

Spring 2017

Leadership Instruments Library (LIL) for Graduate Research

Sam Nickels
James Madison University

Karen A. Ford
James Madison University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.lib.jmu.edu/lil>



Part of the [Leadership Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Nickels, Sam and Ford, Karen A., "Leadership Instruments Library (LIL) for Graduate Research" (2017). *Leadership Instruments Library*. 1.
<https://commons.lib.jmu.edu/lil/1>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Strategic Leadership Studies at JMU Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Leadership Instruments Library by an authorized administrator of JMU Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact dc_admin@jmu.edu.

Leadership Instruments Library (LIL) for Graduate Research

Created by Sam Nickels at the request of the School of Strategic Leadership Studies (SSLS) program at James Madison University, 2016-2017. Anyone should feel free to suggest updates, expand the information on instruments or add new instruments. Send the information to SSLS and we'll screen the info before adding it to the library. Suggested changes/additions need to be well documented with citations. To provide corrected or new information, please contact the School of Strategic Leadership Studies at James Madison University: SSLS@jmu.edu. We hope you find it useful!

Dr. Sam Nickels, former graduate assistant at SSLS (SamuelNickels@yahoo.com) and
Dr. Karen Ford, Head, SSLS (Fordka@jmu.edu).

Table of Contents

There are no page numbers in the TOC due to the evolving nature of this document. To reach a section or to search the document, please use the search function (Ctrl-F) and enter the word(s) you are looking for.

- Acknowledgements
- Purpose and Introduction
- How to use the LIL
- List of Sources
- Brief List of Instruments (alphabetical listing of instruments, categories, reviews)
- Detailed List of Instruments (instruments, categories, reviews, comparative studies)
- Resources and Reviews of Instruments
- Research Designs and Frameworks (for assessing leadership and leadership development)
- Additional Leadership Resources and Related Instruments (such as organizational assessment, social capital and empowerment)
- Recommendations for further research on leadership instruments
- References
- Appendixes

Acknowledgements

February 23, 2017: The LIL was the brainchild of Dr. Karen Ford and staff at the School for Strategic Leadership Studies (SSLS) at James Madison University (JMU) in Harrisonburg Virginia, including Dr. Margaret Sloan, Dr. Dary Erwin, Dr. Adam Vanhove, and Brooke Rhodes. SSLS wishes to thank Dr. Sam Nickels for leading and writing the first draft of this project. He was assisted in the first edition by JMU Honors Program students carrying out an independent study: Jamie Simpkins, Elijah Phillips, and Karlie Lorenz.

Introduction

This library consists of over 100 instruments that are related to individual and organizational measures of leadership. Below this list are additional instruments that are indirectly related to leadership, for example, empowerment.

Where available or where we had time to obtain the information, this listing includes name of instrument, number of citations, focus/use of the instrument, target population(s), information on validity and reliability (including follow-up tests by other researchers), date of instrument and how long and to what extent it's been used, who developed the instrument, whether it is open source and available free or what the cost is and how to access/find the instrument, limitations, whether the instrument is available in other languages, and so on. While many instrument have been validated or adapted and validated in other languages and countries, this library project was not of the scope to try to include this information. However, one can easily search in other languages and find a much larger number of available instruments. Instruments covered in this review include current and older instruments, some of which have been adapted to newer and shorter versions, but this library focuses primarily on original versions, so it is up to you to search for newer, adapted, or shorter validated versions.

One approach to leadership development is through feedback. This approach tends to be used for leadership development purposes rather than research, but there is some overlap, and some such tools (such as 360 degree feedback tools) are included in this Library. For descriptive information about types of feedback tools (assessments, multi-rater feedback, experiential activities, and input from key stakeholders) please read the article "Feedback and Leadership" by Steve Wolinski (2011) included in this library as an Appendix under the title "Introduction to types of leadership feedback tools."

Leadership is defined differently by both theorists and the context. As such, there is no broadly accepted definition of leadership; nor should there necessarily be one definition. There are student leaders, production team leaders, community organizing leaders, nonprofit executives, various ranks of military leaders, company CEOs, nonprofit board leaders, teachers as leaders, administration leaders in higher education, grassroots association community leaders, religious leaders and leaders of gender-based men's and women's religious groups (monks/nuns), political leaders at various local, state and national contexts, female and male styles, ethnic subcultural influences on leaders, international style differences, traditions within a multitude of indigenous peoples, and so on. As such, one will not encounter a one-size-fits-all leadership instrument. "The design of [a] leadership instrument depends upon the specific leadership theory on which it is based, and will target traits, behaviours, interactions, charisma or other dimensions accordingly. In other words, different leadership instruments measure different leadership facets. It follows that in measuring leadership, the person requiring the measure must understand exactly what is to be measured, and select the appropriate instrument" (Johnson, n.d., 2). For example, House and Aditya (1997) note most leadership studies have focused on supervisory leadership, with the result that most leadership instruments are limited in application to supervisors and managers.

In the nearly 2000 pages of the *Encyclopedia of Leadership* (Goerthals et al., 2004) there is less than one page on measuring leadership. In the same text, Nirenberg (2004) says “If being effective is important, it should be measured” (849), yet he provides little to help guide us. He says followers need to be satisfied and objectives need to be met, regular observable feedback is more likely at the small-group level, and that 360-degree feedback instruments are useful for obtaining feedback from others at all levels. Without 360 measures (other people to rate the leader), there is little to no incentive for followers to push for more effective leadership, because they have no power over their supervisor. Political leadership is different because politicians use polls to solicit information about what their followers want and how they feel about him/her. Nirenberg does provide a long list of personal and interpersonal skills and attributes that contribute to success at the individual level as well, derived from studies of the corporate sector. Regarding evaluating leadership effectiveness in the organizational context, Nirenberg states that the right environment can be determined by surveys and structured action research techniques involving all employees in developing the culture they will find most satisfying and productive (852). Likewise, a search of “*Leadership in Nonprofit Organizations: A Reference Handbook*” (Agard, 2011) issuing over 1000 pages had no entries at all for “measuring,” “instruments,” or “scales,” nor did articles on theory discuss measurement. Thus the *Encyclopedia of Leadership* left me feeling somewhat frustrated. It seems it is up to us to determine what we think we should measure in a particular context and look for instruments that are accomplishing that, are tested and valid, as well as affordable. There are no easy paths here.

There are some important issues to consider in designing leadership research and deciding which tools may be most appropriate. Day and Antonakis in “*The Nature of Leadership*” (2012) note that leadership has global, shared, and configural properties that each reflect different forms of aggregation from lower-level units (events, individuals, groups, and organizations). In addition, they cite newer quantitative techniques that can help researchers ask new questions and study traditional leadership questions in novel ways (e.g., latent polynomial regression, multilevel member weighted modeling, intercept as mean latent growth modeling, multilevel SEM, and latent class cluster analysis). The point is that these techniques can be used as means of measuring leadership, especially in complex relationships among numerous variables, in addition to the traditional leadership instruments, which is what this library primarily covers. Likewise, outside the scope of this library are techniques mentioned by Zyphur, Barsky, and Zhang (2012) that may be useful to leadership researchers, such as “agent-based simulations for testing complexity theories of leadership (e.g., Dionne & Dionne, 2008), social network-based approaches to study shared leadership (e.g., Carson, Tesluk, & Marrone, 2007; Ensley, Hmieleski, & Pearce, 2006), the life narrative method for examining leadership development (e.g., Ligon, Hunter & Mumford, 2008), and various biological approaches (e.g. Zhang, Ilies & Arvey, 2009)” (67).

Judge and Long (2012) argue that researchers have recently criticized the bias inherent in most leadership research and instruments towards positive outcomes only. There are negative leadership traits in addition to positive ones, and positive traits can sometimes have negative outcomes on leaders, followers and organizations (see Table 6.1 in the text). They call for

further development of scales to capture the above paradox and measure all traits, resulting in a more comprehensive understanding of the influence of inherited traits. Unfortunately, they do not discuss specific instruments; researchers will need to do a search based on this and cited articles to look for articles published since 2012 that may have developed instruments that include negative traits.

Judge and Long (2012) argue another area in which researchers have recently criticized the bias inherent in 360 degree instruments where followers are asked to fill out surveys to assess the effectiveness of leader behaviors. Critics argue that 1) researchers are assuming followers need or even desire leadership, and 2) researchers assume that leader behavior is always observed. However, many workers don't spend much time with their leaders, and leaders often do a lot of their work in places unobserved by followers. As a remedy to these potential problems, the authors argue that "researchers should not rely too much on follower perception of behaviors (Hunter et al., 2007) and we should corroborate follower perceptions with other more pertinent performance measures....Studies should control of interaction time by measuring how often followers actually observe their leaders performing work tasks" (206).

Finally, Judge and Long (2012) cover another area of concern: measurement issues of outcomes. They state that many critics say that research often places too much emphasis on how leaders are perceived by followers and peers, and not enough emphasis on how organizations actually perform. The end result is that politics and socializing are potentially more influential of captured leader outcomes than is the actual impact that leaders have on group or organizational performance. They suggest a more useful approach would be to study the actual impact that leaders have on group processes, team results, and ultimately the success of the organization. A related issue is whether the researcher is measuring the process or the goal accomplishment ("How did the team play?" vs. "Did the team win?"). To alleviate the "play versus win" debate, the authors suggest 1) researchers investigate and incorporate comprehensive measures used by organizations like a balanced scorecard to capture multiple leader outcomes, 2) utilize external resources and perspectives, such as benchmarking, to measure performance (to mitigate inward-looking focus that plagues many research studies), and 3) ensure proper time lags in studies as a best practice to measure objective leader outcomes because it often takes time for outcomes to appear.

Judge and Long (2012) note that mediators should also be considered important in studies. For example, they cite research that shows transformational and charismatic leader behaviors may mediate the links between leader traits and outcomes; that the Big Five personality dimensions may mediate leader behaviors of initiating structure and consideration; that ethical and authentic leadership behaviors may influence outcomes; and that leader motives (to get along, to get ahead, to find meaning) may link leader traits with leader emergence.

Note on being careful with weak methodologies and instruments: "The preponderance of weak study designs in health care leadership research has been noted by others (eg Gilmartin and D'Aunno, 2007; Cummings, Lee, MacGregor, Paul, Stafford, Davey & Wong, 2008; Brady Germain & Cummings, 2010; Wong et al., 2013). Among the key problems are small sample sizes; lack of underpinning theory; survey instruments with inadequate reliability and validity;

failure to measure important control variables; cross sectional designs; reliance on self-report (eg for measuring patient safety); and poor measurement of leadership (not systematic), all of which makes it difficult to draw more wide-ranging conclusions about the processes by which leadership affects key outcomes, in terms of moderators or mediators. Multilevel analysis could be used more effectively in this literature, as there seems to be an almost exclusive focus on the individual level rather than on teams or the organisational level (eg, strategic leadership)" (West et al., 2015, 13).

Note on leadership in the nonprofit sector: There are few instruments if any that have been specifically designed for use in the nonprofit sector. Armstrong and Ashraff, (2011) write about nonprofit leadership competencies and highlight Light's (2002, cited in Armstrong & Ashraff, 2011) theory of 5 key conditions that a nonprofit leader needs to create for followers to succeed; Greenleaf's (1977, cited in Armstrong & Ashraff, 2011) servant leadership; Badaracco's (1998, cited in Armstrong & Ashraff, 2011) moral leadership model; and Martin's (2007, cited in Murphy, 2011) integrative thinking model. Murphy (2011) discusses three theories of leadership that seem most appropriate to the nonprofit sector. These include Greenleaf's servant leadership; Kouzes and Posner's (2007) Five Practices of Leadership; and Helgesen's (1990, 1995) Web of Inclusion model. While neither of these sources discuss measurement tools related to these theories, I will summarize what I've found here. This library contains a number of servant leadership instruments that were rated in a review of best instruments measuring servant leadership. Kouzes and Posner's model has been used in many studies and they sell the authoritative version. For Helgesen's web of inclusion model, a brief search of the literature revealed only 2 qualitative studies. While Light is a prolific author with two books on the nonprofit sector, I could find nothing on studies related to measuring his theories of what is important in nonprofit leaders. Not a single hit came up for studies or even commentaries on Badaracco's model. Nor were there any hits for leadership studies related to Martin's integrative thinking model. In summary, Greenleaf's servant leadership and the Kouzes and Posner's five practices of leadership appear to be the only cited nonprofit models in which leadership has been measured in studies. Having said this, there are instruments like the MLQ-5X that have been used in educational, nonprofit, nursing, and many other nonprofit settings, and claim to have equal success in these settings.

Note on language: my experience searching for instruments in Spanish revealed that many of the instruments I was looking for were available in that language, as well as newly validated adapted or shortened versions of the instrument. These new versions can be translated into English to be used in the U.S. A back-translation process, cognitive review, and piloting process should be used to ensure proper language and cultural re-adaptation of any instrument used in different countries/language/cultures. This can be a lot of work, but can help tremendously if you need something a bit different (shorter, or adapted to a different language or culture sub-population).

The Center for Assessment and Research Studies (CARS) at James Madison University gives a number of tests each year to students and a database of the tests they've provided over the years, along with, I assume, responses to those tests. One test, the GPI (global perspectives

inventory) has a few direct leadership questions such as if students have participated in leadership development programs, and many indirect L questions, such as openness to others and diverse cultures, putting others before oneself, volunteer participation, etc. There is a Univ of OHIO website in charge of the instrument that has reliability/validity data, domain description, etc. Other instruments/ assessments they have used might relate to leadership, but that I have not reviewed include: Civic minded student scale, global experience, American experience, test of ethical reasoning, critical thinking assessment, Rosenberg self esteem scale, conformity authority, student development, meaningful life survey (is this the same as MLQ?), and various non-cognitive assessments, communication assessments, student opinion scales, and so on.

How to Use the LIL

We had various options for how to post this information. We could have created an interactive site with web pages that would increase search functions, but in the end, due to time and financial constraints, we opted to simply post a Word format document and let people do their own searching with the Ctrl-F function keys. To facilitate this we have added keywords to each instrument and to a backend engine search optimizer. This will allow users to easily search and find instruments of interest to them. In addition to Leader and Leadership, these keywords include:

- Sector: Organizational, Business, Private sector, Public sector, Nonprofit sector, For-profit sector, government sector, Military, Higher education, Secondary education.
- Type of instrument: instrument, assessment, questionnaire, inventory.
- Theoretical basis: charismatic, transformational, servant, authentic, empower, ethical, member exchange, personality, path, shared, participatory.
- Target population or group: Education, School, University, Management, Employee, Principal, teacher, executive, grassroots, CEO, women, executive director, team.
- Who assesses: self-assessment, supervisor, self-rater, other-rater, 360.
- Focus: quality of life, motivational, change, behavior, international, global, attributes, development, grassroots, competency, effectiveness, capacity, performance, political, skills, profile.
- Cost: cost-free

Instruments are listed alphabetically. Some instruments fall under categories rather than by their individual name (for example, 360 degree feedback tools). Instrument names sometimes overlap or have the same acronym (MLQ refers to 2 instruments). One may choose to search for instrument names by using the FIND command (Ctrl-F). One can search by keyword as well, for example, searching (in the area of education) by education, principal, educational, school, teacher, higher education, etc. Many instruments do not have clear information about cost – whether the instrument is open source, usable free with permission, usable free for noncommercial academic or research purposes, available at a discount for such purposes, or available only at full cost. Ultimately, it is up to the user of this library to obtain this information and the appropriate permissions. SSSL does not assume any responsibility for improper use of

the instruments accessed in this library. Any inaccurate information regarding cost or permission requirements may be updated by sending the correct information along with justification to SSLS@jmu.edu. We cannot guarantee that any changes will be made or that they will be made within a given time frame.

Much of the information encountered was out of date, incomplete, or lacking important useful data (for example, the target population of the instrument or studies on the instrument, reliability and validity info, etc.). **We encourage users of this library to contribute to its improvement by sending SSLS this kind of information along with sources for where the info came from (citations are critical). This is a free, open source document. Please screen the info you send us to ensure it is public, not copyrighted, or that permission has been granted to post the information.**

A suggestion for searching for leadership instruments on the internet: reviews and meta-analyses, while not usually focused on comparing instruments, do usually list the measurement tool(s) used by each study reviewed. Thus, searching for “meta-analysis” or “review” plus your topic of interest (eg, “student leadership”) may yield a wealth of studies with their instruments listed. This will provide you both a sense of what instruments are available and what instruments are used most broadly.

List of Sources

The information for the library of leadership measurement instruments was gathered non-systematically from a variety of sources over a period of 8 months between 2016 and 2017. These included:

- Discussions with James Madison University faculty and staff in the School of Strategic Leadership Studies, the Center for Assessment Research Studies, and the Department of Graduate Psychology.
- Online searches for leadership libraries, and studies that reviewed or compared leadership instruments. We have not found any other leadership instrument libraries that are current and updated, and thus believe the current resource to be of significant value, especially as relates to instruments that are available at no or low cost along with important information on each one.
- Online google searches for leadership instruments, assessments, measurement, etc.
- Online reviews of graduate leadership schools and programs globally viewable in English, both their websites and calls to the following programs: Gonzaga, Harvard, Stanford, and other universities with leadership development programs.
- Reviews of commercial websites and sometimes calls or emails to inquire about instruments and their availability and cost.
- Review of various instrument libraries not specifically related to leadership (these are noted below as citations for various instruments; please search this document to see if we’ve missed any library of instruments that you are aware of).
- Contacts with European colleagues who are instrument development experts.

Brief List of Instruments

360 leadership assessments and personality/style assessments¹ and Manager View/360 (Leslie and Fleenor, 1998)

Authentic leadership: Practical reflexivity, self-awareness, and self-authorship, Eriksen, M., 2009.

Authentic Leadership Questionnaire (ALQ), Walumbwa et al. (2007).²

Azimuth (Leader Azimuth Check II)

BarOn Emotional Quotient Inventory – 2011.

Benchmarks

Campbell Leadership Descriptor, Campbell, D.

Campbell Leadership Index (CLI). Campbell, D. 1991. "A multi-rater instrument to help measure personal characteristics that are directly related to the nature and demands of leadership."

CK Scale of Charismatic Leadership - by Conger, Kanungo, Menon & Mathur (1997)

Collaborative Leadership Self Assessment – Himmelman

Collaborative Leadership Self Assessment Questionnaire - by TurningPoint

Community leadership development measure – Rohs and Langone, 1997

Community-based leadership development measurement (Forti, 2011)

Curiosity Index - Breadth and Depth (Fulcher and Erwin, 2005)

Educational leadership assessments

Empowering behavior questionnaire

Empowerment Profile (for leaders)

Ethical leadership at work

Executive Success Profile (Leslie / Fleenor, 1998)

EXEC: Survey of Executive Leadership (Leslie / Fleenor, 1998)

Global Leader Index (IMD.org)

¹ Almost all 360 instruments available online come through commercial leadership development consulting firms for a significant cost. However, some 360 degree instruments one might be able to obtain free, especially from organizations that developed their own, or one can construct one's own. Read the 360 section carefully to avoid costly mistakes in the use of these types of multi-rater feedback instruments.

² Comes in various versions, from \$0 to \$250, for example, non-commercial research use is free.

Global Transformational Leadership scale (GTL) (Carless, Wearing, & Mann, 2000).

Government tools – Office of Personnel Management

Harris self-assessment instruments (Harris, 2013)

1. Human Resources Inventory
2. Leadership Motivation Inventory
3. Values Imprint Survey
4. Quality of Life Index
5. Relocation Preparation Index
6. Change Inventory for Leaders
7. Force Field Analysis Inventory
8. Group Maturity Analysis
9. Individual Behavior Analysis
10. Team Performance Survey
11. Team Synergy Analysis Inventory
12. High Performance Management Inventory
13. Management Communications Inventory
14. Managing People Skills Inventory
15. Intercultural Relations Inventory
16. Inventory of Transformational Management Skills
17. Organizational Culture Survey
18. Organizational Role & Relationships Inventory
19. Organizational Meetings
20. Management Inventory

Influence Behavior Questionnaire: MATRIX (Leslie / Fleenor, 1998)

Instructional leadership Evaluation and Development Program (ILEAD). Braskamp, LA.; Maehr, ML. 1985-1988.

International Personality Item Pool (IPIP.ori.org)

Interpersonal Influence Inventory (Glaser, 1983-1993)

LEAD self/other, Blanchard (1996).

Leader Attributes Inventory (LAI)

Leader Behavior Analysis and LBA II. 1991. Zigarmi, Forsyth, Blanchard, et al.

Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ and LBDQ-12), Stogdill (1963).

Leader Behavior Questionnaire: The Visionary Leader (Sashkin, 1984-1996) (Leslie / Fleenor, 1998)

Leader Behavior Scale (Behling & McFillen, 1996, Charismatic Transformational model)

Leader Competency Inventory (LCI-Kelner)

Leader Competency Inventory (LCI-Penn State)

Leader Effectiveness Analysis (Leslie and Fleenor, 1998)

Leader Identity Stage (Pyle, 2013)

Leader Member Exchange (LMX-7)

Leader Self-Identity (Hiller, 2005)

Leadership Archetype Questionnaire – by Kets de Vries et al, 2009

Leadership Development, Handbook of (CCL, 2007)

Leadership Development Evaluation, The Handbook of (CCL/Wiley, 2006)

Leadership Development Report (LDR)

Leadership Effectiveness Analysis (LEA), 1987-1993, Management Research Group (Leslie / Fleenor, 1998)

Leadership Effectiveness Scorecard (Hazy, 2006)

Leadership/Impact (Leslie / Fleenor, 1998)

Leadership Opinion Questionnaire, Fleishman (1969).

Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) (Kouzes and Posner)

Leadership Self Efficacy Scale (Murphy, 1992)

Leadership Skills (Acumen Leadership Skills) (Leslie / Fleenor, 1998)

Leadership Skills Inventory (LSI)

Leadership Skills Inventory – Karnes (LSI – Karnes)

Leadership Skills Profile (1)

Leadership Skills Profile (2)

Leadership Spectrum Profile

Leadership Styles Inventory (Leslie / Fleenor, 1998)

Leadership Tool Assessment Inventory

Leadership Traits Questionnaire (LTQ) - by P. G. Northhouse

Leadership Versatility Index (LVI)

Least Preferred Co-worker (LPC)

Leatherman Leadership Questionnaire (LLQ)

Life Styles Inventory (Leslie and Fleenor, 1998)

Management – The “Free Management Library” (online topic library of resources)

Management and Leadership Systems. Peck, CS. 1992-2001.

Management Effectiveness Profile System (MEPS) (Leslie / Fleenor, 1998)

Managerial Practices Survey (Yukl, 1990): COMPASS

MATRIX: The Influence Behavior Questionnaire (Leslie and Fleenor, 1998)

Meaning in Life Questionnaire (MLQ) (Steger, Frazier, Oishi, & Kaler, 2006)

MSCEIT – Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test, 2002.

MLQ-5X (multifactorial leadership questionnaire)

Organizational capacity: The Social Capital Assessment Tool (World Bank, 1999)

Organizational leadership assessments (Charting Impact, by the Independent Sector, 2016)

Organizational leadership development and succession planning diagnostic (Bridgespan)

Organizational leadership in philanthropy (GEO, 2016)

Organizational leadership trait identification (Bridgespan)

Path-Goal Leadership Questionnaire - by Indvik (1985, 1988)

Performance Skills Leader. Human Technology, Inc. 1996.

Personality assessments – Myers-Briggs Type Indicator® (MBTI®), Behavioral Style DISC™ Profile, Everything DiSC – Workplace, Everything DiSC – Work of Leaders, Subject-Object Interview (SOI), Hogan Personality Inventory (HPI), NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI), California Psychological Inventory (CPI), Big 5 personality traits, Workplace Motivators, Social Styles, and the most accurate and useful technique “asking for feedback.”

Political leadership (measuring) (Colton, 2013)

Principal leadership assessment (Goldring et al., 2008)

Profile of Aptitude for Leadership. Training House, Inc. 1991.

PROFILOR (Leslie / Fleenor, 1998)

PROSPECTOR (Leslie / Fleenor, 1998)

Qualitative assessment, for example with open to closed questions for individuals or focus groups.

Return on Investment (ROI) as a means to measure leadership development programs

Servant Leadership (source: Green et al., 2015):

- *Organizational Leadership Assessment*-- Laub (1999)
- *Servant Leadership Scale* -- Ehrhart (2004)
- *Servant Leadership Questionnaire*-- Barbuto and Wheeler (2006)
- *Servant Leadership Scale* -- Liden, Wayne, Zhao and Henderson (2008)
- *Servant Leadership Behavior Scale*-- Sendjaya, Sarros and Santora (2008)
- *Servant Leadership Survey* -- van Dierendonck and Nuijten (2011)

Shared leadership

Socially Responsible Leadership Scale (Tyree, 1988)

Strategic Leadership Development Inventory (SLDI)

Survey of Leadership Practices (Leslie / Fleenor, 1998)

Survey of Management Practices (Leslie / Fleenor, 1998)

System for the Multiple-Level Observation of Groups (SYMLOG) (Leslie / Fleenor, 1998)

Tacit Knowledge for Measuring Leadership (a scenario-based tool)

Team Assessments (see Team Assessments below by Dan Baker)

Team Effectiveness Survey (Hall)

Team Leadership Survey - by Hill (based on Hill's Team Leadership Model)

Toxic Leadership Scale (Schmidt, 2008)

Transformational Leader Inventory (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990)

Transformational leadership survey (Edwards et al., 2010)

U.S. Army Automated Command Climate Survey

Volunteer Leadership Development Instrument (VLDI) (Meier et al., 2009)

Walter Reed Army Institute of Research Leadership Assessment Tool

Watson-Glaser Critical Thinking Appraisal

Women's boldness assessment – or Influence Preference Assessment

Workstyles (Acumen Leadership Workstyles) (Leslie / Fleenor, 1998)

Detailed List of Leadership Instruments

360° Assessments

- Overview article: The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly of 360° Evaluations, by [Marissa Tirona](#) and [Michelle Gislason \(CompassPoint Nonprofit Services\)](#) | July 26, 2011. <https://nonprofitquarterly.org/2011/07/26/the-good-the-bad-and-the-ugly-of-360d-evaluations/#> [available in this library]
 - Review from Sam Nickels: EXCELLENT article from the Nonprofit Quarterly, so written from a nonprofit perspective on 360 assessments, but lots of learning/tips/issues covered that are likely good for any type of organization. The article covers what a 360 assessment is, how it's done best, what the pitfalls and dangers are of using this instrument, recommended sources, and much more. I highly recommend a thorough study of this article before choosing to use this widely-recommended assessment, since in some cases it causes more damage than help. For example, from another source (Kellogg Foundation, 2002): "Three hundred sixty-degree assessments are particularly valuable when they are integrated as a learning component of [a leadership development program]. Some programs [in this study] explicitly considered and rejected using 360-degree assessments because they felt that it would compromise the integrity of the learning space they wanted to create which was one based on trust, curiosity, and shared responsibility. The value of a 360-degree assessment and the conditions under which this tool may be used appropriately and effectively have not been fully explored" (23). Sam
- The following info comes from Zaccaro et al. (1999) on 360 instruments in general:
 - Description: The term 360 degree feedback refers to the practice of gathering and processing multirater assessments on individuals and then feeding back the results. Typically, a 360-degree instrument is a questionnaire with about 100 items to rate. Approximately 10 people (raters) complete it: the person being assessed (self-rating), his or her supervisor, several peers, and subordinates. It is recommended that 360-degree feedback reports be confidential (between supervisor and respondent) and that an outside consultant deliver assessment feedback and coaching. In the majority of organizations, 360-degree feedback is

used for developmental purposes. Ratings are collected anonymously and provided to managers in the aggregate. Usually, only the managers being rated see the feedback report. The ratings are not included in the managers' formal performance appraisal.

- Reliability: A study investigated within-source interrater reliability of supervisor, peer, and subordinate feedback ratings made for managerial development. Raters provided 360-degree feedback ratings on a sample of 153 managers. Using generalizability theory, results indicated little within-source agreement exists (Harris & Schaubroeck, 1988).
- Validity: Harris and Schaubroeck (1988) conducted a meta-analysis and found relatively high correlations between peer and supervisor ratings, but only a moderate correlation between self-supervisor and self-peer ratings. They also found that, while rating format and rating scale had little impact, job type appeared to moderate self-peer and self-supervisor ratings. The analysis showed a higher convergence between observer (peer and supervisor) ratings than self and observer ratings. Self-peer and self-supervisor ratings are particularly low for managerial/professional staff.
- Limitations: Disagreement among rating sources is both common and expected. In a hierarchical organization, the 360-degree approach violates the hierarchy of organizational practices. Research suggests that upward feedback can substantially affect the acceptance of feedback for managers. Bernardin, Dahmus, & Redmon (1993) demonstrated that supervisors are generally accepting of upward feedback, but they are less supportive of this feedback if it only comes from subordinates. Also, 360-degree feedback assessments may have problems with anonymity. Often, raters will fear being identified in rating their supervisor despite attempts at confidentiality.
- Application: A 360-degree assessment can be used as a performance appraisal tool or for developmental purposes. Implicit in the measure, a 360-degree assessment should be completed by the supervisor, self, peers, and subordinates.
- Source: The Center for Creative Leadership, One Leadership Place, Greensboro, NC 27410, Phone: (336) 288-7210
- References and Suggested Readings
 - Atwater, L., Roush, P., & Fischthal, A. (1995). The influence of upward feedback on self and follower ratings of leadership. *Personnel Psychology*, 48, 35-59.
 - Bernardin, H. J., Dahmus, S. A., & Redmon, G. (1993). Attitudes of first-line supervisors toward subordinate appraisals. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 32, 315-324.
 - Freeman, F. H., Knott, K. B., & Schwartz, M. K. (1996). *Leadership Education: A Source Book*. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.
 - Harris, M., & Schaubroeck, J. (1988). A meta analysis of self-supervisor, self-peer and

peer supervisor ratings. *Personnel Psychology*, 41, 43-61.

- Heneman, H. (1974). Comparisons of self- and superior-rating of managerial performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59, 638-642.
- Shore, E., Shore, L., & Thornton, G. (1992). Construct validity of self and peer evaluations of performance dimensions in an assessment center. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77 42-54.
- 360 leadership assessments and personality/style assessments: a review by Dan McCarthy (2008). All his recommendations are from professional commercial leadership vendors/trainers, so they are costly, but they are also high quality and proven. Guide to Leadership Assessments. Dan McCarthy blog, June 22, 2008. Retrieved from <http://www.greatleadershipbydan.com/2008/06/guide-to-leadership-assessments.html>
 - I'm often asked is there's such thing as a leadership "test", or some kind of assessment to determine how good a leader someone is. While there's no single silver bullet for assessing leadership capability (at least I don't think there is, no matter what the assessments salespeople try to tell you), there are a number of useful assessments that can give a leader insights into their development needs. There are hundreds of assessments out there....It's always best not to overly rely on any one assessment, and instead look for feedback from a number of sources. The following list only represents tools I'm familiar with, have personally used (oh yes, *every one*), and can recommend.
 - 360 Assessments -- I think these are the best way to get a handle on your leadership strengths and weaknesses. I like them because they are usually more likely to lead to behavior change and positive results. A 360 assessment, or multi-rater assessment, usually consists of a list of questions based on a set of leadership competencies. You can buy an commercial assessment that's based on a proven competency model, or create your own based on your own model. The leader usually selects their own raters (better for buy-in), and someone else (internal or external administrator, or web-based service) sends it to their boss, direct reports, peers, and others. Individual ratings and comments (other than the bosses) are anonymous, and grouped together by category. 360s can be used for performance assessment (results go to boss, HR) or for development(results go only to leader). Both have their places, with advantages & disadvantages. The important thing is to be transparent about it. Here are a number of great 360 assessments:

1. [The Center for Creative Leadership's](#) Benchmarks .

[Benchmarks](#) is a comprehensive 360-degree assessment tool for experienced managers that measures 16 skills and perspectives critical for success, as well as, five possible career derailers. Benchmarks offers an in-depth look at development by assessing skills developed from a multitude of leadership experiences, identifying what lessons may yet to be learned and helping the executive determine what specific work experiences need to be sought out in order to develop critical skills for success. CCL has managers and executives versions.

Benchmarks requires certification to administer it, and costs \$330 per person, with volume discounts. It's available in multiple languages. CCL also has a simplified version that does not require interpretation by a trained assessment specialist, which costs \$160 per person. For detailed information on the development of the assessment and studies that have used or assessed the tool, see the online version of "The Benchmarks Sourcebook," 2011, by Leslie and Peterson, <http://www.slideshare.net/amidonp/jean-brittain-leslie-michael-john-petersonbenchmarks-sourcebook>

2. The [Leadership Practices Inventory](#).

The Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) is a 360 degree Leadership assessment instrument created by James M. Kouzes and Barry Z. Posner which has been used to assess the Leadership behavior of nearly one million Leaders worldwide. Historically available in paper format, LPI Online offers a more automated, less labor intensive way of administrating the Leadership Practices Inventory. No certification is required, costs \$125, available in multiple languages.

- Comment by Dan Baker: [Leadership Practices Inventory \(LPI 360\)](#) – I like to use this when a company doesn't already use a 360 assessment or when they need a good basic 360 assessment rather than a Rolls Royce. Like other 360 feedback tools, this instrument is used to collect and compare input from bosses, peers, direct reports and others about an individual's leadership performance. The on-line LPI 360 measures the extent to which the individual exhibits [Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership](#), which come from the research of Kouzes and Posner, described in their classic book: [The Leadership Challenge](#). I like this tool because it covers research-based leadership behaviors that are general across companies and industries. It's also easy to use and administer. The results report shows the individual's results compared to overall norms, and it's easy to understand. One very nice feature that I have not seen in most other 360 tools is that allows an administrator to add customized open-ended questions.

3. [Development dimensions International](#) (DDI) has a number of assessments, but the 360 I like is [The Leadership Mirror](#). Available in multiple languages, costs depend.

4. [Personnel Decisions International's](#) (PDI) [The Profilor](#).

The PROFILOR is a comprehensive 360 feedback tool designed specifically for training and development purposes. It's fully customizable to reflect your organization's terminology and/or competency models.

Available in 11 languages. Over half of Fortune 100 relies on the PROFILOR to assess development needs. Costs vary.

5. [Lominger's Voices](#).

Another research-based 360° assessment with access to Lominger's Library of 67 Competencies, 19 Career Stallers and Stoppers, 26 Clusters and 8 Factors, 7 International Focus

Areas, 10 Universal Performance Dimensions, and 356 Behavioral Aspects. Cost \$210, requires certification to purchase, available in multiple languages.

Comment by Dan Baker: [Voices 360](#) – Lominger (a Korn / Ferry company) has a research-based multi-rater leadership development tool that is among the premium assessments for leadership development. One valuable feature of the Voices 360 is the ability of an organization to choose which competencies – from an extensive list of research-based competencies – will be used to rate their leaders. Then, based on a specific leader's role, the leader and leader's manager identify together the most important competencies from the company's list. Assessors then are asked to provide input on the leader's proficiency level in each of these competencies. Results show not only how assessors rated the leader in those competency areas; they also show potential blind spots and hidden strengths, along with potential career stallers and stoppers. As with most 360 assessments, the leader's results are compared across the groups of raters (manager, peers, self, other) and also to norms for others who have taken the assessment. Results are sliced and diced in several helpful views, and raters are encouraged to enter comments, which are also hugely helpful. One unique and helpful view is a one-page skill importance chart that plots how the leader was rated on the most important skills for the role with an eye towards action planning.

Comments from blog readers:

Erika Andersen said... Dan, This is a really useful listing. By the way, some interesting research just came out, comparing MBTI, DISC and Social Style. It turns out Social Style scored highest in terms of people being able to understand and make use of the tool. I was thrilled to hear it, because I'm a big fan of Social Style for exactly those reasons. I've found it the most practical of these tools, in terms of helping people see what they can do differently to create better relationships with wider variety of people.

Chris Morgan said... My favourite 360 tool is the Extraordinary Leader. In addition to the usual 360 benefits it also benchmarks you against world class leaders from consistently high performing organisations. This can be quite a leveller for some people....or quite a positive surprise for others!
<http://learn2develop.blogspot.com/2008/04/my-favourite-360-feedback-tool-for.html#links>

Craig Chappelow said... Dan, A very nice roundup of 360 assessments. I manage our 360 business here at CCL, and would have created the same list of vendors if someone asked me who I think is doing responsible, scientifically-developed work in the 360 space. While all of the 360s offered by these vendors are different, a client could not make a bad choice by going with any of them.

- o The [Vanderbilt Assessment for Leadership in Education™ \(VAL-ED\)](#)

VAL-ED “research-based evaluation tool that measures the effectiveness of school leaders by providing a detailed assessment of a principal's performance. [Aligned to the ISLLC standards](#), the VAL-ED focuses on learning-centered leadership behaviors that influence teachers, staff, and most importantly, student achievement. It is a 360 assessment, intended to be taken by not only the principal, but by teachers and the principal's supervisor, ensuring that the very best information is available.” Costs: **“The cost for Val-Ed is \$360 per Principal (or school leader)**. This covers up to two surveys, most do a pre and a post. Since this is a completely web-based delivery, it includes an unlimited number of teacher respondents including the principal's self-evaluation and their supervisor(s) response. PLEASE BE AWARE THAT ALL VAL-ED CONTRACTS MUST HAVE AN END DATE OF DECEMBER 14, 2016. ALL SURVEYS MUST BE DELIVERED, ALL DATA AND REPORTS MUST BE CAPTURED AND COMPLETED BY DECEMBER 14, 2016. AFTER DECEMBER 14, 2016, DISCOVERY EDUCATION WILL NO LONGER BE THE CARRIER FOR THE VAL-ED TOOL.

- o **The Extraordinary Leader(TM) Survey by Zenger and Folkman**, a leadership consulting firm.

There is no data or studies on this that I found from a cursory look, but the consulting firm offers the self-assessment short version online free as a self-assessment, even though they clarify that it is more useful if completed as part of a 360 package. But doing it online (as I did) gives one a sense of what the questions are like, what the 16 competencies are of import to this consulting group, what their domains are, and you get a free report back that compares your scores to 35,000 others who have taken it (normative database). Very brief and easy: you can access it ([here](#)) or see the attached article that includes the test, a report, and info on links to the test and the Harvard Business Review article that one can use to create a plan development plan based on your report, which the authors note only 10% of test takers are serious enough to do.

- EXAMPLES: See the following examples of 360 degree instruments in the Library:
 - o 360 degree assessment - Manager Effectiveness Evaluation – EXAMPLE
 - o 360 degree feedback - sample w questions, domains, comparison report, goals template, etc.

Authentic Leadership: Practical Reflexivity, Self-Awareness, and Self-Authorship

Purpose/focus of the instrument

This is a tool (course process) for university students to use to help them recognize and develop authentic leadership and its attendant benefits.

Abstract: “This assignment provides a process to facilitate student engagement in practical reflexivity and self-authorship through which students develop the self-awareness that is required to be an authentic and effective leader. It facilitates the development of students’ personal leadership principles, which help guide their decision making and actions, and provides criteria on which to evaluate their leadership effectiveness. This facilitation of the development of students’ personal leadership principles is accomplished by having students first identify and clarify their values and beliefs and to consider the impact of these on their day-to-day organizational lives and leadership. By explicitly defining themselves in the form of their values and beliefs, students have a clear sense of self on which to base their authentic leadership. Their beliefs are expressed in the form of self-narratives. These self-narratives are shared as audio recordings with fellow classmates to facilitate students’ learning, self-understanding, and empathy.”

Where is instrument found? Is it available online or only through a service?

Instructions for completing the essay-based instrument can be found at the following link (<http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/1052562909339307>) in Appendices A, B, and C.

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author? No cost
It’s free.

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

The idea for this essay originated from, is based on, and will follow the format of Edward R. Murrow’s 1950s radio program titled *This I Believe*, and the international project of the same name that engages “people in writing, sharing, and discussing the core values that guide their daily lives” (<http://thisibelieve.org/index.php>).

Who developed the instrument, where?

In 2009, Matthew Eriksen adapted this instrument from Edward Murrow’s 1950s radio program titled *This I Believe* (see above)

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

This assignment was developed for a Masters of Business Administration (MBA) leadership course in the United States. It is a required course of all students in the MBA program. Each section of the course has on average 23 students enrolled. Students’ work experience has ranged from 0 to 28 years. The assignment is now being used in an undergraduate leadership development seminar in the school of business of a private liberal arts college.

**What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?
How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?**

Number of citations for the instrument

51 citations on google scholar.

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers
Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

References (up to 5)

Eriksen, M. (2009). Authentic leadership: Practical reflexivity, self-awareness, and self-authorship. *Journal of Management Education* December, 33(6), 747-771. doi: 10.1177/1052562909339307. meriksen@providence.edu

Further notes

Authentic Leadership Questionnaire (ALQ)

Purpose/focus of the instrument

A simple 16-item 5-pt Likert scale instrument, the ALQ measures the authentic leadership attributes of the leaders as perceived by the employees. Authentic leadership reflects the ability of leaders to demonstrate self-awareness, relational transparency, internalized moral perspective, and balanced processing.

Abstract: This study developed and tested a theory-based measure of authentic leadership using five separate samples obtained from China, Kenya, and the United States. Confirmatory factor analyses supported a higher order, multidimensional model of the authentic leadership construct (the Authentic Leadership Questionnaire [ALQ]) comprising leader self-awareness, relational transparency, internalized moral perspective, and balanced processing. Structural equation modeling (SEM) demonstrated the predictive validity for the ALQ measure for important work-related attitudes and behaviors, beyond what ethical and transformational leadership offered. Finally, results revealed a positive relationship between authentic leadership and supervisor-rated performance. Implications for research and practice are discussed.

Where is instrument found? Is it available online or only through a service?

