

University of San Diego

Digital USD

---

Dissertations

Theses and Dissertations

---

1987

## Executive Effectiveness Profile Instrument Development and Validation

John W. Hanes EdD  
*University of San Diego*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations>



Part of the [Leadership Studies Commons](#)

---

### Digital USD Citation

Hanes, John W. EdD, "Executive Effectiveness Profile Instrument Development and Validation" (1987). *Dissertations*. 499.

<https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations/499>

This Dissertation: Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Digital USD. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital USD. For more information, please contact [digital@sandiego.edu](mailto:digital@sandiego.edu).

**EXECUTIVE EFFECTIVENESS PROFILE**  
**Instrument Development and Validation**

by  
**John W. Hanes**

**A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment**  
**of the requirements for the degree of**  
**Doctor of Education**  
**University of San Diego**  
**1987**

**Dissertation Committee**

**William P. Foster, Ed.D., Director**  
**Edward Kujawa, Jr., Ph.D.**  
**Donald Penner, Ph.D.**

© Copyright by John W. Hanes 1987

All rights reserved.

**Executive Effectiveness Profile  
Instrument Development and Validation**

**ABSTRACT**

As executives ascend in organizational structures, they become less likely to receive objective feedback from superiors, peers, and subordinates regarding the effects of their behavior within their organizations. This loss of feedback can contribute to perceptual blind spots within the executives. Such blind spots and their ensuing negative consequences have been found to be a major cause of executive derailment. Despite the enormous value of feedback, there is a paucity of proven methodologies for providing executives with constructive feedback on the effectiveness of their behavior.

Consequently, the objective of this research was to design and validate an instrument that measures the perceived effectiveness of an executive's behavior, as judged by the executive's superiors, direct subordinates, and key peers.

The instrument was constructed around a composite definition of executive effectiveness supported by a wide body of accepted theory and empirical studies. Face validity was established through the verification of the relevancy of the items to executive effectiveness. Reliability was established through the test-retest method.

The instrument was evaluated for item clarity and clarity of directions by a pilot group of 10 executives from a San Diego manufacturing company. An experimental group of 50 executives from various business organizations participated in a line item face validity study. A second experimental group of 100 executives, including the 50 executives from the first experimental group, participated in a test-retest reliability study. The coefficient of stability was found to be statistically significant. The instrument's instructions, scoring, and administration procedures were standardized. In summary, a valid and reliable instrument for measuring perceived executive effectiveness was developed.

## **DEDICATION**

**To my Mother and Father . . . without  
their love and sacrifice, this degree  
could not have been possible.**

### Acknowledgements

No dissertation in the social sciences can be written without enormous help from others. My wife, Marilyn, steadfastly supported my efforts, and without her support and encouragement this dissertation would not have been possible. The late nights and weekend work associated with doctoral studies require a tremendous sacrifice from a spouse, and I am deeply appreciative of her love and willingness to make that sacrifice.

My dissertation committee gave me scholarly advice, excellent critiques, and enduring encouragement. My indebtedness to Drs. William P. Foster, Edward Kujawa, Jr., and Donald Penner is enormous. Academic leaders in the field of leadership research, Drs. David DeVries and Ann Morrison at the Center for Creative Leadership provided the foundation upon which this dissertation is based. The faculty of the School of Education at the University of San Diego, especially Dr. Joseph Rost, offered numerous key insights into leadership which greatly aided my research. Dr. Robert Bailey at the Center for Creative Leadership struck a cord with his definition of creative leadership that made me want to pursue executive effectiveness from a leadership perspective.

Research in the social sciences is very dependent on the cooperation of volunteers. Although their names must remain anonymous, I am indebted to the 100 executives who participated in the study. My colleagues in various organizations invited these

executives to participate in the research project, and I extend my appreciation to these professional associates: Nita Millstein, Jeff Newell, Don Penner, and Mike Verderber.

During busy semesters several university students gave freely of their advice, humor, and perspective, for which I am very grateful. They were Kevin Freiberg, Joan Miszak, and Tony Smith.

Part of my doctoral program was made possible by my former employer, Solar Turbines Incorporated. My superiors during that period were Tom Downham, John Linehan, and Ken Stahl, and they wholeheartedly supported me in my efforts. Solar's president, John Hanson, constantly brought realism into my efforts and served as a role model. Mike Verderber kept me moving toward my goal during the early years when it would have been easy to quit.

