

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 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.

Management/Impact

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

Authors: Janet L. Szumal, Ph.D.
Robert A. Cooke, Ph.D.

Copyright Date: 2009

Statement of Purpose

Management/Impact is a feedback system that provides managers and others who have management responsibilities with insights regarding how they approach their work and the impact they have on the people around them. More specifically, Management/Impact focuses on three major areas: (1) Management Approaches—the frequency with which the manager carries out his or her responsibilities in Facilitating versus Inhibiting ways; (2) Impact on Others—the extent to which the manager motivates and drives the people around him or her to behave in Constructive versus Defensive ways; and (3) Management Effectiveness—the manager’s current performance along task, people, and personal criteria.

Target Audience

Management/Impact is relevant and appropriate for managers, project managers, supervisors, and others who have management responsibilities consistent with those measured by Management/Impact.

Feedback Scales

Management/Impact includes 43 scales that are organized into the following areas: Management Approaches (30 scales, 90 items); Impact on Others (12 scales, 60 items); and Management Effectiveness (1 scale, 14 items).

Management Approaches

Management Approaches focuses on the frequency with which the manager carries out 15 different management responsibilities in Facilitating versus Inhibiting ways.

Managing Goals—Facilitating (3 items)

Indicates the frequency with which the manager establishes goals and standards that are achievable, tied to higher-level goals and strategies, and motivating for other people. Sample item: Provide his/her unit with meaningful goals and objectives.

Managing Goals—Inhibiting (3 items)

Indicates the frequency with which the manager establishes goals and standards that are inappropriate, driven by self-interests, and not motivating for other people. Sample item: Set goals that are either inappropriate or unrealistic for his/her unit.

Managing Change—Facilitating (3 items)

Indicates the frequency with which the manager initiates and supports changes and improvements. Sample item: Take advantage of significant trends and new opportunities for his/her unit.

Managing Change—Inhibiting (3 items)

Indicates the frequency with which the manager interferes with and discourages changes and improvements. Sample item: Reject ideas that seem risky or different—even if they could dramatically improve the unit's effectiveness.

Managing Problems—Facilitating (3 items)

Indicates the frequency with which the manager relies on mindfulness and logic to solve problems and make decisions. Sample item: Obtain relevant information and input when solving problems and making decisions.

Managing Problems—Inhibiting (3 items)

Indicates the frequency with which the manager relies on assumptions and intuition to solve problems and make decisions. Sample item: Make decisions before he/she understands the relevant facts.

Managing Results—Facilitating (3 items)

Indicates the frequency with which the manager focuses on both immediate and longer-term results and the means by which they are achieved. Sample item: Evaluate his/her unit's performance in terms of the organization's values and goals.

Managing Results—Inhibiting (3 items)

Indicates the frequency with which the manager strictly focuses on short-term outcomes and results and disregards the means by which they are achieved. Sample item: Concentrate more on what is achieved rather than how it is achieved.

Managing Resources—Facilitating (3 items)

Indicates the frequency with which the manager strategically acquires and allocates resources

in ways that generate the most value over the long term. Sample item: Identify creative ways of utilizing the resources available to his/her unit.

Managing Resources—Inhibiting (3 items)

Indicates the frequency with which the manager acquires and allocates resources in ways that emphasize their immediate value or serve more personal (as opposed to unit or organizational) interests. Sample item: Overlook or neglect better ways of using current resources.

Managing Work Activities—Facilitating (3 items)

Indicates the frequency with which the manager delegates activities and empowers others in carrying out their work. Sample item: Give people autonomy in carrying out their work assignments.

Managing Work Activities—Inhibiting (3 items)

Indicates the frequency with which the manager maintains tight control over the work carried out by his/her unit. Sample item: Dictate rather than delegate the details for carrying out assignments.

Managing Inter-unit Relations—Facilitating (3 items)

Indicates the frequency with which the manager emphasizes integration and coordination with other units. Sample item: Invite other units from the organization to participate in and influence decisions that involve or affect them.

Managing Inter-unit Relations—Inhibiting (3 items)

Indicates the frequency with which the manager emphasizes independence from and competition with other units. Sample item: Complain about or criticize other units within the organization.

Managing Teams—Facilitating (3 items)

Indicates the frequency with which the manager creates opportunities for people to work together as a unit or team. Sample item: Meet with the entire unit or team (rather than individual members) on team-related issues.