This tool can be found on the web without cost, but it is copyrighted, and available from Mind Garden. The seminal article and instrument are available for viewing in our Library. (see below)

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

Cost: depending on use and number of copies, and whether pen/paper or using their online scoring services, from \$0 to \$250 (eg, research meeting certain requirements is \$0, pen and paper \$2/user, \$250 for online group/self/multi-rater options)(see website link for details: <http://www.mindgarden.com/69-authentic-leadership-questionnaire>

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

2007

Who developed the instrument, where?

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

Individual leaders in organizations. "Although organizational stakeholders have certain expectations about the positive attributes they require of...there are relatively few validated tools for measuring these attributes or behaviors."

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

Structural equation modeling (SEM) demonstrated the predictive validity for the ALQ measure for important work-related attitudes and behaviors, beyond what ethical and transformational leadership offered. Finally, results revealed a positive relationship between authentic leadership and supervisor-rated performance. Implications for research and practice are discussed.

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

This study developed and tested a theory-based measure of authentic leadership using five separate samples obtained from China, Kenya, and the United States.

Number of citations for the instrument

1072

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Although there has been considerable attention focused on the topic in recent years, empirical research on authentic leadership has been limited. One possible explanation of this shortage of research is the inherent difficulty involved in measuring authentic leadership behavior (Cooper et al., 2005). Based on our preliminary findings, we offer a theory-driven higher order authentic leadership measure (the ALQ) that has initial evidence to support its reliability and validity, consequently providing future researchers with one method for assessing authentic leadership. Our results suggest that it is possible to discriminate the authentic leadership measure from other related leadership orientations (e.g., ethical leadership and transformational leadership). Exploring the validity of a construct involves demonstrating that the pattern of relationships with other construct measures adheres to theoretical explanations (Hinkin, 1995; Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). At this early stage in the development of the ALQ, we considered differentiating the authentic leadership construct from ethical and transformational leadership to be the more important priority. Although the overall findings are encouraging, it should be noted that they only represent a first step, providing initial evidence of construct validity. Because scale validation is a continuous process, additional research is necessary to further assess the discriminant, convergent, and predictive validity of these component scales with a much broader range of samples and contexts. Such research should consider other variables in the construct's nomological network, including related leadership variables, such as servant leadership and spiritual leadership, and additional outcome variables, such as workplace safety, employee engagement, well-being, and withdrawal behaviors (Avolio et al., 2004; Avolio & Walumbwa, 2006; Gardner, Avolio, Luthans, et al., 2005; Ilies et al., 2005), that merit investigation. It is also important to recognize that the ALQ shares several measurement

limitations that are inherent to measures of leadership in general (see Avolio et al., 2003), such as not accounting for contextual influences on leadership. Nevertheless, it is encouraging to note that the basic factor structure of the ALQ held up across the Chinese, Kenyan, and American settings, suggesting that the core components of authentic leadership may generalize across cultural contexts. Future research may consider theoretically integrating authentic leadership with other related leadership literatures such as ethical, leader-member exchange, transformational, servant, and spiritual leadership by testing the potential mediating roles of these leadership behaviors in the relationship between authentic leadership and various organizational outcomes. Such studies call for longitudinal research designs wherein both qualitative and quantitative data are collected over repeated observations to provide greater insights into the dynamics by which authentic leadership behaviors influence followers' attitudes and behaviors. To further our understanding of the authentic leadership construct, we also encourage researchers to use experimental and quasi-experimental designs. Such designs would make it possible to better isolate the causal effects of authentic leadership, along with its antecedents and consequences. In addition, alternatives to the survey-based measure of authentic leadership presented in this article should certainly be developed, because these provide only a limited view of the construct. That is, future research should use other methods to assess authentic leadership, including observational methods and content coding of speeches, e-mail, scenarios, videotapes, and other correspondence to confirm the results produced by using survey measures. It would also be useful to adopt less subjective measures of individual performance that focus on outcomes of competently performed work. These performance measures should include as broad a range of outcomes as possible to tap into the higher order impact effects of authentic leadership, as well as higher order effects for both transformational and ethical leadership. It would also be interesting for future research to examine whether authentic leadership has an impact on the performance of the supervisor, unit, or overall organization. Consistent with recent theorizing on authentic leadership and the idea that authentic leaders are especially interested in empowering their followers to make a difference (Avolio et al., 2004; Gardner, Avolio, Luthans, et al., 2005; George & Sims, 2007; Ilies et al., 2005; Luthans & Avolio, 2003), we have chosen to define the higher order construct of authentic leadership at the individual level of analysis. This individual level is not intended to rule out the potential for dyadic, group, or organizational levels of analysis for a type of "collective" authentic leadership in the future. Indeed, there is ample evidence that leadership in general has strong theoretical and empirical bases to be conceptualized at multiple levels of analysis (Yammarino, Dionne, Chun, & Dansereau, 2005). For example, in most organizations followers are nested within leaders, and because organizations are typically comprised of multiple levels of leaders, a multilevel approach to investigating leadership is certainly a plausible strategy that should be pursued. As with any new measure, further research is needed to refine the construct, as scale development is an iterative process. Second, although two samples were used in Study 2, a limitation in both samples was the reliance on self-report variables measured from the same source. Although we attempted to address concerns about self-report biases by collecting data at different points in time (Podsakoff et al., 2003), our choice of methods still raises some concern with effect size inflation because of same source bias. Future research could collect ratings from multiple samples and sources or include experimental designs in which key variables can be manipulated and causality assessed under

more tightly controlled circumstances. Alternatively, the measure could be validated using a multitrait–multimethod matrix (see Podsakoff et al., 2003). Another limitation is the preliminary status of the nomological network. As we previously pointed out, the model most likely does not include all relevant or important constructs. Given that authentic leadership theory is in its early stages of development, we did not attempt to advance and test specific hypotheses about the relationships of the authentic leadership dimensions with other constructs. We recommend researchers remain open to developing more detailed nomological networks for the component dimensions of authentic leadership (i.e., other related constructs and organizational outcomes), each of which most likely has somewhat different consequences depending on the focal dimension and the construct to which it is being related. Hence, future research is needed that begins to hypothesize different relationships for each of the four authentic leadership dimensions with relevant organizational outcomes, while also keeping in mind that there may be missing components in our overall construct of authentic leadership. In addition, potential moderators such as organizational culture (Luthans & Avolio, 2003), efficacy beliefs (Bandura, 2000; Kark & Shamir, 2002), and identification processes (Kark & Shamir, 2002) that may influence the relationships found in this study should be examined in future research. Finally, the validity of a scale may be challenged if it is prone to response bias. We encourage future researchers to examine the extent to which the higher order, multidimensional authentic leadership measure is susceptible to such biases. For example, researchers may need to correlate leader ratings with the leader’s responses to social desirable behaviors such as self-deception and impression management (Paulhus, 1984). The study has, however, notable strengths. First, the conceptualization and operational definition of the new authentic leadership were theoretically driven. Thus, although results from CFAs suggested that the measure could be further improved, it is unlikely that the basic conceptualization will expand to include additional major subdimensions. Other strengths include the use of multiple samples of followers and leaders from a broad spectrum of organizations and cultures and relatively large sample sizes for the testing and cross-validation of the instrument. Finally, our measure of authentic leadership assumes that there are general or perhaps universal facets of what constitutes authentic leadership that consistently define such leaders as self-aware, ethical, balanced decision makers and transparent. Yet we also suggest that future researchers consider that the nuances of authentic leadership may vary as one considers what is ethical in one culture versus another, just as one considers what it means to be transparent or self-aware or balanced. Our position is that there will be greater consistency in what is associated with authentic leadership than differences, as has been shown with transformational leadership (Bass, 1998). However, it is important to determine whether there are nuanced differences within and between different cultural contexts when examining such complex constructs as those comprising authentic leadership.

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

References (up to 5)

Walumbwa, F., Avolio, B., Gardner, W., Wernsing, T., & Peterson, S. (2008). Authentic leadership: Development and validation of a theory-based measure. *Journal of Management*.

Further notes

Azimuth or “Leader Azimuth Check II”

Purpose/focus of the instrument

Description: The Leader Azimuth Check is a 360-degree multi-rater assessment that is derived from the Strategic Leadership Development Inventory (SLDI) which was jointly developed by the Army Research Institute (ARI), the Army War College (AWC), and the Industrial College of the Armed Forces (ICAF).

Application: The Azimuth can be used for feedback and developmental purposes for the leader. The Azimuth should be completed by the leader, peers, subordinates, and the supervisor.

There are two current versions of the Leader Azimuth Check: Azimuth Version 2.0 (Unit and Organizational Use) and Azimuth Version 2.1. The 96 items that made up the first Azimuth (Version 1) represented twelve "elements" of leadership:

Supervisory Skills. This broad element of leader behavior is broken out into three sub-elements: interpersonal focus, team focus and mission focus. The interpersonal sub-element examines the way in which supervisors interact with subordinates. The team focus sub-element looks at leadership in developing, motivating, and resourcing of teams. Mission focus examines leaders creating an environment to support subordinates accomplishing their mission.

Tactical and Technical Competence. Tactical and technical competence is also broken down into three specific sub-elements: problem solving skills, knowledge, and planning/organizational skills. The problem solving skills sub-element looks at decision-makers' ability to sort out the important from the unimportant details. The knowledge sub-element looks at the degree to which leaders are accomplished professionals in their technical or tactical area of expertise. The planning and organizational skills sub-element is concerned with leaders' ability to meet deadlines and maintain focus on primary issues even when other things compete for attention.

Political Skills. This element is concerned with sensitivity to political issues and interests beyond the purely military.

Ethics. This element is concerned with personal and professional standards of conduct, and includes the ability to set the proper example of high standards of interpersonal responsibility and honesty.

Communication/Influence. This element includes the establishment and maintenance of both formal and informal channels of communication and information dissemination, as well as the ability to provide an atmosphere conducive to openness and honesty.

Social Maturity. This element is concerned with a leader's ability to maintain composure under conditions which may be personally threatening, the ability to admit and learn from mistakes, and the willingness to consider the opinions of others.

Self-Centeredness. This is a negative element in which the related behaviors should be avoided. This element is centered around the focus on self and lack of concern and care for others.

Compulsive Behavior. Like the element above, this element is concerned with behaviors that are indicators of poor leadership. This element examines the tendency to micromanage, be intolerant of ambiguity, and to desire excessive information before making decisions.

Feedback from the Azimuth is structured according to the elements and is given in aggregate and not item-by-item.

Azimuth (Version 2.1):

The 72 items in the current Azimuth (Version 2 and Version 2.1) were selected to represent key leadership elements in the new Army leadership doctrine (FM 22-100). The items were derived from two sources. Some items were used in the previous version of Azimuth and were retained because feedback from the several thousand officers who had used the previous version, and statistical evidence, showed that most respondents had a consistent interpretation of these items (i.e., the items are statistically "reliable"). Additional items were derived directly from the element definitions and descriptions in FM 22-100. ARI and CAL personnel collaborated in this process, and a draft instrument was pilot tested with a small group of AY96-97 CGSOC students. One goal was to keep the number of items as small as possible to keep the instrument from becoming unwieldy. However, five or six short items cannot possibly capture all of the nuances of a complex behavior like Communicating or Decision Making. In their feedback forms, leaders are told that they can assume that the average item ratings, i.e., the element scores, are a good indicator of a given aspect of their leadership behavior; however, they should not assume that the scores are an absolute assessment of their leadership.

The Azimuth items are divided into the following areas: Communicating; Decision Making; Motivating; Developing, Building (i.e., team building); Learning (i.e., supporting a learning organization); Planning and Organizing: Executing; Assessing; Respect; Selfless Service; Integrity; Emotional Stability; and Other. Two general items are analyzed and reported separately: "This person is a good leader"; and "This person is someone I would follow into combat." Three additional items solicit feedback on the Azimuth form itself and on the data-collection process. Feedback is presented on each of the aspects of Leadership, but not on the individual items (with, of course, the exception of the two general items). However, individual item data is printed out for use by a mentor or advisor who can help to interpret the feedback (see Karrasch and Halpin, 1999).

Where is instrument found? Is it available online or only through a service?

UNABLE to locate the instrument online; not clear if it is available free for review or noncommercial research. SOURCE: Zaccaro et al., 1999. The Zaccaro article appears in this Library.

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

Azimuth Version 2 was designed as a 360-degree instrument for use in a unit or organization. Early experience with a pilot implementation within the Combined Arms and Services Staff School (CAS3) led to a decision to develop a minor variant, Version 2.1, for use within an academic setting. Changes include: a) provision for Self and Peer input only (i.e., 180-degree rather than 360-degree); and b) rewording of items to reflect the classroom rather than an organizational setting. The Center for Army Leadership (CAL) has also developed at least one additional variant that eliminates "negative" items.

Who developed the instrument, where?

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

Reliability and Validity: Periodic checks are conducted on the **thousands of data sets** that have accumulated through the use of Azimuth in operational and classroom settings over the past few years. The Chronbach alpha for all elements is typically above .80. A detailed assessment of the psychometrics of the instrument has been accepted as a dissertation topic, and the results should be available in early 2000.

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

See reliability and validity for number of data sets

Number of citations for the instrument

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Limitations: The Azimuth does not provide an absolute assessment of leadership qualities or potential. The individual items in the instrument provide good coverage of important leadership behaviors, however, there are many other aspects of leadership which are not addressed by this instrument. Furthermore, the numeric ratings are subjective and may be based upon incomplete information, limited opportunities for observation, and potential unconscious biases.

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

References (up to 5)

Source: Dr. Stanley Halpin, U. S. Army Research Institute, Bldg 90 - McClellan Ave
Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027-1360, e-mail: halpin@leav-emhl .army.mil.

Further notes

Benchmarks

Purpose/focus of the instruments

It assesses skills, perspectives, and values that a manager can learn and develop. Developed from studying how managers develop rather than what they do. 22 scales broken into two sections: managerial skills and perspectives (106 items), potential flaws (26 items). Created by the Center for Creative Leadership in 1994. They based it on interviews with 400 top company executives.

Target audience

Middle and upper-level managers and executives

Validity/Reliability

Items that loaded above 0.40 on the factor were used. Item-scale and item-other scale correlations were used, and internal scale consistencies were adequate. Test-retest ranged from 0.62 - 0.87. Ratings by others ranged from 0.71 - 0.95. Internal consistency ranged from 0.70 - 0.97. Interrater reliability of 92 managers ranged from 0.43 - 0.58.

Translations

Exists in English, Dutch, French, German, Norwegian, Italian, Japanese, Chinese, and Spanish.

Cost

Approximately \$200.

References

Leslie, & Fleenor. (1998). Feedback to managers: A review and comparison of multi-rater instruments for management development, 3rd edition. Greensborough, North Carolina: Center for Creative Leadership.

BarOn Emotional Quotient Inventory

Purpose/focus of the instrument

A measure of emotional intelligence that complements cognitive intelligence measures. Emotional intelligence addresses the emotional, personal, social, and survival dimensions of intelligence, it helps predict success because it reflects how a person applies knowledge to the immediate situation, eg, relating to others, adapting to and coping with the immediate surroundings to be successful. Components include intrapersonal (self-regard, emotional self-awareness, assertiveness, independence, self-actualization), adaptability (reality testing, flexibility, problem solving), general mood (optimism, happiness), interpersonal (empathy, social responsibility, interpersonal relationships), and stress management (stress tolerance, impulse control). 133 items with 5-pt response set, takes 35 minutes on average, but no time limit, 6th grade reading level, for persons 16+ years old (a youth version is available for ages 7-

15 years), renders a total score, 5 component scores, and 15 subscale scores (noted above). Can also be used in “preventive work” with children, helping them become aware of their emotions and those of others, to be successful reality testers and problem solvers, to cope better with stress, to be less impulsive, to be more positive about themselves, and to get along better with others—such emotional training “should be integrated into the existing curricula of public school.”

Where is instrument found? Is it available online or only through a service?

Commercially available (according to the 2004 manual). There is a short version of 52 items “ideal for mental health professionals who deal with large caseloads, for HR professionals who wish to screen applicants in the hiring process, career path counseling, or large numbers of employees.” Available in over 20 languages. Also available in 360 version w self/other raters.

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

Called the 800 number in the manual: latest version, updated items, etc. is 2011. Self-rater “workplace report” is \$60. There is also a Leadership version based on the transformational leadership model for \$90 that comes in self or multi-rater versions. Researchers get a 30% discount on each cost, plus a 5% discount on orders over \$1000. So running the leadership version on 100 subjects would equal about \$5700. Instruments on permanent reserve at Carrier Library by prof. D. Irwin, SSLS, James Madison University.

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

Who developed the instrument, where?

Dr. Reuven Bar-On

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

For persons 16+ years old. Can be used in “preventive work” with children, helping them become aware of their emotions and those of others, to be successful reality testers and problem solvers, to cope better with stress, to be less impulsive, to be more positive about themselves, and to get along better with others.

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

The 200 page manual also outlines the conceptual framework, administration and scoring, interpreting results (with case studies on predicting success and failure in the corporate world, predicting occupational failure and success in the business world, predicting academic attrition or dropout of students, predicting patient coping with a severe medical condition, predicting aggressive behavior in the workplace, predicting successful rehabilitation in prisoners eligible for parole, and predicting suicide or successful treatment outcomes in the clinical setting; later he reviews other studies showing predictive ability for adjusting to a new country and to acculturate, and successful substance abuse treatment), norming of the EQ-I, and reliability and validity. Internal consistency ranged from .69 to .86 with overall average of .76. Test retest was .85 at 1 month and .75 at 4 months. Item analysis was used to improve content and face validities. EFA identified a 13-factor model as best, with self-contentment accounting for 23% of

variance, while the other 12 items accounted for 4.8% or less. CFA was used for clarification of subscales. Construct validity was obtained through 6 studies using 10 similar instruments. The author discusses other studies showing convergent, divergent, criterion group, discriminant, and predictive validity.

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Developed with expert input, factor analysis, has a 4000-participant normative database, which includes a multicultural focus w scores obtained from sites in North America, South America, Europe and Africa. Tested on over 110,000 people worldwide.

Number of citations for the instrument

Over 1000 google scholar citations for studies using this test.

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

Available in over 20 languages

References (up to 5)

http://www.hpsys.com/EI_BarOnEQ-I.htm

Further notes

Campbell Leadership Descriptor

Purpose/focus of the instrument

A self-rating assessment. Promotional website: "Designed specifically for use in situations where a comprehensive analysis of leadership characteristics is useful, the *Campbell Leadership Descriptor* helps individuals identify their strengths and weaknesses in nine major leadership attributes: Vision, Management, Empowerment, Diplomacy, Feedback, Entrepreneurialism, Personal style, Personal energy, Multicultural awareness. The Workbook's self-scored assessment allows individuals to produce their own profile on the spot, and then shows them how their self-profile compares with other leaders. It also includes questions to help them evaluate the implications of their strengths and weaknesses and how to use that information to develop their own action plan for improvement." "Learning Outcomes include understanding the major components of leadership, identifying the characteristics of a successful leader, evaluating one's leadership strengths and weaknesses by comparing one's results to "good" and "poor" leaders, and developing a personal action plan for improving leadership skills and abilities."

Where is instrument found? Is it available online or only through a service?

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

The Facilitator's Guide Package offers everything you need to prepare for and conduct a leadership workshop, including instructions for scoring and interpreting the Descriptor, a sample of a completed Descriptor, a step-by-step facilitator's "script," master copies of overhead transparencies, illustrative case studies, a list of recommended books, and more." Costs: Facilitator package \$69, survey \$21. Available at: <http://www.hrdqstore.com/campbell-leadership-descriptor-leadership-assessment-tool.html> .

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?
2002

Who developed the instrument, where?

David P. Campbell

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

According to the brochure, the instrument is "applicable for leaders at every level in every type of organization"

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

None found, but articles addressing the instrument contested that it was highly validated

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Number of citations for the instrument

On google scholar, 7 citations for the Campbell Leadership Descriptor and 3 citations for the Campbell Leadership Descriptor: Participant Workbook

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

References (up to 5)

1. Brochure: <https://www.ccl.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/campbell-leadership-descriptor-brochure-center-for-creative-leadership.pdf>
2. Campbell, D. P. (2002). Campbell Leadership Descriptor: Facilitator's guide. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Further notes

Campbell Leadership Index

Purpose/focus of the instrument

"A multi-rater instrument to help measure personal characteristics that are directly related to the nature and demands of leadership."

Benefits of the CLI (promotional, website)

- – *Highly actionable developmental planning* – take results and quickly implement a targeted
- development plan for professional growth
- – *Well-accepted* – used in small, medium, and large sized organizations, across a broad cross
- section of industry, government, and academia
- – *High Utility* – robust, thorough, and easy to understand reporting
- – *Well-established* – normed on higher-level talent and their observers across 30 samples
- – *Easy to use* – web-enabled multi-rater administrator's site along with Internet-based
- administration, scoring, tracking, and reporting capabilities

Measurement Dimensions

- – **Leadership** (Ambitious, Daring, Dynamic, Enterprising, Experienced, Farsighted, Original, Persuasive)
- – **Energy**
- – **Affability** (Affectionate, Considerate, Empowering, Entertaining, Friendly)
- – **Dependability** (Credible, Organized, Productive, Thrifty)
- – **Resilience** (Calm, Flexible, Optimistic, Trusting)

Where is the instrument found? Is it available online or only through a service?

General Dynamics Information Technology. For more information about the Campbell™ Development Surveys, including pricing, contact General Dynamics Information Technology at +1 800 922 7343, or [visit their Web Site](#). **This library includes a copy of a detailed report form, with the 100 questions of the CLI listed by domains (CLI Sample Report).**

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

Here is the info on pricing from the company that manages the Campbell instruments:

- Campbell™ Organizational Survey (COS™) \$4410 for up to 200, online only, \$7350 with 25 additional/supplemental questions, 67 items. Collects and assesses the attitudes and opinions of employees organization-wide on important matters such as benefits, working conditions, top leadership, and organizational planning.
- Campbell Leadership Index (CLI®) \$1733 for 6 persons. Quantifying the perceptions of the leader and selected observers, the CLI instrument helps measure personal characteristics that are directly related to the nature and demands of leadership.
- Campbell-Hallam™ Team Leader Profile (TLP®) . Quantifies the perceptions of the team leader and selected observers such as direct reports, peers, and managers – providing feedback that can quickly be used to impact team leader effectiveness. \$210 per survey/report per team leader.
- Campbell-Hallam Team Development Survey (TDS™) Gathers team performance information and assists team members in self-management – providing valuable

feedback that enables the group to focus on strategies for improvement. \$750 for 10 team surveys and reports, 5 observer surveys, 1 team report.

- Organizational Survey System (OSS™)
- Teamwork KSA
- Employee Safety Inventory for Training and Development (ESI®-TD)
- System for Testing & Evaluation of Potential (LH-STEP™)
- See more at: <http://hcrm.gdit.com/HCRM-Solutions-and-Capabilities/Assessments-and-Surveys/Assessment-Solutions/Employee-Leadership-and-Organizational-Developmen/#sthash.1GPrXKbL.dpuf>

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

1991

Who developed the instrument, where?

David P. Campbell

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

Students and adults seeking feedback on their leadership characteristics

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

Test-retest ranged from 72-96. Internal consistency ranged from 0.56-0.87. Inter-rater correlations ranged from 0.68-0.82. validity has been examined in four studies and is moderately strong.

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Number of citations for the instrument

67 citations on google scholar for the Campbell Leadership Index Manual

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

International translations not currently available

References (up to 5)

http://www.creativeorgdesign.com/tests_page.php?id=50

Further notes

CK Scale of Charismatic Leadership

Purpose/focus of the instrument

The Conger-Kanungo Charismatic Leadership Questionnaire is 25-items using a 6-pt Likert scale. Therrell (2010)— rated instruments that targeted middle and low level leadership development, using the full-range leadership model of Bass/Avolio, and rated instruments according to a facet rating system that looked at reliability and validity issues. The Bass MLQ, LPI of Posner and Kouzes, Conger and Kanungo, Podsakoff et al., and Behling were the highest at 5,6,7 out of 9.

1997 Abstract: As part of an ongoing research program on charismatic leadership, Conger and Kanungo (1994) developed and tested a questionnaire to measure the perceived behavioural dimensions of charismatic leadership as proposed in their model (1987, 1988). This article reports on further analyses of the dimensionality and validity of the Conger-Kanungo-scale. It begins with a reanalysis of the data from the 1994 study. It then reports on three separate studies conducted in the United States using managers (N=303), in Canada using political party delegates (N=71), and in India using clerical staff (N=98), to examine convergent and discriminant validity. The results of the dimensionality analyses suggest a five-factor model consistent with the Weberian notion of charismatic leadership. The results of the U.S., Canadian, and Indian studies provide further evidence that the Conger-Kanungo scale has acceptable reliability and validity as a diagnostic tool in diverse contexts.

Where is the instrument found? Is it available online or only through a service?

A copyrighted copy is in this library.

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

Unable to locate anyone selling or offering this scale. The only version of the instrument I came across was from a 1998 book by C-K, which is copyrighted and one is instructed to contact Sage Publications. One may simply have to contact them for permission to use the scale free (I would hope).

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

(1994, 1997).

Who developed the instrument, where?

Conger, Kanungo, Menon & Mathur

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

“In the 1994 study, Conger & Kanungo administered a questionnaire to 750 **managers** in four different corporations in the United States and Canada to describe their superiors’ behavior.” (see citation for question below)

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

From the abstract of (Conger, et al., 1997): “A paper reports on further analyses of the dimensionality and validity of the Conger-Kanungo scale, beginning with a reanalysis of the data from the 1994 study. It then reports on 3 separate studies - conducted in the US using managers, in Canada using political party delegates, and in India using clerical staff - to examine convergent and discriminant validity. The results of the dimensionality analyses suggest a 5-factor model consistent with the Weberian notion of charismatic leadership. The results of the US, Canadian, and Indian studies provide further evidence that the Conger-Kanungo scale has acceptable reliability and validity as a diagnostic tool in diverse contexts.”

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

750 managers in the original study

Number of citations for the instrument

Seminal article from 1987 has 2091 citations on google scholar.

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

It is at least in English and German. From the abstract of (Kersting & Rowold, 2008): “In terms of construct validity, it was demonstrated that the translated instrument had adequate factorial validity. In addition, charismatic leadership measured in terms of the CKS showed convergent validity with respect to both transformational and transactional leadership and initiating structure, and divergent validity with respect to laissez-faire and consideration. In sum, the results contribute to leadership theory and practice.”

References (up to 5)

1. Conger, J. A., Kanungo, R. N., Menon, S. T., & Mathur, P. (1997). Measuring charisma: Dimensionality and validity of the Conger-Kanungo scale of charismatic leadership. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*. 14(3), 290—302. Doi: 10.1111/j.19364490.1997.tb00136.x
2. Kersting, M., & Rowold, J. (2008). The assessment of charismatic leadership: Validity of a German version of the Conger-Kanungo Scale (CKS). *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*. 24(2), 124—130. Doi: 10.1027/1015-5759.24.2.124

Further notes

Collaborative Leadership Self-Assessment

Purpose/focus of the instrument

A 30-item 4-pt Likert scale self-assessment focused on how well one leads collaboratively, developed from and focused on a community organizing context.

Where is instrument found? Is it available online or only through a service?

The assessment is here in this library.

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

Available free for non-commercial purposes. No cost

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

No date given.

Who developed the instrument, where?

Himmelman

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

No reliability or validity information provided, but the author's info is listed for contacting.

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Number of citations for the instrument

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validate

References (up to 5)

Further notes

Collaborative Leadership Self-Assessment Tools

Purpose/focus of the instrument

Each instrument is short, only 10 or 11 items, on a 7-pt Likert scale.

Being a collaborative leader means that a person is skilled at both understanding what's happening in a group, and successfully intervene to assist the group in moving toward its goal.

Consequently, a collaborative leader often possesses the ability to do the following:

Assess the Environment

Create Clarity: Visioning and Mobilizing

Build Trust

Share Power and Influence

Develop People

Regularly engage in Self-Reflection

The Turning Point Collaborative Leadership Self-Assessment Questionnaires are intended to help individuals focus on and evaluate key behaviors that are important to each of six practices of effective collaborative leaders. The specific self-assessment questions are intended to trigger

personal reflection about these key behaviors associated with specific collaborative practices. The self-assessment questionnaires can be used as a stand-alone device to assess collaborative leadership capacity or as an activity in courses or workshops, where participants will be encouraged to use their private assessment of how frequently they use a collaborative leadership behavior as a basis to identify strengths as well as areas for growth and development. When combined, the self assessment questions related to all six practices provide a behavioral view of successful collaborative leaders and help individuals assess their personal collaborative leadership capacity. The results can be used by individuals, facilitators, trainers, supervisors, and others to select specific modules from the Collaborative Leadership Learning Modules: A Comprehensive Series. Modules from this series can be used to help individuals and groups increase their level of understanding of collaborative concepts and improve their collaborative leadership capacity.

Where is instrument found? Is it available online or only through a service?

The questionnaires are provided on the following pages or you can download them from: http://www.collaborativeleadership.org/pages/pdfs/CL_self-assessments_lores.pdf. **Please note:** Robert Wood Johnson Foundation gave permission to use these assessments. If anyone has an interest in using these materials in other publications, please contact the RWJF Communications Office at Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, Route 1 and College Road East, Princeton, NJ 08543, Telephone: 609 627-7572, <http://www.rwjf.org>. This paper with the instruments is included in this library.

**Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?
Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?**

Who developed the instrument, where?

The University of Washington School of Public Health and Community Medicine, with funding from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, developed this series of self-assessment questionnaires that can assist persons working with coalitions in determining how well they practice collaborative leadership.

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Number of citations for the instrument

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validate

References (up to 5)

<http://northwoodscoalition.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/Chapter-7-Collaborative-Leadership-Self-Assessment-Tools.pdf>

Further notes

Community leadership development measure

Purpose/focus of the instrument

Nine questions on a 5 Likert scale. Study showed differences between control and 2 interventions (pre/post test and then/post test) as well as between both interventions (3 significant differences in pre/post and 7 significant differences in then/post; no significant differences in the control group).n=274 (81 to 110 in each of 3 groups). Study was comparing pre/post vs then/post techniques with a control group (see abstract below).

Abstract: This study sought to determine the change in level of leadership skills of participants in a community leadership program and the degree of response shift (change in level of understanding of leadership skills) in the self-report measures employed. While most participants reported increases in their leadership skills at the end of the program, differences were found between their self-report ratings using the pretest-posttest approach and the then-posttest approach. The findings together with other studies cited suggest that when employing self-report measures, the then-posttest approach provides a less conservative (more variance) and more accurate means of assessing leadership skill development than would the traditional pretest-posttest approach. Suggestions for reducing the effects of response shift are also offered.

Questions:

- 1 Confidence to promote causes
- 2 Ability to motivate people
- 3 Knowledge of resources for problem solving
- 4 Ability to make informed decisions on public issues
- 5 Ability to influence community affairs
- 6 Ability to work with people
- 7 Ability to lead a group
- 8 Knowledge of legislative process
- 9 Ability to deal with local leaders

Scale: 1=very good, 2=good, 3=fair, 4=poor, 5=very poor

Where is instrument found? Is it available online or only through a service?

Unable to locate the instrument anywhere for sale.

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

1997

Who developed the instrument, where?

From the "Community Leadership: A County Perspective" program, run by Georgia extension service to help develop community leaders. Rohs and Langone

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

No reliability or validity information.

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Number of citations for the instrument

Cited by 49 on google.

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

References (up to 5)

Rohs, F. R., & Langone, C. A. (1997). Increased accuracy in measuring leadership impacts. *The Journal of Leadership Studies*, 4(1), 150-158.

Further notes

Community-based leadership development measurement

Purpose/focus of the instrument

This is a process, not an instrument per se. The author of the article, who works at Bridgespan Group, stated “we conducted a [third-party assessment](#) of the nation’s largest philanthropic leadership program—Neighborhood Builders, operated by Bank of America. Now in its eighth year, Neighborhood Builders selects “high performing” community-based nonprofits, and provides them with a meaningful unrestricted grant (\$200,000) and multiple three-day sessions of leadership training for the executive director and an emerging leader. It also fosters relationships within a network that has grown to 1,200 nonprofit leaders. The bank invests in this program as part of a broader commitment to strengthen communities where it does business. (intervention description)

“Our research found that the program is having a strong, positive impact on participating leaders and organizations, and through them, the individuals and communities they serve. For instance, Chinese American Service League, a Chicago-based social services organization, attributes its ability to grow through the downturn in large part to the fundraising knowledge it gained at the training, the financial management advice it received from a peer organization it met at the training, and fundraising and accounting software it purchased with the unrestricted grant.”

To develop a strong measurement process takes time and several steps; the author suggests the following:

1. Develop a detailed theory of change. It isn't worth spending a dime on measurement until you've carefully defined which leaders you intend to target, what specific training and other programming they need, what they will gain, how those gains will be applied, and what should ultimately result. Ask yourself: Do you want to be accountable for long-term outcomes? At what levels (the leader, the organization, the community, etc.)? Over what time period? Should every participant receive the same set of services and benefit in the same way? For Neighborhood Builders (the Bank of America funded program he and colleagues studied), detailing the theory of change clarified the intermediate outcomes it sought (improvements in aspirations, leadership knowledge and skills, peer relationships, and stature with other funders) and the longer-term outcomes for improved leadership and organizational performance.

2. Measure with mixed methods. Start with basic data tracking, leader by leader, along the theory of change: characteristics of the leaders, the amount and type of programming they access, their assessment of whether the programming was delivered as intended, etc. Then make sure to gather intermediate and longer-term outcome data after sufficient time has elapsed. While questionnaires and surveys will tell you whether outcomes were achieved, qualitative methods such as interviews, focus groups, and document review are often necessary to determine whether the outcomes resulted from the program, particularly in the absence of a comparison group. Indeed, for Neighborhood Builders, we relied on in-depth interviews using common qualitative evaluation techniques such as [most significant change](#) and [alternative explanation elimination](#) to assess the program's influence on outcomes.

3. Continuously measure to improve impact. High-performing nonprofits use measurement to enable innovation and improvement. By gathering and analyzing your data leader by leader, you should be able to determine which types of leaders benefit the most, what programming most drives outcomes, etc.; and then adjust your approaches to achieve greater impact. Our assessment of Neighborhood Builders identified nearly a dozen potential programmatic improvements, including how to better select leaders and which follow-up services (such as ongoing peer networks and skills-based employee volunteerism) to add or strengthen. These improvements can be piloted, measured, and then adopted at scale if they work.

4. Build rigor over time. Leadership programs don't need to build a full-scale measurement system right from the start. The best programs are intentional about whether and how to improve the rigor of their measurement over time, based partly on what they want to do with the results. Do they want to improve at their current size? Attract more resources to scale it? Inform the field? By engaging evaluators early, these programs can understand their options and implement changes now to prepare for the future. In the case of Neighborhood Builders, those options include building a comparison group, validating self-reported data, and measuring the program's return on investment.

Where is instrument found? Is it available online or only through a service?

from an article in the Stanford Social Innovation Review

(http://ssir.org/articles/entry/measuring_leadership_development)

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?
2011

Who developed the instrument, where?
Forti

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Number of citations for the instrument

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

References (up to 5)

Further notes

Competing values framework (CVF) for assessing organizational culture

Purpose/focus of the instrument

Writing about leadership in the healthcare sector in England, West et al. (2015) state that “our approach to leader and leadership development is distorted by a preoccupation with individual leader development (important though it is), often provided by external providers in remote locations. Developing collective leadership for an organisation depends crucially on context and is likely to be best done ‘in place’, highlighting the important contribution of organisation development and not just leader development. The leadership of organisations needs to be consistent in terms of leadership styles and behaviours; in developing shared leadership across the organisation; in embodying the vision and values of the organisation; in ensuring shared and consistent approaches to performance management; in practising compassion as a cultural value in all relationships within the organisation; in encouraging, facilitating and rewarding learning, quality improvement and innovation; and in developing team, inter-team and cross-boundary working within and across organisations in health and in social care. And leaders must work together and build cultures where the success of patient care overall is every leader’s priority, not just the success of their individual areas of responsibility” (22).

It is thus important to measure both leaders’ impacts on organizational outcomes and organizational outcomes as measures of dispersed or shared leadership. Two areas of measurement typically include organizational culture and climate. “Organisational culture is defined as “the values and beliefs that characterise organisations as transmitted by the socialisation experiences newcomers have, the decisions made by management, and the stories

and myths people tell and re-tell about their organisations” (Schneider & Barbera, 2014). The most frequently employed approach to measuring culture in health care is the competing values framework (CVF) (Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983)” (West et al., 2015, 14). The authors cite a number of studies that use the CVF framework, and these studies in turn could be read (or the authors contacted) to determine what specific instruments they used. Some of these include type of organization (most where hospital studies, which included the following types: clan, market, hierarchical, adhocracy), patient satisfaction, cohesiveness, participation, loyalty, tradition, morale, and other desired hospital outcomes such as hospital board level innovations.

Where is instrument found? Is it available online or only through a service?

Open access: available free online. No cost.

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

2015

Who developed the instrument, where?

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

There is clear evidence from the more robust studies in the literature that supportive management and staff perceptions of having effective leaders creates a climate that is associated with health care excellence.

Reliability: Hart & Quinn (1993) developed a 16 item questionnaire measuring the four roles of leadership: Vision Setter, Motivator, Analyzer, and Task Master. Internal consistency values for Vision Setter, Motivator, Analyzer, and Task Master were .56, .71, .69, and .58, respectively.

Validity: Validity: Hart & Quinn (1993) demonstrated construct validity of the four leadership roles performing a factor analysis on the items. Four factors emerged clearly reflecting the Vision Setter, Motivator, Analyzer, and B2-1 Task Master executive roles. The authors also demonstrated criterion related validity of three of the four executive roles. Vision Setter was found to predict business performance ($R^2 = .12, p < .01$) and organizational effectiveness ($R^2 = .12, p < .01$); Motivator was found to predict organizational effectiveness ($R^2 = .23, p < .001$); and Analyzer was found to predict business performance ($R^2 = .12, p < .01$).

Source: Robert E. Quinn, University of Michigan, School of Business Administration, RM 3084 914 Hill Street, Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1234, Phone: 734-998-8159, e-mail: requinn@umich.edu (reliability, validity and source info above taken from the Zaccaro, 1999 article).

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Number of citations for the instrument

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

References (up to 5)

West, M., Armit, K., Loewenthal, L., Eckert, R., West, T. and Lee, A. (2015). Leadership and Leadership Development in Healthcare: The Evidence Base. London, Faculty of Medical Leadership and Management. Open access: available free online.

Further notes

Educational leadership assessments

Purpose/focus of the instrument

Measuring Leadership: A Guide to Assessment for Development of School Executives. This book was reviewed by Larry Lashway, *ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management*.

“This is a "how to" book for school-leader selection, appraisal, and development. It focuses on ways in which to measure components of leadership so that leadership evaluation can move beyond impressionistic opinions. The text is divided into five chapters. The rationale for leadership assessment, along with the dangers to be avoided in such assessment, are explored in the first chapter. Chapter 2 provides an overview of various perspectives on leadership. A selective review of the non-school-leadership literature is followed by a brief treatment of the school-leadership literature. Examples of instruments used to assess leadership, viewed from each of the different perspectives, are referred to throughout the chapter. Chapters 3 and 4 examine the interdependence of the needs of every school district, the forms of leadership best suited to meet those needs, and strategies for choosing a leadership-assessment instrument. These two chapters address how to select an instrument for a school district and then how to interpret and use the data generated by such an instrument. Technical issues are also examined. In the last chapter, nearly 20 instruments for assessing leadership are described, including their purposes, basic features, type of feedback garnered, and appropriate followup.”

Descriptors: [Administrator Effectiveness](#), [Administrator Evaluation](#), [Educational Administration](#), [Elementary Secondary Education](#), [Evaluation Methods](#), [Instructional Leadership](#), [Management Development](#), [Principals](#), [School Administration](#)

Where is instrument found? Is it available online or only through a service?

The book is going for \$5 currently on Amazon books.

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

Who developed the instrument, where?

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?
How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?
Number of citations for the instrument
Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers
Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated
References (up to 5)
Further notes

Empowering Behavior Questionnaire

Purpose/focus of the instrument

Info below taken from Zaccaro et al. (1999).

Description: The Empowering Behavior Questionnaire is a multidimensional measure of psychological empowerment in the workplace. Originally conceptualized by Thomas and Velthouse (1990) and later developed by Spreitzer (1995), psychological empowerment is a motivational construct involving four cognitions: meaning, competence, self-determination, and impact. These four cognitions reflect an active role of work orientation.

The meaning, competence, self-determination, and impact scales each consists of three items adopted from other measures. The meaning scale contains three items developed by Tymon (1988); the competence scale contains three items from Jones's (1986) self-efficacy scale; the self-determination scale contains three items from Hackman and Oldham's (1985) autonomy scale; and the impact scale contains three items from Ashforth's (1989) helplessness scale.

Application: No information was available to guide suggestions on the application of the Empowering Behavior Questionnaire.

Where is instrument found? Is it available online or only through a service?

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

Who developed the instrument, where?

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

Reliability: Coefficient alpha reliability analysis was conducted on two samples of mid-level employees from an industrial and insurance organization. The overall empowerment construct was .72 for the industrial sample and .62 for the insurance sample. Test-retest reliability was performed for the insurance sample. Results indicated moderate stability of the empowerment scale over time (Spreitzer, 1995).

Validity: A second order confirmatory factor analysis was conducted on two samples of mid-level employees from an industrial and insurance organization to assess the convergent and discriminant validity of the empowerment items and the contribution of the four dimensions to the overall construct empowerment (Spreitzer, 1995). Results indicated that each of the dimension were distinct from one another. Confirmatory factor analysis demonstrated an excellent fit for the industrial sample, and a modest fit for the insurance sample. The dimensions also demonstrated convergent validity showing relation with an overall construct of psychological empowerment. Each of the items loaded strongly on the appropriate factor, and the four factors were significantly correlated with each other in both samples.