Finally, my typist, Kathleen Brooks, provided invaluable editorial suggestions along with a cheerful, upbeat attitude.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Dedication . . . . .	ii
Acknowledgements . . . . .	iii
List of Tables . . . . .	vii
List of Appendices . . . . .	viii
Chapter One – The Need for Instrumentation . . . . .	1
Statement of the Issue . . . . .	1
Objective of the Research . . . . .	2
Research Design and Methodology . . . . .	3
Pilot Group . . . . .	7
Validity . . . . .	9
Reliability . . . . .	10
Limitations . . . . .	16
Significance of the Study . . . . .	17
Definitions . . . . .	18
Conclusion . . . . .	22
Chapter Two – Review of the Literature . . . . .	23
Introduction . . . . .	23
Review of Existing Executive Assessment/ Feedback Instruments . . . . .	24
Limitations of the Review . . . . .	25
Discussion of Existing Assessment/ Feedback Materials . . . . .	26
Discussion . . . . .	29
Conceptual Basis of the Instrument . . . . .	30
Discussion . . . . .	45
Accepted Principles of Instrument Design . . . . .	45
Chapter Three – The Executive Effectiveness . . . . .	48
Profile Experiment . . . . .	48
Introduction . . . . .	48
Instrument Design: Basic Process . . . . .	48
Pilot Tryout . . . . .	52
Experimental Group Subjects . . . . .	53
Administration . . . . .	55
Scoring Key Development . . . . .	58
Research Subjects Consent/Ethical Consideration . . . . .	61

<b>Chapter Four – Results of the Experiment . . . . .</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>Introduction . . . . .</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>Face Validity . . . . .</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>Reliability . . . . .</b>	<b>69</b>
<b>Chapter Five – Understanding Executive Effectiveness in Business Organizations . . . . .</b>	<b>94</b>
<b>Introduction . . . . .</b>	<b>94</b>
<b>Instrument Evaluation . . . . .</b>	<b>94</b>
<b>A Measure of an Executive's Perceived Effectiveness – Validity . . . . .</b>	<b>94</b>
<b>A Measure of an Executive's Perceived Effectiveness – Reliability . . . . .</b>	<b>97</b>
<b>Limitations . . . . .</b>	<b>98</b>
<b>The Purpose of the Instrument:</b>	
<b>Executive Development . . . . .</b>	<b>102</b>
<b>Executive Development Activity . . . . .</b>	<b>102</b>
<b>New Instrument to Expand Upon . . . . .</b>	<b>104</b>
<b>Significance of the Research . . . . .</b>	<b>106</b>
<b>Leadership Studies . . . . .</b>	<b>106</b>
<b>Future Implications of the Study . . . . .</b>	<b>109</b>
<b>References . . . . .</b>	<b>111</b>
<b>Appendices . . . . .</b>	<b>119</b>

**LIST OF TABLES**

<b>TABLE A</b>	<b>Face Validity Study of 50 Subjects</b>
<b>TABLE B</b>	<b>Test-Retest Reliability Scores (2-day interval)</b>
<b>TABLE C</b>	<b>Test-Retest Reliability Scores (7-day interval)</b>
<b>TABLE D</b>	<b>Test-Retest Reliability Scores (24-day interval)</b>
<b>TABLE E</b>	<b>Test-Retest Reliability Scores (all intervals)</b>

**LIST OF APPENDICES**

**A. Item Analysis Questionnaire . . . . .**

**B. Feedback Profile Interpretive Guide . . . . .**

**C. Instruments Reviewed 1976-1986 . . . . .**

**D. Instruments Reviewed Prior to 1976 . . . . .**

**E. Nine Dimensions Measured by the Instrument . . . . .**

**F. Final Executive Effectiveness Profile Instrument . . . . .**

**G. Face Validity Survey . . . . .**

**H. Definitions of Scales . . . . .**

**I. Research Subjects Consent Form . . . . .**

**J. Committee on Protection of Human Subjects,  
Form A . . . . .**

**K. Committee on Protection of Human Subjects,  
Form B . . . . .**

## CHAPTER ONE

### Statement of the Issue

The higher one ascends in an organizational structure, the less likely one is to receive objective feedback from superiors, peers, and subordinates. Specifically, the dearth of constructive feedback on effectiveness can cause an executive to lose touch with how his/her behavior is affecting others in the organization.