Managing Teams—Inhibiting (3 items)

Indicates the frequency with which the manager focuses on individuals rather than the team as a whole. Sample item: Take sides when disagreements arise within your unit.

Managing Communications—Facilitating (3 items)

Indicates the frequency with which the manager relies on two-way communication to gather and disseminate information. Sample item: Really listen to what people have to say.

Managing Communications—Inhibiting (3 items)

Indicates the frequency with which the manager relies on one-way communication channels and focuses more on disseminating than gathering information. Sample item: Rely on the most convenient modes of communication—regardless of whether they are the most appropriate or effective.

Managing Rewards—Facilitating (3 items)

Indicates the frequency with which the manager actively recognizes other people's efforts and performance in meaningful ways. Sample item: Express appreciation for people's efforts.

Managing Rewards—Inhibiting (3 items)

Indicates the frequency with which the manager overlooks or fails to notice people's efforts and performance. Sample item: Overlook or take for granted the amount of effort that people put into their work.

Managing Learning—Facilitating (3 items)

Indicates the frequency with which the manager provides suggestions and guidance to help other people learn and improve. Sample item: Provide others with constructive feedback and suggestions to help them improve.

Managing Learning—Inhibiting (3 items)

Indicates the frequency with which the manager fails to help others or provides the wrong kind of help when people are experiencing performance difficulties or problems. Sample item: Try to "fix" others' mistakes or errors by himself/herself (rather than help them learn how to correct things for themselves).

Managing Personal Relations—Facilitating (3 items)

Indicates the frequency with which the manager treats people fairly and with respect. Sample item: Demonstrate courtesy and consideration for others.

Managing Personal Relations—Inhibiting (3 items)

Indicates the frequency with which the manager treats people with indifference or insensitivity. Sample item: Disregard the needs and interests of others.

Managing Integrity—Facilitating (3 items)

Indicates the frequency with which the manager behaves in a reliable, credible, and sincere manner. Sample item: Behave in a genuine, sincere manner.

Managing Integrity—Inhibiting (3 items)

Indicates the frequency with which the manager is inconsistent and misleading in what he/she says and does. Sample item: Say one thing—and then do something different later.

Managing Self-development—Facilitating (3 items)

Indicates the frequency with which the manager takes action to improve and overcome weaknesses in his/her thinking and behavior. Sample item: Learn from (rather than repeat) mistakes.

Managing Self-development—Inhibiting (3 items)

Indicates the frequency with which the manager rejects opportunities to improve and develop himself/herself. Sample item: Blame others for his/her mistakes or errors.

Managing Emotions—Facilitating (3 items)

Indicates the frequency with which the manager thinks before he/she reacts—even in challenging or difficult situations. Sample item: Stay focused—even when dealing with upsetting situations.

Managing Emotions—Inhibiting (3 items)

Indicates the frequency with which the manager impulsively reacts before he/she thinks. Sample item: Let emotions override his/her better judgment.

Impact on Others

Impact on Others consists of 12 scales that indicate the extent to which the manager motivates and drives the people around him or her to behave in Constructive versus Defensive ways.

Constructive*Achievement* (5 items)

Indicates the extent to which the manager motivates and encourages others to set challenging yet realistic goals, establish plans to reach those goals, and pursue them with enthusiasm. Sample item: Expect people to take “ownership” over decisions and actions.

Self-actualizing (5 items)

Indicates the extent to which the manager motivates and encourages others to gain enjoyment from their work, develop themselves professionally, and approach problems with interest, creativity, and integrity. Sample item: Expect people to maintain their integrity and personal standards.

Humanistic-Encouraging (5 items)

Indicates the extent to which the manager 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: Encourage people to show concern for the needs of others.

Affiliative (5 items)

Indicates the extent to which the manager 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: Encourage people to discuss things in a friendly and open manner.

Passive/Defensive*Approval* (5 items)

Indicates the extent to which the manager motivates and requires others to gain the consent of those around them, “go along” with people, and maintain (superficially) pleasant interpersonal relationships. Sample item: Expect people to “go along” with others.

Conventional (5 items)

Indicates the extent to which the manager motivates and requires others to conform, fit in the mold, and adhere to rules, policies, and standard operating procedures. Sample item: cause people to refer to rules and procedures to justify their actions.