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Number of citations for the instrument

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Limitations: While results demonstrated that the four dimensions were not equivalent, the high correlation among the factors (e.g., the impact scale correlated .43 with meaning and .63 with self-determination) leads to speculation whether each dimension is indeed measuring distinct constructs.

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

References (up to 5)

Source: Gretchen M. Spreitzer, University of Southern California, School of Business Administration, Los Angeles, CA 90089-1421. References* and Suggested Readings:

*Ashforth, B. E. (1989). The experience of powerlessness in organizations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 43, 207-242.

Chiles, A. M., & Zorn, T. E. (1995). Empowerment in organizations: Employees' perceptions of influences on empowerment. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 23, 1-25.

*Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1980). *Work redesign*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

*Jones, G. R. (1986). Socialization tactics, self-efficacy, and newcomers' adjustments to organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 29, 262-279.

*Spreitzer, G. M. (1995). Psychological empowerment in the workplace: Construct definition, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 1442-1465.

Spreitzer, G. M., Kizilos, M. A. & Nason, S. W. (1997). A dimensional analysis of the relationship between psychological empowerment and effectiveness, satisfaction, and strain. *Journal of Management*, 23, 679-704.

*Thomas, K. W., & Velthouse, B. A. (1990). Cognitive elements of empowerment. *Academy of Management Review*, 15, 666-681.

*Tyman, W. G., Jr. (1988). An empirical investigation of a cognitive model of empowerment. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University, Philadelphia.

Further notes

Empowerment Profile

Purpose/focus of the instrument

Promotional website: "Wise leaders know that power is an unusual kind of currency. The more you give it away, the more you end up having. Help leaders understand this essential concept with the new edition of the *Empowerment Profile* - an in-depth instrument that provides leaders with a measurement of the degree to which they perceive themselves to have power at work. Participants create two profiles: one based on their assessment of their own empowerment, the second profile based on scores compiled from the leader's employees' assessments of their own empowerment. The 40-item assessment measures perceptions of empowerment along 8 dimensions, including autonomy, climate, control, and influence. Together, the two charts provide a complete look at empowerment in the leader's work environment. The Leader Version includes the leader's self-assessment and the profiles. Background information and an action planning section help leaders understand how to empower themselves and their employees. The Employee Version contains only the employee's self-assessment. It is designed to provide leaders with data on how empowered their employees actually feel."

Where is instrument found? Is it available online or only through a service?

Available at: <http://www.hrdgstore.com/empowerment>

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

Facilitator set is \$141, employee version \$7, Leader version \$18, theoretical profile (free download, but you must register).

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

2nd Edition, by John E. Jones, PhD and William L Bearly, EdE.

Who developed the instrument, where?

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Number of citations for the instrument

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

References (up to 5)

Further notes

Ethical leadership at work (ELW) questionnaire

Purpose/focus of the instrument

Abstract

This paper describes the development and validation of the multi-dimensional Ethical Leadership at Work (ELW) questionnaire. Based on theory, interviews and a student sample, we developed seven ethical leader behaviors (fairness, integrity, ethical guidance, people orientation, power sharing, role clarification, and concern for sustainability). We then tested the factor structure in two employee samples (first common-source, EFA; next multi-source, CFA). To establish construct validity we related ethical leader behaviors to other leadership styles and employee attitudes in Study 1. The expected pattern of relationships emerged, e.g., positive relationships with satisfaction and commitment, and negative ones with cynicism. The results suggest that the ELW scales have sound psychometric properties and good construct validity. In Study 2, using a multi-source sample, the ELW behaviors explained variance in trust, OCB, and leader and follower effectiveness beyond a uni-dimensional measure of ethical leadership. Ethical leadership was also related to OCB (supervisor-rated). Employees who rate their leader higher on power sharing and fairness show more OCB. Taken together, the results suggest that the ELW is a useful new multidimensional measurement tool that can help further our understanding of the antecedents and consequences of ethical leadership.

Where is instrument found? Is it available online or only through a service?

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

Who developed the instrument, where?

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

The following article furthered the ELW validity, and provided a version in German.

Abstract

The present study evaluates the psychometric properties of a German version of the Ethical Leadership at Work questionnaire (ELW-D), and further embeds the construct of ethical leadership within its nomological network. Confirmatory factor analyses (CFAs) based on the total sample of $N = 363$ employees support the assumed seven-factor structure of the German translation. Within a sub-sample of $N = 133$, the ELW-D shows positive correlations with related leadership behaviors (transformational leadership, contingent reward, and servant leadership), and negative correlations with destructive ones (passive leadership, autocratic leadership, and abusive supervision), approving convergent validity of the scale. Comparisons of correlated correlation coefficients reveal restrictions of its discriminant validity. In support of the criterion-related validity ($N = 100$), the ELW-D relates to work-related attitudes (e.g., job satisfaction, satisfaction with the leader, trust in the leader) and follower behaviors (e.g., extra effort, organizational citizenship behavior) in the way expected. Besides, ELW-D-dimensions show

incremental validity over and above the Ethical Leadership Scale, emphasizing the added value of this questionnaire.

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Number of citations for the instrument

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

References (up to 5)

Kalshoven, K., Den Hartog, D. N., & De Hoogh, A. H. B. (2011). Ethical leadership at work questionnaire (ELW): Development and validation of a multidimensional measure. *The leadership quarterly*, 22(1), 51-69.

Steinmann, B., Nubold, A., & Maier, G. W. (2016). Validation of a German Version of the Ethical Leadership at Work Questionnaire by Kalshoven et al. (2011). *Front Psychol.* 2016; 7: 446. Published online 2016 Mar 31. doi: [10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00446](https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00446)

Further notes

Global Leader Index

Purpose/focus of the instrument

(from IMD.org) – This is a leadership tool that assesses your strengths and weaknesses across 16 domains with 48 questions, using a 7pt Likert scale. It notes your strengths and weaknesses and ranks you against a database of 14,000 business executives (primarily) who have taken the assessment, so the focus is very much global corporate leaders (in both instrument development and output comparisons). No printout option, so you have to PrntScr to save each screen into another document for future reflection. You are then offered brochures to pay to participate in their various trainings, from an MBA program to workshops. See: <http://www.imd.org/business-school/leadership-assessment.html> .

Where is instrument found? Is it available online or only through a service?

You can register and do the assessment online for free

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

No cost

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

Who developed the instrument, where?

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

There is no info on reliability and validity. However, there is general information about how the tool was developed and used, and the citations may provide validity info, I just did not take time to delve into them.

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Number of citations for the instrument

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

References (up to 5)

Citations are provided on the website

Further notes

Global transformational leadership scale (GTL)

Purpose/focus of the instrument

It is a short 7 item tool that, unlike the MLQ, measures only transformational leadership. The MLQ measures leadership styles across a single spectrum, from transformational to passive. Items and Time to administer: 7 items, 2-4 minutes to administer. The instrument was developed by Carless, Wearing, and Mann (2000) as an alternative to long instruments such as the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ; Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1995), the Conger-Kanungo scale (Conger & Kanungo, 1994) and the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI; Kouzes & Posner, 1990) that assess a range of leader behaviors but are time consuming to complete. Their goal was “to develop a short, practical instrument of transformational leadership which is easily administered and scored yet is also reliable and valid.” After reviewing the literature, they propose that the following behaviours encompass the concept of transformational leadership: (1) communicates a vision, (2) develops staff, (3) provides support, (4) empowers staff, (5) is innovative, (6) leads by example, and (7) is charismatic.” The GTL was designed and tested as a rater instrument, to be filled out by either a subordinate or a direct superior or best to do both. Scoring is obtained by summing a total score. “High scores suggest the manager makes extensive use of transformational leadership, low scores are associated with infrequent or rare use of transformational leadership.”

Where is instrument found? Is it available online or only through a service?

The scale does not appear on the web anywhere for sale or use. I tried to contact the lead author without success. She doesn't appear to be at the institutions where she was 10-15 years ago, indicating possible retirement or perhaps deceased.

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

2000

Who developed the instrument, where?**Target population for which the instrument was developed?****What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?**

This instrument has been used in a few studies and has strong reliability and validity. I found that several other studies had used this instrument with adequate indications of reliability and validity. Instrument provided in the seminal article, but no information in the article on cost/open access.

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

The study had a sample of 1,440 subordinates who assessed the leader behaviour of 695 branch managers in a large Australian financial organisation. Exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis showed that the GTL measured a single construct of leadership and had satisfactory reliability. The possible range in scores on the GTL is 7-35. The mean score was 25.00 and the standard deviation was 6.76. These statistics indicate that there is adequate dispersion of scores on the GTL. Cronbach's alpha was calculated as .93, which supports the conclusion that the GTL is a reliable measure of transformational leadership. The eigenvalue was 5.0 which explained 71% of the variance. The exploratory factor loadings ranged from .78 to .88 with a mean of .84 (SD = .05). The GTL was compared to the LPI and MLQ for convergent validity, and correlations ranged from .76 to .88 with a mean of .83 (SD = .04), indicating strong convergent validity. T-tests were used to show that the GTL discriminates significantly between all of the contrasted groups: (a) highly motivated subordinates compared with less motivated subordinates; (b) high and poor performing managers (based on District Manager and subordinate ratings); and (c) highly effective leaders compared with less effective leaders. These findings provide substantial evidence of the discriminant validity of the GTL.

Number of citations for the instrument

web citations = 267

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers**Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated**

Languages: Sam Nickels used this instrument in his dissertation and used a back-translation process to get a valid Spanish translation, which he used in study after running it through a limited cognitive review and pilot. Reliability is available in his SSSL dissertation.

References (up to 5)

Additional information/links: Citation: Carless, S. A., Wearing, A. J., & Mann, L. (2000). A short measure of transformational leadership. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 14*(3), 389-405.

Further notes

Government tools

Purpose/focus of the instrument

Office of Personnel Management (OPM) of the US federal government offers employees a number of flexible use tools for assessing new leaders, top leaders, 360 learning formats, etc. The tools are based around a leader framework: “A Common Framework: The OPM Executive Core Qualifications.”

All of OPM’s leadership development tools are centered on the competencies included in the Executive Core Qualifications (ECQ) Leadership Model. Each assessment provides leaders insights from a different perspective or on a different aspect of leadership effectiveness related to the ECQ competencies listed below:

- **Fundamental Competencies:** Interpersonal Skills, Written Communication, Oral Communication, Integrity/Honesty, Continual Learning, Public Service Motivation
- **Leading Change:** Creativity & Innovation, External Awareness, Flexibility, Resilience, Strategic Thinking, Vision
- **Leading People:** Conflict Management, Leveraging Diversity, Developing Others, Team Building
- **Results Driven:** Accountability, Customer Service, Decisiveness, Entrepreneurship, Problem Solving, Technical Credibility
- **Business Acumen:** Financial Management, Human Capital Management, Technology Management
- **Building Coalitions:** Partnering, Political Savvy, Influencing/Negotiating

Where is instrument found? Is it available online or only through a service?

Contact OPM for more information, may not be accessible to people who are not federal government employees. It appears the assistance to employees (and thus access to the instruments) is provided through a 3rd party consulting firm. For additional information regarding the Leadership Assessment Center, contact us at Leadership_Assessment@opm.gov.

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

Who developed the instrument, where?

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Number of citations for the instrument

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

References (up to 5)

Further notes

Harris self-assessment instruments

Purpose/focus of the instrument

Harris is an expert with a long history of consulting with government and private sector leaders. His book “Developing High Performance Leaders” contains a large number of self assessments for managers and other leaders who want to learn more about their leadership style, ability, motivation, values, etc. Some of the assessments are related to one’s organization, but still filled out by the individual. Harris, 2013.

Where is instrument found? See below.

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)

The assessments below are available from www.hrdpress.com (Human Resource Development Press).

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

The assessments below are available from www.hrdpress.com (Human Resource Development Press) for \$99.95 in a single booklet form. Some of the inventories (+) are available for single personal use only by purchasing Harris’ book “Developing High Performance Leaders” (\$10-\$50 depending on whether purchase used or new); the book also includes two additional inventories not available in the booklet inventories listed below (Pre-training self-evaluation and the Cross-cultural relations inventory, although it’s not clear if this is the same as the “Intercultural Relations Inventory” listed below) (<http://www.hrdpress.com/Twenty-Reproducible-Assessment-Instruments-20RAI>)

1. Human Resources Inventory +
2. Leadership Motivation Inventory +
3. Values Imprint Survey
4. Quality of Life Index
5. Relocation Preparation Index
6. Change Inventory for Leaders +
7. Force Field Analysis Inventory +
8. Group Maturity Analysis
9. Individual Behavior Analysis +
10. Team Performance Survey
11. Team Synergy Analysis Inventory
12. High Performance Management Inventory +
13. Management Communications Inventory +
14. Managing People Skills Inventory +
15. Intercultural Relations Inventory
16. Inventory of Transformational Management Skills
17. Organizational Culture Survey
18. Organizational Role & Relationships Inventory
19. Organizational Meetings
20. Management Inventory

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

Assessments developed over the years by Harris. Apparently no revisions or editions.

Who developed the instrument, where? P.R. Harris, U.S.A.

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

Appears to be managers and organizational leaders in business, government, and other sectors who are interested in self-learning. These instruments are apparently not part of any study, so there is no target population of studies related to reliability and validity.

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

See note above. There is no reliability or validity data presented by Harris on these instruments developed by him, probably for use in his consulting business over the years.

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples? Unknown. It appears likely that the instruments have never been tested in a study.

Number of citations for the instrument

Number of citations of his book on google scholar: 2

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers. None noted by author. Limitations noted by LIL writers include lack of rigorous validation of instruments, imprecision of targeting and use, and open interpretability of scoring.

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

Unknown. Publisher may know if the book has been translated into other languages.

References

Harris, PR (2013). Developing High Performance Leaders: A behavioral science guide for the knowledge of work culture. New York, NY: Routledge.

Instructional leadership Evaluation and Development Program (ILEAD).

Purpose/focus of the instrument

"Designed to assess instructional leadership behavior, job satisfaction and commitment, and school culture or climate from the teacher's perspective." "Designed to assess school climate from the student perspective." "Designed to simultaneously assess the person, the job, and the culture or climate of the setting in which the person works."

Where is instrument found?

MetriTech, Inc. 1985-1988. Now out of print. MetriTech, Inc., 4106 Fieldstone Road, Champaign, IL 61822; Telephone: 800-747-4868; FAX: 217-398-5798; E-mail: mtinfo@metritech.com; Web: <http://www.metritech.com>

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)

Unknown. May be locatable on the web, since there are citations. The publisher states it is no longer available in print.

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author? Unknown.

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

Who developed the instrument, where?

Braskamp, Larry A.; Maehr, Martin L.; MetriTech, Inc. 1985-1988.

Target population for which the instrument was developed? Unknown

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors? Unknown

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples? Unknown

Number of citations for the instrument: 3

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers Unknown

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated Unknown
Citations (up to 5)

Further notes

Interpersonal Influence Inventory

Purpose/focus of the instrument

Are you aggressive, assertive, or passive? To help people assess the manner in which they choose to influence others. Based on an assertive behavior model, suggests two sets of behaviors create a four-behavior matrix—openness to communication and consideration for others results in either openly aggressive behavior, concealed aggressive behavior (low on both openness and consideration), passive behavior, or assertive behavior (high on both openness and consideration). Citations include Bennis and other leader and management texts, especially focused on learning to be assertive.

Where is instrument found? Instrument on permanent reserve at Carrier Library by prof. D. Irwin, JMU.

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)
Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?
Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

Who developed the instrument, where?

Organization Design and Development, Inc., developed by Rollin Glaser, 1983 to 1993.

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

40-items, self assessment only, no validity/reliability info.

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Number of citations for the instrument

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

Citations (up to 5)

Further notes

LEAD

Purpose/focus of the instrument

Assessments by self/other, 12 situations with 4 options, measures styles, situational leadership theory, for leaders of any group.

Where is instrument found?

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

Available at cost.

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

Blanchard (1996),

Who developed the instrument, where?

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

Good psychometrics and ease of use, according to Huber et al., 2000.

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Number of citations for the instrument

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

Citations (up to 5)

Further notes

Leader Attributes Inventory (LAI) (*)

Purpose/focus of the instrument

Measures the degree to which individuals possess each of 37 attributes (characteristics, knowledge, skills, and values possessed by individuals) that predispose successful leadership performance as a leader in vocational education. The Leader Attributes Inventory (LAI) instrument comes in a Self-Rating Form and an Observer-Rating Form. Each form takes about 15 minutes to complete. Each item is a positive statement of a different attribute accompanied by a 6-point response scale which describes the extent to which the rater believes the person being rated (ratee) possesses the attribute. The response scale ranges from 1 (very undescriptive) to 6 (very descriptive). The Leader Attributes Inventory can be used for an assessment of leader attributes at a point in time, to measure change in leader attributes over time, or to evaluate the impact of leadership development programs.

Where is instrument found?

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

[Click here to purchase Leader Attributes Inventory instrument.](#) This link takes one to a website where one can download the manual, which includes the instrument. The “cost” is \$8.50, probably originally for printing and mailing a hard copy. It was federally funded, so there is actually no one selling the product now, to my knowledge. I downloaded the manual/instrument and it's available here at no cost.

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

Who developed the instrument, where?

Authors: Moss, J., Jr., & Liang, T (1990)

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

Reliability of Scale(s): Tests of the Leader Attributes Inventory (LAI) showed that its reliability as a self-report, when assessed in terms of response consistency, was satisfactory. The Leader Attributes Inventory (LAI) has also demonstrated evidence of test-retest reliability, internal consistency, and interrater reliability. (Liang, 1990; Moss, Johansen, & Preskill, 1991; Moss, Lambrecht, & Jensrud, 1994).

Validity of Scale(s): Face and content validity have been reported for the Leader Attributes Inventory (LAI) (Finch, Gregson, & Faulkner, 1991; Moss, et al., 1992). Evidence indicates that the 37 leader attributes in the Leader Attributes Inventory are actually used by vocational

educators and others (Bensen, 1994) who are engaged in successful leadership activities. Two studies (Liang, 1990; Moss, Johansen, & Preskill, 1991) showed high correlation coefficients when the Leader Attributes Inventory was compared to another leadership measurement tool. Two other studies (White, Asche, & Fortune, 1992; Migler 1991) showed a strong relationship between Leader Attributes Inventory scores and current effectiveness as a leader. The Leader Attributes Inventory also appears to have high construct validity; its 37 attributes have been shown empirically to be highly related to the six leadership tasks which comprise the operational definition of the conceptualization of leadership of the National Center for Research in Vocational Education.

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples? See citations

Number of citations for the instrument: 18 to 20 citations depending on the 1991 or 1994 seminal articles by Moss.

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

Citations

Bensen, T. M. (1994, March 20). *Leadership attributes addressed in Industrial Technology/Technology Education doctoral programs as perceived by faculty and recent graduates*. Paper presented at the 56th Annual ITEEA Conference, Kansas City, MO.

Finch, C. R., Gregson, J. A., & Faulkner, S. L. (1991). *Leadership behaviors of successful vocational education administrators* (MDS-097). Berkeley: National Center for Research on Vocational Education, University of California at Berkeley.

Liang, T. (1990). *Relationships among leader attributes, behaviors, and effectiveness of vocational education administrators*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, St. Paul.

Migler, J. R. (1991). *Selected leadership attributes and styles of administrators in exemplary vocational education institutions and administrators in Minnesota technical colleges*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, St. Paul.

Moss, J., Jr., Johansen, B.-C., & Preskill, A. (1991). Developing the *Leader Attributes Inventory: An odyssey*. *Journal of Industrial Teacher Education*, 28(2), 7-22.

Moss, J., Jr., Lambrecht, J. J., & Jensrud, Q. (1994). *Leader attributes inventory manual*. Berkeley, CA: National Center for Research in Vocational Education. [View](#)

Moss, J., Jr., & Liang, T. (1990). *Leadership, leadership development, and the National Center for Research in Vocational Education* (MDS-041). Berkeley: National Center for Research in Vocational Education, University of California at Berkeley.

Moss, J., Jr., Jensrud, Q., & Johansen, B.-C. (1992). *An evaluation of ten leadership development programs for graduate students in vocational education* (MDS-293). Berkeley: National Center for Research in Vocational Education, University of California at Berkeley.

White, D. J., Asche, F.M., & Fortune, J.C. (1992, April). *Minority leadership training: Evaluation and analysis of a five-state program: An interim report*. Paper presented at the American Education Research Association meeting, San Francisco, CA.

Source: <http://www.statisticssolutions.com/leadership/>

Further notes

Leader Behavior Analysis

Purpose/focus of the instrument

Developed to assess leadership style.

Where is instrument found?

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

Ken Blanchard Companies (The), 125 State Place, Escondido, CA 92029; Telephone: 760-489-5005; Web: <http://www.kenblanchard.com>

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

Who developed the instrument, where?

1991. Zigarmi, Drea; Forsyth, Douglas; Blanchard, Kenneth; Hambleton, Ronald. *Leader Behavior Analysis II*: KH Blanchard, RK Hambleton, D Zigarmi.

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Number of citations for the instrument: 16

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

References

Further notes

Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ & LBDQ-12)

Purpose/focus of the instrument

A detailed questionnaire designed to describe how leaders behave. Results of many questionnaires have shown that consideration and initiating structure were the two most

important factors in leadership behaviour. They are independent and a leader can be high in both, low in both, or some other combination.

100 items, 12 subscales, but only subscales 5 and 8 are commonly used, employees, strong psychometrics, good ease of use, costs, Ohio State Univ. (Source: Huber et al., 2000).

Where is instrument found?

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

Unable to determine if it is available at cost or free, but we were able to download the LBDQ-XII self version with all 100 items and instructions.

https://cyfar.org/sites/default/files/LBDQ_1962_Self_Assessment.pdf

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

Who developed the instrument, where?

Stogdill (1963, University of Ohio), based on the work of others he cites. See LBDQ manual:

<https://fisher.osu.edu/supplements/10/2862/1962%20LBDQ%20MANUAL.pdf>

Target population for which the instrument was developed? From the manual: It can be used to describe the behavior of the leader, or leaders, in any type of group or organization, provided the followers have had an opportunity to observe the leader in action as a leader of their group.

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

100 items, 12 subscales, but only subscales 5 and 8 are commonly used, employees, strong psychometrics, good ease of use, costs, Ohio State Univ. (Source: Huber et al., 2000).

The Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ). The LBDQ, and its sibling the LBDQ-XII, have been around for more than 50 years and are still being used today.... analyses of the instruments (LBDQ and LBDQ-XII) were reviewed to support the instruments robust reliability and validity. (From the book Online Instruments by Rody Rodriguez)

The manual for the 100 item questionnaire has reliability tables. "The reliability of the subscales was determined by a modified Kuder-Richardson formula. The modification consists in the fact that each item was correlated with the remainder of the items in its subscale rather than with the subscale score including the item. This procedure yields a conservative estimate of subscale reliability. The reliability coefficients are shown in Table 2."

The LBDQ-XII appears to be the same 100 item version but subdivided by 12 domains. Manual available at: <https://fisher.osu.edu/supplements/10/2862/1962%20LBDQ%20MANUAL.pdf>

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples? See 1124 citations

Number of citations for the instrument: 1124

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

References (up to 5)

Further notes

Subscales:

1. Representation – speaks and acts as the representative of the group. (5 items)
2. Demand Reconciliation – reconciles conflicting demands and reduces disorder to system. (5 items)
3. Tolerance of Uncertainty – is able to tolerate uncertainty and postponement without anxiety or upset. (10 items)
4. Persuasiveness – uses persuasion and argument effectively; exhibits strong convictions. (10 items)
5. Initiation of Structure – clearly defines own role, and lets followers know what is expected. (10 items)
6. Tolerance and Freedom - allows followers scope for initiative, decision and action. (10 items)
7. Role Assumption – actively exercises the leadership role rather than surrendering leadership to others. (10 items)
8. Consideration – regards the comfort, well being, status, and contributions of followers. (10 items)
9. Production Emphasis – applies pressure for productive output. (10 items)
10. Predictive Accuracy – exhibits foresight and ability to predict outcome accurately. (5 items)
11. Integration – maintains a closely knit organization; resolves intermember conflicts. (5 items)
12. Superior Orientation – maintains cordial relations with superiors; has influence with them; is striving for higher status. (10 items)

Leader Behavior Scale & Follower Belief Scale

Purpose/focus of the instrument

Behling & McFillen in 1996 developed a Charismatic Transformational leadership model. One source (Thurrell, 2010) rated instruments that targeted middle and low level (non-executive) leadership development, using the full-range leadership model of Bass/Avolio, and rated the instruments according to a facet rating system that looked at reliability and validity issues. Behling & McFillen study rated well on her review.

McCann et al. (2006) describe and assess B&M's two instruments in their study of the theory and instruments of B&M:

Leader Behavior Scale. Behling and McFillen constructed the Leader Behavior Scale (LBS) to measure the six attributes of leader behavior in their model. The scale includes 18 items: three items for each of the six leader behaviors.

Follower Belief Scale. Behling and McFillen constructed the Follower Belief Scale (FBS) to measure the three follower beliefs of awe, inspiration, and empowerment in their model. The scale includes 15 items: five for each of the three follower beliefs.

From the theoretical model article: Two key problems hamper the study of charismatic/transformational leadership. First, the field lacks a generally accepted conceptual framework to guide research and practice. Second, only limited efforts have been made to operationalize key constructs. The authors report on an effort to remedy both problems here. They present a model that captures many of the major points common to existing models of charismatic/transformational leadership, that describes the development of instruments to measure attributes of the behaviors of charismatic/transformational leaders as well as key follower beliefs, and that hypothesizes the relationships between charismatic leadership behaviors, follower beliefs, and follower behavior.

Where is instrument found?

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

Unable to find the scales online. No cost info found either.

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

Who developed the instrument, where?

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

Leader Behavioral Scale: Three internal consistency tests for the six subscales were conducted by Behling and McFillen and resulted in satisfactory Cronbach's alphas all higher than .70. Similarly satisfactory alpha coefficients were found in this study: displays empathy, .68; dramatizes mission, .71; projects self-assurance, .78; enhances image, .73; assures followers of competency, .85; and provides opportunities for success, .82. Scored on Likert-type scales ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 6 (*strongly agree*).

Follower Belief Scale: Studies of reliability and validity reported by Behling and McFillen showed that the follower belief subscales have good reliability and validity. Four independent tests of internal consistencies by Behling and McFillen resulted in Cronbach alpha coefficients of .85, .80, .85, and .83 for inspiration; .92, .88, .95, and .95 for awe; and .79, .90, .81, and .93 for empowerment. Similarly strong alpha coefficients were found in this study: inspiration, .85; awe, .89; and empowerment, .83. Behling and McFillen did not report details of a factor analysis on their scale, but a factor analysis in this study, using principal axis factoring and direct

oblimin rotation requesting three factors, produced the factor loadings shown in Table 2 accounting for 66% of the variance in the data. The underlined loadings in Table 2 show Behling and McFillen's allocation of items to subscales (e.g., the first five items in Table 2 are part of the scale for inspiration). As can be seen from Table 2, all of the 15 items loaded highest on the factors on which they were expected to load. In this study, all 15 items were used in the manner originally proposed by Behling and McFillen.

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Number of citations for the instrument: 180 citations

(<http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1059601196212004>) and there were 57 citations of an article that assessed the Behling and McFillen leader model.

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

References (up to 5)

Further notes

Leader Competency Inventory (LCI-Kelner)

Purpose/focus of the instrument

The Leader Competency Inventory (LCI) is a method for measuring an individual's use of four specific dimensions of leadership – information seeking, conceptual thinking, strategic orientation, and service orientation. Participants are asked to respond to 46 items in which they state the degree to which they have demonstrated or seen various behaviors. At most 1 hour is needed for completion for the LCI and is done through a pencil-and-paper format. There are four competencies to report upon: Information seeking, conceptual thinking, strategic orientation, and customer service orientation. Although this self reporting questionnaire is able to show participants their degree of leadership competencies, the participants are also able to see how colleagues and direct reports see their leadership competencies.

Where is instrument found?

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

Who developed the instrument, where?

Author: Stephen D. Kelner, 1993

Where to Purchase

[Creative Organizational Design](http://www.creativeorgdesign.com)

http://www.creativeorgdesign.com/tests_page.htm?id=124

“The Leadership Competency Inventory has been discontinued and replaced with the Inventory of Leadership Styles, available to be viewed on this site.”

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

The Leadership Competency Inventory is a self-scoring questionnaire that measures an individual's use of four competencies essential to effective leadership. Research has shown that those who can convey an inspiring vision to others demonstrate specific behaviors.

The four competencies are:

Information Seeking - The ability to gather information from a variety of sources to gain full comprehension of all possibilities.

Conceptual Thinking - The ability to capture a clear, crisp image from a complex situation or from an assortment of information.

Strategic Orientation - The ability to develop a long-term strategic focus toward a goal and link daily events or current actions to a final objective.

Customer Service Orientation - The ability to identify and focus on the long-term best interest of the customer.

In today's business environment, it is critical not just to manage changes as they occur, but to lead those changes toward a goal that will benefit the organization. While managers preserve order and reliability in the workplace, leaders dramatically alter the way a group operates by transforming their ideas into images that excite people, thus redefining an organization's overall direction. Both are essential to the success of an organization: reliability without change promotes stagnation; change without consistency leads to chaos.

The LCI enables participants to assess the degree to which they exhibit leadership competencies as perceived by themselves, colleagues and direct reports. Scoring grids in the interpretive notes are used to illustrate the person's demonstration of detailed levels of behaviour, and provide an overall profile of the four major competencies.

Suggested applications:

- Leadership Seminars and Workshops
- Executive Career Development
- Executive Succession Planning
- Performance Appraisals

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Number of citations for the instrument

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

References (up to 5)

Pearson, Carolyn L. Review of the Leadership Competency Inventory. University of West Florida, Pensacola, FL. (cited on Statistics Solutions: <http://www.statisticssolutions.com/leader-competency-inventory-lci/>)

Further notes

This is one of two LCI instruments we found. The second follows.

Leader Competency Inventory (LCI-Penn State)

Purpose/focus of the instrument

This article reports psychometric evaluation of the Penn State Leadership Competency Inventory (LCI). The 32-item LCI was validated on a sample of 323 managers in the healthcare industry. Preliminary validity and reliability evidence of the LCI was established through exploratory factor analysis (EFA), item-total correlations, Cronbach's alpha coefficients, and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). The four-factor leadership competency scale, comprising supervisory and managerial competencies, organizational leadership, personal mastery, and resource leadership, accounted for 58% of variance. According to CFA results, the model fit of the four latent factors of the LCI was confirmed to be appropriate. Cross-validation with other populations is needed to confirm the factor structure. Limitations and further research recommendations are discussed. Reference: Leadership competency inventory: A systematic process of developing and validating a leadership competency scale (Yoon et al., 2010)

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The LCI incorporated competencies from studies conducted by the federal government. One is the Leadership Effectiveness Framework (LEF; U.S. Office of Personnel Management [OPM], Human Resources Development Group [HRDG], & Office of Executive and Management Policy [OEMP], 1993); the other is the SCANS report for America 2000 (SCANS, 1992).

The LCI was developed by faculty members of Pennsylvania State University Continuing and Professional Education (PSUCaPE, 2007). Similar to the development of Lentz's and Naquin and Holton's scales (1993 and 2006, respectively), the LCI was developed following preliminary research using the OPM model (Donahue, 1996). Unlike Lentz's and Naquin and Holton's studies, the 2007 version of the LCI was expanded to include competencies identified in the SCANS report for America 2000 (Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills [SCANS], 1992). The LCI has been used by PSUCaPE to identify leadership training and development needs over the past two years; in practice, it has played a critical role in management development business. At the time of this writing, 34 organizations have used the LCI to assess the leadership development needs of their supervisors and managers. More than 75% of them subscribed to development programs based on the results (E. Bergstrom, personal communication, May 7, 2009). PSUCaPE received an Applied Research award in 2009 from University Continuing Education Association (UCEA) for the LCI's innovative features and its

contribution to adult and continuing education. Although PSUCaPE clients in both private and public sectors have reported very favorable results from use of the LCI, no formal validation study had been undertaken (until now with this study). (Yoon et al., 2010)

Where is instrument found?

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

Who developed the instrument, where?

Penn State: The LCI was developed by three experts in leadership development, Wesley Donahue, Katheryn Woodley, and John Park. They hold Ph.D.s in workforce education, organizational psychology, and adult education, respectively, and each has more than 20 years of leadership training experience for both public and private sector organizations.

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

The results show the LCI to possess sound reliability and validity for the population of health care supervisors and managers studied. Beyond its efficacy with health care populations, the LCI was designed to be used with any private and public sector organization, even though it is based on research originally conducted on federal government populations. According to Thach and Thompson (2007), "In general, the literature suggests that there is a set of common leadership competencies that are appropriate for any type of organization, whether it be for-profit, non-profit, or governmental" (p. 360). Donahue (1996) confirmed that the OPM model is applicable to private industry with a modification. OPM also ensured that their leadership competencies are relevant to models outside of the government (Rodriguez et al., 2002). Thus, there is a possibility that the LCI can be useful with a variety of organization types.

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

See above.

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Number of citations for the instrument

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

References (up to 5)

Further notes

Leader Identity Stage

Purpose/focus of the instrument

Only 1 item that consists of selecting one of 6 statements, which represent the 6 stages of leadership identity theorized by Komives et al. (2006), arranged from most basic to advanced

(awareness to integration): from the basic statement “I am aware of national leaders and others in positions of authority, but I do not consider myself a leader. I am not involved in any or many activities on a regular basis, but I may be interested in becoming more involved.” To the advanced statement “I feel confident in my leadership abilities and in my ability to facilitate change as a group member or a leader. I realize I am a role model to others. I am continually striving to learn more about myself and contribute to the greater good.” The instrument and theoretical foundation appear to be targeted to the college student population. It appears the instrument was created by Lori Pyle for her dissertation because she was unable to locate other instruments that measure this construct (leader identity stage). Information on James Madison University’s Commons (open source), Dr. Lori Pyle’s dissertation study (Pyle, 2013).

Where is instrument found? Open source, JMU Commons

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

Who developed the instrument, where?

Lori Pyle, 2012-2013

Target population for which the instrument was developed? University Students?

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Number of citations for the instrument

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

References (up to 5)

Further notes

Leader Member Exchange (LMX-7)--

Purpose/focus of the instrument

Where is instrument found?

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

Who developed the instrument, where?

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Number of citations for the instrument**Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers****Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated****References (up to 5)****Further notes**

LMX theory is essentially about the dyadic relationship between an individual member and his or her supervisor, and describes reciprocal fulfillment of expectations (Graen et al., 1982). An important ingredient of the dyadic theory is the differentiated relationships yielding different qualities of exchange, in turn creating 'in' groups and 'out' groups of subordinates (Dansereau et al., 1975). LMX theory, based on social exchange theory (Sparrowe & Liden, 1997), maintains that the work group under a leader should not be considered a single entity (Dansereau et al., 1975). Instead, it distinguishes between the formal contract of 'management' and the socially influencing behaviour of 'leadership' (Jacobs cited in (Bhal & Ansari, 1996).

LMX has been shown to positively relate to performance and satisfaction (Graen et al., 1986), locus of control and time-based pressure (Kinicki & Vecchio, 1994), delegation (Schriesheim et al., 1998), job attitudes and performance evaluations (Dienesch & Liden, 1986), and commitment and citizenship behaviour. Literature showed more studies with positive LMX-performance relationships than negative, but there was considerable variation.

The LMX-7 instrument contains 7 items that examine the quality of exchange between leader and subordinate, and is completed by the subordinates of the supervisor/manager/leader. Bhal & Ansari (1996) criticised existing LMX measures, including the LMX-7, for lack of psychometric rigour in their development. There is, however, considerable literature using the 7-item LMX measure (Scandura & Graen, 1984), with most users reporting high alphas such as .91 (Klein & Kim, 1998), .86 (Scandura & Schriesheim, 1994) and .9 (Wayne et al., 1997). A refined version (LMX-6) has been produced from the same team (Schriesheim et al., 1992), and although empirically validated, has not yet enjoyed published replication or use. During development of LMX6, the tests for convergent and discriminative validity included the LMX7, providing the missing psychometric rigour. Additional psychometric validation for LMX7 occurred during the development and validation of a multidimensional measure of leader-member exchange (Liden & Maslyn, 1993)

The LMX7 instrument can be used to examine the quality of social relationships perceived by subordinates to exist between themselves and their immediate leader. The testing of the instrument has been confined to organisational settings and is aimed at middle to lower management. The fact that it has not had meaningful exposure to higher levels of leadership, suggests that it should be limited to management levels under the executive layer.

Comment: The LMX seems more useful in hierarchical organisation with managers and supervisors, rather than organisations with a flat structure. LMX does not apply at executive level because high levels do not have the same co-worker/superior social support relationships.

LMX also does not suit very high stress environments because there is a tendency for 'directing' behaviours to replace 'social influence' behaviours by supervisors under stress. (Staw et al., 1981) report that decisions made under stressful circumstances are, unlike LMX behaviour, likely to exhibit symptoms of the threat rigidity syndrome, meaning decision will be characterized by restriction of information-processing, constriction of control, and rigidity of response. SOURCE: Johnson, I. (n.d.)

Additional information follows from Zaccaro et al. (1999):

Reliability: Scandura and Schriesheim (1994) reported a coefficient alpha reliability of .86 for the LMX-7 measure.

Validity: The literature on leader-member exchange (e.g., Graen & Scandura, 1987) and mentoring (e.g., Scandura, 1992) have established clear links between the developmental activities of superiors, or mentors, and the career outcomes of subordinates, or proteges. Gerstner and Day (1997) conducted a meta-analysis on the LMX-7 measure and reported significant relationships between LMX and job performance, satisfaction with supervision, overall satisfaction, commitment, role conflict, role clarity, member competence, and turnover intentions. Thus, the meta-analysis showed that the LMX-7 measure has sound psychometric properties and that the LMX is congruent with numerous empirical relationships associated with transformational leadership.

Limitations: Dienesch and Liden (1986) suggested that LMX studies need to expand the domain of variables examined as part of the leader-subordinate interaction process. Augmenting the LMX approach with aspects of transformational leadership, such as mentoring, may be very beneficial. Adding mentoring to LMX expands the boundaries of the leader-subordinate relationship considerably.

Application: The LMX-7 can be used to assess the leader's ability to communicate with his or her employees, describes how leaders use their position power to develop different exchange relationships with different subordinates. For example, when high levels of leader-member exchange exist, subordinates see themselves as having good working relationships with their supervisors and as knowing how satisfied their supervisors are with their performance. Used for leader-subordinate exchange development

Source (as of 1999): George B. Graen, P.O. Box 43131, Lafayette, LA 70504-3131
e-mail: gbgl010 @usl.edu. Detailed references can be seen in Zaccaro et al., 1999.

Leader Self-Identity

Purpose/focus of the instrument

Where is instrument found?

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

Who developed the instrument, where?

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Number of citations for the instrument

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

References (up to 5)

Further notes

(Hiller, 2005), asks respondents to rate the extent to which four statements about leader self-perception applied to them in terms of Descriptiveness, Importance, and Certainty across a 4-point Likert scale. For example, "rate the extent to which the following statements describe you: I am a leader; I see myself as a leader; If I had to describe myself to others, I would include the "leader"; and I prefer being seen by others as a leader." In Pyle's SSLS dissertation study, alphas ranged from .83 to .93. Information from SSLS's Dr. Lori Pyle's dissertation study (2013).

Leadership Archetype Questionnaire (Kets de Vries et al., 2009)

Purpose/focus of the instrument

Where is instrument found?

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

Who developed the instrument, where?

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Number of citations for the instrument

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

References (up to 5)

Further notes

Leadership Development Evaluation, Handbook of

Purpose/focus of the instrument
Where is instrument found?
Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)
Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?
Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?
Who developed the instrument, where?
Target population for which the instrument was developed?
What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?
How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?
Number of citations for the instrument
Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers
Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated
References (up to 5)
Further notes
 – by the Center for Creative Leadership.

The Handbook of Leadership Development Evaluation, Jossey-Bass & CCL, 2007

Table of Contents

Forward by Laura C. Leviton	xi
Preface	xiii
Acknowledgements	xvii
The Authors	xix
Introduction	1
PART ONE: DESIGNING LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT EVALUATIONS	13
1. Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Evaluations	19
2. Leading with Theory: Using a Theory of Change Approach for Leadership Development Evaluations	48
3. EvaluLEAD: An Open-Systems Perspective on Evaluating Leadership Development	71
4. Making Evaluation Work for the Greater Good: Supporting Provocative Possibility and Responsive Praxis in Leadership Development	111
5. Measuring Return on Investment in Leadership Development	137
PART TWO: LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT EVALUATION IN CONTEXT	167

6. Building Leadership Development, Social Justice, and Social Change in Evaluation Through a Pipeline Program	173
7. From the Inside Out: Evaluating Personal Transformation Leadership Efforts	199
8. Evaluating Leadership Development and Organizational Performance	228
9. The Importance of Local Context in Leadership Development and Evaluation	261
10. Evaluating Community Leadership Programs	284
11. Evaluating Leadership as a Strategy to Transform Complex Systems	315
12. Evaluating Leadership Development for Social Change	343
13. Evaluating Youth Leadership Through Civic Activism	377
14. Evaluating Leadership Efforts for Neighborhood Transformation	403
PART THREE: INCREASING IMPACT THROUGH EVALUATION USE	427
15. Strategic Uses of Evaluation	433
16. Evaluation for Planning and Improving Leadership Development Programs: A Framework Based on the Baldrige Education Criteria for Performance Excellence	464
17. Communications in Evaluation: A Systems Approach	487
18. Accelerating Learning About Leadership Development: A Learning Community Approach	511
19. Continuous Learning	536
Afterword: Future Directions for Leadership Development Evaluation	559
Name Index	575
Subject Index	579
About the Center for Creative Leadership	

Leadership Development Evaluation, The Handbook of (CCL/Wiley, 2006)

Purpose/focus of the instrument

Where is instrument found?

