.S., includes one Self-Report Inventory, 12 Description by Others Inventories, Workbook, administrative support, and a Personalized Individual Feedback Report. The LWS Self-Assessment Package includes one Self-Report Inventory, Workbook, administrative support, and a Personalized Individual Self-Report.

Please contact your local office for more information.

Length of Instrument

The LWS Report Inventory includes 10 demographic questions and 94 behavioral style items.

The LWS Description by Others Inventory includes nine effectiveness questions, five demographic questions, and 94 items. Participants can complete an assessment in approximately 15 minutes.

ACUMEN Leadership WorkStyles Bibliography

- Conte, H. R., & Plutchik, R. (1981). A circumplex model for interpersonal personality traits. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50*, 701–711.
- Cooke, R. A., & Lafferty, J. C. (1987). *Organizational culture inventory*. Plymouth, MI: Human Synergistics International.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika, 16*(3), 197–234.
- Gratzinger, P., Warren, R. A., & Cooke, R. A. (1990). Psychological orientations and leadership: Thinking styles that differentiate between effective and ineffective managers. In K. E. Clark & M. B. Clark (Eds.), *Measures of leadership* (pp. 239–247). West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America.
- Guest, C. W., & Blucher, S. R. (1997). *Acumen WorkStyles 6.0: Technical report on methods and validity*. San Rafael, CA: Acumen International.
- Lafferty, J. C. (1973). *Level I Life Styles Inventory, Self Description*. Plymouth, MI: Human Synergistics International.
- Leary, T. (1957). *Interpersonal diagnosis of personality*. New York, NY: Ronald Press.
- Warren, R. A., & Gratzinger, P. D. (1990). *Technical review: Acumen methods and validity*. San Rafael, CA: Acumen International.
- Wiggins, J. S. (1979). A psychological taxonomy of trait-descriptive terms: The interpersonal domain. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37*, 395–412.

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>.