Research studies indicate that an executive is more likely to fail due to specific behavioral deficiencies such as insensitivity, inflexibility, improper delegation, or lack of strategic thinking than to lack of expertise in his/her technical specialty (McCall & Lombardo, 1983). In essence, perceptual blind spots can be a major contributor to executive ineffectiveness. As Mintzberg concluded, "The manager's effectiveness is significantly influenced by insight into his or her own work. Performance depends upon how well the dilemmas of the job are understood and responded to" (1983, p. 428).

For this reason, executives in steadily increasing numbers have been attempting to elicit feedback on their behavior from others in their organizations. Despite this desire for increased feedback, "there is a paucity of proven methodologies that can meet the real needs of executives for constructive feedback" (Thompson, 1985, p. 341). Providing executives with meaningful feedback on their

perceived effectiveness remains a difficult and sensitive issue in most organizations (Richetto, 1985).

Concern over this issue had led to the construction of a number of instruments for providing executives with reliable and useful data on how their behavior is perceived by key organization insiders. Researchers, however, have called into question the overall quality of existing instruments (Morrison, McCall, & DeVries, 1978). An updated review by the researcher has confirmed the marginal overall quality of existing instruments. Existing executive assessment instruments suffer from assorted deficiencies, including a narrow or outdated focus, poor linkage to accepted management and leadership theory, lack of item clarity, poor feedback display, unreliability, and low face validity.

#### Objective of the Research

Consequently, the purpose of this research is to develop a valid and reliable instrument which will provide an executive with insight into how a broad spectrum of his/her management and leadership practices are viewed by key organization insiders.

Benefits of instrumented assessment are many: (1) the approach is widely accepted by executives and their subordinates, (2) key insiders are in a unique position to observe and report on the activities and perceived effectiveness of a particular executive, (3) completion of instruments is easy for organizational members, (4) confidentiality

of the assessment can be easily ensured through direct return of the instrument to a neutral third party, and results can be summarized by respondent category, (5) instruments can be filled out by respondents at their leisure, (6) the cost of feedback can be contained to an acceptable level, (7) results of the assessment can be communicated by a skilled professional in a manner which minimizes the possibility of misinterpretation.

The instrument provides insight into specific behavioral areas, including perceptions of an executive's (1) communication skills, (2) courage, (3) integrity, (4) motivation, (5) performance orientation, (6) problem solving, (7) subordinate development, (8) vision, and (9) work facilitation.

#### Research Design and Methodology

The general instrument development outline suggested by Borg and Gall (1983) provided the basic format that the researcher followed in developing the Executive Effectiveness Profile. The design phases included definition setting, target population specification, a review of related measures, dimension/scale choice, item pool generation, prototype development, prototype testing, and specification of administration procedures. Followed carefully, these phases lead to construction of a successful instrument.

Important for face validity, a definition of executive effectiveness was developed and utilized throughout the research.

This definition represented a synthesis of definitions of leadership and management of several management theorists and researchers.

A more in-depth analysis of the work of a wide cross-section of management/leadership theorists was performed. Key behaviors from each of the theories/studies were grouped into related categories. Ultimately, nine scales were derived, which included the most important behaviors identified by a wide cross-section of theorists. Each scale's inclusion can thus be supported by extensive studies of what executives actually do. No single study on executive or managerial roles was used as the sole basis of this instrument. Instead, roles identified in the most important studies—such as Mintzberg's (1983)—have been included in the scales which make up this instrument. The definition of each scale was made as broad as practically feasible to include elements labeled and categorized differently by the various theorists. This categorization process is difficult. As Mintzberg said, "The roles I have described are not easily separable. In the terminology of the psychologist they form a gestalt, an integrated whole. No role can be pulled out of the framework and the job left intact" (1983, p. 428).

These scales are (1) Communication Skills, (2) Courage, (3) Integrity, (4) Motivation, (5) Performance Orientation, (6) Problem Solving, (7) Subordinate Development, (8) Vision, and (9) Work Facilitation.