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

Who developed the instrument, where?

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Number of citations for the instrument

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

References (up to 5)

Further notes

-- \$115 hardcover, \$93 ebook.

Website description: "With the increase in the number of organizational leadership development programs, there is a pressing need for evaluation to answer important questions, improve practice, and inform decisions. The *Handbook* is a comprehensive resource filled with examples, tools, and the most innovative models and approaches designed to evaluate leadership development in a variety of settings. It will help you answer the most common questions about leadership development efforts, including:

- What difference does leadership development make?
- What development and support strategies work best to enhance leadership?
- Is the time and money spent on leadership development worthwhile?
- What outcomes can be expected from leadership development?
- How can leadership development efforts be sustained?"

It is not clear whether and how many actual assessment tools appear in the text, and Wiley was unable to respond to me in a timely fashion regarding whether teachers can use the assessments in class and whether noncommercial research students and faculty can use the assessments without charge. One can write Wiley regarding this information:

permissions@wiley.com.

TOC:

PART ONE: DESIGNING LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT EVALUATION.

1 Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Evaluations (S. Bartholomew Craig and Kelly M. Hannum).

2 Leading with Theory: Using a Theory of Change Approach for Leadership Development Evaluations (Manuel Gutiérrez and Tania Tasse).

3 EvaluLEAD: An Open-Systems Perspective on Evaluating Leadership Development (John T. Grove, Barry M. Kibel, and Taylor Haas).

4 Making Evaluation Work for the Greater Good: Supporting Provocative Possibility and Responsive Praxis in Leadership Development (Hazel Symonette).

5 Measuring Return on Investment in Leadership Development (Jack J. Phillips and Patti Phillips).

PART TWO: LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT EVALUATION IN CONTEXT.

- 6 Building Leadership Development, Social Justice, and Social Change in Evaluation Through a Pipeline Program (Prisca M. Collins and Rodney K. Hopson).
- 7 From the Inside Out: Evaluating Personal Transformation Leadership Efforts (Sally Leiderman).
- 8 Evaluating Leadership Development and Organizational Performance (Nancy Vollmer LeMay and Alison Ellis).
- 9 The Importance of Local Context in Leadership Development and Evaluation (Larry Peters and John Baum).
- 10 Evaluating Community Leadership Programs (Teresa R. Behrens and Maenette K. P. Benham).
- 11 Evaluating Leadership as a Strategy to Transform Complex Systems (Kimberly Jinnett and Todd Kern).
- 12 Evaluating Leadership Development for Social Change (Kim Ammann Howard and Claire Reinelt).
- 13 Evaluating Youth Leadership Development Through Civic Activism (Hanh Cao Yu, Heather K. Lewis-Charp, and Michelle Alberti Gambone).
- 14 Evaluating Leadership Efforts for Neighborhood Transformation (Nilofer Ahsan).

PART THREE: INCREASING IMPACT THROUGH EVALUATION USE.

- 15 Strategic Uses of Evaluation (E. Jane Davidson and Jennifer W. Martineau).
- 16 Evaluation for Planning and Improving Leadership Development Programs: A Framework Based on the Baldrige Education Criteria for Performance Excellence (Karl E. Umble).
- 17 Communication in Evaluation: A Systems Approach (Darlene F. Russ-Eft).
- 18 Accelerating Learning About Leadership Development: A Learning Community Approach (Deborah Meehan and Claire Reinelt).
- 19 Continuous Learning (Rosalie T. Torres).

Afterword: Future Directions for Leadership Development Evaluation (Kelly M. Hannum, Jennifer W. Martineau, and Claire Reinelt).

Source: <http://www.wiley.com/WileyCDA/WileyTitle/productCd-0787982172.html>.

Leadership Development Report --

Purpose/focus of the instrument

Where is instrument found?

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

Who developed the instrument, where?

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Number of citations for the instrument

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

References (up to 5)

Further notes

Commercial product. Seems to be connecting personality traits and leadership (see “scales” listing below). “Online Scoring includes Technical Manual, 1 LDR test administration, SigmaTesting.com account set up, and technical support” and costs \$98. No validity or reliability info on the website. From the website:

- FOR: Consultants who are looking for a comprehensive and candid profile of leadership development, Leaders who want to improve their performance on critical leadership competencies.
- The Leadership Development Report (LDR) is a personality-based assessment designed for leaders wishing to improve managerial and executive performance. The comprehensive report features results in the form of percentile scores on 25 personality dimensions paired with development advice. The LDR can be used as a coaching tool to support leadership development and performance or as a career development tool for MBA and executive development programs.
- The LDR can be administered in 40 minutes on SIGMA’s online platform – SigmaTesting.com. Reports are generated immediately. Results are presented using graphs, percentile scores, scale descriptions, and brief tips for development advice.
- Over 30 years of research have identified the personality dimensions that predict leadership performance. The assessments that comprise the foundation of the LDR, the **Jackson Personality Inventory – Revised (JPI-R)**, **Personality Research Form (PRF)**, and the **Survey of Work Styles (SWS)**, are among the most widely researched personality assessments in existence—over 2000 published research articles reference one or more of these assessments. The LDR items were selected with high-performing managers and executives in mind.
- The advice provided in the LDR report helps the test taker optimize their leadership effectiveness in a range of important areas. The LDR capitalizes on the test taker’s personality profile to maximize leadership strengths, allowing an individual to work and manage more effectively given their unique set of personality characteristics.

25 LEADERSHIP SCALES

- Sociability
- Dominance
- SocialConfidence
- Expressiveness
- Agreeableness
- Independence
- ApprovalSeeking
- WorkOrientation
- EnergyLevel
- RiskOrientation
- SocialAstuteness

- JobSatisfaction
- Competitiveness
- TimeUrgency
- WorkInvolvement
- Anger
- Anxiety
- Supportiveness
- Impatience
- Organization
- TraditionalValues
- Responsibility
- IntellectualCuriosity
- Change
- Openmindedness

Author Jackson, Douglas N.; Carswell, Julie

Purpose “An expert system providing insight into how a manager’s personality affects his or her performance and how to modify a manager’s behavior within his or her natural limits.”

Publication Date 1996–2000.

Publisher address SIGMA Assessment Systems, Inc., P.O. Box 610757, Port Huron, MI 48061-0757; Telephone: 800-265-1285; FAX: 800-361-9411; E-mail: SIGMA@SigmaAssessmentSystems.com; Web:

Leadership Effectiveness Scorecard – Measuring and monitoring distributed leadership

Purpose/focus of the instrument

In this model and measurement tool, there are five value levers and four cultural cornerstones that “provide a convenient way to systematically identify the leadership cues distributed throughout the organization as the measurable social effects of its embedded leadership meta-capability. By querying a statistically significant sample of members throughout an organization and gathering data about the distributed leadership cues to which they are responding, a researcher can build a map of the leadership meta-capability at various points and at multiple levels in the organization. This approach offers new insight into the distributed leadership at work within the organization and offers practitioners the opportunity to intervene at precise areas of concern and to monitor the results of the intervention.”

Where is instrument found?

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

No information on how to access the instrument, or the cost.

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

Who developed the instrument, where?

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Number of citations for the instrument

64

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

Citations (up to 5)

Further notes

From the seminal article (Hazy, 2006): "As complex systems, organizations face the challenge of continuing efficient operations and adapting to a changing environment. This challenge is often framed in the context of strategic leadership: leaders are seen as managing the tension between long- and short-term objectives and between exploration and exploitation. This article looks at how leadership and the actions of leaders relate to these adaptive tensions and how the effectiveness of leadership can be measured in a complexity science context. To do this, leadership is conceptualized as an organizational meta-capability that processes information about the environment and the organization, and then changes the organization by reconfiguring and building new capabilities. The article suggests a family of possible metrics, discusses the complexity of their interactions, and suggests future research." (abstract)

"The Leadership Effectiveness Scorecard™ measures and reports for each of 20 cells the leadership signal intensity (from 1 = low or no signal detected, to 5 = high or very clear signal) as received by members. For simplicity, an arbitrary color code is used to indicate approximate signal level: Dark Green = good (> 3.9), Green = "okay" (3.5 to 3.8), Yellow = "caution" (3.0 to 3.4) and Red = "risk" (< 3.0). Together, these metrics reflect the influence of leadership on an organization's culture and the extent to which that culture drives value through winning strategies, resources, and execution." (from the seminal article: Hazy, 2006)

In this model and measurement tool, there are five value levers and four cultural cornerstones that "provide a convenient way to systematically identify the leadership cues distributed throughout the organization as the measurable social effects of its embedded leadership meta-capability. By querying a statistically significant sample of members throughout an organization and gathering data about the distributed leadership cues to which they are responding, a researcher can build a map of the leadership meta-capability at various points and at multiple levels in the organization. This approach offers new insight into the distributed leadership at work within the organization and offers practitioners the opportunity to intervene at precise areas of concern and to monitor the results of the intervention."

No information on how to access the instrument, or the cost.

Leadership Opinion Questionnaire, Fleishman (1969), 40-item Likert scale on leadership consideration and structure, for supervisors and employees, strong psychometrics and good ease of use, available from Science Research Associates. (Source: Huber et al., 2000)

Purpose/focus of the instrument

Where is instrument found?

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)

Instrument is available from Science Research Associates or at the Creative Organizational Design website- http://www.creativeorgdesign.com/tests_page.php?id=137
LOQ can only be obtained through a service on a paper format.

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

Cost: 25 test booklets: \$46, *Examiner's Manual*: \$24, scoring software: \$129 (Schwartz & Gimbel, 204)

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

LOQ was developed in 1969, revised in 1989 (Schwartz & Gimbel, 204).

Who developed the instrument, where?

Developed by E.A. Fleishman as a part of the Ohio State Leadership Studies (Creative Organizational Design)

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

More info/validity measures are available from Creative Organizational Design website upon request.

Validity link: <http://psycnet.apa.org/journals/bul/81/11/756.pdf&uid=1975-05359-001>

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

The instrument was piloted on 100 foremen, then revised and tested on 122 foremen and 60 of their supervisors at the Central School of the International Harvester Company (Fleishman, 153-154).

Number of citations for the instrument

139 citations

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

Citations (up to 5)

Further notes

Citations:

seminal article: Fleishman, E. A. (1953). The measurement of leadership attitudes in industry. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 37(3), 153-158.

Schwartz, M. K., & Gimbel, K. G. (Eds.). (2000). *Leadership resources: A guide to training and development tools*. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.

Follow-ups:

Walters, N. J., Wilmoth, J. N., & Pitts, C. A. (1987). Factor Dimensions of the leadership opinion questionnaire for nursing students. *Journal of Health Occupations Education*, 2(2), 63-89.

Leadership practices inventory (LPI) (Posner, B.Z., & Kouzes, J.M. (1988).

Development and validation of the Leadership Practices Inventory. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 48(2), 483-496.) Web citations = 202

Purpose/focus of the instrument

Where is instrument found?

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

Self-assessment costs \$20, observer copies are \$15, facilitator packet \$250.

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

Who developed the instrument, where?

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Number of citations for the instrument

202

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

The Leadership Practices Inventory is available in English, Simplified Chinese, Arabic, Latin American Spanish, Brazilian Portuguese, and Mongolian.

Citations (up to 5)

Further notes

Leadership Practices Inventory, Posner & Kouzes (1988)

30-items Likert scale, assesses actions and behaviors of leadership in 5 domains, strong psychometrics and ease of use, for leaders in any group, cost. (Source: Huber et al., 2000).

Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) is the cornerstone of The Leadership Challenge®, our global

campaign to liberate the leader in everyone. Over three million people have used the LPI as a first step to reaching their personal leadership best. The Leadership Challenge framework grew out of rigorous research that first began in 1982 when Jim Kouzes and Barry Posner set out to understand those times when leaders performed at their personal best. They conducted hundreds of interviews and reviewed hundreds of cases studies and survey questionnaires. What emerged were five fundamental practices common to extraordinary leadership achievements. Now known worldwide as the most practical model of leadership development, The Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership® continues to prove its effectiveness in cultivating and liberating the leadership potential in anyone—at any level, in any organization.” The authors’ commercial website (<http://www.leadershipchallenge.com/Research-section-Our-Authors-Research-Detail/bringing-the-rigor-of-research-to-the-art-of-leadership.aspx>).

Comes in self-assessment and 360 feedback “observer” versions (see both versions in appendices- copyrighted, requires purchase for use.), as well as an undergraduate student version. 30 items on a “10-point frequency scale.” Self assessment is \$20 per copy, observer copies are \$15, facilitator packet is about \$250, and there are multiple other “tools” for sale.

In addition to reviewing the literature, the authors now count on over 5000 qualitative surveys that undergird the development of the tool. They also count on a normative database of 2.5 million managers and non-managers that used the test between 2007 and 2014 showing internal reliability on the 5 domains varies from about .8 to .9. They cite dozens of other studies using LPI that range from .6 to .9, mostly in business, education, and government. They cite very few studies in the nonprofit sector in the U.S. or in developing countries (medium income, no low income countries). Test re-test is general very high, usually in the .90 range. Like many other 360 instruments, there is a statistically significant difference between raters (self and observers); however, the effect size is generally very small (<.10) meaning that there is little difference between the ratings of the two rater groups. Gender shows little difference. Race has shown significant differences in some studies, with Blacks and Hispanics showing higher means on the LPI (stronger leadership) than other racial groups, including Whites, but again with a generally low effect size. They cite studies including a comparative international study that show factorial analyses confirm the 5 domain model, accounting for between 70% and 90% of variance.

They also ran a regression comparing leader effectiveness with the 5 domains in order to establish whether the LPI was significantly related to other critical individual or organizational performance measures (predictive validity) such as managerial effectiveness or organizational effectiveness such as workgroup performance, team cohesiveness, commitment, satisfaction, and credibility. For example, their study showed high significance ($F=318.88$ with $p<.0001$) that accounted for over 55% of variance around followers’ assessments of their leaders’ effectiveness and 5 domains.

Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI). LPI Leadership Practices Inventory (Posner & Kouzes, 1993). The following information is from Johnson (n.d.).

This instrument grew not from a model, but from a desire to measure actual successful organisational leadership behaviours, and to shift away from psychological characteristics (Kouzes & Posner cited in (Posner & Kouzes, 1993). It moved from 'what they are like' to 'what do they do'. Surveys and interviews of over 1,100 leaders about their best personal leadership experiences yielded data about the ideal behaviours of leaders. A process of testing on another 2,100 managers and narrowing down the data, resulted in two 5 point Likert-style instrument of 30 questions covering 5 leadership practices. The 5 practices are: challenging the process, inspiring a shared vision, enabling others to act, modeling the way, and encouraging the heart. One of the instruments (LPI Observer) is for subordinates to report on their manager. The other (LPI Self), is for the manager to self-report. Reliability and validity tests involved another 2,876 managers and their subordinates, representing both genders, and 4 foreign countries. Internal consistency of the 5 sub-scales ranged from .70 to .91, with test-retest reliability .93 and above.

Further psychometric investigation (Posner & Kouzes, 1993) using data from 5,298 managers and 30,913 subordinates confirmed 5 factors corresponding to the hypothesised dimensions. The authors also reported small gender differences with females reportedly engaging more in modeling and encouraging. Female subordinates reported their managers as more challenging and higher modeling, regardless of manager gender, and LPI Self scores tend to be higher than LPI Observer.

In addressing the initial restriction of the LPI to managerial populations, the LPI was modified to suit non-managers and individuals (Posner & Kouzes, 1994). Called PLI-IC:Self and LPC-IC:Observer, the new instrument returned alphas of .68 to .85 for the 'self' instrument, and .82 to .91 for the 'observer' instrument. Test-retest reliability returned .90 to .92. Once again, self-scores tend to be higher than observer scores. This instrument suits the emerging understanding that leadership is not about a position in the organisation, but is a skill exercised by any individual.

LPI scores have been shown to relate to organisational effectiveness, work group vitality, job satisfaction and organisational commitment (summary cited in (Posner & Kouzes, 1993). LPI has differentiated between transactional and transformational styles (Fields & Herold, 1997), where challenging the process and inspiring a shared vision related to transformational leadership, while enabling others related to transactional leadership. Encouraging the heart and modeling the way related to both styles.

Comment: Between the LPI and the LPI-IC, leaders throughout an organisation can be assessed. Not only can the LPI quantify the five sub-scale qualities of leadership practice, but by combining scores appropriately it can distinguish between transformational and transactional leadership style. Such a comprehensive range of information from a 30-item instrument may be useful to assess adjustments during periods of organisational change, regardless of cultures or genders involved. This instrument is restricted to intra-organisational leadership. Copy of 1985 version and manuals in Carrier Library, on reserve, JMU.

Purpose/focus of the instrument

This instrument grew not from a model, but from a desire to measure actual successful organisational leadership behaviours, and to shift away from psychological characteristics (Kouzes & Posner cited in (Posner & Kouzes, 1993). The 5 tested practices are: challenging the process, inspiring a shared vision, enabling others to act, modeling the way, and encouraging the heart. LPI scores have been shown to relate to organizational effectiveness, work group vitality, job satisfaction and organizational commitment (summary cited in (Posner & Kouzes, 1993). LPI has differentiated between transactional and transformational styles (Fields & Herold, 1997), where challenging the process and inspiring a shared vision related to transformational leadership, while enabling others related to transactional leadership. Encouraging the heart and modeling the way related to both styles.

Where is instrument found?**Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)**

The assessment is offered in print form and online; both require a fee (Leadership Challenge Website).

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?**Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?**

Developers have published four editions each of the LPI Self and LPI Observer, with the most recent being in 2012.

Who developed the instrument, where?

LPI was developed by James M. Kouzes and Barry Posner.

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

One of the instruments (LPI Observer) is for subordinates to report on their manager. The other (LPI Self), is for the manager to self-report.

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

Reliability and validity tests involved another 2,876 managers and their subordinates, representing both genders, and 4 foreign countries. Internal consistency of the 5 subscales ranged from .70 to .91, with test-retest reliability .93 and above.

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Surveys and interviews of over 1,100 leaders about their best personal leadership experiences yielded data about the ideal behaviors of leaders. A process of testing on another 2,100 managers and narrowing down the data, resulted in two 5 point Likert-style instrument of 30 questions covering 5 leadership practices. Further psychometric investigation (Posner & Kouzes, 1993) using data from 5,298 managers and 30,913 subordinates confirmed 5 factors corresponding to the hypothesized dimensions.

Number of citations for the instrument

770

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

The LPI is offered in English, Chinese (Simplified), Arabic, Spanish (Latin American), Portuguese (Brazilian), and Mongolian (The Leadership Challenge website).

Citations (up to 5)

Further notes

Developers have published four editions each of the LPI Self and LPI Observer, with the most recent being in 2012.

Follow-up: Posner, B. Z., & Kouzes, J. M. (1993). Psychometric properties of the leadership practices inventory--updated. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 53(1), 191-199.

Leadership Self Efficacy Scale (Murphy, 1992; Ensher & Murphy, 1997). An 8 item scale that measures participants' level of confidence in their general leadership abilities, using a 4-point Likert scale. For example, "I am confident of my ability to influence a work group that I lead." Several studies support internal consistency alpha > .75. In SSLS's Dr. Lori Pyle's dissertation study, which included 3 studies, alphas were .84, .91, and .84. Information from SSLS's Dr. Lori Pyle's dissertation study (2013).

Purpose/focus of the instrument

An 8-item scale that measures participants' level of confidence in their general leadership abilities, using a 4-point Likert scale. For example, "I am confident of my ability to influence a work group that I lead."

Where is instrument found?

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

Who developed the instrument, where?

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

Several studies support internal consistency alpha > .75. In SSLS's Dr. Lori Pyle's dissertation study, which included 3 studies, alphas were .84, .91, and .84.

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Number of citations for the instrument

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

Citations (up to 5)

Further notes

Leadership Skills Inventory Leadership Skills Inventory (LSI)(Karnes & Chauvin, 1985).

Schools have a strong interest in assessing the leadership abilities of their students, as do organisations canvassing graduates for potential leadership positions. For schools the interest stems from offering constructive career guidance and training to students, and also to the link between leadership skills and self-actualisation (Karnes et al., 1993). Some instruments, in order to identify potential leaders and quantify their leadership skills, rely upon 'self' and 'other' instruments (student and teacher) and congruency between them (Anderson & Wanberg, 1991). If child and teacher both agree about the ownership of certain skills by the student, then they probably exist. When the Leadership Skills Inventory was tested in this way, student responses showed congruency with the teacher, but only if the teacher had leadership skills (Karnes & D'ilio cited in (Edmunds, 1998). With congruent validity demonstrated, only the student is now required to complete this instrument, making it simple for schools to use, and suitable for organisational recruitment purposes where the teacher is not available.

The Leadership Skills Inventory is a 125 item Likert-style instrument covering nine categories of leadership. Those categories are: fundamentals of leadership; written communication; speech communication skills; 'values' clarification; decision-making skills; group dynamic skills; problem solving skills; personal development skills, and planning skills. This instrument exposes the leadership strengths and weaknesses of a student, enabling clear training plans to be tailor-made for that individual.

A supporting study of the instrument provides empirical support of concurrent, content, and construct validity (Edmunds, 1998). Concurrent validity was supported by correlation ($r=.34$, $p<.01$) between LSI score and observed leadership behaviour. Content validity was gained through expert jury agreement on content applicability of each question. Finally, a single factor was evenly and heavily loaded by each component (.636 to .876), supporting the construct validity, but not supporting the nine categories as separate components. The categories had much in common, with correlations between them ranging from $r=.295$ to $.761$, $p<.01$. The authors recommend that this instrument be used to guide students, but used in combination with other measures to comprehensively identify leadership ability.

Comment: This is to test members of a group to predict emergent leadership or to assign group leadership, or for using on school children to test for leadership, or to monitor the effectiveness of leadership training. The information is of use to teachers, guidance officers, trainers, and the person tested. SOURCE: Johnson, I. (n.d.).

Purpose/focus of the instrument

The Leadership Skills Inventory is a 125 item Likert-style instrument covering nine categories of leadership. Those categories are: fundamentals of leadership; written communication; speech communication skills; 'values' clarification; decision-making skills; group dynamic skills; problem solving skills; personal development skills, and planning skills. This instrument exposes the leadership strengths and weaknesses of a student, enabling clear training plans to be tailor-made for that individual.

Where is instrument found?

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

First developed in 1985, with a new edition in 2000.

Who developed the instrument, where?

Frances A. Karnes and Jane C. Chauvin

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

This is to test members of a group to predict emergent leadership or to assign group leadership, or for using on school children to test for leadership, or to monitor the effectiveness of leadership training. The information is of use to teachers, guidance officers, trainers, and the person tested. SOURCE: Johnson, I. (n.d.).

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

A supporting study of the instrument provides empirical support of concurrent, content, and construct validity (Edmunds, 1998). Concurrent validity was supported by correlation ($r=.34$, $p<.01$) between LSI score and observed leadership behaviour. Content validity was gained through expert jury agreement on content applicability of each question. Finally, a single factor was evenly and heavily loaded by each component (.636 to .876), supporting the construct validity, but not supporting the nine categories as separate components. The categories had much in common, with correlations between them ranging from $r=.295$ to $.761$, $p<.01$. The authors recommend that this instrument be used to guide students, but used in combination with other measures to comprehensively identify leadership ability.

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?**Number of citations for the instrument**

62

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers**Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated****Citations (up to 5)****Further notes****The Leadership Skills Inventory - Karnes** measure an individual's abilities in

the area of leadership. Nine domains are used in the LSI assessing strengths and weaknesses related to leadership. Participants are asked to answer a series of competency statement and then several items using 4-point scale ("Almost Always" to "Almost Never"). The instrument is self-administered and self-scored; the LSI Karnes is done in paper-and-pencil format.

Approximately 45 minutes is required to complete the test. [Frances A. Karnes](#) & Jane C. Chauvin, 1985.

Reliability and Validity. Karnes's test manual data for validity could be more extensive to support that the Leadership Skills Inventory does measure leadership skills. Scores for reliability are moderate to good. The internal reliability and split-half coefficients were mostly at 0.80 and above. Over a specified time period of 4 weeks, the test-retest reliability showed up as 0.49 and under in one of the samples. There was no standard error of measurement investigated in the manual. The construct and concurrent validity was also absent.

Administration, Analysis and Reporting. Statistics Solutions consists of a team of professional methodologists and statisticians that can assist the student or professional researcher in administering the survey instrument, collecting the data, conducting the analyses and explaining the results. For additional information on these services, [click here](#).

Purpose/focus of the instrument

The instrument measures an individual's abilities in the area of leadership. Nine domains are used in the LSI assessing strengths and weaknesses related to leadership. Participants are asked to answer a series of competency statement and then several items using 4-point scale ("Almost Always" to "Almost Never").

Where is instrument found?

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

Who developed the instrument, where?

Frances A. Karnes and Jane C. Chauvin

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

Karnes's test manual data for validity could be more extensive to support that the Leadership Skills Inventory does measure leadership skills. Scores for reliability are moderate to good. The internal reliability and split-half coefficients were mostly at 0.80 and above. Over a specified time period of 4 weeks, the test-retest reliability showed up as 0.49 and under in one of the samples. There was no standard error of measurement investigated in the manual. The construct and concurrent validity was also absent.

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Number of citations for the instrument

62

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

Citations (up to 5)

Further notes

References

Edwards, A. L. (1953). The Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. New York: The Psychological Corporation. [View](#)

Edmunds, Alan L. (1998). Content, Concurrent and Construct Validity of the Leadership Skills Inventory. Kerr, A. Bara. Review of the Leadership Skills Inventory. The University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA.

Lee., Steven W. Review of the Leadership Skills Inventory. Indiana State University, Terre Haute, IN.

Miller, R. (1984). Leader/agents guide/leadership life skills. Stillwater, OK: Southern Region 4-H Materials.

Roeper Review, v20, n4, 281-84.

Shaunessy, Elizabeth; and Karnes, Frances A. (2004). Instruments for Measuring Leadership in Children and Youth. Gifted Child Today, Vol. 27, Issue 1.

Source: <http://www.statisticssolutions.com/leadership/>

Leadership Skills Inventory (LSI) is designed primarily for leaders, letting them assess their own abilities in relation to a leadership model created by the author. Anderson's model is based off of five dimensions: Self-Management Skills, Interpersonal Communication Skills, Consulting Skills for Developing Groups and Organizations, and Versatility Skills.

Participants are required to respond to a 56-item self-assessment using a 10 point scale. Response range from "this skill is new to me" to "I can perform the skill well. I can teach others, too."

Terry D. Anderson, 1999. Purchase at [CRG Assessments](#): \$35 for 1 paper self report, \$40 for online version that scores data and provides feedback; same for other rater; \$147 for 360-degree tool (1 copy).

From website: The **Leadership Skills Inventory–Self** supports anyone in a leadership or supervisory role to first benchmark, then outline, specific steps to increase and improve his or her leadership effectiveness.

Use LSI-S to:

- Establish agreement to the 12 Leadership Principles.
- Assess competency in each of the 5 leadership sections.
- Evaluate proficiency in any of the 60 Transforming Leadership Skills.
- Confirm perceptions of your leadership skills as others see you, using the **LSI–Others 360°** feedback tool.
- Determine the required professional development.
- Identify required skills for success in any leadership role.

Purpose/focus of the instrument

The purpose of this instrument is to aid leaders in gaining transformational leadership skills. It evaluates current skills and provides way to improve. The instrument is designed to be

completed in a progressive manner; each section requires mastery before the individual can proceed to the next section. Each of the five sections (self-management skills, interpersonal communication skills, coaching/counseling/problem management skills, consulting skills for teams and organizations, and organizational development and versatility skills.

<http://www.crgleader.com/online-resources/online-leadership-skills-inventory-self-lsi-s.html>

Where is instrument found?

The instrument can be found on the CRG Assessments website:

<http://www.crgleader.com/online-resources/online-leadership-skills-inventory-self-lsi-s.html>.

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)

The instrument is provided online through Consulting Resource Group International, Inc. (CRG)

<http://www.crgleader.com/online-resources/online-leadership-skills-inventory-self-lsi-s.html>

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

The instrument \$35 for 1 paper self report, \$40 for online version that scores data and provides feedback; same for other rater; \$147 for 360-degree tool (1 copy).

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

The instrument was developed in 1999.

Who developed the instrument, where?

Dr. Terry Anderson developed the instrument.

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

Individuals in leadership positions, prospective business partners, and coaches/trainers are the target population

<http://www.crgleader.com/online-resources/online-leadership-skills-inventory-self-lsi-s.html>

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Number of citations for the instrument

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

Citations (up to 5)

Further notes

Leadership Skills Profile (1)

Author Lippitt, Mary

Purpose To identify leadership business priorities in a given situation, develop business acumen, improve team effectiveness, enhance strategic thinking, and to reflect that leadership requirements change by context or circumstance.

Publication Date 1998–2000.

Publisher address Enterprise Management Ltd., 4531 Roanoak Way, Palm Harbor, FL 34685; Telephone: 727-934-9810; E-mail: mlippitt@enterprisemgt.com; Web: www.enterprisemgt.com

Purpose/focus of the instrument

To identify leadership business priorities in a given situation, develop business acumen, improve team effectiveness, enhance strategic thinking, and to reflect that leadership requirements change by context or circumstance.

Where is instrument found?

Enterprise Management Ltd., 4531 Roanoak Way, Palm Harbor, FL 34685; Telephone: 727-934-9810; E-mail: mlippitt@enterprisemgt.com; Web: www.enterprisemgt.com.

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

The instrument was developed in 1998.

Who developed the instrument, where?

Mary Lippitt created the instrument.

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Number of citations for the instrument

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

Citations (up to 5)

Further notes

Leadership Skills Profile (2). The **Leadership Skills Profile** identifies which individuals have the best leadership qualities. Each organization can use this model due to the customizable format for their specific interest.

Participants are asked to respond to 352 items using a 5-point scale (“Strongly Disagree” to “Strongly Agree”). Approximately 40 minutes is necessary for completion. Administration

can be done on the computer or pencil-and-paper format which requires you to fax the answer sheet to the publisher.

Author Douglas N. Jackson, 2003

Reliability and Validity: The Leadership Skills Profile uses three other instruments as its basis – Jackson Personality Inventory-Revised, Personality Research Form, and the Survey of Work Styles. Each of the three instruments is well-established showing convergent and discriminate validity for the LSP. However, the author doesn't provide data showing reliability. There is no reliability or validity for the 360-degree feedback instrument provided in the LSI. Correlations between the LSP personality scale and the job leadership performance giving scores ranged from 0.31 to 0.51. Much more data is still needed to support strongly that the LSI is both reliable and valid.

Where to Purchase: [Sigma Assessment Systems](#)

References

- Benson, G. Philip. *Review of the Leadership Skills Profile*. New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, NM.
- Geisler, J. S. *Review of the Leadership Skills Profile*. Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, MI.
- Ashour, A. S., & England, G. (1972). Subordinate's assigned level of discretion as a function of leader's personality and situational variables. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 56*(2), 120- 123.
- Brenner, O. C., & Greenhaus, J. H. (1979). Managerial status, sex, and selected personality characteristics. *Journal of Management, 5*(1), 107-113.
- Goffin, R. D., Rothstein, M. G., & Johnston, N. G. (1996). Personality testing and the assessment center: Incremental validity for managerial selection. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*(6), 746-756.
- Johnson, A. M., Vernon, P.A., Harris, J.A., & Jang, K.L. (2004). A Behavior Genetic Investigation of the Relationship Between Leadership and Personality. *Twin Research, 7*(1), 27-32.
- Pratch, L. & Jacobowitz, J. (1996). Gender, motivation, and coping in the evaluation of leadership effectiveness. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 48*(4), 203-220.
- Richardsen, A. M., & Piper, W. E. (1986). Leader style, leader consistency, and participant personality effects on learning in small groups. *Human Relations, 39*(9), 817-836.
- Smither, J. W., London, M., & Richmond, K. R. (2005). The Relationship between Leaders' Personality and their Reactions to and Use of Multisource Feedback: A Longitudinal Study. *Group & Organization Management, 30*(2),181-210.
- Source: <http://www.statisticssolutions.com/leadership/>

Purpose/focus of the instrument

The Leadership Skills Profile identifies which individuals have the best leadership qualities. Each organization can use this model due to the customizable format for their specific interest.

Where is instrument found?

Sigma Assessment Systems

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)

Administration can be done on the computer or pencil-and-paper format which requires you to fax the answer sheet to the publisher.

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?**Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?**

2003

Who developed the instrument, where?

Douglas N. Jackson

Target population for which the instrument was developed?**What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?**

The Leadership Skills Profile uses three other instruments as its basis – Jackson Personality Inventory-Revised, Personality Research Form, and the Survey of Work Styles. Each of the three instruments is well-established showing convergent and discriminant validity for the LSP. However, the author doesn't provide data showing reliability. There is no reliability or validity for the 360-degree feedback instrument provided in the LSI. Correlations between the LSP personality scale and the job leadership performance giving scores ranged from 0.31 to 0.51. Much more data is still needed to support strongly that the LSI is both reliable and valid.

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?**Number of citations for the instrument****Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers****Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated****Citations (up to 5)**

Benson, G. Philip. *Review of the Leadership Skills Profile*. New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, NM.

Geisler, J. S. *Review of the Leadership Skills Profile*. Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, MI.

Ashour, A. S., & England, G. (1972). Subordinate's assigned level of discretion as a function of leader's personality and situational variables. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 56(2)*, 120- 123.

Brenner, O. C., & Greenhaus, J. H. (1979). Managerial status, sex, and selected personality characteristics. *Journal of Management, 5(1)*, 107-113.

Goffin, R. D., Rothstein, M. G., & Johnston, N. G. (1996). Personality testing and the assessment center: Incremental validity for managerial selection. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81(6)*, 746-756.

Johnson, A. M., Vernon, P.A., Harris, J.A., & Jang, K.L. (2004). A Behavior Genetic Investigation of the Relationship Between Leadership and Personality. *Twin Research, 7(1)*, 27-32.

Pratch, L. & Jacobowitz, J. (1996). Gender, motivation, and coping in the evaluation of leadership effectiveness. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 48(4), 203-220.

Richardsen, A. M., & Piper, W. E. (1986). Leader style, leader consistency, and participant personality effects on learning in small groups. *Human Relations*, 39(9), 817-836.

Smither, J. W., London, M., & Richmond, K. R. (2005). The Relationship between Leaders' Personality and their Reactions to and Use of Multisource Feedback: A Longitudinal Study. *Group & Organization Management*, 30(2), 181-210.

Source: <http://www.statisticssolutions.com/leadership/>

Further notes

Leadership Spectrum Profile (LSP). *Based on the book "Brilliant or Blunder: 6 Ways Leaders Navigate Uncertainty, Opportunity and Complexity", which details the "leadership mindset framework." Concepts include: inventing, catalyzing, developing, performing, protecting, and challenging. Website has no validity or reliability info, does not show examples of test, does not discuss cost. Apparently you have to contact the author via email (see below) to find out more info on the instrument. From author's website:*

"Leaders want to make better decisions, gain commitment for change, execute plans, build respect, and produce results. *The Leadership Spectrum* provides a proven results oriented framework to guide leaders as they develop goals and implement change. Endorsed by Jim Kouzes, Jay Conger, John Zenger, Bob Pike, and given *Foreword Magazine's* Bronze Award as Best Business Book for 2002, this book helps leaders understand six key organization results and how to balance them in response to changing realities. Priorities capture the dynamic systems that challenge leaders. The fluid priorities include: developing new products or services (Inventor), winning and retaining customers (Catalyst), designing a supportive infrastructure and systems (Developer), focusing on efficiencies and improving quality (Performer), building the culture and developing people (Protector), and scanning the future and seizing opportunities (Challenger). Detailing the whole cycle, Dr. Mary Lippitt's unique leadership spectrum framework illustrates where each priority fits, what issues are crucial, what questions dominate the organization's life cycle stage, and how strengths can be enhanced. To achieve the right results at the right time, leaders must exercise flexibility given the level of complexity they confront. They must be willing, and able, to explain the business reasons that support the organization's direction in order to build and sustain tangible results."

Author Lippitt, Mary (PhD)

Purpose To identify leadership business priorities in a given situation, develop business acumen, improve team effectiveness, enhance strategic thinking, and to reflect that leadership requirements change by context or circumstance.

Publication Date 1998–2000.

Publisher address Enterprise Management Ltd., 4531 Roanoak Way, Palm Harbor, FL 34685; Telephone: 727-934-9810; E-mail: mlippitt@enterprisemgt.com; Web: www.enterprisemgt.com

The Leadership Spectrum Profile does not focus on the particular aspects of an individual; instead, it addresses the experiences they may encounter in their leadership role (Leadership Spectrum.com/FAQ)

The instrument was developed for executives and managers, team and project leaders, and team members who are directly responsible for achieving goals (Leadership Spectrum.com/FAQ)

Free trials available

Frequently asked questions. (2017). Retrieved from <http://www.leadershipspectrum.com/faq.php>.

Purpose/focus of the instrument

The purpose of the Leadership Spectrum Profile is to identify leadership business priorities in a given situation, develop business acumen, improve team effectiveness, enhance strategic thinking, and to reflect that leadership requirements change by context or circumstance. The Leadership Spectrum Profile does not focus on the particular aspects of an individual; instead, it addresses the experiences they may encounter in their leadership role (Leadership Spectrum.com/FAQ).

Where is instrument found?

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

Free trials of the instrument can be requested.

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

Who developed the instrument, where?

Mary Lippitt

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

The instrument was developed for executives and managers, team and project leaders, and team members who are directly responsible for achieving goals (Leadership Spectrum.com/FAQ).

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Number of citations for the instrument

1

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

Citations (up to 5)

Further notes

Leadership Tool Assessment Inventory (cognitive style, power and influence, influence strategies, diagnosing performance and enhancing motivation, empowerment and delegation, team development, diagnosing team needs, creativity)

This is a collection of online self-assessment tools – see list below of “exercises.” These are on the edu website of Brian Uzzi at Kellogg School of Management at Northwestern. As noted below, these are from “Developing Management Skills”, so it’s not clear whether they are free, available for noncommercial use with permission, or cost. Perhaps the book has reliability and validity information, but the website did not.

These exercises assess your ability to apply critical management skills to identify and solve key organizational problems. Distinct from IQ, managerial intelligence can improve through assessment, learning, and practice. Click on the images below to go to the corresponding test. Scores are automatically calculated and compared to reference distributions of the scores of random samples of managers.

Exercises:

- [The Cognitive Style Instrument](#)- a 24-question assessment in which a person answers what they would do in a hypothetical situation. Each question has two options to choose from. The assessment is available online and appears to be free of charge. Respondents receive scores in two categories: gathering information and evaluating information. Average scores of each gender are provided for comparison, and information about scoring is available on the website.
- [Gaining Power and Influence](#)- 30 questions asking about current attitudes and behavior. Answers on rated on a 6 point Likert scale with 6 being *strongly agree* and 1 being *strongly disagree*. Scoring consists of assessing skills such as gaining information, using influence, resisting influence, and increasing authority. Comparison scores divided into four quartiles are provided.
- [Using Influence Strategies](#)- 15 questions pertaining to the frequency of strategies used to encourage others to go along with what one wants. Answers range on a scale from 1 (“rarely”) to 5 (“always”). Answers are scored in three categories: retribution, reciprocity, and reason. The highest score is then designated as the primary influence strategy, with the second highest being the secondary influence strategy.
- [Diagnosing Poor Performance and Enhancing Motivation](#)- 20 questions on current attitudes and behaviors about how one should motivate another individual. Answers are on a scale of 1 (“Strongly Disagree”) to 6 (“Strongly Agree”). Assessment of answers divides the score into seven skill areas, such as diagnosing performance problems. Comparison scores divided into four quartiles are available.
- [Effective Empowerment and Delegation](#)- 26 questions about current attitudes and behaviors in situations concerning empowerment and work division. Answers are rated on a scale of 1 (“Strongly Disagree”) to 6 (“Strongly Agree”). A total score is made up nine skill areas, such as personal mastery experience. Comparison results divided into four quartiles are provided.

- [Team Development Behaviors](#)- 24 questions on one's current attitudes and behaviors on team building and team meetings. Respondents answer each question with a rating on a scale of 1 ("Strongly Disagree") to 6 ("Strongly Agree"). A total score is devised from six skill areas, such as diagnosing team development. Comparison scores divided into four - quartiles are available.
- [Diagnosing the Need for Team Building](#)- 20 questions asking about the need for team building. Answers are ranked on a scale of 1 ("Little Evidence") to 5 ("A Lot of Evidence"). Total score is then interpreted on a scale, with a sum less than 30 representing a lack of need for team building and greater than 61 being a major need.
- [How Creative Are You?](#)- 40 questions assessing the creative characteristics present in the respondent. Thirty-nine of the questions are multiple-choice; the last question is a list of characteristics to check off. Scores are calculated and divided into six ranges, with the lowest set meaning noncreative and the highest range corresponding to exceptionally creative.

The above information on each exercise was obtained from Uzzi, B. *Leadership assessment tool inventory*- Assess your skills. Retrieved from <http://www.kellogg.northwestern.edu/faculty/uzzi/htm/teaching-leadership.htm>.

Exercises taken from *Developing Management Skills* 3rd Edition by David A. Whetten and Kim S. Cameron. See this book for more assessment tools and exercises related to managerial intelligence.

Purpose/focus of the instrument

These exercises assess your ability to apply critical management skills to identify and solve key organizational problems. Distinct from IQ, managerial intelligence can improve through assessment, learning, and practice.

Where is instrument found?

<http://www.kellogg.northwestern.edu/faculty/uzzi/htm/teaching-leadership.htm>.