Dependent (5 items)

Indicates the extent to which the manager 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: Expect people to simply do what they are told.

Avoidance (5 items)

Indicates the extent to which the manager motivates and requires others to shift responsibilities to others, maintain a low profile, and avoid any possibility of being blamed for a mistake. Sample item: Lead people to play it safe and wait for others to act first.

Aggressive/Defensive*Oppositional* (5 items)

Indicates the extent to which the manager motivates and drives others to point out mistakes, gain status by being critical, and dismiss even good ideas due to minor flaws. Sample item: Lead people to be critical and hard to impress.

Power (5 items)

Indicates the extent to which the manager motivates and drives others to act forceful and aggressive, control the people around them, and build up their power base. Sample item: Drive people to act forceful.

Competitive (5 items)

Indicates the extent to which the manager motivates and drives others to operate in a win/lose framework, outperform their peers, and do anything to look good. Sample item: Prompt people to turn the job into a contest.

Perfectionistic (5 items)

Indicates the extent to which the manager 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: Expect people to work long, hard hours.

Management Effectiveness (14 items)

Measures management effectiveness versus ineffectiveness as related to task, people, and personal (self) criteria of effectiveness. Sample item: Allows the organization to stagnate OR Moves the organization toward its vision and goals.

Response Scales

Management/Impact uses both five-point Likert rating scales and seven-point semantic differentials.

Five-point frequency rating scales are used for the items measuring the Management Approaches. Respondents select from the following response options to describe how frequently the focal manager uses Facilitating and Inhibiting management approaches when carrying out the 15 management responsibilities:

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

Respondents also describe managers' Impact on Others along a five-point Likert rating scale. Respondents select from the following options to indicate the extent to which the focal manager drives or motivates people to behave in certain ways:

- 0 = Not at all
- 1 = To a slight extent
- 2 = To a moderate extent
- 3 = To a great extent
- 4 = 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 14 continuums, each of which is defined by a pair of polar terms. For example:

Limits others' productivity 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Enhances others' productivity

The response options for the Management Approaches and the Impact on Others items are the same on the Self Report and Description by Others Inventories. The effectiveness items only appear in the Description by Others Inventory.

Customization Options: Rater Groups

Breakout results for higher-level managers, peers, and direct reports are optional.

INSTRUMENT DEVELOPMENT

Origin of Items: Theory, Research

Management Effectiveness

The development of the Management Effectiveness and Impact on Others items and scales for Management/Impact were influenced by the Human Synergetics' Leadership/Impact inventory (Cooke & Lafferty, 1996). The theoretical model underpinning the major constructs measured by Management/Impact and Leadership/Impact 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 focused 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 Leadership/Impact and, subsequently, Management/Impact.

Research conducted by Human Synergetics (1986) gave support to the contention 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, 2000), Klein (1992), Masi and Cooke (2000) and others found that the behaviors expected and reinforced by managers have implications for unit as well as organizational effectiveness.

The theoretical model underlying both Management/Impact and Leadership/Impact suggests that the manner in which managers approach their management and leadership activities and responsibilities has an impact on the behavior of others. In turn, the strategies and approaches used by the manager and the impact that he or she has on the behavior of others have implications for his or her effectiveness. The main difference between Management/Impact and Leadership/Impact is that the former focuses on the ways in which managers approach their more tactical, day-to-day management responsibilities and the impact that has on the behavior of the people around them and their management effectiveness. The latter, on the other hand, focuses on the strategies that managers use to carry out their more overarching, strategic-oriented leadership responsibilities and the impact that has on the behavior of others and their leadership effectiveness. As pointed out by various authors (for example, Buckingham & Coffman, 1999; Kotter, 1990), both management and leadership activities are critical for an organization to function effectively. However, because not all managers are responsible for both leadership and management activities, and some managers need to work more on their leadership skills whereas others need to focus more on improving their management skills, Management/Impact and Leadership/Impact were designed to focus on different aspects of the manager's role.

Impact on Others

The Impact on Others scales emerged from the basic framework developed for the Life Styles Inventory (Lafferty, 1973) and the Organizational Culture Inventory (Cooke & Lafferty, 1983). This framework was used to define 12 sets of behaviors that a manager can encourage or promote and are described by two underlying dimensions. The first dimension is based on Maslow's

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 & Mouton, 1964).