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

These are from "Developing Management Skills", so it's not clear whether they are free, available for noncommercial use with permission, or cost.

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

Who developed the instrument, where?

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

The website does not have reliability and validity data on the instrument; the book (*Developing Management Skills*) may have it.

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Number of citations for the instrument

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers
Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated
Citations (up to 5)
Further notes

Leadership Traits Questionnaire (Northouse, P. G.)

Purpose/focus of the instrument

The purpose of this instrument is “to gain an understanding of how traits are used in leadership and to obtain an assessment of your own leadership traits” (Retrieved from https://studysites.sagepub.com/northouseintro2e/study/resources/questionnaires/89527_02q.pdf). Each leader and five people they know well are to take the 14-question assessment in which they indicate the extent to which they agree with statements about leadership traits (articulate, perceptive, self confident).

Where is instrument found?

The instrument can be found online at https://studysites.sagepub.com/northouseintro2e/study/resources/questionnaires/89527_02q.pdf.

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

Who developed the instrument, where?

P.G. Northouse

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

The instrument is for leaders and people who know them well as they help in assessing.

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

Research by Anderson et al. (2006) reported reliabilities of .92 to .95. Cronbach’s alpha ranged from .90 to .93 for total leadership style, task leadership style, and relational leadership style (Madlock, 2008).

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Number of citations for the instrument

9295 (for *Leadership: Theory and practice* by P.G. Northouse, 2012).

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

Citations (up to 5)

Madlock, P. E. (2008). The link between leadership style, communicator competence, and employee satisfaction. *International Journal of Business Communication*, 45(1), 61-78. doi: 10.1177/0021943607309351.

Anderson, C. M., Madlock, P. E., & Hoffman, P. (2006, April). Leadership, commitment, and attitudes as predictors of satisfaction in small task groups. Paper presented at the Central States Communication Association Convention , Indianapolis, IN.

Further notes

Leadership Versatility Index (LVI). Commercial product, see website for cost.

Promotional material: “The LVI uses the 360 method of comparing feedback from the “full circle”—superiors, peers, subordinates, and self-perceptions. But that’s where the similarity ends. The LVI is not just another 360; it is a patented solution for improving results through leadership. Our innovative features include:

- A breakthrough rating scale that identifies when “strengths become weaknesses” through overuse.
- A compact behavioral model that represents the tensions and tradeoffs that make leadership a balancing act.
- A central, integrative concept of versatility defined as the mastery of opposing forces needed to deal with paradox and fast-paced change.
- A blend of quantitative ratings and in-depth qualitative written feedback that provides a clear and compelling message.
- An underlying model of learning and development that combines the outer work of behavior change with the inner work of mindset change.
- A program of published research demonstrating reliability and validity at predicting employee engagement, team performance, and effectiveness.”



Reliability and validity data, as well as prices, not available on website.

Author Kaplan, Robert E.; Kaiser, Robert B.

Purpose Designed to measure “versatility on two complementary pairs of leadership dimensions: forceful and enabling, and strategic and operational.”

Publication Date 2001-2007.

Publisher address Kaiser Leadership Solutions, LLC, 1903 G Ashwood Ct., Greensboro, NC 27455; Telephone: 336-217-2740; E-mail: info@kaiserleadership.com; Web: www.kaiserleadership.com

Purpose/focus of the instrument

Promotional material from <http://kaiserleadership.com/about-the-lvi/> : “The LVI uses the 360 method of comparing feedback from the “full circle”—superiors, peers, subordinates, and self-perceptions. But that’s where the similarity ends. The LVI is not just another 360; it is a patented solution for improving results through leadership. Our innovative features include:

- A breakthrough rating scale that identifies when “strengths become weaknesses” through overuse.
- A compact behavioral model that represents the tensions and tradeoffs that make leadership a balancing act.
- A central, integrative concept of versatility defined as the mastery of opposing forces needed to deal with paradox and fast-paced change.

- A blend of quantitative ratings and in-depth qualitative written feedback that provides a clear and compelling message.
- An underlying model of learning and development that combines the outer work of behavior change with the inner work of mindset change.
- A program of published research demonstrating reliability and validity at predicting employee engagement, team performance, and effectiveness.”

Where is instrument found?

Kaiser Leadership Solutions, LLC, 1903 G Ashwood Ct., Greensboro, NC 27455; Telephone: 336-217-2740; E-mail: info@kaiserleadership.com; Web: www.kaiserleadership.com

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

2001

Who developed the instrument, where?

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

Researchers (Kaplan & Kaiser, 2003) found the instrument has an internal reliability ranging from the low .80s to .90 for the versatilities on each of the two dualities (forceful/enabling and strategic/operational).

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Number of citations for the instrument

8

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

Citations (up to 5)

Kaplan, R. E., & Kaiser K. B. (2003). Developing versatile leadership. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 44(4), 19-26.

Further notes

Least preferred co-worker (LPC). This contingency model for leadership assumes that the leadership style is fixed within each leader, and that each situation with its task structure and different level of position power requires a certain style of leadership that is a combination of task and relationship-orientated styles. The aim is to match leadership style with the situation requirement (Fielder cited in (Robbins et al., 1994). The instrument from this theory comprises eighteen 8 point bipolar adjective scales which are summed, and is unusual in that instead of asking about the leader, or the subordinate, it asks about the person with whom the leader (being tested) has found it most difficult to work. In other words, they describe their

'least preferred co-worker'. A high score indicates that the leader places importance on good personal relations, while a low score shows emphasis on productivity and tasks.

Field studies have generally supported the theory and the instrument, while laboratory studies have been less supportive (Peters et al., 1985). Reliability has been supported at alpha .64 and average internal consistency of coefficients of .88 (Rice, 1978). Other researchers, however, find some cause to question Fiedler's interpretation of the LPC, with their results from the instrument suggesting a closer fit with a democratic - autocratic continuum (Edwards et al., 1990).

Comments: Although updated by Fiedler to become Cognitive Resource Theory, the LPC still enjoys support. The participants chosen by researchers, and the theoretical concept, suggest that LPC is applicable to smaller organisations, or larger ones with varied environments, where low to middle managers can be matched with prevailing local leadership situations. Literature implies its usefulness where there are placements or selection choices to be made, and where there is no requirement or facility or intention to help, guide, train, or monitor leadership improvements. Because this theory assumes leadership style is fixed, the organisation most suited to this instrument is one that does not train or develop leaders, is not under stress or changing, and needs a best fit from the start.

SOURCE: Johnson, I. (n.d.).

Purpose/focus of the instrument

This contingency model for leadership assumes that the leadership style is fixed within each leader, and that each situation with its task structure and different level of position power requires a certain style of leadership that is a combination of task and relationship-orientated styles. The aim is to match leadership style with the situation requirement (Fiedler cited in Robbins et al., 1994). The instrument from this theory comprises eighteen 8 point bipolar adjective scales which are summed, and is unusual in that instead of asking about the leader, or the subordinate, it asks about the person with whom the leader (being tested) has found it most difficult to work. In other words, they describe their 'least preferred co-worker'. A high score indicates that the leader places importance on good personal relations, while a low score shows emphasis on productivity and tasks.

Where is instrument found?

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)

The instrument is available online in pdf format at https://cyfar.org/sites/default/files/Least_PreferredCoworkerScale.pdf.

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

Who developed the instrument, where?

Fred E. Fielder

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

Because this theory assumes leadership style is fixed, the organisation most suited to this instrument is one that does not train or develop leaders, is not under stress or changing, and needs a best fit from the start.

SOURCE: Johnson, I. (n.d.).

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

Field studies have generally supported the theory and the instrument, while laboratory studies have been less supportive (Peters et al., 1985). Reliability has been supported at alpha .64 and average internal consistency of coefficients of .88 (Rice, 1978). Other researchers, however, find some cause to question Fiedler's interpretation of the LPC, with their results from the instrument suggesting a closer fit with a democratic - autocratic continuum (Edwards et al., 1990).

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Number of citations for the instrument

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Mitchell et al. notes several limitations of the instrument, such as the focus on only leader-member relations. The instrument does not address relations among members. In addition, LPC leaves out some situations that may affect the influence of a leader in groups. The instrument is based on a dimension of favorability, of which Mitchell et al. has suggested there may be alternate interpretations. Such an interpretation may be situation complexity. There is also skepticism of the validity of the instrument, as single measures together are not face valid. Construct validity is also thought to be incomplete (Mitchell et al., 1970)

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

Citations (up to 5)

Mitchell, T. R., Biglan, A., Oncken, G. R., & Fiedler, F. E. (1970). The Contingency Model: criticisms and suggestions. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 13(3), 253-267.

Further notes

Leatherman Leadership Questionnaire (the information below is sourced

from: Mathieu, JE, Klimoski, RJ, Rouse, CE, and Marsh, WM. (1998). Evaluation of ARI Leader Assessment Measures, U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.

Retrieved from www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a346233.pdf)

Purpose	Aid in selecting supervisors, provide feedback on leadership knowledge
Population	Managers, supervisors, and prospective supervisors
Acronym	LLQ
Scores	1) Assigning Work; 2) Career Counseling; 3) Coaching Employees; 4) Communication; 5) Managing Change; 6) Handling Employee Complaints; 7) Dealing With Employee Conflicts; 8) Counseling Employees; 9) Decision Making; 10) Delegating; 11) Discipline; 12) Handling Emotional Situations; 13) Setting Goals/Planning; 14) Grievances; 15) Conducting Meetings; 16) Feedback; 17) Negotiating; 18) Performance

Appraisal; 19) Establishing Performance Standards; 20) Persuading; 21) Presentations; 22) Problem Solving; 23) Conducting Selection Interviews; 24) Team Building; 25) Conducting Termination Interviews; 26) Helping Employees Manage Time; 27) One On One Training.

Administration Individual and group

Price Set of 12 overhead transparencies, manual, 10 sets of booklets, answer sets and scoring service for \$600

Time 5 hours for complete test, 2 1/2 hours per part

Authors Richard W. Leatherman (1987)

Publisher International Training Consultants, Inc.

Theory

This instrument was designed to be a knowledge-based measure of supervisory leadership for selection and feedback purposes. The theory states that there are 27 skills that a leader needs to be effective. These skills are the following: 1) assigning work; 2) career counseling; 3) coaching employees; 4) communication; 5) managing change; 6) handling employee complaints; 7) dealing with employee conflicts; 8) counseling employees; 9) decision making; 10) delegating; 11) discipline; 12) handling emotional situations; 13) setting goals/planning; 14) grievances; 15) conducting meetings; 16) feedback; 17) negotiating; 18) performance appraisal; 19) establishing performance standards; 20) persuading; 21) presentations; 22) problem solving; 23) conducting selection interviews; 24) team building; 25) conducting termination interviews; 26) helping employees manage time; 27) one on one training (Katkovsky, 1992).

Supervisory tasks were identified through a literature review. Next, experts developed items, and constructed scales by placed these items into the dimensions. The instrument yields two feedback reports; one benchmarks the organization on the 27 tasks versus other organizations. A second report is generated for each individual to present and compare his or her scores with other respondents in the organization, as well as with the international averages. The individual's strengths and needs are identified via this report. The instrument has 339 items in a multiple-choice format. The feedback report provides detailed information concerning each leadership task in terms of strengths and weaknesses, by comparisons against others in the organization and the population of previous participants (Katkovsky, 1992).

Psychometrics: The internal consistency reported for the LLQ based on Kuder-Richardson's formula 20 was .97. However, the correlations and reliabilities of the individual scales were not presented to allow assessment of the distinctiveness of each task. Given the high internal consistency, the measure may tap only one factor instead of the 27 different skills that were proposed (Katkovsky, 1992).

The content validity was established by agreement of six out of eight expert panel members on the importance of the tasks and assignment of items into scales. There is some concern for the construct validity of the scale. In a study of 229 participants from seven organizations, significant task differences were obtained across jobs. These differences suggest that there is not likely to be a single universal "best fit" profile of requisite skills across jobs. Concurrent

criterion-related studies with the LLQ and assessment center scores show inconsistent results, with one study showing no significant relationships and a second study finding overall significant rhos for three different samples (Katkovsky, 1992).

Generalizability: The questionnaire taps supervisory content, so the instrument should generalize to any setting where leadership is being assessed. The entire instrument takes approximately four to five hours to complete, limiting its use. The administration and scoring of the results are completed electronically. The items appear to be face valid, and vary in transparency in our opinion.

Purpose/focus of the instrument

The purpose of this instrument is to aid in selecting supervisors, provide feedback on leadership knowledge (Mathieu et al., 1998).

Where is instrument found?

The instrument can be purchased online at <https://www.edgetrainingsystems.com/Store/ProductID/52>.

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)

It is available only through a company.

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

Set of 12 overhead transparencies, manual, 10 sets of booklets, answer sets and scoring service for \$600.

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

1987

Who developed the instrument, where?

Richard W. Leatherman

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

The target population includes managers, supervisors, and prospective supervisors.

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

The internal consistency reported for the LLQ based on Kuder-Richardson's formula 20 was .97. However, the correlations and reliabilities of the individual scales were not presented to allow assessment of the distinctiveness of each task. Given the high internal consistency, the measure may tap only one factor instead of the 27 different skills that were proposed (Katkovsky, 1992). The content validity was established by agreement of six out of eight expert panel members on the importance of the tasks and assignment of items into scales. There is some concern for the construct validity of the scale. In a study of 229 participants from seven organizations, significant task differences were obtained across jobs. These differences suggest that there is

not likely to be a single universal "best fit" profile of requisite skills across jobs. Concurrent criterion-related studies with the LLQ and assessment center scores show inconsistent results, with one study showing no significant relationships and a second study finding overall significant rhos for three different samples (Katkovsky, 1992).

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Number of citations for the instrument

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

Citations (up to 5)

Further notes

Management – The “Free Management Library”

<http://managementhelp.org/aboutfml/what-it-is.htm>

From the website: “The Library provides free, easy-to-access, online articles to develop yourself, other individuals, groups and organizations (whether the organization is for-profit or nonprofit). Over the past 15 years, the Library has grown to be one of the world's largest well-organized collections of these types of articles and resources. The Library has been averaging 1,000,000 to 1,500,000 visitors (not hits) per month.. Many of its topics consistently rank in the top ten results from Google searches. Anyone can upload a link [to an article or document], which, once approved, will be listed in the library.” Leadership is a major topic, but is broken down into many subtopics. There is an Assessments section linked to the main page which provides multiple free-access versions of self assessments, organizational and team assessments, and other resources related to assessments. “There are approximately 650 topics in the Library, spanning almost 10,000 links. Each topic has additionally recommended books and related Library topics. The Library is not an ezine site or "content farm". We do not try to accumulate as many articles as possible in order to maximize the number of visitors we get in order to maximize ad revenue. We do not buy articles. We decline about 50% of the articles submitted to the site. The Library is an informational and educational site....The Library focuses especially on free, online and practical information that visitors can quickly apply. Articles are about personal, professional and organizational development. Topics cover both for-profit and nonprofit organizations....Visitors also can use various assessments to closely examine themselves, their groups and their organizations. Results of those assessments can be use to select the best topics to focus on, in the Library....The Library is itself a **free community resource** to be shared and contributed to by users and authors across the world....[People] from up to 80 countries are using the Library.”

The website and monitoring is overseen by Authenticity Consulting, LLC, which wrote a lot of the original text. This is not a “wiki” type site where different people can add to an article. You must submit a link to an article (also called blogs), have it approved, then the link is posted. To me (Sam Nickels), it appears that writers need to have their articles online elsewhere as this site only posts links.

Here is a list of leadership assessments they say are mostly free and available online, as well as a list of self, team, and organizational assessments, again mostly free and available online, although some are copyrighted and available for wider use only with permission. The following topic links are found on their Diagnostics page

(<http://managementhelp.org/aboutfml/diagnostics.htm>)

- Self assessments
- Team assessments
- Organizational assessments
- Leadership assessments

Purpose/focus of the instrument

The Library focuses especially on free, online and practical information that visitors can quickly apply. Articles are about personal, professional and organizational development. Topics cover both for-profit and nonprofit organizations. Visitors also can use various assessments to closely examine themselves, their groups and their organizations. The Library is itself a free community resource to be shared and contributed to by users and authors across the world (Retrieved from <http://managementhelp.org/aboutfml/what-it-is.htm>)

Where is instrument found?

A list of topics can be accessed at <http://managementhelp.org>.

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)

It is available online.

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

The library is free. No cost.

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

Who developed the instrument, where?

The instrument was developed by Authenticity Consulting, LLC.

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Number of citations for the instrument

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

Citations (up to 5)

Further notes

Management and Leadership Systems. Peck, CS. 1992-2001. Assesses management, leadership skills, team effectiveness. ASI Consulting Group, LLC, 1111 N. Marshall Street, Suite 903, Milwaukee, WI 53202-3380; Telephone: 414-241-2400.

UNABLE TO LOCATE ANY INFORMATION ON THIS INSTRUMENT

Purpose/focus of the instrument

Where is instrument found?

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

Who developed the instrument, where?

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Number of citations for the instrument

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

Citations (up to 5)

Further notes

Managerial practices survey (Yukl, 1990) also known as “Compass - the Managerial Practices Survey (MPS)”.

Purpose/focus of the instrument

The following description is taken from Zaccaro et al. (1999).

Description: The Managerial Practice Survey (MPS) instrument is designed to provide managers with information about their current behaviors on the job, to help them identify their strengths, and to expand their repertoire of effective management practices. Based on a 15-year research program, MPS measures 14 categories of management and leadership behaviors. These are: informing, clarifying, monitoring, planning, problem solving, consulting, delegating, inspiring, recognizing, rewarding, supporting, mentoring, networking, and team building. The wording of the items on the MPS make them suitable for use by peers as well as subordinates.

Where is instrument found?

It is published by Manus. The instrument was developed by Yukl (1984-1995).

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

Approximately \$300

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

1996

Who developed the instrument, where?**Target population for which the instrument was developed?****What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?**

Validity: Several studies suggest that behaviors in the MPS are relevant for managerial effectiveness (e.g., Wall and Lepsinger, 1984, 1985 and 1986 as cited in Clark & Clark, 1990). Content validity was well established with correct classification ranging from 72% to 96% (Taber & Falble, 1984, 1985, 1986, and 1988 as cited in Clark & Clark, 1990). Finally, the criterion-related validity of the MPS was tested in several studies (Yukl & Kanuk, 1979; Yukl & Van Fleet, 1982; Miles, 1985). Across all studies, there was evidence for the relevance of most criteria for managerial effectiveness.

Reliability: As cited in Clark & Clark (1990), Yukl, Wall, & Lepsinger reported an internal consistency for the MPS scales that ranged from .84 to .91, for a sample of 1,173 subjects. Test-retest reliability was tested for the stability of the MPS scales and results ranged from .48 to .94.

Interrater reliability was also tested for agreement between subordinates with respect to their descriptions of the manager's behavior. The researchers found managers differ in their behavior and subordinate ratings can detect this difference. The F-Tests were significant at the .01 level for all 13 scales.

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?**Number of citations for the instrument****Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers**

Although the MPS's target audiences are managers at all levels, reliability and validity studies were conducted among mid-level managers only.

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

French, German, Italian, Korean, and Spanish, but validity has not been tested in these other languages.

Citations (up to 5)

Application: The MPS can be used to assess subordinates' perceptions of leader behavior. Subordinates complete the questionnaire and results can be fed back to the leaders for developmental purposes.

Source: Manus, 100 Prospect Street, South Tower, Stanford, CT 06901, Phone: (203) 326-3890. Full references through 1998 for this instrument can be found in the Zaccaro et al. (1999) article in this Library. Current cost (if any) and recent availability were not determined. However, the instrument appears here under "Managerial Practices Survey."

Further notes

MSCEIT – Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test,

2002. This instrument is from the same publishers (and likely at the same costs) as the above BarOn instrument. Developed by three leaders in the field of EI, it assesses EI with an ability-based scale, that is, how well people perform tasks and solve emotional problems, rather than simply asking them about their subjective assessment of their emotional skills. Developed in the scientific tradition of the earlier Multifactor Emotional Intelligence Scale (MEIS) from the 1990s. Using an ability based approach means scores are relatively unaffected by self-concept, response set, emotional state, and other confounds. EI has a single overall performance level, but can be divided into subareas of experiential and strategic emotional intelligence: ability to accurately perceive emotions, use emotions to facilitate thinking, problem solving and creativity, understand emotions, and manage emotions for personal growth (Mayer and Salovey, 1997). The manual states: The MSCEIT is a reliable and valid measure, no other test or combination of tests captures what the MSCEIT measures, was normed on a sample of 5000 respondents from North America, responses are computer-scored. Details are fully covered in the manual. Instruments on permanent reserve at Carrier Library by prof. D. Irwin, JMU.

Purpose/focus of the instrument

The MSCEIT uses scientific knowledge of emotional intelligence to assess individuals' abilities to emotionally problem solve. It measures four categories of emotional intelligence: perceiving emotion accurately, using emotion to facilitate thought, understanding emotion, and managing emotion.

Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (1997). What is emotional intelligence? In P. Salovey & D. J. Sluyter (Eds.), *Emotional development and emotional intelligence* (pp. 3-31). New York: Basic Books.

The instrument asks 141 questions and has 15 main scores- total EI score, two Area scores, four Branch scores,

Where is instrument found?

It can be obtained online or by ordering a booklet from Multi-Health Systems in Ontario, Canada.

Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., Caruso, D. R., & Sitarenios, G. (2003). Measuring emotional intelligence with the MSCEIT V2.0. *Emotion, 3*(1), 97-105. doi: 10.1037/1528-3542.3.1.97

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

Multi-Factor Emotional Intelligence Scale (MEIS) was the original ability scale for emotional intelligence, developed in 1999. It was then revised into the MSCEIT Research Version 1.1, followed by the most recent version, the MSCEIT V2.0 in 2002.

Who developed the instrument, where?

John D. Mayer, Peter Salovey, and David R. Caruso at New Hampshire University.

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Number of citations for the instrument

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

The authors noted there were limitations; however, they did not go into detail. The authors did note that the most prominent issue.

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

Citations (up to 5)

Further notes

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ 5x-Short)— web citations = 2236 (Avolio & Bass, 1999), and even more (2567 citations) for a meta-analytic review of the MLQ by Lowe et al., 1996.

Usually referred to just as the MLQ, the most popular (shorter 45-item) version is the MLQ-5x or MLQ (5x-short). This is the only version now available. Not to be confused with the MLQ instrument below (Meaning in Life Questionnaire).

“Previous leadership models have fallen short in explaining a "full range" of leadership styles, ranging from the charismatic and inspirational leaders to avoidant laissez-faire leaders The full range model of leadership was developed to broaden the range of leadership styles typically investigated in the field....to challenge the leadership field to broaden its thinking about what constitutes a much broader range of leadership styles than the paradigms of initiation of structure and consideration.” (from the purchase manual, available in this library). The major leadership constructs [of the MLQ]—transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and passive/avoidant -leadership—form a new paradigm for understanding both the lower and higher order effects of leadership style. “There are two questionnaire forms: the Self Rating Form, where supervisors rate themselves as leaders (ratees), and the Rater Form, where associates rate their leaders (raters). “At the ineffective end of the range, the MLQ assesses perceptions of leadership behaviors that represent avoidance of responsibility and action. This is called Laissez Faire leadership. At the most effective end of the range, the MLQ assesses perceptions of leadership behaviors that generate the higher order developed and performance effects, which is called transformational leadership.” This instrument was developed in the corporate, military and governmental/public sectors.

The original version was 63 items, validated, but was later reduced to a validated 45 item “short” version. The short is the only version now available. MLQ uses a five point scale for rating from Not at all to Frequently. On average, it takes approximately 15 minutes to complete the questionnaire. “Respondents should have a reading ability comparable to the U.S. ninth-grade level, although the MLQ has been used in organizational settings such as a correctional institution, where respondents had less than a ninth grade reading ability (Crookall, 1989). In this case, trained staff read the MLQ aloud.” (Manual)

Validity and reliability (including follow-up tests by other researchers):

- The authors state the MLQ has been used and tested extensively over many years. Indeed, it appears to be the most frequently used leadership instrument. “The first meta-analysis of the literature (Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996)... found that transformational leadership had the strongest and most positive impact whether outcomes were measured subjectively or objectively. Moreover, there was a consistent hierarchical pattern of results. “[In Howell & Avolio (1993) in a study of four large Canadian financial institutions,] leadership data and data on organizational culture, including such factors as innovativeness, willingness to take risks, and complexity of structure, were gathered and correlated with the MLQ ratings collected for each manager. Results of this analysis showed that ratings of leadership were correlated with key aspects of the organization culture. “Preliminary findings suggest that while age is unrelated to MLQ results, female leaders tend to score higher in transformational and lower in transactional leadership than their male counterparts (Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, and Van Engen (2003); Bass, Avolio, & Atwater, 1996). There has been no evidence to indicate any systematic difference in ratings as a function of race or ethnicity of the rater group or target leader.” (Manual)
- Reliability: In a large study carried out by the authors, based on ratings from nine samples ($N = 2,154$), reliabilities for the total items and for each leadership factor scale ranged from .74 to .94. (Manual)

Domain information: see manual summary in this library.

Who developed the instrument and cost:

- Bruce J. Avolio and Bernard M. Bass, 3rd edition, copyrights 1995, 2000, and 2004.
- Published by Mind Garden, Inc. email: info@mindgarden.com , web: www.mindgarden.com
- “Mind Garden can provide Web based collection of multi-rater data for researchers interested in using the Web. For consultants, Mind Garden provides both paper form-based and Web-based multi-rater (360°) collection of ratings about a leader as well as a comprehensive feedback report.” (Manual)
- COST: Purchase is required. There is no free permission for use of the instrument in a classroom setting. The “academic rate” is the same for students and faculty:
 - For pen and paper edition, whether self-assessment version or rater version, the cost is as follows: the minimum administrations is $50 \times \$2 = \100 ; prices come down with volume, eg, $1001 \text{ administrations} \times .60 = \601 .
 - For the online version that includes their data analysis, cost is more expensive: minimum $50 \times \$2.40$, $1001 \times .72 = \$721$. One can use their online collection system but then do your own analysis in Qualtrics by downloading the data, in which case the cost is the same as pen and paper.
- The Full Range of Leadership Development Program (FRLD) uses the MLQ, the MLQ Manual, and the MLQ Report. Other assessments complement this effort, such as the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire for Teams (MLQT), which assesses shared

and/or collective leadership along a full range of styles; the Organizational Development Questionnaire (ODQ), which assesses organizational culture.

Language availability: "Translations have been made in Italian, Spanish, French, German, Dutch, Norwegian, Hebrew, Chinese, Arabic, Japanese, Korean, and Indonesian. Commercial translations of the MLQ scales and report are available in English, German, Italian, Portuguese, Spanish, Swedish (abbreviated report), and Turkish." (Manual)

Examples of the instrument:

- Appendix A: MLQ 45 item official version (purchased copy) of both the Leader (self-assessment) and Rater (other person assessing the leader) versions, both of which are in English and Spanish.
- Appendix B: MLQ 45 item version translated into Spanish with additional sociodemographic questions, found on the web, no information available on the translation, would need to be reviewed by a professional level translator, or compared to the version in Appendix A for quality control.

Purpose/focus of the instrument

"Previous leadership models have fallen short in explaining a "full range" of leadership styles, ranging from the charismatic and inspirational leaders to avoidant laissez-faire leaders The full range model of leadership was developed to broaden the range of leadership styles typically investigated in the field....to challenge the leadership field to broaden its thinking about what constitutes a much broader range of leadership styles than the paradigms of initiation of structure and consideration." (from the purchase manual, available in this library). The major leadership constructs [of the MLQ]—transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and passive/avoidant -leadership—form a new paradigm for understanding both the lower and higher order effects of leadership style.

Where is instrument found?

· "Mind Garden can provide Web based collection of multi-rater data for researchers interested in using the Web. For consultants, Mind Garden provides both paper form-based and Web-based multi-rater (360°) collection of ratings about a leader as well as a comprehensive feedback report." (Manual)

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

Purchase is required. There is no free permission for use of the instrument in a classroom setting. The "academic rate" is the same for students and faculty. For pen and paper edition, whether self-assessment version or rater version, the cost is as follows: the minimum administrations is $50 \times \$2 = \100 ; prices come down with volume, eg, $1001 \text{ administrations} \times .60 = \601 . For the online version that includes their data analysis, cost is more expensive: minimum $50 \times \$2.40$, $1001 \times .72 = \$721$. One can use their online collection system but then do your own analysis in Qualtrics by downloading the data, in which case the cost is the same as pen and paper.

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

The original version was 63 items, validated, but was later reduced to a validated 45 item “short” version. The short is the only version now available.

Who developed the instrument, where?

Bruce J. Avolio and Bernard M. Bass, 3rd edition, copyrights 1995, 2000, and 2004. Published by Mind Garden, Inc. email: info@mindgarden.com , web: www.mindgarden.com

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

This instrument was developed in the corporate, military and governmental/public sectors.

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

The authors state the MLQ has been used and tested extensively over many years. Indeed, it appears to be the most frequently used leadership instrument. “The first meta-analysis of the literature (Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996)... found that transformational leadership had the strongest and most positive impact whether outcomes were measured subjectively or objectively. Moreover, there was a consistent hierarchical pattern of results. “[In Howell & Avolio (1993) in a study of four large Canadian financial institutions,] leadership data and data on organizational culture, including such factors as innovativeness, willingness to take risks, and complexity of structure, were gathered and correlated with the MLQ ratings collected for each manager. Results of this analysis showed that ratings of leadership were correlated with key aspects of the organization culture. “Preliminary findings suggest that while age is unrelated to MLQ results, female leaders tend to score higher in transformational and lower in transactional leadership than their male counterparts (Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, and Van Engen (2003); Bass, Avolio, & Atwater, 1996). There has been no evidence to indicate any systematic difference in ratings as a function of race or ethnicity of the rater group or target leader.” (Manual) Reliability: In a large study carried out by the authors, based on ratings from nine samples ($N = 2,154$), reliabilities for the total items and for each leadership factor scale ranged from .74 to .94. (Manual)

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?**Number of citations for the instrument**

Web citations = 2236 (Avolio & Bass, 1999), and even more (2567 citations) for a meta-analytic review of the MLQ by Lowe et al., 1996.

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers**Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated**

Language availability: “Translations have been made in Italian, Spanish, French, German, Dutch, Norwegian, Hebrew, Chinese, Arabic, Japanese, Korean, and Indonesian. Commercial translations of the MLQ scales and report are available in English, German, Italian, Portuguese, Spanish, Swedish (abbreviated report), and Turkish.” (Manual)

Citations (up to 5)**Further notes**

Organizational capacity: The Social Capital Assessment Tool

provides an *organizational profile* that is designed to assist organizations to delineate the relationships and networks that exist among formal and informal institutions in communities. It also provides tools for assessing the organization's internal characteristics that may promote or hinder the building of social capital in a given community. Annex 1E, Organizational Profile Scoresheet begins by looking at organizational leadership. Questions are geared towards identifying who the leadership is, how it functions, whether women participate, etc. It is especially appropriate to communities and grassroots organizations in low and middle income countries, but could be used in wealthier communities as well, for example, it assesses: "institutional capacity (in terms of the quality of leadership, participation, organizational culture and organizational capacity)." The explanation document and 5 part assessment is included in the Library. Social capital assessment tool—Background paper, Anirudh Krishna and Elizabeth Shrader – World Bank, 1999, Retrieved from:

<http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTSOCIALCAPITAL/Resources/Social-Capital-Assessment-Tool-SOCAT-/sciwp22.pdf> .

Annexes, with actual tools: Retrieved from:

<http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTSOCIALCAPITAL/Resources/Social-Capital-Assessment-Tool-SOCAT-/annex1.pdf> .

Purpose/focus of the instrument

An organizational profile that is designed to assist organizations to delineate the relationships and networks that exist among formal and informal institutions in communities. It also provides tools for assessing the organization's internal characteristics that may promote or hinder the building of social capital in a given community.

Where is instrument found?

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)

Available online at <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTSOCIALCAPITAL/Resources/Social-Capital-Assessment-Tool-SOCAT-/annex1.pdf>.

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

1999

Who developed the instrument, where?

Anirudh Krishna and Elizabeth Shrader, The World Bank, Washington D.C.

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

It is especially appropriate to communities and grassroots organizations in low and middle income countries, but could be used in wealthier communities as well.

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Number of citations for the instrument

431

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

Citations (up to 5)

Further notes

Organizational leadership assessments

CHARTING IMPACT – a guide from the Independent Sector for sharing your goals and impacts with stakeholders: https://www.independentsector.org/charting_impact.

From the website: “At the heart of Charting Impact are five powerful questions that require reflection and promote communication about what really matters – results. For each nonprofit or foundation, Charting Impact encourages strategic thinking about how it will achieve its goals. Responding to the five questions creates a unique report that shares concise, detailed information about plans and progress with key stakeholders, including the public. Research conducted in 2012 shows that demonstrating impact to donors, the community or major funders is the number one reason why organizations complete their reports. This “aha” moment comes once they discover the added value that grows out of the Charting Impact process.” The 5 questions are:

1. [What is your organization aiming to accomplish?](#)
2. [What are your strategies for making this happen?](#)
3. [What are your organization’s capabilities for doing this?](#)
4. [How will your organization know if you are making progress?](#)
5. [What have and haven’t you accomplished so far?](#)

While these are not leadership tools specifically, they can be used to gauge whether or not an organization, or an organization under the leadership of an individual or group (eg, a board, a management team, or a shared leadership group), is accomplishing clear goals and impacts. That is, measuring the accomplishment of these organizational assessments can be considered a measure of leadership.

See Library document “Charting impact—Tools for impact analysis from the Independent Sector.”

Purpose/focus of the instrument

“Charting Impact was created to provide donors and organizations a method to communicate their goals, strategies and outcomes in a consistent format. The five questions are designed to fit foundations and nonprofits of all sizes, large and small. The project of answering each question requires self-reflection and an examination of your organization’s mission, results, and goals.” (Retrieved from <http://reports.chartingimpact.org/ci-about>).

Where is instrument found?

<https://learn.guidestar.org/update-nonprofit-report/charting-impact>

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

Available for free without permission of author.

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

Who developed the instrument, where?

Initially developed by Independent Sector and BBB Wise Giving Alliance, merging in 2009.

GuideStar also joined them at this time (Retrieved from <http://reports.chartingimpact.org/ci-history#Alliance>).

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Number of citations for the instrument

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

Citations (up to 5)

Further notes

Organizational leadership development and succession planning diagnostic (Bridgespan)

This is a free diagnostic tool that is available only on Bridgespan's website. The focus is determining to what extent the organization is developing its leadership and planning for leader succession. From the website: "According to a Bridgespan Group survey of more than 150 nonprofit leadership teams, leadership development and succession planning for senior leader positions is the single greatest organizational weakness nonprofits face. To help address this challenge, we have developed a free diagnostic survey to help leaders understand where their organizations are strong – and what can be improved. Take the "Building Future Leaders" diagnostic survey, receive a report to see how your organization compares to others, and jumpstart your thinking on what successful leadership development could look like in your organization. You will be presented with 31 statements that relate to five core processes of leadership development and succession planning. Definitions:

1. *Leadership development and succession planning: the set of activities an organization uses to develop a strong internal and external pipeline of future leaders*
2. *Senior leaders: an organization's senior positions, such as Executive Directors and their direct reports (for nonprofit networks, this would also include local site or chapter leaders)*
3. *Leadership capacity: the skills, roles, and number of leadership positions needed*

For each statement, you will be asked to assess your organization's current performance in building future leaders within your organization. The survey should take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete. Once you have submitted the survey, you will be able to see your results compared to the average of previous respondents. If you have any questions or have difficulty completing the survey, please contact Bridgespan at leadership@bridgespan.org."

Purpose/focus of the instrument

The focus is determining to what extent the organization is developing its leadership and planning for leader succession. From the website: "According to a Bridgespan Group survey of more than 150 nonprofit leadership teams, leadership development and succession planning for senior leader positions is the single greatest organizational weakness nonprofits face. To help address this challenge, we have developed a free diagnostic survey to help leaders understand where their organizations are strong – and what can be improved."

Where is instrument found?

The instrument can be found at <https://www.bridgespan.org/insights/library/leadership-development/building-future-leaders-diagnostic-survey>.

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)

It is available only through the Bridgespan website.

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

The instrument is available for free. No cost.

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

2012

Who developed the instrument, where?

The Bridgespan Group, Inc.

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Number of citations for the instrument

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

Citations (up to 5)

Further notes

Organizational leadership evaluation (nonprofit executive director performance evaluation)

Nonprofit organizations can use a simple evaluation form of organizational leadership to measure the annual progress against organizational expectations. See a sample form in Library (Simple Sample evaluation form for Board to use with Executive Director). Such a form can also be used in research across multiple organizations if the same form/approach is used (although individual forms are likely to be adapted to organizational values, which will differ).

Retrieved from: <http://www.managementcenter.org/resources/executive-director-performance-evaluations/>. The Management Center, no date.

Purpose/focus of the instrument

To measure the annual progress against organizational expectations.

Where is instrument found?

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

Who developed the instrument, where?

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Number of citations for the instrument

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

Citations (up to 5)

Further notes

Organizational leadership in philanthropy

“Grantmakers for Effective Organizations (GEO) is an affinity group of the Council on Foundations that is dedicated to promoting learning and encouraging dialogue among funders committed to the field of organizational effectiveness. Their website has links to organizations that study or promote organizational effectiveness, an extensive list of readings, publications and papers” (from the website: www.geofunders.org). The framework below lists four areas in which evidence shows that grant makers/philanthropists who lead by carrying out these activities are better able to foster effective nonprofit organizations with whom they support and in turn to better achieve their goals. This framework could be used as a measure for philanthropic leadership effectiveness. For example, a mixed method questionnaire could be developed in which philanthropists are asked (or grantees are asked about their philanthropists in a kind of 360 degree approach, along with board leaders, staff, or peer grantors) to rate on a scale of 1 to 10 to what degree they “strengthen their relationship with their grantees” and to comment on how they do this and how they could do it better; to what degree they “support resilience in their nonprofit grantees” and to comment on how they do this and how they could do it better; to what degree they “carry out activities to learn for improvement with their grantees” and to comment on how they do this and how they could do it better; and to what

degree they “collaborate” and to comment on how they do this and how they could do it better.



Purpose/focus of the instrument

It is not an instrument that assesses leadership skills, but rather a framework to guide other philanthropies or nonprofit organizations on how to effectively lead. A questionnaire based on the four categories: strengthening relationship with grantees, supporting nonprofit resilience, learning for improvement, and collaborating for greater impact, could be developed. Members and leaders of nonprofits or philanthropies could rate the extent to which these guidelines are followed in their own organizations.

Where is instrument found?

The framework and their descriptions can be found on <http://www.geofunders.org/about>.

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)

It is available on the Geofunders website. Grantmakers for Effective Organizations is a nonprofit organization made up of 550 grantmakers hoping to reform how philanthropies are led. <http://www.geofunders.org/about>.

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

It is available for free. No cost.

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

1997

Who developed the instrument, where?

Grantmakers for Effective Organization (GEO). This organization includes 550 community members, a Board of Directors made up of 14 directors or presidents of various philanthropies, as well as a 14 member Nonprofit Advisory Council.

Target population for which the instrument was developed?**What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?****How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?****Number of citations for the instrument****Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers****Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated****Citations (up to 5)****Further notes**

Organizational leadership trait identification (Bridgespan)

“Discovering the critical success traits of your best hires.” This matrix tool simply lists a large number of traits that many leaders in the workplace have. The pdf is included here in the Library so you can review and use the tool, which appears free on the Bridgespan website as part of their “Nonprofit leadership development toolkit.” A team working together identifies the organization’s best current or past leaders, then agrees on the traits that these leaders share, checking off the boxes next to the many possible traits. Bridgespan says this is a method to identify the strengths of the each particular organization’s leaders, which in turn can be incorporated into the org’s hiring, evaluation and development plans. They wisely advise a final step of monitoring the use of the tool, to see whether it is in fact effective at obtaining good leaders for the organization or not. The source listed for the items is Monster.com, an online hiring company. This is not a good source, though I did not go to Monster to see where THEY obtained the list from. Another perhaps better source may be the IPIP list of traits listed here under International Personality Item Pool (IPIP.ori.org), which is research and theory based.

Purpose/focus of the instrument

Bridgespan says this is a method to identify the strengths of the each particular organization’s leaders, which in turn can be incorporated into the org’s hiring, evaluation and development plans.

Where is instrument found?**Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)****Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?****Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?****Who developed the instrument, where?****Target population for which the instrument was developed?****What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?**

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?
Number of citations for the instrument
Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers
Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated
Citations (up to 5)
Further notes

Path-Goal Leadership Questionnaire

Indvik (1985, 1988)

Purpose/focus of the instrument

The purpose of the instrument is to identify the leadership styles that an individual utilizes in their life most often and what styles they rarely use.

(<http://people.uncw.edu/nottinghamj/documents/slides6/Northouse6e%20Ch7%20Path-Goal%20Survey.pdf>). Such styles include directive, achievement-oriented, participative, supportive

(<http://people.uncw.edu/nottinghamj/documents/slides6/Northouse6e%20Ch7%20Path-Goal%20Survey.pdf>).

Where is instrument found?

The instrument is available in pdf form at

<http://people.uncw.edu/nottinghamj/documents/slides6/Northouse6e%20Ch7%20Path-Goal%20Survey.pdf>.

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)

The instrument is available online

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

1985

Who developed the instrument, where?

Julie Indvik

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Number of citations for the instrument

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

Citations (up to 5)

Further notes

Performance Skills Leader

Human Technology, Inc. 1996. Designed to identify "leadership strengths and developmental needs." HRD Press, Inc., 22 Amherst Road, Amherst, MA 01002-9709; Telephone: 800-822-2801; FAX: 413-253-3490; E-mail: customerservice@hrdpress.com; Web: <http://www.hrdpress.com>.