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

Managers 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 managers are achievement, self-actualizing, humanistic-encouraging, and affiliative.

Managers 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 managers are approval, conventional, dependent, and avoidance.

Managers 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 managers are oppositional, power, competitive, and perfectionistic.

Finally, the theoretical model underlying Management/Impact 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 provide an important benchmark against which that impact can be compared (Cooke & Sharkey, 2006; Fuda, 2010).

Management Approaches

Research based on the Human Synergetics' Organizational Culture Inventory and Organizational Effectiveness Inventory influenced the development of the Management Approaches scales and items. Management/Impact measures the frequency with which an individual employs facilitating and inhibiting approaches when carrying out 15 responsibilities relevant to managing tasks, people, and self (that is, personal). The focus on facilitating and inhibiting approaches is consistent with the dichotomous frameworks suggested by a number of management theories for understanding and differentiating between more and less effective approaches to management (Fisher, 2000; McGregor, 1960; Walton, 1985). The 15 management responsibilities were selected from a longer list that was compiled based on an extensive review of the management literature. From this list, responsibilities that could be carried out in facilitating versus inhibiting ways that in turn would likely have a constructive versus defensive impact on other people were identified and items were developed (Szumal & Cooke, 2009).

Development of Feedback Scales

Data from 1,290 respondents describing 220 managers using the Management/Impact Descriptions by Others inventory were used to confirm the factor structure of the Management Approaches, Impact on Others, and Management Effectiveness scales using principal components analysis with promax rotation. A summary of the results is presented below and the implications are discussed in the section on construct validity.

A two-factor solution explains approximately 64 percent of the variance in the 30 Management Approaches scales. The two factors reflect inhibiting and facilitating management approaches with 29 of the 30 scales loading on the correct factor. The negative loading of the Personal Relations—Facilitating scale on the inhibiting factor is stronger than its positive loading on the Facilitating factor. When principal components analysis was run again with the two Personal Relations scales (Facilitating and Inhibiting) removed, the remaining 28 scales all loaded on the correct factors with 64 percent of the variance explained by the factors.

A three-factor solution explains approximately 78 percent of the variance in the 12 Impact on Others scales. These factors reflect Constructive, Passive/Defensive, and Aggressive/Defensive impact styles. Eleven of the 12 scales load on the proper factor. The Approval scale loads on both the Passive/Defensive and Aggressive/Defensive factors, with a slightly stronger loading on the Aggressive/Defensive factor. Given this, two items have been modified to enhance the validity of this scale. Analyses carried out on data collected since the modifications shows that the 12 impact scales, including Approval, now all load on the correct factors (Szumal, 2012).

A one-factor solution most parsimoniously explains the variance in the 14 Management Effectiveness items. The factor explains approximately 67 percent of the variance in the items and reflects Overall Management Effectiveness.

Reliability

The data from the same 1,290 respondents as above were used for these analyses.

Internal consistency

Cronbach's (1951) alpha was used to gauge the internal consistency of the Management/Impact scales. The alphas for the Management Approaches scales range from .57 to .84, with an average alpha equal to .70. Alphas for the Impact on Others scales range from .65 to .87, with an average alpha equal to .76, and the alpha for the Management Effectiveness scale equals .96.

Interrater reliability

Interrater reliability was examined using a series of one-way analyses of variance (ANOVAs) with the focal manager as the independent variable and the Management/Impact scales as the dependent variables.

The *F* statistics for the two composite and 30 specific Management Approaches scales are significant at the .0001 level. The eta-squared statistics for the composite Management Approaches

scales (Facilitating and Inhibiting) are .33 and .32, respectively, and range from .25 to .33 for the 30 specific scales, with the average equal to .30. The F statistics for the 12 Impact on Others scales are significant at the .0001 level. The eta-squared statistics for these scales range from .27 for Approval to .41 for Conventional, with an average eta-squared statistic of .33. The F statistic for the Management Effectiveness scale is also significant at the .0001 level, with the eta-squared statistic equal to .27.

Test-retest reliability

Not available.

Validity

Construct validity

Convergent

Discriminant

The results of the principal components analysis on data from the 1,290 respondents describing 220 managers were used to examine the construct validity of the Management/Impact scales. The analyses were conducted using promax rotation given that all of the scales are theoretically related.