Purpose/focus of the instrument

The focus of this instrument is to help employees identify their strengths and weaknesses in leadership. A unique aspect of the Performance Skills Leader is the ability to compare your perceptions with your team members and managers. The instrument assesses 5 aspects of leadership: strategic focus, business focus, workforce focus, interpersonal focus, and personal focus (http://www.creativeorgdesign.com/tests_page.php?id=485).

Where is instrument found?

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)

It is available online or on paper.

(http://www.creativeorgdesign.com/tests_page.php?id=485)

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

Who developed the instrument, where?

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Number of citations for the instrument

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

Citations (up to 5)

Further notes

Personality/Preferences/Style Assessments

From blog by Dan McCarthy: These kind of assessments don't really measure leadership capability, but they can provide a leader additional insights into their behavior. For any of these, there's no good or bad profile, and results should be used only for development, not performance assessment.

MBTI Complete. The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator® (MBTI®) instrument is a questionnaire designed to make Jung’s ideas about psychological type useful in everyday life. It identifies a person’s four basic type preferences that combine into one of 16 different personality types. These results help you understand normal differences in the way people think, communicate, and interact—differences that can be the source of much misunderstanding. The MBTI instrument has been used for more than 50 years to establish greater understanding between individuals, and has been translated into more than 15 different languages for use around the world. Cost is \$59.95, and the online Complete requires no certification.

<https://www.mbticomplete.com/mbtimessage.aspx?ERR=ERR-COOKIE001>

Behavioral Style DISC™ Profile. There's a lot of suppliers who sell this assessment, I linked to a reputable local provider I use. DISC Provides leaders insight into their behavioral characteristics, communication style, and behavioral adaptations to their work environment. It's usually used for development, but can also be used for team building and selection (if properly benchmarked). No certification is required, cost varies. Not sure about languages, I'm sure some one's translated it.

<http://www.vitalwork.com/assessment-tools.asp>

COMMENT ON DISC from “Six leadership and team assessments and when to use them.” Retrieved from <http://www.people-results.com/leadership-team-assessments/>.
Joe Baker, December 1, 2014:

Everything DiSC – Workplace – If I were on a desert island with individuals and teams to develop, and I could bring only one personality and behavior style assessment with me, this would be the one. It’s valid and reliable, cost-effective, versatile and easy to apply. The framework of four basic quadrants (Dominance, Influence, Steadiness and Conscientiousness) is [simple to understand but not simplistic](#). There are further nuances to an individual’s results (one of 12 styles) including personalized narrative about priorities, motivators, stressors and potential limitations. The report also emphasizes clearly and practically how you can best understand and relate to others given their styles. Like other Everything DiSC assessments, the Everything DiSC Workplace builds on decades of research and usage across all industries and walks of life. It also incorporates adaptive testing, a sophisticated approach where the individual is asked extra “tie-breaker” questions when needed. Results reports are nearly one-third more precise than Inscape’s previous generation of DiSC assessments, which were already solid. In addition to the results report that is extremely user friendly, insightful and action-oriented, there are comparison reports available so that, for example, a manager and her direct report can each get a report that compares their results and suggests tips for working effectively with each other. Facilitator and Group results reports are also available to help with team and culture development. <http://www.everythingdisc.com/Disc-Personality-Assessment-Solutions.aspx>

Everything DiSC – Work of Leaders – This self-assessment is unique in that it combines the components of the DiSC style preference assessment with additional items to assess leadership behaviors using a comprehensive but easy-to-remember set of overall leadership tasks: vision, alignment and execution. Extensive research on hundreds of leadership models, assessments and prior research went into the development of the framework and Work of Leaders assessment, and it was tested over several years and iterations of user testing. This is summarized in the book by Wiley Publishing researchers: [The Work of Leaders](#). I think this is a great new tool and am amazed at the insights this and other Everything DiSC assessments provide based on self-assessment. This will be especially valuable where an organization doesn't already have a clearly defined leadership competency framework.

<http://www.everythingdisc.com/Disc-Personality-Assessment-Solutions.aspx#work-of-leaders>

Personality (proclivity) instruments recommended/reviewed by Mathieu et al., 1998.

- o Jackson Personality Inventory – Revised (JPI-R)
- o Personality Research Form (PRF)
- o Survey of Work Styles (SWS)
- o Subject-Object Interview (SOI)
- o Myers Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI)
- o Hogan Personality Inventory (HPI)
- o NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI)
- o California Psychological Inventory (CPI)
- o Big 5 personality traits—this is a model rather than an instrument, not sure what is out there to measure these.

Workplace Motivators. Same provider. This one identifies interests, attitudes and values held by a leader —the primary driving factors behind a leader's behaviors. It can be used for development and selection applications. No certification required, cost varies. Not sure about languages. <http://www.vitalwork.com/assessment-tools.asp>

Social Styles. The SOCIAL STYLE Model is a tool for understanding our basic behaviors and the impact we have on others. I like it because it's easy to understand and remember. There's a self perception, and a more accurate multi-rater assessment. Not sure about the costs and other details, I haven't used this one in a while.

http://www.tracomcorp.com/products_services/social_style/model.html

Finally, here's the leadership assessment that I believe to be **the** most accurate and useful. It requires no certification, is available in any language, and best of all, it's free. It's called "[asking for feedback](#)". Ask your boss, your employees, your peers, your family, and anyone else who's opinion you value. Go ahead - try it. Just remember to listen, shut up, and say "thank-you". 18 tips for receiving feedback:

<http://greatleadershipbydan.blogspot.com/2008/01/18-tips-for-receiving-feedback.html>.

Profile of Aptitude for Leadership. Training House, Inc. 1991. Measures individual's relative strength in four leadership styles. HRD Press, Inc., 22 Amherst Road, Amherst, MA 01002–9709; Telephone: 800-822-2801; FAX: 413-253-3490; E-mail: customerservice@hrdpress.com; Web: <http://www.hrdpress.com>.

Return on Investments in Leadership Development in Healthcare

Purpose/focus of the instrument: The Canadian Health Leadership Network, through the auspices of its Research and Evaluation Working group (CHLNet-R) is designing and conducting both a pan-Canadian and international research project aimed at developing a valid and reliable tool and/or technique for determining the Return on Investment (ROI) from formal leadership and leadership development programs. ROI can be a powerful tool to help identify health leadership interventions or programs that have the greatest potential to improve outputs and outcomes in relation to their costs.

Over the past eight months—based on the initiative by Michael West from the King's Fund in the United Kingdom (UK), augmented by additional discussions Dr. Graham Dickson has had with Vijaya Nath, Director, Leadership Development at the King's Fund and David Sweeney, Director of Leadership at Health Education and Training Institute in New South Wales Australia—CHLNet-R has outlined an approach to this project that is profiled in this proposal. However, if the international project becomes not viable, a pan-Canadian only project will be undertaken. We believe this proposal adds great value to both CHLNet as a whole and for individual network partners. At the May 26th CHLNet Roundtable, network partners approved moving forward and seeking additional individual partner participation and funding.

In the past year CHLNet and its network partners have been promoting a Canada-wide action plan aimed at gaining support from the national government, provincial governments, and health regions across the country for a coordinated national/regional initiative to grow leadership development in support of health reform in Canada. As part of that plan a Research and Evaluation subcommittee was formed. In the process of carrying out consultations and making presentations to government bodies, it has become clear that the “return on investment”—i.e., the benefits that would accrue to the various partners from a heightened investment and effort in leadership development across Canada—is neither known, nor clear. While it is common sense to argue that improved leadership will improve health outcomes and support health reform, evidence is required to justify that investment—that is, to move money from one place of investment to another in support of leadership development. Cost-benefit analysis is also close to the concept of ROI, where benefits and costs are translated into dollar values. ROI subtracts the costs from the benefits and the higher the ROI the better in making decisions.² ROI has been shown to work in all types of sectors and programs including leadership development.³ Benefits by health care organizations have been seen for leadership development programs when

individuals return to their workplaces but a simple tool that can be employed to evaluate outputs and outcomes in relation to their costs has not been developed.

Return on Investment (ROI) as a means to measure value of leadership development programs. In “A Pan-Canadian and International Project on Return on Investments in Leadership Development in Healthcare: A Proposal 2016” the Canadian Health Leadership Network, through the auspices of its Research and Evaluation Working group (CHLNet- R) outlines a proposal to design and conduct both a pan-Canadian and international research project aimed at developing a valid and reliable tool and/or technique for determining the Return on Investment (ROI) from formal leadership and leadership development programs. ROI can be a powerful tool to help identify health leadership interventions or programs that have the greatest potential to improve outputs and outcomes in relation to their costs. This goal came out of discussions that included policy and political decision-makers who needed to know the connection between investment outcomes and investment costs. Their proposal include activities to:

- Confirm the conceptual model (e.g. logic model) for linking leadership quality to organizational outputs and outcomes
- Identify a methodology for evaluating the impact of leadership development programs both in terms of outputs and outcomes
- Identify key concepts, approaches, and components of a cost effective ROI evaluative instrument

Source: retrieved from

<https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=7&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=0ahUKEwiQ0aP9gozNAhWEIR4KHVwUBJ4QFghWMAy&url=http%3A%2F%2Fchlnet.ca%2Fwp-content%2Fuploads%2FCHLNet-CanadianInternationalROIProposal-Jan2016.pdf&usq=AFQjCNFUX6Fj-x8yXF3tDziwRgVjRG3zJA&sig2=e2RBpIy-dT-wkIHgCjys0A>

Changes in leadership self-efficacy, leader identity, capacity for socially responsible leadership, and curiosity due to a structured leader development program

Socially Responsible Leadership Scale

(104 items, Tyree, 1988) and SRLS-R2 (68 items, Astin, 1996; HERI, 1996). 8 subscales: consciousness of self (I know myself pretty well), congruence (my behaviors are congruent with my beliefs), commitment, common purpose (I support what the group is trying to accomplish), collaboration (I am able to trust the people with whom I work), controversy with civility (greater harmony can come out of disagreement), citizenship, change (there is energy in doing something a new way). Studies reflect alphas between .72 to .90. Information from SSLS's Dr. Lori Pyle's dissertation study (2013).

Purpose/focus of the instrument: As the study of leadership evolves, it is vital to consider adult development; specifically student leadership development. This study examined changes over

time in undergraduate students' leadership self-efficacy, leader identity, and socially responsible leadership capacity. As a component of motivation to learn, curiosity breadth and depth were included to explore how the "positive approach to new information" relates to individual leader growth. This research helps explain how leader identity fits into a student leader development model as an outcome and as a contributor to future leader identity growth and engagement with leadership tasks.

Where is instrument found?: This dissertation can be found on the James Madison University scholarly commons website, a repository service provided by libraries and educational technologies. (<http://commons.lib.jmu.edu/diss201019/93/>) It is also included in the Leadership Studies Commons. (<http://network.bepress.com/social-and-behavioral-sciences/leadership-studies/>)

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.): The dissertation is available online through JMU's scholarly commons.

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author? The dissertation is available to download for free. No cost

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)? The dissertation was published in August 2013.

Who developed the instrument, where?: Lori K. Pyle authored the dissertation. It was submitted to the Graduate Faculty of James Madison University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Target population for which the instrument was developed? This research is relevant for individual institutions, for higher education, for K-12 schools and programs, and larger society.

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?: Participants in the study included mainly traditional-age undergraduate college students. There were around 332 respondents.

Number of citations for the instrument: 1

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers: This study has some limitations that should be considered. First, because the sample was from a single university and the study participants were not randomly selected, generalizability of the results may be limited. Additionally, the experiment group had exposure to only one of the many leadership development programs at the university. The study was slightly unbalanced by gender. Also, self-reports methods of assessment can be prone to response bias.

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated: None

References (up to 5): References are stated in the dissertation

Further notes:

A Model of Relational Leadership: The Integration of Trust and Leader-Member Exchange

Purpose/focus of the instrument:

Noted in the dissertation, the Relational Leadership Model is based on a review of leader-member exchange (LMX) and interpersonal trust. This model asserts that the LMX relationship is built through interpersonal exchanges in which parties to the relationship evaluate the ability, benevolence, and integrity of each other. These perceptions, in turn, influence the behaviors predicted by LMX researchers. This integrated model of relational leadership provides insights into the dynamics of leader-subordinate relationships and resolves some of the inconsistencies in the LMX research without losing the richness and uniqueness of the exchange theory. A number of propositions for future research in relational leadership are also suggested.

Where is instrument found?

The instrument can be found on the following link:

https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Holly_Brower/publication/223276753_A_Model_of_Relational_Leadership_The_Integration_of_Trust_and_Leader-Member_Exchange/links/5806482e08ae0075d82c5a3c.pdf

The instrument is analyzed in Lori K. Pyle's dissertation. This dissertation can be found on the James Madison University scholarly commons website, a repository service provided by libraries and educational technologies. (<http://commons.lib.jmu.edu/diss201019/93/>) It is also included in the Leadership Studies Commons. (<http://network.bepress.com/social-and-behavioral-sciences/leadership-studies/>)

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.) The instrument model is available online for free in pdf form. * Direct all correspondence to: Holly Brower, College of Business Administration, Butler University, 4600 Sunset Avenue, Indianapolis, IN 46208; *e-mail*: hbrower@butler.edu.

Leadership Quarterly. 11(2). 227-250. Copyright © 2000 by Elsevier Science Inc.
All rights of reproduction in any form reserved. ISSN: 1048-9843

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author? The instrument model is available for free and doesn't require the permission of the author. No cost

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

The instrument was published in 2000.

Who developed the instrument, where?

Holly H. Brower from Butler University, F. David Schoorman from Purdue University, and Hwee Hoon Tan from the National University of Singapore.

Target population for which the instrument was developed? Any Relational Setting

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples? This model contains multiple theories, not studies.

Number of citations for the instrument 603

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

None noted

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

References (up to 5)

Anderson, S. E.. & Williams, L. J. (1996). Interpersonal, job and individual factors related to helping processes at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*, 282-296.

Bauer, T. N., & Green, S.G. (1996). The development of leader-member exchange: A longitudinal test. *Academy of Management Journal, 39*, 1538-1567.

Boyle, R.. & Bonacich, P. (1970). The development of trust and mistrust in mixed motive games. *Sociometry, 33*, 123-139.

Butler, J. K. (1991). Toward understanding and measuring conditions of trust: Evolution of a conditions of trust inventory. *Journal of Management, 17*, 643-663.

Cashman, D., Dansereau, F., Graen, G., & Haga, W. J. (1976). Organizational understructure and leadership: A longitudinal investigation of the managerial role-making process. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 15*, 278-296.

Further notes

Assessing the Servant Organization Development of the Servant Organizational Leadership Assessment (SOLA) Instrument.

Organizational Leadership Assessment by Laub (1999)

Purpose/focus of the instrument

This growing interest is fueled by many changes taking place in the workplace as well as in society at large. In the past 25 years we have seen a dramatic increase of women in the workplace, a growing ethnic and racial diversity and a desire to see the workplace serve as a learning environment for personal growth and fulfillment. These changes have found the traditional leadership model of power and authority to be lacking. This traditional model has held prominence since the beginning of time and our history is written around the use and abuse of leadership power.

Where is instrument found? The instrument is found in the following link:

<http://www.olagroup.net/Images/mmDocument/Laub%20Dissertation%20Complete%2099.pdf>

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.) The instrument is available online for free. The dissertation was submitted to the Graduate Faculty at Florida Atlantic University in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree.

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

See above. No cost

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

1999

Who developed the instrument, where?

James Alan Laub developed the instrument in Boca Raton, Florida.

For additional information concerning this project please contact Jim Laub at: 12253 Lacewood Lane, Wellington, FL 33414 (561) 642-0094

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

Servant leadership is a concept that is attracting a broader audience throughout all kinds of organizations today.

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

The experts were chosen based upon the fact that they had written on servant leadership or had taught at the university level on the subject. Fourteen experts completed all three parts of the Delphi out of the original 25 who were asked to participate. Fifteen originally agreed to participate but one dropped out after round one.

Number of citations for the instrument 564

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Although servant leadership has been written about and practiced by some in the past few years it has not been studied in a systematic manner. Greenleaf's (1977) writings were not based on research or even what he called conscious logic. They were based on a keen intuitive sense of people and their relationships within institutions. There also is a need to review what has been written since Greenleaf to determine what has been added to his work and can perhaps take us beyond his original ideas.

What *is* servant leadership?

What are the characteristics of servant leadership?

Can the presence of these characteristics within organizations and teams be assessed through a written instrument?

Assumptions The major assumptions of the study are:

That the characteristics of servant leadership can be identified and are observable in the context of organizational and team life. That a consensus of opinion of a group of experts is more valid than the thinking of one individual (Guglielmino, 1997) in determining the characteristics of servant leadership. That the experts in the Delphi study were complete and thorough in their responses to the questionnaires. That the participants in the field test of the instrument answered truthfully.

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated: N/A

References (up to 5)

Bass, B.M. (1981). *Stogdill's handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research*. New York: The Free Press.

Blanchard, K. (1995). *Servant leadership*. *Executive Excellence*, 12(10), 12.

Bogue, E.G. (1994). *Leadership by design: Strengthening integrity in higher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.

Bolman, L.G., & Deal, T.E. (1995). *Leading with soul: An uncommon journey of spirit*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Bornstein, S.M. & Smith, A.F. (1996). *The puzzles of leadership*. In Hesselbein, F., Goldsmith, M. & Beckhard, R. (Ed.) , *The leader of the future: New visions, strategies, and practices for the next era* (pp. 281-292). San Francisco: Jossey- Bass Inc. Publishers.

Further notes

<http://www.olagroup.net/Images/mmDocument/Laub%20Dissertation%20Complete%2099.pdf>

Leadership and Procedural Justice Climate as Antecedents of Unit-level Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Servant Leadership Scale *by* Ehrhart (2004)

Purpose/focus of the instrument: Despite an abundance of research conducted on organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) at the individual level of analysis, relatively little is known about unit-level OCB. Structural equation modeling techniques were used to test a model in which procedural justice climate was hypothesized to partially mediate the relationship between leadership behavior (servant-leadership) and unit-level OCB. Overall, the evidence generally supported the association of both servant-leadership and procedural justice climate with unit-level OCB. Building on the current study, a multilevel framework for the study of OCB is presented in conjunction with a discussion of future research directions in four specific areas.

Where is instrument found? The instrument can be found at the following link:

<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2004.tb02484.x/full>

It can also be found in the Personnel Psychology academic journal, Volume 57, Issue 1
Pages 61–94

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.) It is available online through the Wiley Online Library.

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author? The instrument can be accessed to rent for a purchase of \$6 and for purchase in pdf form for \$38.

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)? The instrument was developed and first published in March 2004 and published again in 2007.

Who developed the instrument, where? Mark G. Ehrhart of San Diego State University developed the instrument in their department of Psychology.

Address: Department of Psychology. San Diego State University, 5500 Campanile Drive, San Diego, CA, 92182–4611; mehrhart@sunstroke.sdsu.edu

Target population for which the instrument was developed? Work environment

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?: To investigate the antecedents of unit-level OCB, data were collected from employees of 249 grocery store departments. Models were tested using both employee ratings and manager ratings of unit-level OCB.

Number of citations for the instrument 775

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers: The results gave general support for the hypotheses, although there were some differences depending on the source of the OCB ratings (supervisor or subordinate), whether the type of department was controlled for, and whether a common method variance factor was included.

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated N/A

References (up to 5) N/A

Further notes

Scale Development and Construct Clarification of Servant Leadership

Servant Leadership Questionnaire Barbuto and Wheeler (2006)

Purpose/focus of the instrument:

This article presents an integrated construct of servant leadership derived from a review of the literature. Subscale items were developed to measure 11 potential dimensions of servant leadership: calling, listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, growth, and community building. Results produced five servant leadership factors—altruistic calling, emotional healing, persuasive mapping, wisdom, and organizational stewardship—with significant relations to transformational leadership, leader-member exchange, extra effort, satisfaction, and organizational effectiveness. Strong factor structures and good performance in all validity criteria indicate that the instrument offers value for future research.

Where is instrument found?

The instrument can be found at the following link:

http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1050&context=aglecfacpub&sei-redir=1&referer=https%3A%2F%2Fscholar.google.com%2Fscholar%3Fq%3DServant%2BLeadership%2BQuestionnaire%2BBarbuto%2Band%2BWheeler%2B%25282006%2529%26btnG%3D%26hl%3Den%26as_sdt%3D0%252C47#search=%22Servant%20Leadership%20Questionnaire%20Barbuto%20Wheeler%20%282006%29%22

Barbuto, John E. and Wheeler, Daniel W., "Scale Development and Construct Clarification of Servant Leadership" (2006). Faculty Publications: Agricultural Leadership, Education & Communication Department. Paper 51. <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/aglecfacpub/51>

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.):

The Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Agricultural Leadership, Education & Communication Department at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications: Agricultural Leadership, Education & Communication Department by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author? The instrument is free online. No cost

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

The article was published in 2006.

Who developed the instrument, where?

John E. Barbuto, Jr. is an associate professor of leadership in the Department of Agricultural Leadership, Education and Communication at the University of Nebraska– Lincoln. His research interests include work motivation, servant leadership, antecedents of leadership, and leadership education. jbarbuto@unlnotes.unl.edu

Daniel W. Wheeler is professor of leadership and head of the Department of Agricultural Leadership, Education and Communication at the University of Nebraska– Lincoln. His research interests include servant leadership, spirituality, organizational development, and faculty development. dwheeler1@unl.edu

Target population for which the instrument was developed? Servant Leaders

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples? Data from 80 leaders and 388 raters were used to test the internal consistency, confirmatory factor structure, and assess convergent, divergent, and predictive validity.

Number of citations for the instrument 755

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers:

One of the potential limitations of this study was in the sampling procedure used. Because data were collected from elected officials and their staffs, this sample cannot be classified as a probability sample. However, because the participant response rate was well more than 80% and the participating leaders serve communities of varied populations, we believe we have a good representation of elected leaders. We believe the advantage of sampling elected officials outweighs many of the inherent sampling challenges associated with this population— particularly for studying this construct. Generalization to the private sector may require additional field research.

There is a snowball effect in the sampling procedure because elected officials were asked to distribute materials to their staff to complete the rater versions of the questionnaires. This procedure takes away much of the randomness of the sample. However, elected officers were not asked to select individuals but rather to distribute questionnaires to all of their staff, thus limiting some of the potential bias in rater selection. An alternative strategy may have been to obtain a list of staff members for each elected official and then randomly distribute rater materials to complete and return to the researchers. It may be argued that having elected officials distribute the materials contributed to the high response rates obtained in this sampling procedure and signaled to raters a sincere desire for candid assessment to guide potential leadership development.

Another concern was the assumption of independent observations because multiple raters assessed each leader. Because leaders develop different leadership exchanges with each employee (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995), independent observations are not compromised using this procedure. Because our level of analysis was at the dyadic level, the procedures used were reasonable.

Objective measures of performance (as opposed to subjective ratings) would enhance the predictive validity of the work. In this study, performance was measured using a subjective response from leaders and raters. An objective measure, one that quantifies productivity or performance, would provide richness to the analysis. Also, multiple source methods may be incorporated to better control for response bias in the data. Because raters assessed leaders' servant leadership and their effectiveness, there is likely single method bias. This tends to inflate relationships because of the subjectivity of tests and may skew predictive validity. This concern is readily correctable in future studies by planning research designs to incorporate multiple methods.

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated: N/A

References (up to 5)

Akuchie, N. D. (1993). The servants and the superstars: An examination of servant leadership in light of Matthew 20: 20-28. *The Christian Education Journal*, 16, 39-43.

Avolio, B. J. (1999). *Full leadership development: Building the vital forces in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Avolio, B. J., & Locke, E. E. (2002). Philosophies of leader motivation: Altruism versus egoism. *Leadership Quarterly*, 13, 169-191.

Awamleh, R., & Gardner, W. L. (1999). Perceptions of leader charisma and effectiveness: The effects of vision content, delivery, and organizational performance. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10, 345-374.

Barbuto, J. E., & Wheeler, D. W. (2002). *Becoming a servant leader: Do you have what it takes?* NebGuide G02-1481-A. Lincoln: University of Nebraska, Nebraska Cooperative Extension.

Further notes

Servant leadership: Development of a multidimensional measure and multi-level assessment

Servant Leadership Scale Liden, Wayne, Zhao and Henderson (2008)

Purpose/focus of the instrument:

Servant leadership stresses personal integrity and serving others, including employees, customers, and communities. This article focuses on a servant leadership measure that was created by identifying 9 dimensions. The results suggest that servant leadership is a multidimensional construct and at the individual level makes a unique contribution beyond transformational leadership and LMX in explaining community citizenship behaviors, in-role performance, and organizational commitment. No between-leader (group-level) differences were found in the outcomes variables.

Where is instrument found?

The instrument is available at the following link:

https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Robert_Liden/publication/222086542_Servant_Leadership_Development_of_a_Multidimensional_Measure_and_Multi-level_Assessment/links/543e7d040cf2e76f02228169.pdf

It is also accessible in *The Leadership Quarterly*. Volume 19, Issue 2, Pages 161-177

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.) The instrument is available online in pdf form.

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author? The instrument is available for free online. No cost

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)? The instrument was developed in 2008.

Who developed the instrument, where? : Liden, Wayne, Zhao and Henderson

Target population for which the instrument was developed?: Servant Leaders

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?: Relevant items were then developed and subjected to factor analysis with a sample of 298 students, resulting in a 7-factor solution. Using an organizational sample of 182 individuals, we verified this 7-factor model with confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). We further validated our 28-item servant leadership scale by regressing outcomes on the servant leadership dimensions,

controlling for transformational leadership and leader–member exchange (LMX) in a multi-level hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) analysis.

Number of citations for the instrument: 651

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers: One limitation of the study was its cross-sectional design, which compromised the causal inference of the detected relationships. A second limitation was the low power available for detecting group-level effects. Some group-level effects approached standard significance levels, suggesting that, with a larger sample of groups and a larger sample of employees within groups, effects existing in the population might be detected. Additionally, the common organizational membership of the supervisors examined in this study may have constrained between-group differences in some servant leadership behaviors. Also, both phases of the research study were conducted with U.S. samples, leading to the suggestions that future research using our servant leadership scale be conducted across differing types of organizations and cultures.

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated: N/A

References (up to 5):

- Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., & Jung, D. I. (1995). Multifactor leadership questionnaire technical report. Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden.
- Barbuto, J., & Wheeler, D. (2006). Scale development and construct clarification of servant leadership. *Group & Organization Management*, 31, 300–326.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1997). Does the transactional–transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries? *American Psychologist*, 52, 130–139.
- Bass, B. M., & Steidlmeier, P. (1999). Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership behavior. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10, 181–217.

Further notes

Defining and Measuring Servant Leadership Behaviour in Organizations

Servant Leadership Behavior Scale Sendjaya, Sarros and Santora (2008)

Purpose/focus of the instrument: This paper examines the development and initial validation of a multidimensional measure of servant leadership behaviour (Servant Leadership Behaviour

Scale). The resultant servant leadership model is characterized by its service orientation, holistic outlook, and moral-spiritual emphasis, thereby extending current models of servant leadership and existing works on contemporary leadership approaches. Theoretical contributions, practical implications, and future research directions are discussed in the concluding section of the paper.

Where is instrument found?

The instrument can be found at the following link:

https://www.researchgate.net/profile/James_Sarros/publication/4913979_Defining_and_Measuring_Servant_Leadership_Behaviour_in_Organizations/links/0912f51380dc290148000000/Defining-and-Measuring-Servant-Leadership-Behaviour-in-Organizations.pdf

It can also be found in the Wiley Online Library within the Journal of Management Studies. Volume 45, Issue 2. Pages 402-424

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)

The article is available online through the Wiley Online Library.

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author? The

Article is available online for free in pdf form. No cost

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

The article was published March 2008.

Who developed the instrument, where?: The article was authored by Sen Sendjaya, James C. Sarros and Joseph C. Santora from Monash University, Clayton, Australia; Monash University, Clayton, Australia; Thomas Edison State College, Trenton, NJ, USA

Target population for which the instrument was developed?: Servant Leadership

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?: Both qualitative and quantitative studies are reported to establish preliminary psychometric properties for the new 35-item, six-dimension measure.

Number of citations for the instrument: 423

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers: N/A

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated: N/A

References (up to 5)

Alimo-Metcalfe, B. and Alban-Metcalfe, R. J. (2001). 'The development of a new Transformational Leadership Questionnaire'. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 74, 1–27.

Anastasi, A. and Urbina, S. (1997). *Psychological Testing*, 7th edition. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Anderson, J. C. and Gerbing, D. W. (1982). 'Some methods of respecifying measurement models to obtain unidimensional construct measurement'. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 19, 453–60.

Anderson, J. C. and Gerbing, D. W. (1988). 'Structural equation modeling in practice: a review and recommended two-step approach'. *Psychological Bulletin*, 103, 411–23.

Autry, J. A. (2001). *The Servant Leader*. Roseville, CA: Prima.

Further notes

Servant Leadership Survey Development and Validation of a Multidimensional Measure

van Dierendonck and Nuijten (2011)

Purpose/focus of the instrument: The purpose of this paper is to describe the development and validation of a multi-dimensional instrument to measure servant leadership.

The aim of this article is to describe the development of a valid and reliable instrument that measures servant leadership in all its complexity, that is behaviorally oriented, focuses on the role of the leader in the relationship with followers, and which is easy to use. Despite previous attempts to construct a valid and reliable instrument, there still is a need for a concise scale representing the essential characteristics of servant leadership within a multi-dimensional framework directly linked to Greenleaf's ideas. At the moment, there is no generally agreed upon definition of what servant leadership is in terms of leader behavior. That is an important reason why different measures exist. It should be acknowledged that no single measure can fully capture and operationalise complicated constructs—like servant leadership—and that it may be sensible to have a broader range of instruments available (Leary and Hoyle 2009).

Where is instrument found?: The instrument can be found on the following link:

<http://eds.b.ebscohost.com/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=235cd460-7dbf-4ec1-b94d-17f4a2bf329d%40sessionmgr120&vid=0&hid=122>

Journal of Business and Psychology
September 2011, Volume 26, Issue 3, pp 249–267

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.): It is available online for free with open access.

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?: See above. No cost

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?:
The instrument was published online for the first time September 3, 2010.

Who developed the instrument, where?: Dirk van Dierendonck and Inge Nuijten developed the instrument at Rotterdam School of Management, and Erasmus University Rotterdam in the Netherlands

Target population for which the instrument was developed?: Servant Leaders

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?: To study the content validity of the SLS it is compared to two other measures of servant leadership, a one-dimensional measure (Ehrhart [2004](#)) and a multi-dimensional measure (Liden et al. [2008](#)). Given that all three measures focus on servant leadership, considerable overlap is to be expected, indicating convergent validity. However, we expect some discriminant validity as well, because the SLS covers essential aspects of servant leadership that other scales have neglected.

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?: The composite sample of this study consisted of four samples, including 668 persons from the Netherlands.

Number of citations for the instrument: 246

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers: N/A

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated: N/A

References (up to 5):

Autry, J. A. (2004). *The servant leader: How to build a creative team, develop great morale, and improve bottom-line performance*. New York: Three Rivers Press.[Google Scholar](#)

Barbuto, J. E., Jr., & Wheeler, D. W. (2006). Scale development and construct clarification of servant leadership. *Group & Organization Management*, 31, 300–326.[CrossRefGoogle Scholar](#)

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.[Google Scholar](#)

Bass, B. M., Avolio, B. J., Jung, D. I., & Berson, Y. (2003). Predicting unit performance by assessing transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 207–218.[PubMedCrossRefGoogle Scholar](#)

Block, P. (1993). *Stewardship: Choosing service over self-interest*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.[Google Scholar](#)

Further notes

Servant Leadership: A Quantitative Review of Instruments and Related Findings

Mark T. Green, Our Lady of the Lake University

Richard A. Rodriguez, Lone Star College

Carol A. Wheeler, Our Lady of the Lake University

Barbara Baggerly-Hinojosa, Our Lady of the Lake University

Abstract

Although Robert K. Greenleaf's servant leadership philosophy is almost 35 years old, only in the past decade have validated instruments been developed and described in peer-reviewed literature. This article provides a review of six instruments that measure constructs related to servant leadership, and summarizes 84 statistical results from 20 quantitative, peer-reviewed studies.

Servant Organizational Leadership Assessment (SOLA) Instrument.

Organizational Leadership Assessment by Laub (1999)

Purpose/focus of the instrument: The purpose of this study is to collect, from the literature and a panel of experts, an agreed-upon list of the characteristics of servant leadership, and to develop an instrument for assessing the level at which leaders and workers perceive that these characteristics are displayed in their organizations or teams.

Where is instrument found? : The instrument can be found through the following link:

<http://www.olagroup.net/Images/mmDocument/Laub%20Dissertation%20Complete%2099.pdf>

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.): The instrument is available online for free in pdf form.

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?:

Research Acquisition: As of 2015, researchers interested in using the *Organizational Leadership Assessment* should contact Dr. Laub at the OLA Group. No cost

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?:

See below.

Who developed the instrument, where?: James Alan Laub submitted a Dissertation to the Graduate Faculty at Florida Atlantic University in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree in 1999.

Target population for which the instrument was developed?: Servant Leaders

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?:

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?: In addition to the collection of servant leadership characteristics from the literature, this study involved both a Delphi survey and the development of the Servant Organizational Leadership Assessment (SOLA) instrument.

Number of citations for the instrument:

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers: Noted on page 120 of the article.

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated: N/A

References (up to 5) :

Bass, B.M. (1981). *Stogdill's handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research*. New York: The Free Press. Blanchard, K. (1995). Servant leadership. *Executive Excellence*, 12(10), 12. Bogue, E.G. (1994). *Leadership by design: Strengthening integrity in higher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc. Bolman, L.G., & Deal, T.E. (1995). *Leading with soul: An uncommon journey of spirit*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers. Bornstein, S.M. & Smith, A.F. (1996). The puzzles of leadership. In Hesselbein, F., Goldsmith, M. & Beckhard, R. (Ed.), *The leader of the future: New visions, strategies, and practices for the next era* (pp. 281-292). San Francisco: JosseyBass Inc. Publishers.

Further notes

The *Organizational Leadership Assessment* indicates that it measures six aspects of servant leadership, as shown in Table 4.

Table 4. Dimensions Measured by the Organizational Leadership Assessment.

Laub (1999)	
Valuing people	Believing in people Serving other's needs before his or her own Receptive, non-judgmental listening
Developing people	Providing opportunities for learning and growth Modeling appropriate behavior Building up others through encouragement and affirmation
Building community	Building strong personal relationships Working collaboratively with others Valuing the differences of others
Displaying authenticity	Being open and accountable to others A willingness to learn from others Maintaining integrity and trust
Providing leadership	Envisioning the future Taking initiative Clarifying goals
Sharing leadership	Facilitating a shared vision Sharing power and releasing control Sharing status and promoting others

Development

Laub (1999) developed the *Organizational Leadership Assessment* as part of his doctoral dissertation. First, he developed a pool of questions based on his review of the literature on servant leadership. In order to bolster his question bank, Laub recruited between 14 and 25

servant leadership experts to participate in a three step *Delphi* process. After the third iteration of the *Delphi* process, the *Organizational Leadership Assessment* contained 80 items. Those items were field tested with 828 participants, and a series of exploratory factor analyses (EFAs) were conducted. Laub found that 27 items loaded on one component (organizational assessment), and 53 items loaded on another component (leadership assessment). After the EFAs, the instrument was reduced to 60 questions in order to decrease the time it took to complete the instrument. Laub reported Cronbach Alpha scores for each subscale in the range of .90 to .93.

Servant Leadership Questionnaire

Servant Leadership Questionnaire Barbuto and Wheeler (2006)

Purpose/focus of the instrument: This article presents an integrated construct of servant leadership derived from a review of the literature. Subscale items were developed to measure 11 potential dimensions of servant leadership: calling, listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, growth, and community building. Data from 80 leaders and 388 raters were used to test the internal consistency, confirm factor structure, and assess convergent, divergent, and predictive validity. Results produced five servant leadership factors—altruistic calling, emotional healing, persuasive mapping, wisdom, and organizational stewardship—with significant relations to transformational leadership, leader-member exchange, extra effort, satisfaction, and organizational effectiveness. Strong factor structures and good performance in all validity criteria indicate that the instrument offers value for future research.

Where is instrument found?: The instrument can be found on the following link:

<http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/1059601106287091>

Group & Organization Management, Vol. 31 No. 3, June 2006 300-326 DOI:
10.1177/1059601106287091

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.): The instrument is available online.

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?: The content is free in pdf form. No cost

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?
The instrument was published in 2006.

Who developed the instrument, where?: John E. Barbuto, Jr and Daniel W. Wheeler from the University of Nebraska–Lincoln.

Target population for which the instrument was developed?: Servant Leaders

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?: To ascertain the face validity of items and identify poorly written or vague items, a panel of 11 expert judges, consisting of 6 leadership faculty from three universities and 5 advanced leadership doctoral students from one university, performed a priori analysis. Items categorized into 1 of the 11 servant leadership characteristics 60% of the time (7 of 11 judges) were retained (Hinkin & Schriesheim, 1989; Revelle & Rocklin, 1979). Four of the initial 56 items that failed to meet this criterion were rewritten. A final panel of 5 judges (all faculty) reviewed the revised 56 items and correctly categorized all items greater than 80% (4 out of 5 judges) of the time, indicating face validity of the 56 subscale items.

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?: Data were collected from an intact group of elected officials as part of a full-day leadership training seminar for members of an association that sponsors annual professional development programs for its members. The sample is appropriate for studying servant leadership because the role of these elected officials was to serve their communities in public office. Participants filled out the self-report version of the servant leadership instrument 4 weeks prior to the workshop and the self-report version of the multi-leadership behavior questionnaire (MLQ) at the workshop. Each participant was asked to solicit between four and six raters to complete a similar battery of instruments, consisting of the rater version of the servant leadership instrument, the rater version of the MLQ, and the rater version of the LMX-7. Responses to the MLQ and LMX-7 measures were collected to assess the convergent validity between similar constructs.

Number of citations for the instrument: 758

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers:

One of the potential limitations of this study was in the sampling procedure used. Because data were collected from elected officials and their staffs, this sample cannot be classified as a probability sample. However, because the participant response rate was well more than 80% and the participating leaders serve communities of varied populations, we believe we have a good representation of elected leaders. We believe the advantage of sampling elected officials outweighs many of the inherent sampling challenges associated with this population—particularly for studying this construct. Generalization to the private sector may require additional field research. There is a snowball effect in the sampling procedure because elected officials were asked to distribute materials to their staff to complete the rater versions of the questionnaires. This procedure takes away much of the randomness of the sample. However, elected officers were not asked to select individuals but rather to distribute questionnaires to all of their staff, thus limiting some of the potential bias in rater selection. An alternative strategy may have been to obtain a list of staff members for each elected official and then randomly distribute rater materials to complete and return to the researchers. It may be argued that having elected officials distribute the materials contributed to the high response rates obtained in this sampling procedure and signaled to raters a sincere desire for candid assessment to guide potential leadership development. Another concern was the assumption of independent observations because multiple raters assessed each leader. Because leaders develop different leadership exchanges with each employee (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995), independent observations are not compromised using this procedure. Because our level of analysis was at the dyadic level, the procedures used were reasonable. Objective measures of performance (as opposed to

subjective ratings) would enhance the predictive validity of the work. In this study, performance was measured using a subjective response from leaders and raters. An objective measure, one that quantifies productivity or performance, would provide richness to the analysis. Also, multiple source methods may be incorporated to better control for response bias in the data. Because raters assessed leaders' servant leadership and their effectiveness, there is likely single method bias. This tends to inflate relationships because of the subjectivity of tests and may skew predictive validity. This concern is readily correctable in future studies by planning research designs to incorporate multiple methods.

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated: N/A

References (up to 5):

Akuchie, N. D. (1993). The servants and the superstars: An examination of servant leadership in light of Matthew 20: 20-28. *The Christian Education Journal*, 16, 39-43.

Avolio, B. J. (1999). *Full leadership development: Building the vital forces in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Avolio, B. J., & Locke, E. E. (2002). Philosophies of leader motivation: Altruism versus egoism. *Leadership Quarterly*, 13, 169-191.

Awamleh, R., & Gardner, W. L. (1999). Perceptions of leader charisma and effectiveness: The effects of vision content, delivery, and organizational performance. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10, 345-374.

Barbuto, J. E., & Wheeler, D. W. (2002). *Becoming a servant leader: Do you have what it takes?* NebGuide G02-1481-A. Lincoln: University of Nebraska, Nebraska Cooperative Extension.

Further notes:

Servant leadership: Development of a multidimensional measure and multi-level assessment

Servant Leadership Scale Liden, Wayne, Zhao and Henderson (2008)

Name of the instrument

Purpose/focus of the instrument

Where is instrument found?

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

Who developed the instrument, where?

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?
Number of citations for the instrument
Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers
Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated
References (up to 5)
Further notes

Servant Leadership Behavior Scale

Sendjaya Sarros and Santora (2008)

Name of the instrument

Purpose/focus of the instrument

Where is instrument found?

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

Who developed the instrument, where?

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Number of citations for the instrument

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

References (up to 5)

Further notes

Servant Leadership Survey (SLS)

by van Dierendonck and Nuijten (2011)

Purpose/focus of the instrument: The purpose of this paper is to describe the development and validation of a multi-dimensional instrument to measure servant leadership.

Where is instrument found?: The instrument can be found through the following link:

<http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10869-010-9194-1>

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.): The instrument is available online through the Journal of Business and Psychology.

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?:

The instrument is available for free non-commercial use: “Copyright 2010 by Van Dierendonck and Nuijten. The Servant Leadership Survey may freely be used for scientific purposes. Item numbers in the table refer to the items placed in the survey.” For commercial use, please contact the authors. The instrument is available in Table 1 of the online seminal article: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3152712/table/Tab1/>. It has 30 items. All the items are structured beginning with “My manager...”, for example “My manager learns from criticism.”

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?:
The instrument was developed in September 2010.

Who developed the instrument, where?: Dirk van Dierendonck and Inge Nuijten in the Netherlands.

Target population for which the instrument was developed?: Servant Leaders

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?:

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?:

A composite sample was used by combining the eight samples used in the four studies of Phase 1. This composite sample consisted of 1571 persons, 1187 filled out the Dutch version and 384 filled out the English version. Different concepts were measured in each of the samples, all on a six-point Likert scale, except for the scale by Liden et al. (2008) that used a seven-point Likert scale.

Number of citations for the instrument: 246

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers:

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated: This measure was also validated in a 3-country Spanish-speaking version (<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26055345>).

References (up to 5):

Autry, J. A. (2004). *The servant leader: How to build a creative team, develop great morale, and improve bottom-line performance*. New York: Three Rivers Press. [Google Scholar](#)

Barbuto, J. E., Jr., & Wheeler, D. W. (2006). Scale development and construct clarification of servant leadership. *Group & Organization Management*, 31, 300–326. [CrossRef](#) [Google Scholar](#)

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press. [Google Scholar](#)

Bass, B. M., Avolio, B. J., Jung, D. I., & Berson, Y. (2003). Predicting unit performance by assessing transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 207–218. [PubMedCrossRefGoogle Scholar](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/152712/)

Further notes:

The following description is from the seminal article, available on open access at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3152712/>

The SLS primarily focuses on the leader–follower relationship measured from the perspective of the follower. Our aim was that it should (1) cover the essential aspects of servant leadership, (2) be easy to apply, and (3) be psychometrically valid and reliable.

Design/Methodology/Approach:

Based on an extensive literature review and expert judgment, 99 items were formulated. In three steps, using eight samples totaling 1571 persons from The Netherlands and the UK with a diverse occupational background, a combined exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis approach was used. This was followed by an analysis of the criterion-related validity.

Findings:

The final result is an eight-dimensional measure of 30 items: the eight dimensions being: standing back, forgiveness, courage, empowerment, accountability, authenticity, humility, and stewardship. The internal consistency of the subscales is good. The results show that the Servant Leadership Survey (SLS) has convergent validity with other leadership measures, and also adds unique elements to the leadership field. Evidence for criterion-related validity came from studies relating the eight dimensions to well-being and performance.

Implications:

With this survey, a valid and reliable instrument to measure the essential elements of servant leadership has been introduced.

Originality/Value:

The SLS is the first measure where the underlying factor structure was developed and confirmed across several field studies in two countries. It can be used in future studies to test the underlying premises of servant leadership theory. The SLS provides a clear picture of the key servant leadership qualities and shows where improvements can be made on the individual and organizational level; as such, it may also offer a valuable starting point for training and leadership development.

Keywords: Servant leadership, Measurement development, Positive organizational behavior, Empowerment, Humility.

Rodríguez-Carvajal R, de Rivas S, Herrero M, Moreno-Jiménez B, van Dierendonck D. (2014). Leading people positively: cross-cultural validation of the Servant Leadership Survey (SLS). *Span J Psychol*. 2014 Oct 24;17:E63. doi: 10.1017/sjp.2014.73.

Socially Responsible Leadership Scale (Tyree, 1988)

Purpose/focus of the instrument

Where is instrument found?

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

Who developed the instrument, where?

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Number of citations for the instrument

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

References (up to 5)

Further notes

Strategic Leadership Development Inventory

(SLDI, taken from paper by Hatfield, 1997, which is in this Library)

Name of the instrument

A robust study done in the 1970's by the U.S. Army Research Institute, the U.S. Army War College, and the Industrial Collage of the Armed Forces formed the basis of the Strategic Leader Develop Inventory (SLDI). This study further codified elements of leadership that are unique to the strategic level. The Army War College imbeds these principles in the Strategic Leadership Primer, a key document used at the Army War College, and amongst senior leaders throughout the government to discern strategic level competencies. However, many of the traits in the latest edition of this manual's comprehensive list are universal to all leaders, as are those lists in previously mentioned field manuals. They apply at all levels of leadership. A few traits, however, are truly linked to strategic leaders and their required and unique competencies. This is not to say operational and tactical leaders have limits on their leadership, but that in general, these characteristics separate strategic leaders from others.

The SLDI was developed by T. Owens Jacobs. Original questions were developed by surveying general officers and senior defense civilians to identify key job requirements and skills they believed to be critical to success at senior leadership domains. Additional questions were developed through surveying USAWC students asking them to identify strengths and weaknesses they felt were critical to the effectiveness of senior leaders they had observed. Further refinement occurred over a six year period as additional surveys were conducted on 1200 USAWC students, their supervisors, peers, and subordinates. The information from these sources was developed into the current tool that assesses characteristics found to be most important in leadership effectiveness. For convenience the characteristics are grouped into the three broad skills and attribute areas of *conceptual skills and attributes*, *positive attributes*, and *negative attributes*.... The SLDI provides a comparative view of an individual's strengths and weaknesses by combining a self assessment

with an independent assessment from peers and supervisors. Such an assessment provides the advantage of identifying areas for future growth that may not have otherwise been apparent.

Azimuth (Leader Azimuth II) was developed based on the SLDI; see Azimuth in this listing.

Purpose/focus of the instrument

Where is instrument found?

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

Unable to locate the inventory online or any information about how to obtain the instrument.

Who developed the instrument, where?

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Number of citations for the instrument

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

References (up to 5)

Further notes

Tacit Knowledge for Measuring Leadership (a scenario-based tool)

Purpose/focus of the instrument

The review of this tool below comes from Zaccaro et al. (1999). The tool was developed specifically for measuring experience-obtained knowledge by platoon, company, and battalion commanders in the Army. What is interesting is that the technique they cover for instrument development could to be applied in any type of leadership situation/organization. It appears that categories of leadership are developed regarding personal, interpersonal, and organization management/leadership. These are each provided a scenario with a problem. Then 5 to 20 responses are provided for each scenario. Experts are used to determine the baseline “best” responses to each scenario. Later, leaders taking the test are compared against the expert baseline. What is not clear is how the original categories were developed and whether they are linked in any way to theory.

This instrument seems to be somewhere in between a selective response instrument (selective includes multiple choice and Likert) and a constructive response instrument (constructive includes ratings, performance reviews, writing an essay about a concept/process/procedure/case study, etc.). This is because the test taker selects multiple choice responses, but based on experiential scenarios with responses made by others across a spectrum. Actually, I have lots of questions about how to develop such an instrument, and while it appears useful as a different

way of measurement, I will stop here because I have not explored this enough to provide you more information. However, it is clear that it falls far short of open ended performance-review type questions (How would you manage this crisis?), which are more heavily dependent upon raters.

Description: The Tacit Knowledge for Military Leadership instrument is a measure that assesses military leader tacit knowledge. Tacit knowledge can be described as action-oriented, practical knowledge that can be acquired on one's own through personal experience rather than instruction. Tacit knowledge in military leadership consists of many dimensions, but three have been investigated extensively. The three dimensions are 1) interpersonal tacit knowledge which requires the leader to manage him/herself in terms of organizing one's own self, managing time and priorities, seeking challenges and control, and taking responsibility; 2) interpersonal tacit knowledge which requires the leader to influence and control others, support and cooperate with others, and learn from others; and 3) organizational tacit knowledge which requires the leader to solve organizational problems.

The TKML consists of several work-related situational items with five to twenty responses. Each situation poses problems, and the participant indicates how he or she would solve it by rating the responses. The difference between the respondents' set of ratings from the standard of experts' ratings for all of the situations is the individual's measure of his or her tacit knowledge. The TKML instruments have been designed for use on battalion commanders, company commanders and platoon leaders. The dimensions of tacit knowledge for the battalion commander include: communicating a vision, establishing a climate for development, managing the leader and the subordinate, providing constancy, and using influence tactics. The dimensions of tacit knowledge for the company commander include: caring for soldiers through task completion, prioritizing and solving problems, proactive decision making, assessing risk, and short term decision making. The dimensions of tacit knowledge for the platoon leader are: acquiring confidence in interpersonal skills, defining leadership style, taking a stand, and taking a fostering accountability.

Where is instrument found?

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

Who developed the instrument, where?

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

Application: The TKML may be useful in development of officer training. Additionally, the TKML may be used as part of a selection battery for military leaders. Because the TKML is a self-assessment tool, it should only be completed by the leader.

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

Reliability: TKML items were developed by conducting interviews with active duty Army officers. Tacit knowledge contained in the interview summaries was identified and coded by two researchers. Interrater reliability was 73%. The summaries were then reviewed by three senior military members to achieve content consensus (Hedlund, Horvath, Forsythe, Snooks, & Williams, 1998).

Validity: Tacit knowledge has been found to increase with experience. The TKML was found to discriminate experienced individuals from those who are not experienced. Testing of the TKML demonstrated that experienced leaders displayed higher levels of tacit knowledge than novice leaders. A discriminant analysis provided support that experienced and novice leaders responded differently to the TKML items. Canonical correlation coefficients were $R=.73$, $p<.05$; $R=.72$, $p<.05$; $R=.55$, $p<.05$ for battalion commanders, company commanders, and platoon leaders, respectively (Hedlund, et al., 1998). Criterion-related validity was also found for the TKML. The instrument correlated .3 to .5 with job performance measures.

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Number of citations for the instrument

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Limitations: More conclusive evidence of the generalizability is needed for the TKML. Additionally, further research on the construct and criterion-related validity is necessary which is in progress.

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

References (up to 5)

References* and Suggested Readings

Hedlund, J., Horvath, J. A., Forsythe, G. B., Snook, S., Williams, W. M. (1998). Tacit knowledge in military leadership: Evidence of construct validity (Tech. Rep. No. 1080) Alexandria, VA: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences. (AD A343 446).

Hedlund, J., Williams, W. M., Horvath, J. A., Forsythe, G. B., Snook, S., WattendorfJ., McNally, J. A., Sweeney, P. J., Bullis, R. C., & Dennis, R. C., Steinberg, R, J. (1998). Tacit knowledge for military leaders: Company commander questionnaire (Research Product 99-09). Alexandria, VA: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.

Hedlund, J., Williams, W. M., Horvath, J. A., Forsythe, G. B., Snook, S., WattendorfJ., McNally, J. A., Sweeney, P. J., Bullis, R. C., & Dennis, R. C., Steinberg, R, J. (1998). Tacit knowledge for military leaders: Platoon leader questionnaire (Research Product. 99-07). Alexandria, VA: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences. (AD A362 347)

Horvath, J. A., Hedlund, J., Snook, S., Forsyth, G. B., Sternberg, R. J. (1998). Tacit knowledge in military leadership: Some research products and their applications to leadership development (Tech. Rep. No. 1081). Alexandria, VA: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences. AD A344 857)

Hovarth, J. A., Sternberg, , R. J., Forsythe, G. B., Sweeney, P. J., & Bullis, R. C. (1996). Tacit knowledge in military leadership: supporting instrument development (Tech. Rep.

No. 1042). Alexandria, VA: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.

Horvath, J. A., Williams, W. M., Forsyth, G. B., Sweeney, P. J., & Sternberg, R. J. (1994). Tacit knowledge in military leadership: A review of the literature (Tech. Rep. No. 1017). Alexandria, VA: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.

Legree, P. J. (1993). The effect of response format on reliability estimates for tacit knowledge scales (Tech Rep. No. 94-25). Alexandria, VA: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences. (AD A283 547).

Steinberg, R. J. (1997). Successful intelligence. New York: Plume.

Sternberg, R. J., & Wagner, R. K. (1991). Promoting individual and organizational productivity through practice intelligence: The role of tacit knowledge in personal and organizational effectiveness (Research Note 91-52). Alexandria, VA: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences. (AD A238 086)

Further notes

Source: Psotka, J., TAPC-ARI-RP , 5001 Eisenhower Ave, Alexandria, VA 22333-5600, Phone: 703-617-5572, email: jpsotka@ari.army.mil

Team Assessments

Purpose/focus of the instrument

—by Joe Baker, from <http://www.people-results.com/leadership-team-assessments/> FROM A COMMERCIAL WEBSITE:

Shadowmatch – Want a fresh and sophisticated approach to understanding your team’s cultural dynamics and how to improve group and individual performance? The Shadowmatch Behavioral Benchmarking System does this and much more. It came from extensive research born out of a desire to work effectively across government, business, education and religious sectors, along with ethnic groups, in post-apartheid South Africa. Now it’s highly regarded and used by several well-known global businesses and organizations. Unique features include measures across 19 behavior habits (e.g., resilience and responsiveness), task efficiency and conceptual application scores, an attitude result and a timed assessment experience that incorporates problem-solving and “real-life” scenarios.

A person’s responses feed a complex artificial intelligence system that assesses the behavioral patterns the individual demonstrated while working through the assessment instead of merely asking them about their preferences. Once all individuals’ results are completed, a team benchmark is established that can be used for assessing and improving team dynamics and flagging individual development opportunities. It has other uses, too, such as developing recruiting profiles and making staffing decisions. Interactive technology on the back-end allows a facilitator to show and adjust the comparison of team and individuals’ results while the team watches. It’s a very cool tool.

Five Behaviors of a Cohesive Team – Patrick Lencioni struck a chord with millions when he wrote *The Five Dysfunctions of a Team*, one of the best-selling business books

of all time. He teamed with Wiley publishers recently to develop an on-line teaming assessment – The Five Behaviors of a Cohesive Team – that not only leverages the best of the book but also integrates Everything DiSC style components. When taking this assessment, individuals answer the core Everything DiSC questions to reveal their behavior style preferences, and then they answer questions about their team. It's powerful.

Although people receive individual results, this assessment is designed to be discussed in the context of a team situation where they review individual and team results together. Team results on each of the five behaviors are rated red, yellow and green to direct attention to where the team should focus. The results suggest practical tips and exercises for building each of the five behaviors (trust, conflict, commitment, accountability and results), drawing from DiSC results and dynamics present on the team.

All these assessments (and many others I did not include here) are great and the results reports are easy to understand and actionable.

To get the most value from any assessment, leverage a trained coach or facilitator, who is skilled and knowledgeable with the assessment and with leadership and team development. For more tips on using (or not using) assessments, see [Don't Waste your Organization's Time and Money on Assessments](#) or feel free to contact me.

Where is instrument found?

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

Who developed the instrument, where?

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Number of citations for the instrument

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

References (up to 5)

Further notes

Team Leadership Survey

– by Hill, based on Hill's Team Leadership Model

Name of the instrument

Purpose/focus of the instrument

Where is instrument found?

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

Who developed the instrument, where?

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Number of citations for the instrument

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

References (up to 5)

Further notes

Team Effectiveness Survey (Hall)

Purpose/focus of the instrument

This information comes from the Zaccaro et al. 1999 article. It is not clear whether this survey tool has continued to be used or not, nor whether there are more recent articles to verify validity. While the focus is on “team” there are certainly ways that leaders can be involved – for example, to compare teams of different leaders, to help leaders identify strengths and weaknesses of their teams, and to focus on leadership elements within the team.

Description: The Team Effectiveness Survey (TES) is a measure designed to assess process issues associated with team dynamics. Specifically, the TES assesses team functioning and identifies individuals who are primarily responsible for the team's style of functioning. It is based on the assumption that team effectiveness will improve as team members understand more about their own interactional tendencies and discuss these tendencies with team members. The TES measures individual and team scores of exposure (the tendency to engage in open expressions of one's own feeling and knowledge) and feedback (the tendency to solicit information from others about their feelings and knowledge). These two dimensions are proposed to influence the effectiveness of communication and problem solving. Exposure and feedback scores identify four types of individuals and/or teams:

Type A - low feedback and low exposure;

Type B - high feedback and low exposure;

Type C - low feedback and high exposure; and

Type D - high feedback and high exposure.

These profiles serve as immediate feedback to confirm or deny self-ratings and furnish an overview of team functioning. The TES also measures supportive and defensive climates. High defensive climate scores and low supportive climate scores indicate that the individual has a constraining effect on the team and fosters a lack of trust among team members. Conversely, high supportive climate scores and low defensive scores indicate that the individual works well with the team and encourages feelings of well-being. Both individual and team scores are calculated with the TES. Each team member will have a score on the four dimensions (exposure, feedback, defensive climate, and supportive climate) and a group average for each dimension.

Where is instrument found?

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

Who developed the instrument, where?

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

Application:* The TES can be used for team building, training and development, or developmental purposes. It is designed to evaluate individual team members' teamwork practices. This information can be used to help improve team functioning and communication. The TES should be completed by team members themselves.

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

Reliability: Interjudge reliability has been established as .68 (Hall, 1996).

Validity: No construct or criterion-related validity studies have been reported. Therefore, the TES is suitable only for concept training and as a stimulus to team discussion (Hall, 1996).

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Number of citations for the instrument

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Limitations: Concern has been expressed toward the construct validity of the TES. For example, it is proposed that exposure and feedback are not independent constructs. There is no evidence of the empirical validity of the scores and inferences of team or individual effectiveness.

Researchers need to demonstrate that the instrument does indeed measure team effectiveness before adopting this instrument.

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

References (up to 5)

Hall, J. (1996). Team Effectiveness Survey: An assessment of process issues which characterize the inter workings of the team. The Woodlands, TX: Teleometrics International.

Further notes

Source: Teleometrics International Inc., 755 Woodstead Ct. Spring, TX 77380. Phone: (281) 367-0060

Toxic Leadership Scale

Purpose/focus of the instrument

The Toxic Leadership Scale was developed in order to better study behaviors that make effective leaders. This scale can be used with both qualitative and quantitative methodologies and is different from other leadership constructs or scales in that it can significantly predict employee outcomes such as job satisfaction and satisfaction with the supervisor.

Where is instrument found?

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author? No cost
Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?
Who developed the instrument, where?

Author [Andrew Alexander Schmidt](#) (2008)

To Access this Instrument [Toxic Leadership Scale](#)

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

This instrument is reliable, each of the five scales has high reliability (Abusive Supervision: $\alpha=0.93$, Authoritarian Leadership: $\alpha=0.89$, Narcissism: $\alpha=0.88$, Self-Promotion: $\alpha=0.91$, Unpredictable Leadership: $\alpha=0.92$).

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Number of citations for the instrument

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

References (up to 5)

Dissertations that have used the Toxic Leadership Scale Instrument

Leet, Edward. (March 2011). *The Impact Toxic or Severe Dysfunctional Leadership has on the Effectiveness of an Organization*. (Murdoch University).

Reference

Schmidt, Andrew Alexander. (2008). *Development and Validation of the Toxic Leadership Scale*. (University of Maryland, College Park).

Further notes

Source: <http://www.statisticssolutions.com/leadership/>

Transformational Leader Inventory

Purpose/focus of the instrument

Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter (1990).

The info below is taken from Thurrell (2010)

Thurrell rated instruments that targeted middle and low level leadership development (in a military org.), using the full-range leadership model of Bass/Avolio, and rated several instruments (including this one)

Where is instrument found?

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)
Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?
Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?
Who developed the instrument, where?

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

Thurrell rated instruments that targeted middle and low level leadership development (in a military org.), using the full-range leadership model of Bass/Avolio, and rated several instruments (including this one) according to a facet rating system that looked at reliability and validity issues. The Bass MLQ, LPI of Posner and Kouzes, Conger and Kanungo, Podsakoff, and Behling were the highest at 5,6,7 out of 9. The TLI is considered by some to be of higher validity than the Bass/Avolio MLQ (Dr. Adam Vanhove, personal communication, 2016) and is free. The seminal article along with the TLI self-rater and subordinate rater versions are included in this Library. The seminal article also refers to mediators and the instruments they used (trust and satisfaction) on outcome measures of organizational citizen behavior.

Number of citations for the instrument

web citations = 1490 citations

Transformational leadership survey

(Edwards et al., 2010) (<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4006131/>)

Purpose/focus of the instrument

The aim of the current study was to develop a non-commercial instrument for assessing transformational leadership within substance use treatment organizations that is available free of charge, reliable, valid, and that can be used to inform organizational self-monitoring and training efforts. The Survey of Transformational Leadership (STL) utilizes a thorough and comprehensive approach, eliciting detailed information about specific leadership behaviors. Results suggest that within the five core components (i.e., idealized influence, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, individualized consideration, and empowerment) nine distinct themes emerge, representing various facets of transformational-oriented practices. 83 items.

Where is instrument found?

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

Who developed the instrument, where?

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

Using focus groups, factor analysis, and validation instruments, the current study developed and established psychometrics for the Survey of Transformational Leadership. In 2008, clinical directors were evaluated on leadership practices by 213 counselors within 57 programs in four U.S. regions. Nine transformational leadership themes emerged: integrity, sensible risk,

demonstrates innovation, encourages innovation, inspirational motivation, supports others, develops others, delegates tasks, and expects excellence. This breakdown of transformational leadership into a larger number of components has the potential to help leaders better understand their influences on followers.

Study was funded by the National Institutes of Health. For construct validity, the TLS was compared against the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), Attributes of Leader Behavior Questionnaire (ALBQ), and Survey of Organizational Functioning (SOF), the latter using the job satisfaction subscale. Authors concluded the new instrument had sufficient reliability and validity for both subscale items and as an overall measure of transformational leadership.

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Number of citations for the instrument

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

References (up to 5)

Further notes

U.S. Army Automated Command Climate Survey

Purpose/focus of the instrument

The following is taken from the Zaccaro et al. 1999 article.

Description: The U.S. Army Automated Command Climate Survey is a fully automated, self-contained, survey program. It is designed to assist the company (or equivalent-sized unit) commander in assessing and developing action plans for sustaining and improving his or her unit command climate. The Command Climate Survey consists of 24 basic questions and two comment questions, which address 20 command climate areas. In addition, the unit commander can add up to ten optional unit-specific questions. The 20 climate areas include: officer leadership, NCO leadership, immediate supervisor, leader accessibility, leader concern for families, leader concern for single soldiers, unit cohesion, counseling, training, racist materials, sexually offensive materials, stress, training schedule, sponsorship, respect, unit readiness, morale, sexual harassment, discrimination, and reporting harassment/discrimination incidents.

Additional questions on gender and race are asked. Written comments are requested regarding unit strengths and areas most needing improvement. The survey results may provide indicators of strengths and issues in a unit. In addition, the program automatically encrypts the data to protect soldiers' anonymity. The survey results help the commander determine his or her unit climate and assist in development and implementation of actions for improvement. Company commanders are encouraged to perform a Command Climate Survey within 90 days of assuming command to help them assess a variety of issues, including unit readiness, racial and sexual harassment climate, and morale. Army officials indicate this survey will likely become a requirement.

Where is instrument found?

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

Source: Morris Peterson, ATTN: TAPC-ARI-PS, U. S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral Sciences, 5001 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, VA 22333-5600, Phone: (703) 617-7803, DSN: 767-7803, e-mail: peterson@ari.army.mil

References and Suggested Readings

Reimer, D. J. (1998). Developing great leaders in turbulent times. Military Review, 281 5-12. No cost

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

Who developed the instrument, where?

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

Application: The Command Climate Survey can be used to identify problems in a commander's unit and help to develop solutions. The survey is designed as a self-contained, stand-alone tool for the commander. The commander can administer the survey, score or tally the results, and conduct the analysis to assess his or her unit's current climate.

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

Reliability: No reliability studies have yet been performed.

Validity: No reliability studies have yet been performed.

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Number of citations for the instrument

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Limitations: No evidence of validation or reliability has been reported.

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

References (up to 5)

Further notes

Volunteer Leadership Development Instrument

The instrument is available here: 2 versions in English and Spanish

Purpose/focus of the instrument

The VLDI was specifically developed for small volunteer organizations and it is focused on measuring leadership development of leaders in that context.

Where is instrument found?

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

I wrote the authors for permission, which was finally obtained. No cost.

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

Who developed the instrument, where?

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

This is an instrument used in only two studies that we are aware of, and little information was collected on its reliability and validity, but the authors were satisfied with how it functioned in their small, retrospective, cross-sectional study. Questions were well developed from the literature, then reviewed by a panel of experts for content validity (Meier et al., 2009). It was adapted into a Spanish version and used in El Salvador satisfactorily (Nickels, 2016).

Comparison of the original VLDI and adapted VLDI instruments

Original: n=35, Cronbach alpha on 20 items was high ($r = .943$), Spearman's rank order correlation was chosen because the data were finite and the total N was small, collected using a Likert-type scale questionnaire. Personal time management was the variable that showed the highest congruence among the 20 leadership skill impact items. Authors then showed a table with the spearman correlations of the other 19 variables to this strongest variable. Eighteen of the 19 items were statistically significant, and 10 of these showed high correlation coefficients as well (above .600), indicating strong relationships. However, the authors did not show the whole table and discuss other correlations, including low ones. Nor did they compare them to any other leadership measure.

Adapted version (out study): n=138, Cronbach alpha on 18 items was moderately high ($r = .850$). Inter-item correlations indicated that 1 of 18 items could be removed to improve the alpha score.

Scoring: items are summed; there are no reverse items. The questions for this instrument are available online, and there does not appear to be any copyright.

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Number of citations for the instrument

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

References (up to 5)

Further notes

Walter Reed Army Institute of Research Leadership Assessment Tool

Purpose/focus of the instrument

The following info is taken from Zaccaro et al. 1999 article. Multiple references can be found in that article.

Description: This measure uses human dimensions to assess and monitor how changes in work environments impact soldiers and leaders. This measure has provided a method of (1) quantifying and recording how the work environment of soldiers and leaders change as a function of external factors and (2) estimating the organizational impact of these changes. The measure has the following scales, each testing a different human dimension: task significance, support for task significance, support for unit's mission information, dissemination unit leadership/vertical cohesion, peer relations/horizontal cohesion, job satisfaction, and collective efficacy.

Where is instrument found?

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author? No cost

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

Who developed the instrument, where?

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

Application: The WRAIR assessment tool can be tested on unit soldiers to identify what external factors influence soldiers and their working environments. Results from the assessment can be used to evaluate organizational climate.

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

Reliability: Bliese and Halverson (1996, 1998), Marlowe (1986), and Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins & Klesh, (1983) have tested the reliability of the scales. All researchers found moderately high Cronbach Alpha coefficients (.81 to .92). However, the role clarity and work overload scales showed moderately low reliability.

Validity: No validity studies were completed on this measure.

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Number of citations for the instrument

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Limitation: The most significant limitation of the measure is the lack of data supporting the validity of the measure. Further, while the entire package of scales is convenient, more current measurement scales are available for the individual dimensions (e.g., commitment).

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

References (up to 5)

Further notes

Sources: MAJ Paul D. Bliese, Department of Operational Stress Research, Walter Reed Army Institute of Research, Phone: (301) 295-7856. e-mail: bliese@wrair-emhl.army.mil

Watson-Glaser Critical Thinking Appraisal

Purpose/focus of the instrument

The info below is from the commercial website: <http://us.talentlens.com/watson-glaser-critical-thinking-test>

Watson-Glaser™ II Critical Thinking Appraisal

Improve decision making and accurately identify top performers

How long will your company survive if your staff makes bad decisions? The Watson-Glaser™ II Critical Thinking Appraisal is the leading critical thinking test used to assess and develop decision making skills and judgment. Thousands of organizations and schools use Watson-Glaser to hire great managers, develop high-potential employees, and admit students into challenging programs.

- Good decision-making
- Judgment and problem solving
- Openness to new experience
- Practical intelligence

RED critical thinking model



Recognize Assumptions: Separate fact from opinion

Evaluate Arguments: Impartially evaluate arguments and suspend judgment

Draw Conclusions: Decide your course of action.

GLOBAL PRODUCT – Available in US, UK, Australian, and Indian English, Spanish, French, and Dutch

- 35-40 minutes

Where is instrument found?

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

Online Price:

\$27.00 for Profile

\$36.00 for Profile + Int

\$47.00 for Profile + Dev

\$76.00 for All Three Reports

Call 888.298.6227 to purchase these paper products or register for [online testing](#) here.

Online Administration

27.00

0158341481	WGCTA-S: Short Form - Comprehensive Kit (25 Applicants)	511.00
0158186451	WGCTA-S: Short Form Answer Documents (25)	135.00
0158993349	WGCTA-S: Short Form Key for Hand Scoring (25)	151.00
0158339339	WGCTA-S: Short Form Manual	76.00
015833941X	WGCTA-S: Short Form Test Booklets (25)	305.00

Three reports let you apply the results in many ways

- o Profile Report: See the overall score, subscales, and a few predictive behaviors
- o Interview Report: Conduct a structured critical thinking behavioral interview with sample questions
- o Development Report: Build a custom learning & development plan to enhance an individual's skills

Pearson Publishing has a “Research Assistance Program” with a discount: Our Research Assistance Program (RAP) is designed to encourage post-publication research that provides new information about the applications and characteristics of our instruments. By making the results of such studies available to the field, you will be contributing to scientific knowledge and sound professional practice.

Terms and Conditions

1. **The RAP offers a 50% discount on test materials and scoring services (applicable to all quantity level prices) for approved research studies conducted in the United States.**
2. The proposed project should be a non-billable, potentially publishable, well-designed research study that will be of interest to others in the field. In general, [program evaluation studies](#) do not qualify because program evaluation is one of the standard applications of tests and because such research is not focused on providing new information about the tests.
3. Products that Pearson distributes but does not publish do not qualify for the discount. For information about the eligible products, please email ResearchAssist@Pearson.com or call 1.800.627.7271.
4. The researcher (or a member of the research project team) must meet the Pearson user qualification requirements for the tests used in the research project.
5. The RAP grants a one-time discount for the test materials and scoring services specified in the original application. Researchers should include in their original application all of the materials and scoring services they expect to need for the project. A new application is required if additional materials or scoring services are needed.
6. The reproduction or translation of tests is prohibited under the RAP.
7. The researcher agrees to provide a report of the study results to Pearson.

There are more details and forms to complete, can be accessed at:

<http://www.pearsonclinical.com/rap.html>

**Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?
Who developed the instrument, where?**

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

Uses: Selection [of critical thinkers], development [of critical thinking for employees and leaders], high potential identification [screening/interviewing during hiring], college recruiting

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Number of citations for the instrument

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

References (up to 5)

Further notes

Women's boldness assessment – or Influence Preference Assessment (2016)

Purpose/focus of the instrument

A common stereotype is that men have a tendency to be bolder than women. And numerous studies have shown that male business leaders do tend to take more risks. But looking through our database of 360-degree assessments from 75,000 leaders around the world, we noticed that on average the women were bolder than the men.

We created a “boldness index” out of seven behaviors we commonly assess. (If you want to take our assessment based on this index, [you can](#).) Because these are among the behaviors that we assess in our routine leadership assessments, we think they may be more relevant to real managers than studies that assess “risk” either in lab situations or in purely financial terms. Here's the list:

- Challenges standard approaches
- Creates an atmosphere of continual improvement
- Does everything possible to achieve goals
- Gets others to go beyond what they originally thought possible
- Energizes others to take on challenging goals
- Quickly recognizes situations where change is needed
- Has the courage to make needed changes

When boldness is defined this way, women on average rank in the 52nd percentile of boldness, a few ticks higher than the average men rating of the 49th percentile. (It's important to note that

because of the imbalanced gender ratio of senior executives, there were nearly twice as many men in our data set as women.) While that doesn't seem like a huge difference, it stood out to us because "men take more risks" is so ingrained in social science.

We then analyzed the top eight men-dominated functions and the two female-dominated functions by gender and age. Did women become bolder over time, or were they bolder from the beginning of their careers? What the data showed is that women in the age group 30 and younger in men-dominated professions were rated in the 62nd percentile, while women in the same age group in the women-dominated professions were in the 42nd percentile.

It would seem that to be a younger woman in a men-dominated function requires a fairly bold personality — a willingness to challenge the status quo, push harder for results, and do something out of the ordinary. So to return to our original question, are women bolder than men? Probably not in the general population. But the ones who succeed in business, especially men-dominated fields, may have to be.

Where is instrument found?

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

Who developed the instrument, where?

Target population for which the instrument was developed?

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

One downside is there is no 360 view—no one else is given the opportunity to rate me on the site, and having that feedback is likely to be more accurate, or at least complement my own perspective. The authors acknowledge this yet state that self-rating perspectives are still valid. I did not see any validity, reliability data on the website but did not search much either.

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?

Number of citations for the instrument

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated

References (up to 5)

Further notes

We invite you to take our complimentary Influence Preference Assessment by following the steps below. (<http://zengerfolkman.com/influence-preference-assessment/>)

Step 1: Click the "START ASSESSMENT" button below and enter your name and email on the following page. (*Please provide a valid email address so that you can receive the link to take the assessment.*)

Step 2: Check your email, open the Zenger Folkman message, and click on the assessment link provided within.

Step 3: Take the assessment. Please fill in all questions including demographics.

Step 4: After you complete the assessment, click "Request Feedback Report" and check your email to download your report. (please refer to the original email for your username and password.)

[START ASSESSMENT](#)

I tested this out and it worked well and was very interesting. The test is 85 questions, takes 25-30 mins, then you get a feedback form with your raw score as well as compared to quartile rankings of others. You have to register, but it's free, and I could download my results in pdf format. You are measured on 3 scales—boldness (range between cautious and bold), and two scales that impact whether that boldness is more or less likely to succeed: quick and intuitive judgement vs. deliberate and balanced judgement; and strategic perspective in contrast to more tactical thinking. I was about 55% ranking on boldness, but right in the middle on strategic/tactical and way at the bottom 0% ranking on quick/intuitive vs deliberate/balanced, meaning that I need to work on being less quick/int and more deliberate/balanced. The authors clearly state that there is no right or wrong place on the scales, that it depends on what your work context is, responsibilities, and how you want to work. They also note that bold leadership is effective only when it is reined in, so to speak, or guided/complemented by other leadership skills, specifically being strategic in thinking and deliberate/balanced in judgment. For me that means my boldness can come out in poor decision making because I tend to be quick and intuitive. The questions in the assessment are not easy to answer, they are trade offs, which was emotionally stressful (I'm both of these, not one or the other!), yet they are also real-life questions, reflecting the trade-offs and difficult decisions we make every day. In that sense I think the questions were very good.

Resources and Reviews of Instruments

Education: The Evaluation of Principals: What and How do States and Districts Assess Educational Leadership?

Purpose/focus of the instrument: ABSTRACT: The purpose of this paper is to present the results of a comprehensive review of current principal leadership assessment practices in the United States. Our analyses of both the general content and the usage of 65 actual instruments used by districts and states provide an in-depth look of what and how districts evaluate their school principals. Using the Learning-Centered Leadership Framework (Porter et al., 2006), our paper focuses on identifying the congruency (or lack thereof) between current evaluation practices and the research-based criteria for effective leadership that are associated with school performance. Using an iterative and deductive process for instrument content analysis, we found that districts focus on a variety of performance areas when evaluating their principals, with different formats at various levels of specificity. We also found very limited coverage on leadership behaviors ensuring rigorous curriculum and quality instructions, which are linked with school-wide improvement for the ultimate purpose of enhanced student learning. In seeking information on how principals are evaluated, we found that in most cases, the practices of leadership assessment lack justification and documentation in terms of the utility, psychometric properties, and accuracy of the instruments.

Where is instrument found?:

This article is published as Vol. 110, No. 1 in The Elementary School Journal, pp.19-39. ESJ publishes peer-reviewed articles that pertain to both education theory and research and their

implications for teaching practice. In addition, ESJ presents articles that relate the latest research in child development, cognitive psychology, and sociology to school learning and teaching.

Author Contact Information: ellen.goldring@vanderbilt.edu

The article can also be found here:

https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Ellen_Goldring/publication/228337322_The_evaluation_of_principals_What_and_how_do_states_and_districts_assess_leadership/links/00b7d5240f6a0c3ef7000000.pdf

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.): The article can be found for free online in PDF form. It can also be found through most databases.

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?: See above. No Cost

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?:

The paper was presented at the Annual Meeting of American Educational Research Association in New York, New York in March 2008. The article was published in September of 2009 by The University of Chicago Press.

Who developed the instrument, where?: Ellen Goldring, Xiu Chen Cravens, Joseph Murphy, Stephen N. Elliott, and Becca Carson of Vanderbilt University. Andrew C. Porter from the University of Pennsylvania.

Target population for which the instrument was developed?: Secondary Education Administration

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?: The analyses of both the general content and the usage of 65 actual instruments used by districts and states provide an in-depth look of what and how districts evaluate their school principals.

Number of citations for the instrument: 109

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers:

As noted in the article: "It is important to point out that with procedure documentation on only 67% of the sampled instruments, we do not have a complete picture of how assessments are conducted in the districts and states yet. However, among the 44 instruments that have procedure documentation, we lack information about psychometric properties on 40 (91%), evaluator training to use the instrument on 35 (80%), and the standards used by the instruments on 19 (43%)."

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated: None (searched in Google Scholar)

References (up to 5):

Bryk, A. S., & Driscoll, M. E. (1988). *The high school as community: Contextual influences and consequences for students and teachers*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin- Madison, National Center on Effective Secondary Schools.

Bryk, A., Camburn, E., & Louis, K. S. (1999). Professional community in Chicago elementary schools. Facilitating factors and organizational consequences. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 35, 751-781.

Catano, N., & Stronge, J. H. (2006). What are principals expected to do? Congruence between principal evaluation and performance standards. *NASSP Bulletin*, 90(3), 221-237.

Coburn, C. E., (2004). Beyond decoupling: Rethinking the relationship between the institutional environment and the classroom. *Sociology of Education*, 77(3), 211-244.

Conley, D. T., & Goldman, P. (1994). Ten propositions for facilitative leadership. In J. Murphy & K. S. Louis (Eds.), *Reshaping the principalship: Insights from transformational reform efforts*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Further notes:

Goldring, E., Xiu Chen Cravens, Murphy, J., Elliott, S. N., Carson, B., Porter, A. C. (2008). The Evaluation of Principals: What and How do States and Districts Assess Leadership? Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of American Educational Research Association, New York, New York, March 2008.

While the paper does not list or show the instruments, figure 4 outlines the main categories that are covered by the instruments. This article is in the Library for your review. Author contact info is in the article, and I would assume that they may have a list of the state and district assessments and perhaps even digital copies available upon request, since most of the assessments were short.

International Personality Item Pool (IPIP)

A Scientific Collaboratory for the Development of Advanced Measures of Personality and Other Individual Differences. <http://ipip.ori.org/>

- Site Overview: This is the official website for the International Personality Item Pool (IPIP). The site includes over 3,000 items and over 250 scales that have been constructed from the items. New items and scales are developed on an irregular basis. The items and scales are in the public domain, which means that one can copy, edit, translate, or use them for any purpose without asking permission and without paying a fee.
- One can look up scales or personality traits related to your construct of interest. For example: Leadership scales ([AB5C](#)), ([HPI: Ambition](#)), ([6FPQ](#)), ([VIA: Leadership](#)), ([HPI: Leadership](#)), ([ORVIS: Leadership](#))—these contain items specifically related to leadership, albeit in different scales with somewhat different constructs. Extraversion scales ([NEO Domain](#)), ([Big-Five Domain](#)), ([Big-7: 525](#)), ([6FPQ: EX](#)), ([BFAS: Extraversion](#)) – these contain items related to extraversion, which in turn is correlated with leadership. There are also multi-construct inventories (including measures of the Big Five personality factors) that can be used to help people determine their overall personal personality inventory.

- One can use the items found in the scales or 3000 items found elsewhere on the site to construct your own leadership scale. Testing it out will then allow alpha to be calculated, etc. IPIP provides instructions for scoring a scale found on the site, as well as constructing your own scale with items provided on the site.
- One can click on “Publications that employ the IPIP” and then Ctrl-F to “find” or do a keyword search. For example, a search for “leader” returned 17 articles that employed items or scales from the IPIP in their studies.
- This site takes a little work to master, but it appears to be an updated, ongoing, adapting, free, high quality resource for students and professionals to obtain no-cost instruments that are reliable and valid, or a great resource for developing your own scale/instrument based on items that are related to dozens of constructs. I’d highly recommend spending some time on this site. To get detailed information on scales, you’ll have to spend time looking up and reading the citations related to each one.

Research Designs and Frameworks:

Approaches for Assessing Leadership and Leadership Development

Organizational leadership in philanthropy

“Grantmakers for Effective Organizations (GEO) is an affinity group of the Council on Foundations that is dedicated to promoting learning and encouraging dialogue among funders committed to the field of organizational effectiveness. Their website has links to organizations that study or promote organizational effectiveness, an extensive list of readings, publications and papers” (from the website: www.geofunders.org). The framework below lists four areas in which evidence shows that grant-makers/philanthropists who lead by carrying out these activities are better able to foster effective nonprofit organizations with whom they support and in turn to better achieve their goals. This framework could be used as a measure for philanthropic leadership effectiveness. For example, a mixed method questionnaire could be developed in which philanthropists are asked (or grantees are asked about their philanthropists in a kind of 360 degree approach, along with board leaders, staff, or peer grantors) to rate on a scale of 1 to 10 to what degree they “strengthen their relationship with their grantees” and to comment on how they do this and how they could do it better; to what degree they “support resilience in their nonprofit grantees” and to comment on how they do this and how they could do it better; to what degree they “carry out activities to learn for improvement with their grantees” and to comment on how they do this and how they could do it better; and to what degree they “collaborate” and to comment on how they do this and how they could do it better.

Purpose/focus of the instrument

It is not an instrument that assesses leadership skills, but rather a framework to guide other philanthropies or nonprofit organizations on how to effectively lead. A questionnaire based on the four categories: strengthening relationship with grantees, supporting nonprofit

resilience, learning for improvement, and collaborating for greater impact, could be developed. Members and leaders of nonprofits or philanthropies could rate the extent to which these guidelines are followed in their own organizations.