For the analysis carried out on the 12 Impact on Others scales, the 4 Constructive scales all load on the first factor, the 4 Aggressive/Defensive scales load on the second factor, and the 4 Passive/Defensive scales load on the third factor, providing strong evidence of the convergent validity of these scales. Eleven of the 12 scales do not load on any other factor, providing strong evidence for their discriminant validity. The Approval scale is the only one that loads on two factors, with a slightly higher loading on the Aggressive/Defensive factor than the Passive/Defensive factor. As noted above, two of the items in this scale have since been modified to enhance this scale's discriminant validity.

The results of the analysis of the 30 Management Approaches scales show that all of the Inhibiting scales load only on the first factor and 14 of the 15 Facilitating scales load only on the second factor, providing strong support for both the convergent and discriminant validity of these scales. The loadings for the Personal Relations—Facilitating scale are just above -.40 on the Inhibiting factor and just below .40 on the Facilitating factor, suggesting that this particular scale may measure a lack of an inhibiting approach to the same extent as the demonstration of a facilitating one.

Convergent validity of the 14 Management Effectiveness items is demonstrated by their loading on to a single factor, representing Overall Management Effectiveness.

Criterion-related validity

Concurrent

Predictive

The descriptions of 220 focal managers by 1,290 others who completed the Management/Impact Descriptions by Others inventory were aggregated to the manager level and then correlations

were run to examine the concurrent validity of the Management/Impact scales. All of the correlations described below are significant at $p < .001$ and are in directions consistent with the theoretical framework underlying Management/Impact.

The composite Facilitating Approach scale is positive related to the 4 Constructive Impact on Others (correlations range from .73 to .79) and Overall Management Effectiveness (correlation equals .74) scales and negatively related to the Passive/Defensive and Aggressive/Defensive Impact scales (correlations range from -.17 to -.41). The composite Inhibiting Approach Management scale is positively related to the 8 Passive/Defensive and Aggressive/Defensive Impact on Others scales (correlations range from .41 to .59) and negatively correlated with the Constructive Impact (correlations range from -.50 to -.60) and Overall Management Effectiveness (correlation equals -.69) scales.

The Constructive Impact on Others scales are also positively correlated with Overall Management Effectiveness (correlations range from .57 to .62), whereas the Passive/Defensive and Aggressive/Defensive Impact scales are negatively correlated with Overall Management Effectiveness (correlations range from -.22 to -.42).

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.

International Use

Translations

Not available.

International norms

Not available.

Internationally tested for validity/reliability

No.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE FEEDBACK REPORT

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

Participants receive a confidential feedback report that includes bar charts for the management responsibilities and circumplacial profiles showing percentile scores for the impact styles. Item-level feedback is reported in tables that also show the discrepancies between others' reports and self-report. Composite feedback from others regarding management effectiveness is presented at the item level in tables and grid/plot form, showing average scores and standard deviations.

Breakout of Rater Responses

Results along the Impact on Others and the specific Management Approaches scales can be reported for higher-level managers, 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 a sample of 220 managers who were described by 1,290 others (direct reports, peers, and higher-level managers). Text regarding the benchmark scores along the Management Approaches scales is provided.

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 tables that show the numerical differences. Self/others discrepancies along the Management Approaches are highlighted by bar charts and tables.

Item-level feedback

Item-level results along all of the Management/Impact 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 percentile 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

The feedback report guides participants through the process of using their feedback to effectively deal with the challenges that they currently face as managers. It is recommended that participants read the sections in sequence to obtain a thorough understanding of their current performance and, more importantly, the steps they can take to enhance their effectiveness as they move forward.

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

A comprehensive notebook and accompanying CD with materials relevant to presenting on Management/Impact as well as interpreting and debriefing Management/Impact results is provided as part of the accreditation program (see below).

Workshop

Human Synergetics offers workshops to help change agents, human resources and organizational development professionals, internal and external consultants, and coaches measurably impact the effectiveness of the organizations they support. These interactive, hands-on workshops focus on expertly applying Human Synergetics processes, assessments, and simulations to meet a variety of organizational-change and development goals, including enhancing the positive impact of managers and leaders; quantifying, creating, and reinforcing constructive cultures; capturing and developing team synergy; and optimizing organizational performance.

Supplemental norms

Not available.