Where is instrument found?

The framework and their descriptions can be found on <http://www.geofunders.org/about>.

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.)

It is available on the Geofunders website. Grantmakers for Effective Organizations is a nonprofit organization made up of 550 grantmakers hoping to reform how philanthropies are led. <http://www.geofunders.org/about>

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?

It is available for free. No cost

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?

1997

Who developed the instrument, where?

Grantmakers for Effective Organization (GEO).

Political Leadership after Communism

Purpose/focus of the instrument: Political scientists have paid little attention to the role of leadership. This article suggests a way to think systematically about leaders' contributions in the former Soviet Union by examining their ability to achieve their own goals and the impact they have. The fifteen countries provide a wide range of variation on the dependent variable.

Where is instrument found?

The peer-reviewed periodical is published as Vol. 20, No. 2 in Demokratizatsiya, a journal covering past and current political, economical, social, and legal changes and developments in the Soviet Union and its successor states, published by George Washington University.

Demokratizatsiya, with 123 issues and 1,094 articles, can be retrieved from:

<https://www.questia.com/library/p5659/demokratizatsiya>

The periodical can be retrieved from:

https://www2.gwu.edu/~ieresgwu/assets/docs/demokratizatsiya%20archive/GWASHU_DEMO_20_2/A50LT14524342803/A50LT14524342803.pdf

Is it available online or only through a service? (company, university, individual, etc.):

Online

Is it available free? What is the cost? Does it require the permission of the author?:

The periodical can be accessed for free. It can also be accessed through most databases. No cost

Year the instrument was developed? Have there been revisions or new editions (years)?:

The research was published in the Spring of 2012. Russian and Soviet government expert Timothy J. Colton delivered a talk on Nov. 4 2013 on leadership in post-Soviet nations. The lecture was titled “Political Leadership after Communism” and sponsored by the Levitt Center Speaker Series. An article by [Benjamin Anderson](#), was posted November 5, 2013 reviewing such talk.

Who developed the instrument, where?: Author, Timothy J. Colton is the Morris and Anna Feldberg Professor of Government and Russian Studies and chair of the Government Department at Harvard University, and the author of numerous books on Russian and Soviet politics.

Target population for which the instrument was developed?: Political scientists and governments

What are the reliability and validity data on the instrument, from which authors?

How thoroughly has the instrument been tested, and with what size samples?: 15 countries were studied and reviewed in the periodical.

Number of citations for the instrument: 4

Limitations noted by the seminal author or other commentators/researchers:

Retrieved from the research article: “...To be fair, the discipline of political science generally finds leadership a notoriously hard phenomenon to investigate. This is said to be so for a variety of reasons: individual leaders are idiosyncratic; they do not sort into neat boxes or lend themselves to generalization; firsthand testimony about their lives and performance in office is often unreliable because it is self-serving, either pro or con the subject; leaders invariably share the stage with numerous other players and forces, which gets in the way of figuring out who and what count the most... If there is anything to this sketch, leadership scholars would need to refine it and work on a reasonably rigorous and reliable coding scheme. Two big jobs would then need to be done. The first would be to ascertain what causes are conducive to these observed effects. Are some leaders more effective than others, or higher in impact than others, because they are especially skilled at articulating a vision and shaping the agenda, at building upper-echelon coalitions, at motivating the masses, or at piecing institutional instruments together—or at some discernible combination of these bits? To what extent does leadership agency govern outcomes, as weighed against structural variables and systemic tendencies? Are ineffectiveness and low impact associated with any different action configuration by these same criteria? If unfavorable background conditions overwhelm some leaders, as nationalist protest did to Gorbachev in 1990–91, was the situation ever retrievable through action by the leader? The second mega question to pose is about the medium- and long- term trends. Presumably there will come a time, as communism recedes into the past, when the adjectival phrase “post-communist” will cease to be meaningful as a qualifier for the noun “leadership.” In much of East Central Europe, that watershed has probably been passed. In most of the post-Soviet states, I do not sense that it has. Am I right? If so, how much longer will the post-communist dispensation continue? And how will we know that it is gone?

Availability in other languages and whether these versions have been validated: None (searched in Google Scholar)

References (up to 5): See especially Bryan D. Jones, ed. 1989. *Leadership and Politics: New Perspectives in Political Science*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas; Morris P. Fiorina and Kenneth A. Shepsle. "Formal Theories of Leadership: Agents, Agenda Setters, and Entrepreneurs." In Bryan D. Jones, ed. 1989. *Leadership and Politics: New Perspectives in Political Science*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas; Robert C. Tucker. 1995. *Politics as Leadership*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press; and Richard J. Samuels. 2003. *Machiavelli's Children: Leaders and Their Legacies in Italy and Japan*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. Also, Burns. 2003. *Transforming Leadership: A New Pursuit of Happiness*. New York: Atlantic Monthly Press.

Further notes:

Harvard's Timothy Colton Discusses Political Leadership after Communism. By [Benjamin Anderson](#), Posted November 5, 2013.

The following article is retrieved from: <http://www.hamilton.edu/news/story/colton-discusses-political-leadership-after-communism>

Russian and Soviet government expert Timothy J. Colton delivered a talk on Nov. 4 on leadership in post-Soviet nations. The lecture was titled "Political Leadership after Communism" and sponsored by the Levitt Center Speaker Series. Colton is the Morris and Anna Feldberg Professor of Government and Russian Studies and chair of the Government Department at Harvard University, and the author of numerous books on Russian and Soviet politics.

Colton began his lecture by discussing some of the commonly cited pitfalls with the study of political leadership. Critics of the field often point out the difficulty in parsing general patterns from the study of individual leaders, as well as the complexity of measuring leadership characteristics. They also argue individual leaders are only one piece of a larger arena of political action and therefore should not be studied in isolation. After describing these common critiques of the study of leadership, Colton presented his own typology of leadership, illustrating his theory within the context of post-Soviet governance.

In his lecture, Colton argued political leaders can be ranked according to both their effectiveness and their level of impact. Effectiveness, as Colton defined it, is a leader's success in achieving his or her stated goals. Impact on the other hand, is the influence of a leader's action on a national, regional, and global scale. In his lecture, Colton pointed out that some leaders may be highly effective in achieving their goals, but if these goals are modest they may nevertheless have a low overall impact. After explaining his distinction between effectiveness and impact, Colton illustrated his typology with examples of post-Soviet leadership. He ranked a variety of political leaders as either effective or ineffective, and their impact as low, ambiguous or high.

Current Russian President Vladimir Putin, according to Colton, is an effective leader with a high level of impact. Colton pointed out that Putin has achieved most of his stated goals while in office, improving Russia's political stability, enhancing economic growth, and putting an end to war with Chechnya, among other accomplishments. He argued the Russian president has not

only been effective in achieving these goals, but has had a tremendous impact on the country and the international community. On the other hand, Colton pointed to former Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev as an ineffective leader who had a high level of impact. He argued that while Gorbachev failed to achieve his stated goals, this failure nevertheless led to the collapse of the Soviet Union and had a significant global impact. The example illustrated that indeed “leaders who fail to carry out their directives can be more influential than leaders who achieve modest objectives.”

In addition to Putin and Gorbachev, Colton described the leadership styles of a multitude of post-Soviet leaders. Ilham Aliev of Azerbaijan, Stanislav Shushkevich of Belarus, Dmitry Medvedev of Russian, and Roza Otunbayeva were among those discussed in-depth. Colton concluded his talk with general observations from his study of post-Soviet leadership. For example, he noted that the majority of leaders who have been both effective and highly impactful are those promoting undemocratic agendas. He also pointed out that leaders in the region have generally become more successful with time, suggesting that recent leaders may have learned from their predecessors’ mistakes. Finally, Colton argued that those who peacefully relinquish their powers in favor of democratic institutions might be the leaders that history remembers the most.

Q-methodology

Militello, M., & Benham, M. K. P. (2010). “Sorting Out” collective leadership: How Q-methodology can be used to evaluate leadership development. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21, 620–632.

Abstract: Q-methodology has proven to be an effective way to solicit participants' perceptions of outcomes. In this article, Q-methodology is described as a data collection tool that can be used to better evaluate the development of collective leadership. Additionally, this methodology provided a valuable tool for participants themselves (leadership development) and evaluators (evaluation development). In writing this article, we drew upon data from a longitudinal study of the Kellogg Leadership for Community Change (KLCC) initiative at six sites from 2002 through 2007 where multiple data collection strategies were employed, including Q-methodology.

Retrospective pre-tests (Pre and post testing)

Rohs, F. R., & Langone, C. A. (1997). Increased accuracy in measuring leadership impacts. *The Journal of Leadership Studies*, 4(1), 150-158.

This study sought to determine the change in level of leadership skills of participants in a community leadership program and the degree of response shift (change in level of understanding of leadership skills) in the self-report measures employed. While most of the participants reported increases in their leadership skills at the end of the program,

differences were found between their self-report ratings using the pretest/posttest approach and the then/posttest approach. The degree of response shift (pre/then comparison) was also evident. The findings from this study together with other studies cited suggest that when employing self-report measures, the then/post approach provides a less conservative and more accurate means of assessing leadership skill development than would the traditional pretest/posttest approach. Suggestions for reducing the effects of response shift are also offered.

Growth curve modeling

Growth curve modeling is now beginning to be used with longitudinal data in leadership studies. “*Growth curve modeling* is a broad term that has been used in different contexts during the past century to refer to a wide array of statistical models for repeated measures data.... However, within the past decade or so, this term has primarily come to define a discrete set of analytical approaches, particularly as applied within the social sciences. More specifically, the contemporary use of the term *growth curve model* typically refers to statistical methods that allow for the estimation of inter-individual variability in intra-individual patterns of change over time.... In other words, growth models attempt to estimate between-person differences in within-person change.” (Twelve frequently asked questions about growth curve modeling,

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3131138/>)

Additional considerations, statistical tools, and designs

There are some important issues to consider in designing leadership research and deciding which tools may be most appropriate. Day and Antonakis in “The Nature of Leadership” (2012) note that leadership has global, shared, and configural properties that each reflect different forms of aggregation from lower-level units (events, individuals, groups, and organizations). In addition, they cite newer quantitative techniques that can help researchers ask new questions and study traditional leadership questions in novel ways (e.g., latent polynomial regression, multilevel member weighted modeling, intercept as mean latent growth modeling, multilevel SEM, and latent class cluster analysis). The point is that these techniques can be used as means of measuring leadership, especially in complex relationships among numerous variables, in addition to the traditional leadership instruments, which is what this library primarily covers. Likewise, outside the scope of this library are techniques mentioned by Zyphur, Barsky, and Zhang (2012) that may be useful to leadership researchers, such as “agent-based simulations for testing complexity theories of leadership (e.g., Dionne & Dionne, 2008), social network-based approaches to study shared leadership (e.g., Carson, Tesluk, & Marrone, 2007; Ensley, Hmieleski, & Pearce, 2006), the life narrative method for examining leadership development (e.g., Ligon, Hunter & Mumford, 2008), and various biological approaches (e.g. Zhang, Ilies & Arvey, 2009)” (67).

Shared leadership

Wassenaar and Pearce (2012) state the field of study of shared leadership is quite new and that there is little research that examines the various methods of which to measure shared leadership. They cite 5 methods upheld by Pearce and Conger (2003), 3 quantitative and 2 qualitative. These are: 1) measuring at the group level of analysis to determine outcomes of group-level variables, where the group is the entity of interest and the source of influence, allowing researchers to use techniques for individuals (regression, SEM, etc.) with the group, since it is conceived individually. 2) measuring the group as the sum of its parts (the individuals are the members of influence and the group the target of influence); here one can create group level variables in three ways: evaluate shared leadership using the dominant member's results, that is, the highest rated member's score; use the score of the lowest rated individual on leadership, also known as the "weakest link"; or the average of the group, which is the same as the group as a whole approach mentioned above. 3) use social networks, measuring individual group members as both the sources of influence and also the targets of influence, essentially determining whether the leader behaviors are centralized in one or two people, or dispersed among the group or among many; one can use this technique to see who eventually becomes central and the controlling member. The two qualitative techniques are 4) leadership sociograms (the documentation of individual and group patterns of interaction and observation of group meetings), and 5) ethnography (immersion in the group or organization to document interactions and interplay in a natural setting). The authors highlight the strengths and limitations of each of the 5 methods.

Additional leadership resources and related instruments

Organizational Assessments: [linked here is a document that lists several organizational assessments.](#) They are:

Internal Organization Measures

- Self Assessment Tool for Community Development Organizations- Looks at: Legal, finances, HR, Governance and Planning, IT, Communication, Program management
- Nonprofit Organization Self-Assessment Tool- Looks at: Board governance, Planning and Eval, Finances, Personnel, PR, and Funding

- Nonprofit Organizational Assessment Tool- Quick look at mission, vision, and programs
- Board Assessment Tool- 4 things: performance on core responsibilities, importance of upcoming responsibilities, enablers of board effectiveness, personal involvement
- Local Collaborative Assessment of Capacity- Governance and accountability, outcomes, financing, mobilizing resources, community, staff development, program strategies, etc.
- Non-profit Questionnaire- Looks at governance and oversight, effectiveness measures, compliance of finances, and fundraising and informational materials

Miscellaneous

- Group Assessment Form- Looks at group cohesion, goals, rules, participation, etc.
- Faith and Community Based Readiness Checklist- intended to help faith and community based organization determine preparedness to seed federal support for their programs.
 - Organization
 - Leadership
 - Finances
 - Building and Equipment
 - Personnel

Concluding Questions

At the commercial website HDRQ (<http://www.hrdqstore.com/leadership-assessment-tools.html>) quite a few leadership development and assessment products are listed. I have included a few above, but I list them all here in case you want to pursue any. They do a poor job of listing reliability and validity information, do not usually even list the name of the instrument author(s), which makes it difficult to track down further information on some instruments, and all must be purchased. However, some prices are low cost. Some costs are listed below as examples. All the info listed is from the commercial website. Here is the list:

- **What's my leadership style?** (\$181 for facilitator package, \$18 self-assessment copy, free theoretical background, \$450 for full online workshop)
- **Leading change at every level** (self-assessment and program for training change agents at all levels of an organization)
- **Leader manager profile** (36 item self assessment) (\$181 for facilitator package, \$18 self- assessment, \$9 feedback form for others, \$0 for book on theoretical background of instrument)
- **Project leader assessment** (assesses people skills)
- **Participative Management Profile** (assesses and trains leaders and teams at all levels on how much to involve others in decision making, uses 20 scenarios where people have to

choose among 4 types of decision-making options: Consultation, Command, Consensus, or Convenience)

- **The Comprehensive Leader**, a self-assessment with other-rater version as well, focuses on assessing and improving visionary leaders: “based on extensive research of both academic and practitioner literature on leadership. The foundation of the Model of Comprehensive Leadership is active knowledge — knowledge that is in constant development and consistently provides the basis for leadership behavior. The Model of Comprehensive Leadership captures the four dimensions of leadership knowledge necessary for visionary leadership. They include: Know Yourself, Know Others, Know Your Organization, and Know the World. \$18 self-assessment (\$40 online version with online report), \$9 other assessment, free theoretical background, \$181 facilitator’s package.
- **Responsive Leadership Questionnaire and Capability Inventory** is a situational leadership assessment for management development training. It measures current skill in managing employees and improves leadership effectiveness by developing supervisory skills, leadership skills, coaching skills, and the ability to motivate employees.
- **Courageous Leadership:** Develop capable and confident leaders with this assessment, workbook, and training program that gives leaders the foundational skills and abilities they need to meet challenges more readily, embrace change more fully, and speak more assertively.
- **Focused Leader Profile** - A Situational Approach to Leading Work Groups, examines three critical factors - relationships, task clarity, and power base. Helps leaders narrow their focus, analyze work group situations, and then determine how to respond most effectively.
- **Reality Based Leadership** – assessment and training program: Based on Cy Wakeman’s popular book *Reality-Based Leadership*, this workshop conveys her candid, humorous approach to organizational dynamics. The Reality-Based Leadership model challenges traditional practices and conventional wisdoms in leadership and focuses on Five Core Competencies: *Reality-Based Thinking, Organizational Alignment, Capitalizing on Change, Driving Results, and Accountability.*
- **HRDQ also has trainings, tools and games to develop individual and team leadership**, such as:
 - Leading success program (leadership training program for managers)
 - Mars Rover Challenge (team leadership game)
 - Trust your canary: Respect on the go (training to handle workplace incivility and harassment)
 - Be a leader thumbball (actual ball to spur discussion, team focus)
 - Encouraging innovation through 5 key conversations
 - Leadout: a simulation that uses a real-life business scenario, rooted in the theories developed by top management experts, the challenge is to make quality decisions while confronting everyday organizational issues.
 - Leading Across Differences: The dynamics of diverse groups present an interesting challenge for organizations. How do you teach people of different nationalities, religions, race, and gender to work effectively together? Developed by a research team that includes The Center for Creative Leadership faculty, *Leading Across Differences* is a training package that offers new ways of thinking

about leadership challenges, providing participants with a framework and process for better understanding their context and taking appropriate action. The package consists of a comprehensive Casebook and a Facilitator Guide with 13 research-based cases, 11 chapters written by leadership experts, nine individual exercises, as well as references and resources to extend the learning. The information in the Facilitator's Guide will help you craft a session or series of sessions organized around specific learning outcomes.

Nonprofit organizational and program assessment instruments

The folder "Nonprofit org and program assessment instruments" contains a large number of surveys and instruments that are directed at nonprofit, government, education, and health programs. They assess at the organizational and individual/client level. They include a wide variety of programs, from mentoring to Housing Authority resident survey, patient assessment of physician, community blight, nonprofit board, and much more. The folder contains a list of the surveys (Table of Contents), a Word doc with the TOC and all instruments in Word format, and a sub-folder with the instruments separately provided in pdf format, which is more readable. The instruments were provided by Dr. M. Sloan. There is no information related to instrument development, validity, or cost, but it's apparent that most come without copyright or cost, yet most are likely not validated through studies. Contact the original organization or developer, if provided, for further information. At a minimum, these surveys and instruments are potential models for students to use in developing surveys and instruments on a wide variety of community and nonprofit issues/programs.

Other non-leadership scales used in leadership studies and related scales

Here is a summary of the scales covered below:

- Boston University Empowerment Scale
- Curiosity Index (CI-4)
- Family Empowerment Scale
- Meaning in Life Questionnaire
- Resilience Scale (Wagnild)
- Ryff Psychological Wellbeing Inventory
- Organizational Commitment, The Three-Component Model of
- Personal Empowerment Scale, Organizational Empowerment Scale, Extra-Organizational Empowerment Scale
- Satisfaction with Life Scale
- Sources of Meaning, Meaning in Life Questionnaire
- Work and Meaning Inventory
- World Values Survey
- Social capital instruments (multiple listed)

Curiosity Index (CI-4). (Fulcher & Erwin, 2005) A 16 item self-report measure of a person's positive approach (behaviors and attitudes) to new information, using a 6-point Likert scale. Two subscales (breadth and depth) constitute the curiosity scale, which is a component of intrinsic

motivation. Both scales of alphas in mid .80's. In SSLS's Dr. Pyle's dissertation study alphas were .88 and .85 and time 1 and 2 of breadth of curiosity, and .83 in time 1 and 2 for depth of curiosity. Information source: Dr. Lorie Pyle's SSLS dissertation (2013).

Meaning in Life Questionnaire (MLQ-Steger) (Steger et al., 2006). Comprises two subscales that assess psychological well-being: 5 items assessing the presence of meaning in the life of the person, and 5 items assessing the search for meaning in life. Scored 1 to 7, convergent validity demonstrated in comparisons against two other scales, and alphas at .86 and .87. CFA confirmed each of five items loading on two factors. Test re-test scores were sufficient for short term and to 1 year. Information source: SSLS's Dr. Kevin Meaney's dissertation study (2015).

Steger web citations listed = 1123.

- Authors, focus/use, target population, and history of instrument

A 10-item measure of the presence and search for meaning in life. Has been used to help people understand and track their perceptions about their lives. Has been used in numerous studies around the world and in several internet-based resources on happiness and fulfillment (according to Steger's website). Shows robust psychometric properties across gender, age, racial and national groups.

- Validity and reliability

From the seminal article abstract: Counseling psychologists often work with clients to increase their well-being as well as to decrease their distress. One important aspect of well-being, highlighted particularly in humanistic theories of the counseling process, is perceived meaning in life. However, poor measurement has hampered research on meaning in life. In 3 studies, evidence is provided for the internal consistency, temporal stability, factor structure, and validity of the Meaning in Life Questionnaire (MLQ), a new 10-item measure of the presence of, and the search for, meaning in life. A multitrait-multimethod matrix demonstrates the convergent and discriminant validity of the MLQ subscales across time and informants, in comparison with 2 other meaning scales. The MLQ offers several improvements over current meaning in life measures, including no item overlap with distress measures, a stable factor structure, better discriminant validity, a briefer format, and the ability to measure the search for meaning.

- Date of instrument and how long and to what extent it's been used: 2006. Used extensively in other studies, including validity studies.
- Cost or whether open source, how to access the instrument: From the website: "It is free to use for educational, therapeutic, and research purposes. Commercial use is prohibited without permission. I ask that you contact me to let me know you're using it and let me know what you find out." Download a copy here: <http://www.michaelfsteger.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/08/MLQ.pdf> No cost
- Languages and cultural information related to versions of the instrument

Languages: available in two dozen languages – see website for details:

http://www.michaelfsteger.com/?page_id=13

- Additional information/links
 - o Website: http://www.michaelfsteger.com/?page_id=13
 - o Seminal article: http://www.itari.in/categories/higherpurpose/meaning_in_life.pdf

Steger, M. F., Frazier, P., Oishi, S., & Kaler, M. (2006). The Meaning in Life Questionnaire: Assessing the Presence of and Search for Meaning in Life. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 53(1), 80–93. DOI: 10.1037/0022-0167.53.1.80

Organizational commitment, The three-component model of.

This tool evaluates employees (or leaders) on the type of commitment that predominates as to why they are at the organization. It could be used to screen people for leadership development, to diagnose problems in the organization, for human resource purposes, or other purposes. The following information is taken from the Zaccaro et al. 1999 article.

Title: Three-Component Model of Organizational Commitment

Description: Meyer and Allen's (1991) Three-Component Model of Organizational Commitment contains three forms of commitment: affective, continuance, and normative. Affective commitment reflects the employee's emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization. Employees with a strong affective commitment remain with an organization because they *want* to do so. Continuance commitment refers to an awareness of the costs associated with leaving an organization. Employees who continue employment with an organization based on continuance commitment remain because they *need* to do so. Finally, normative commitment reflects a feeling of obligation to continue employment. Employees with a strong normative commitment feel that they *ought* to remain with the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Common to these three approaches is the view that commitment is a psychological state that (a) characterizes an employee's relationship with the organization and (b) has implications for the decision to continue or discontinue employment in the organization (Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993). The Affective, Continuance, and Normative Commitment Scales (revised) consists of 6 items each (Meyer et al., 1993). Responses to each item are made on a 7-point scale with anchors labeled (1) strongly disagree and (7) strongly agree. For administration, items from the three scales are mixed to form an 18-item series.

Reliability: Measures of the three components of organizational commitment were developed and found to be psychometrically sound (Allen & Meyer, 1990). Internal consistency for the three scales range from a low of 20 for Normative Commitment Scale to a high of 40 for the Affective Commitment Scale. Median reliabilities for the Affective, Continuance, and Normative Commitment Scales are .85, .79, and .73, respectively. (Allen & Meyer, 1996; Meyer & Allen, 1997). Test-retest reliability coefficients range from .38 (Vandenberg & Self, 1993), .60 (Meyer, et al., 1993) to .94 (Blau, Paul, & St. John, 1993).

Validity: Exploratory (Allen & Meyer, 1990; McGee & Ford, 1987; Reilly & Orsak, 1991) and confirmatory (Dunham, Grube, & Castaneda, 1994; Hackett, Bycio, & Hausdorf, 1994; Meyer, Allen, & Gellatly, 1990; Shore & Tetrick, 1991; Somers, 1993) factor analyses support that affective, continuance, and normative commitment are distinct constructs. Results of factor analyses studies also provide evidence that the commitment constructs are distinguishable from

related constructs, e.g., job satisfaction (Shore & Tetrick, 1991), career, job, and work values (Blau et al., 1993), career commitment (Reilly & Orsak, 1991), occupational commitment (Meyer et al., 1993), and perceived organizational support (Shore & Tetrick, 1991).

Limitations: While the research is generally supportive, some findings suggest the need for further refinements in the conceptualization and measurement of commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1997). For example, the continuance scale may comprise two related dimensions: lack of alternative and high personal sacrifice (Hackett et al., 1994; McGee & Ford, 1987; Meyer et al., 1990; Somers, 1993). Other studies have found high correlations between affective and normative scales (Allen & Meyer, 1996; Hackett et al., 1994; Ko, 1997).

Another limitation is that temporal stability appears to be lower when commitment is measured early in employees' careers (e.g. less than one month as studied by Vandenberg & Self, 1993) though it does begin to stabilize fairly quickly (e.g., after one month as studied by Meyer et al., 1993). Therefore, these scales may not be appropriate for use with new employees.

Application: U.S. Army Research Institute (ARI) has employed a 15-item measure based on the Meyer and Allen Three-Component Scales (Oliver, Tiggel, & Hayes, 1996). The Meyer and Allen instrument was modified by substituting "the military" for "my organization" and deleting items which did not apply to the military. These scales can also be modified by using a 5-point Likert scale. Each scale can also be used independently. For example, Oliver et al. (1996) employed only two scales (affective and continuance commitment) using a 5-point scale with results mirroring similar Three-Component Model studies (e.g., McGee & Ford, 1987). While the Three-Component Scales were developed as an independent questionnaire, their brevity affords the opportunity to integrate the items into or with other measures of interest. Also, the measures can be usefully employed as both a diagnostic or research tool.

Source: Natalie Allen, University of Western Ontario Department of Psychology, 1151 Richmond St, Suite 2 London Ontario N6A 5B8, e-mail: nallen@jullian.uwo.ca. An extensive list of references and studies on the instrument appear in the Zaccaro et al. 1999 article.

Personal Empowerment Scale, Organizational Empowerment Scale, Extra-Organizational Empowerment Scale – 3 scales referenced in the US DHHS report on Mental Health (1999).

Segal, Silverman, and Temkin (1995—original article included here in the library) are cited in the U.S. DHHS Surgeon General Report on Mental Health as leaders in the development of empowerment scales for user/peer leaders and user/peer organizations. They developed 3 scales that focus on personal, organizational (power that increases the authority and responsibility of those in the organization, via control and coordination), and extra-organizational (members' involvement in political and other community activities outside the self-help organization).

These instruments are connected to leaders/leadership because 1) the authors take their definition of empowerment from both the literature AND the writings and practice theories of leaders in the self-help mental health movement; and 2) the process of empowerment “may include gaining new resources or competencies such as the capacity to help others, group leadership skills, and organizational leadership abilities” (216).

The abstract notes empowerment connotes gaining control over one's life and influencing the organizational and societal structures in which one lives. The developed and validated 3 instruments using observational work, baseline interviews (n=310), and 6-month follow-up interviews in 4 self-help client-run agencies for persons with severe mental disabilities. All three study scales "demonstrated strong internal consistency and stability...were sensitive to user changes over time and have construct validity."

The instruments were developed in 1995. I did not research the extent to which these instruments were subsequently used in studies, and subsequent validities. However, a web search indicated 204 citations of the original article.

Could not locate either a copy of the instrument or any information on cost. The seminal article is old (1995) and does not provide a copy of the instrument. Institutional info for the authors is included, but again is likely out of date. Languages and cultural information related to versions of the instrument – unknown.

Additional information/links—not provided. Citation: Segal, S. P., Silverman, C., & Temkin, T. (1995). Measuring empowerment in client-run self-help agencies. *Community Mental Health Journal*, 31(3). Included here in library.

Resilience Scale (Wagnild, 2009, 2011) is a 25 items survey reflecting five characteristics of resilience: self-reliance (a belief in oneself and capabilities), purposeful life (life has purpose and valuation of one's contributions), equanimity (balanced perspective, ability to moderate extreme responses to adversity), perseverance (persistence despite adversity or discouragement, willingness to reconstruct one's life), and existential aloneness (realization each person's life path is different, feeling of freedom and uniqueness). 7 point Likert scale. High internal consistency and good validity (specifics not reported). Information source: SSLS's Dr. Donovan Branche's dissertation study (2014).

Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS) (Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985) assesses an individual's global life satisfaction which is a measure closely associated with subjective well-being. 5-item scale, respondents rate their level of agreement with positive statements about their life, from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7). CFA consistently resulted in a single factor solution. Alpha high at .87 in original study, .82 and .80 in two follow-up studies, and .87 in SSLS's Dr. Meaney's study (2015). Convergent validity was shown in different studies. Information source: SSLS's Dr. Kevin Meaney's dissertation study (2015).

Sources of Meaning, Meaning in Life Questionnaire (SoMe) (Schnell, & Becker, 2006; Schnell, 2009) is a 151 item scale measuring 26 sources of meaning as well as degrees of experienced meaningfulness. Multiple subscales can be selected. Alpha .74, high short-term stability with an average 2-month test re-test of .81, and .72 at 6 months. Information source: SSLS's Dr. Kevin Meaney's dissertation study (2015).

Work and Meaning Inventory (WAMI) (Steger, Dik, & Dufy, 2012) is a ten item measure with scores ranging from 1 to 5, aimed at understanding the construct of meaningful work. WAMI consists of three subscales: positive meaning (degree to which people find their work to hold personal meaning or purpose), meaning-making through work (degree to which people rely on their work to help them make sense of life), and greater good motivations (degree to which people see their work benefits others or society). No gender, race differences found, good convergent validity. Alpha of subscales .89, .82., .83, and a overall meaningful work alpha of .93. Information source: SSSL's Dr. Kevin Meaney's dissertation study (2015).

World Values Survey (WorldValuesSurvey.org)

This tool has been developed and used for years now in over 60 countries. It includes values, beliefs, and social capital questions that are standardized and usable across cultures, although one can also adapt the instrument. Versions are available in man languages now. Free.

Social capital instruments

The World Bank has done extensive work on social capital and has two tools. Info from: <http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/TOPICS/EXTSOCIALDEVELOPMENT/EXTSOCIALCAPITAL/0,,contentMDK:20193049~menuPK:994384~pagePK:148956~piPK:216618~theSitePK:401015~isCURL:Y,00.html>. Permanent URL for this page: <http://go.worldbank.org/LHI4AYZEF0>. From the website:

“As a result of the Bank's extensive Social Capital research, the Social Capital Thematic Group has accumulated many insights into how to measure social capital. Based on those insights, we have developed two measurement tools for assessing social capital: the Social Capital Assessment Tool (SOCAT) and the Social Capital Integrated Questionnaire (SOCAP IQ. While those measurement tools will be useful for future research, their primary focus is to inform operations.”

Social Capital Assessment Tool (SOCAT)

The SOCAT is a multifaceted instrument designed to collect social capital data at the household, community and organizational levels. It is an integrated quantitative/qualitative tool. An important feature is the detailed information about structural and cognitive social capital that is collected at the level of the household, which is crucial to link social capital information with poverty and household welfare outcomes.

- [Community Profile and Asset Mapping](#)
- [Community Questionnaire](#)
- [Household Questionnaire](#)

- [Organization Profile Interview Guides](#)
- [Organizational Profile Scoresheet](#)
- [Social Capital Assessment Tool \(SOCAT\) in its entirety](#)

Social Capital Integrated Questionnaire (SOCAP IQ)

The purpose of this paper is to introduce the Integrated Questionnaire for the Measurement of Social Capital (SC-IQ with a focus on applications in developing countries. The tool aims to generate quantitative data on various dimensions of social capital as part of a larger household survey (such as the Living Standards Measurement Survey or a household income/expenditure survey). Specifically, six dimensions are considered: groups and networks; trust and solidarity; collective action and cooperation; information and communication; social cohesion and inclusion; empowerment and political action. The paper addresses sampling and data collection issues for implementing the SC-IQ and provides guidance for the use and analysis of data. The tool has been pilot-tested in Albania and Nigeria and a review of lessons learned is presented.

- [Albania Field Test: Integrated Questionnaire for the Measurement of Social Capital](#) (36KB PDF)
- [Report of Social Capital Household Survey Pilot in Adamawa State, Nigeria](#) (45KB PDF)
- [Social Capital Household Survey in Osun State, Nigeria](#) (12KB PDF)
- [Social Capital \(Pilot\) Survey in Enugu State, Nigeria \(Executive Summary\)](#) (30KB PDF)
- [Integrated Questionnaire for the Measurement of Social Capital](#)
- [Cuestionario Integrado para la Medicion del Capital Social](#)

World Values Survey (WorldValuesSurvey.org)

This tool has been developed and used for years now in over 60 countries. It includes values, beliefs, and social capital questions that are standardized and usable across cultures, although one can also adapt the instrument. Versions are available in many languages now. Free.

Recommendations for further research

While a number of instruments have had extensive research performed on them (MLQ-5x, LPI, etc.), most instruments have very little to no good reliability and validity work done on them. One particularly useful type of study is a comparison of instruments related to a leadership topic. For example, the servant leadership instruments listed in this library were all taken from a recent study comparing and contrasting servant leadership measurement instruments. When this type of review also uses various means to rate the instruments against one another, users have a way to select an instrument that is best for them according to criteria that meet their needs.

Reviews of instruments are most useful if they include a broad sweep of information – who created the instrument and why, what population or sub-population the instrument is related to, what was the intended use of the instrument, date of origin and theoretical background for the instrument, how the instrument was developed (item development technique, etc.), original and subsequent studies providing reliability and validity data and domain studies (exploratory/confirmatory factor analysis, etc.), google scholar count number or other source for number of times the seminal article has been cited, types of questions/approach, example from the assessment itself, scale and scoring information, estimated length of time to carry out the assessment, history of the versions of the instrument including number of items in each version, versions used/available in different languages and whether those versions have been validated culturally and linguistically (for example, with a back-translation process), and cost, copyright and availability information. Important leadership topics where there are gaps in the literature measurement instruments include (but are not limited to): nonprofit leadership, grassroots civil society organization leadership (including in low and middle income countries), community organizing leadership, union organizing leadership, leadership among lower ranks of the teaching profession (that is, teachers as leaders vs. principals), university student leadership, participative/shared leadership, leadership within subpopulations (ethnic, race, indigenous, etc.), and cross-cultural studies that are not based on populations beyond business managers or executives.

References

- Agard, K. A. (2011). *Leadership in nonprofit organizations: A reference handbook*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Anderson, T. D. (1998). *Transforming leadership: Equipping yourself and coaching others to build the leadership organization* (2nd ed.). Boca Raton, FL: St. Lucie Press.
- Armstrong, A., & Ashraff, S. N. (2011). Leadership competencies in a diverse culture. In K. A. Agard (Ed.), *Leadership in nonprofit organizations: A reference handbook*, pp. 267-272.
- Conger, J. A., Kanungo, R. N., Menon, S. T., & Mathur, P. (1997). Measuring charisma: Dimensionality and validity of the Conger-Kanungo Scale of Charismatic Leadership. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 14(3), 290–301. DOI: 10.1111/j.1936-4490.1997.tb00136.x
- Day, D. V. (2012). The nature of leadership development. In D. V. Day and J. Antonakis (Eds.), *The nature of leadership* (2nd ed.) (pp.108-140). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Ehrhart, M. G. (2004). Leadership and procedural justice climate as antecedents of unit level organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, 57(1), 61–94.
- Eriksen, M. (2009). Authentic leadership: Practical reflexivity, self-awareness, and self-authorship. *Journal of Management Education* December, 33(6), 747-771. doi: 10.1177/1052562909339307. meriksen@providence.edu
- Harris, P. R. (2013). *Developing high performance leaders: A behavioral science guide for the knowledge of work culture*. London, UK: Rutledge.
- Hazy, J. K. (2006). Measuring leadership effectiveness in complex socio-technical systems. *E:CO*, 8(3), 58-77.
- Henning-Stout, M. (1998). Test review of the Leadership Skills Inventory. From J. C. Impara & B. S. Plake (Eds.), *The thirteenth mental measurements yearbook* [Electronic version]. Retrieved August 2, 2004, from the Buros Institute's Test Reviews Online website: <http://www.unl.edu/buros>.House,

- R., & Aditya, R. (1997). The social scientific study of leadership: Quo vadis? *Journal of Management*, 23(3), 409-474.
- Huber, D. L., Maas, M., McCloskey, J., Scherb, C. A., Goode, C. J., & Watson, C. (2000). Evaluating nursing administration instruments. *The Journal of Nursing Administration*, 30(5), 251-272.
- Goethals, G. R., Sorenson, G. J., & Burns, J. M. (2004). *Encyclopedia of Leadership* (4 volumes). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Green, M. T., Rodriguez, R. A., Wheeler, C. A., & Baggerly-Hinojosa, B. (2015). Servant leadership: A quantitative review of instruments and related findings. *Servant Leadership: Theory and Practice*, 2(2), 76-96.
- Hatfield, Jr., B. (1977). Strategic leadership development: An operation domain application. A research paper presented to the Research Department, Air Command and Staff College (ACSC). Paper in this Library.
- Johnson, I. (n.d.). Leadership Instruments. Unpublished paper. Retrieved from <http://www.uq.edu.au/vietnampdss/docs/July2011/LeadershipMeasurement.doc>
- Judge, T. A., & Long, D. M. (2012). Individual differences in leadership. In D. V. Day and J. Antonakis (Eds.), *The nature of leadership* (2nd ed.) (pp. 179-217). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Karnes, F. A., & Chauvin, J. C. (1985). Leadership Skills Inventory. East Aurora, NY: DOK Publishers.
- Kellogg Foundation. (2002). Evaluating outcomes and impacts: A scan of 55 leadership development programs. Report.
- Leslie, J. B., & Fleenor, J. W. (1998). Feedback to Managers: A review and comparison of multi-rater instruments for management development, 3rd ed. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.
- Mathieu, J. E., Klimoski, R. J., Rouse, C. E. & Marsh, W. M. (1998). Evaluation of ARI leader assessment measures. U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences. ARI Research Note 98-06. Retrieved from www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a346233.pdf
- McCann, J. A. J., Langford, P. H., & Rawlings, R. M. (2006). Testing Behling and McFillen's Syncretical Model of Charismatic Transformational Leadership. *Group & Organization Management*, 31(2), 237-263. doi: 10.1177/1059601104273061
- McCarthy, D. (2008). Guide to Leadership Assessments. Dan McCarthy blog, June 22, 2008. Retrieved from <http://www.greatleadershipbydan.com/2008/06/guide-to-leadership-assessments.html>
- Militello, M., & Benham, M. K. P. (2010). "Sorting Out" collective leadership: How Q-methodology can be used to evaluate leadership development. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21, 620-632.
- Murphy, J. P. (2011). Theories of nonprofit and organizational leadership. In K. A. Agard (Ed.), *Leadership in nonprofit organizations: A reference handbook*, pp. 295-302.
- Nirenberg, J. (2004). Leadership effectiveness. In GR Goethals, GJ Sorenson, and JM Burns (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Leadership* (volume 2), pp 844-852.
- Raju, Nambury S. (????). Review of the Leadership Skills Inventory. Illinois Institute of Technology. Chicago, IL.
- Rohs, F. R., & Langone, C. A. (1997). Increased accuracy in measuring leadership impacts. *The Journal of Leadership Studies*, 4(1), 150-158.
- Thornton, G. C., III. (1998). Test review of the Leadership Skills Inventory. From J. C. Impara & B. S. Plake (Eds.), *The thirteenth mental measurements yearbook* [Electronic version]. Retrieved August 2, 2004, from the Buros Institute's Test Reviews Online website: <http://www.unl.edu/buros>. Source: <http://www.statisticssolutions.com/leadership/>
- Thurrell, R. (2010). The development of a tactical level full range leadership measurement instrument (Masters thesis). Retrieved from www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a522924.pdf

- Van Dierendonck, D., & Nuijten, I. (2011). The servant leadership survey: Development and validation of a multidimensional measure. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 26*(3), 249-267.
- Walumbwa, F., Avolio, B., Gardner, W., Wernsing, T., & Peterson, S. (2008). Authentic Leadership: Development and Validation of a Theory-Based Measure. *Management Department Faculty Publications*. Paper 24. <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/managementfacpub/24>
- Wassenaar, C. L., & Pearce, C. L. (2012). The nature of shared leadership. In D. V. Day and J. Antonakis (Eds.), *The nature of leadership* (2nd ed.) (pp. 363-389). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- West, M., Armit, K., Loewenthal, L., Eckert, R., West, T. and Lee, A. (2015). Leadership and Leadership Development in Healthcare: The Evidence Base. London, Faculty of Medical Leadership and Management. Open access: available free online.
- Yukl, G., Wall, S., & Lepsinger, R. (1990). Preliminary report on validation of the Managerial Practices Survey. In Measures of Leadership, K.E. Clark and M.B. Clark (eds.). West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America, 1990. See survey in the Library.
- Zaccaro, S. J., Klimoski, R. J., Boyce, L. A., Chandler, C., Banks, D., & Gade, P. A. (1999). Developing a tool kit for the assessment of Army leadership processes and outcomes: Verson 1.0. ARI Research Note 99-35. Organization and Personnel Resources Research Unit, U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences. Retrieve from www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA368448
- Zyphur, M. J., Barsky, A P., & Zhang, Z. (2012). Advances in leadership research methods. In D. V. Day and J. Antonakis (Eds.), *The nature of leadership* (2nd ed.) (pp. 66-107). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

For descriptive information about types of feedback tools (assessments, multi-rater feedback, experiential activities, and input from key stakeholders) please read the article **"Feedback and Leadership"** by Steve Wolinski (2011) included in this library as an Appendix under the title "Introduction to types of leadership feedback tools."