Supplemental materials from the vendor

A comprehensive notebook with an accompanying CD that includes slide presentations, hand-outs, worksheets, and checklists are provided as a part of the accreditation program described below. Other materials that are available and would be useful to trainers include the *Organizational Culture Inventory Interpretation and Development Guide* and the *Life Styles Inventory Leader's Guide*.

Video

Not available.

Internet

Not available.

PowerPoint presentation

PowerPoint presentations are provided on a CD as a part of the accreditation program.

Group profile/report

A composite group profile/report is available upon request.

Certification Requirement

Successful completion of Human Synergistics' Management/Impact Accreditation program is required to purchase and debrief the Management/Impact inventory. The following is required:

1. Accreditation Workshop

In this one-and-a-half-day workshop, participants will learn from both a Human Synergistics facilitator and an experienced Management/Impact practitioner how to administer, interpret, and debrief Management/Impact. Learning methods include a combination of lecture, case study, individual and group work, discussion, handouts, and homework. Participants will also receive a variety of slide presentations, worksheets, handouts, and checklists that they can use later to facilitate their own Management/Impact projects. Workshop prerequisite is attendance at a Human Synergistics' Quantifying Organizational Culture and Personal Styles Workshop or Foundation Workshop, or attendance at an Acumen Leadership *WorkStyles* Workshop.

2. Accreditation Exam

This in-class exam is designed to develop participants' knowledge and skills by providing them with developmental feedback on their analysis and interpretation of Management/Impact results. Deficiencies in answers must be corrected in order to move on to the Accreditation Project.

3. Accreditation Project

Each participant is provided up to three Management/Impact kits that they can use to gain hands-on experience administering, interpreting, and debriefing a Management/Impact project. The Management/Impact accreditation projects of participants must be administered and debriefed within four months of attending the Management/Impact Accreditation Workshop.

4. Debrief Webinar

In this two-hour webinar, participants will be given the opportunity to share the results and outcomes of their project and receive feedback both from other participants and Human Synergistics facilitators. This component must be completed within six months of attending the Management/Impact Accreditation Workshop.

Scoring Process

Management/Impact uses web-based or paper forms to collect and analyze information from focal managers, direct reports, peers, and higher-level managers in an organization.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Cost

Cost varies depending on geographical location, volume, and reporting options. The Management/Impact basic assessment package, in the United States, includes one Self-Report Inventory, 12 Description by Others Inventories, administrative support, and a personalized Confidential Feedback Report for \$200.

Please contact your local Human Synergistics office for more information.

Length of Instrument

The Management/Impact Self-Report Inventory consists of 150 items and takes approximately 20 to 25 minutes to complete. The Management/Impact Description by Others inventory consists of 164 items and takes approximately 25 to 30 minutes to complete.

Management/Impact Bibliography

- Buckingham, M., & Coffman, C. (1999). *First break all of the rules*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- 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., & Lafferty, J. C. (1996). *Leadership/Impact*. Plymouth, MI: Human Synergistics.
- Cooke, R. A., & Sharkey, L. (2006). Developing constructive leader impact. *Consulting Today*. http://www.humansynergistics.com/news/documents/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.
- Cooke, R. A., & Szumal, J. L. (2000). Using the Organizational Culture Inventory to understand the operating cultures of organizations. In N. M. Ashkanasy, C. P. M. Wilderom, & M. F. Peterson (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational culture and climate*, 4 (pp. 1032–1045). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, 16(3), 197–234.
- Fisher, K. (2000). *Leading self-directed work teams*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- 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.
- Kotter, J. (1990). *A force for change: How leadership differs from management*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Lafferty, J. C. (1973). *Level I: Life Styles Inventory*. Plymouth, MI: Human Synergistics.
- Masi, R. J. , & Cooke, R. A. (2000). Effects of transformational leadership on subordinate motivation, empowering norms, and organizational productivity. *The International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 8, 16–47.
- McGregor, D. (1960). *The human side of enterprise*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- 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. (2012). *The reliability and validity of Management/Impact*. Plymouth, MI: Human Synergistics International.
- Szumal, J. L., & Cooke, R. A. (2009). *Management/Impact Confidential Feedback Report*. Plymouth, MI: Human Synergistics International.
- Walton, R. E. (1985). From control to commitment in the workplace. *Harvard Business Review*, 64(2), 77–84.
- 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>.