While the scales selected do not measure all possible areas of executive effectiveness, the researcher feels that the most important areas have been covered. Other scales or items which could have been added are not measured by this instrument because (1) there was not substantial agreement among theorists as to a scale's relevance to executive effectiveness, and (2) there was a conscious effort made to limit the total number of items; that is, to a number that could be completed by a respondent within 15 minutes. The researcher, through 10 years of hands-on experience with instruments of this type, has concluded that instruments taking longer than 15 minutes to complete create a significant psychological barrier to respondents. Exceeding this barrier leads to a lower level of responses received and questionable accuracy of those that are received.

While reviewing the literature, developing a definition of executive effectiveness, and selecting dimensions, it was important to determine the target audience whose behaviors the instrument would seek to assess.

First and foremost was the question of organization level. Should the instrument be targeted to senior executives, lower levels of management, or both? In looking at studies of managerial roles, the researcher felt that there was enough commonality among the jobs of middle managers and senior executives to group them together for purposes of designing an accurate general feedback/assessment

instrument. The job of first-level supervisors was felt to be decidedly different from that of middle and upper managers. Thus, first-level supervisors are not included as part of the target group which the instrument was designed to assess. The instrument was designed to provide feedback to all levels of management above first-level supervisor, including the organization's highest level decision maker.

A secondary question was target organizational setting. While the literature does not define and separate executives roles by industry or setting, the instrument was designed primarily for use in "for profit" business settings. This narrowing of the potential audience of instrument users allowed for a more focused approach to item selection. Such focus allows for greater face validity with the target audience by using terminology which is commonly accepted in business and industry.

Once the target audience was defined and the scales chosen, the next step was to create an item pool. Related measures were examined and some of the better items were extracted to form an initial item pool. Other items were constructed by the researcher after reviewing the literature on management roles and leadership.

The next step was to match the items to the scales. Eleven scales were originally chosen but were reduced to nine after they were reviewed by experts in instrumentation. This reduction was accomplished by folding a scale called Interpersonal Skills into the

**Communication Skills scale.** This widened the definition of communication to include interpersonal elements. In addition, the scale originally called Coordination/Control was folded into the Work Facilitation scale. Work Facilitation was broadened to include control elements, thus eliminating some potential overlap of the scales.

After items were matched to the revised number of nine scales, an expert in instrumentation reviewed the matches. This review resulted in the elimination, or change, of about two-thirds of the items. The principal changes revolved around narrowing the range of behavior covered by each individual item.

The final step of the instrument design process involved creating a prototype instrument that measured nine scales using 5-7 questions per scale. As part of the prototype development, directions for filling out the instrument were created.

### Pilot Study

A pilot group of ten subjects from a manufacturing company in the San Diego area with which the researcher regularly consults was selected. It was known to the researcher that the individuals in the group were representative of the type and level of individuals who would normally be completing the instrument. The group was a heterogeneous mix of middle level managers already assembled as part of a mandatory management development program. Participation in the study was voluntary, and all 10 subjects decided to participate.

The pilot study focused on an item analysis to identify potentially bad items. Specifically, each subject was asked to fill out the "self" copy of the prototype instrument. The subjects were then given a copy of the specific definition of each scale. Based on that definition, the subjects were asked to rate both the clarity and relevancy of each item to its scale using the following 4-point scales (Appendix A):

	<u>Item Clarity</u>			
Not Clear	Moderately Clear	Clear	Very Clear	
	<u>Item Relevancy</u>			
Not Relevant	Moderately Relevant	Relevant	Very Relevant	

Only items that were rated as being Clear or Very Clear and Relevant or Very Relevant by 90 percent or better of the subjects were retained on the final instrument. To add additional meaning to the study, the subjects were interviewed by the researcher after they filled out the item analysis to get the opinions of the instrument and instructions.

Based on item analysis and follow-up interviews, all 56 items passed both the clarity and relevancy tests and were retained on the final instrument. The instructions, however, were changed to provide greater clarity on how to fill out the instrument.

Attention to detail during the instrument design phase contributed greatly to the validity and reliability aspects of the instrument, which will be highlighted next.

### Validity

As in any instrument development, attention to validity is important. Borg and Gall see validity not only as "the degree to which a test measures what it purports to measure" but also "for the purposes to which I wish to put it" (1983, p. 275). Rather than a simple statistical correlation for Borg and Gall, both validity and reliability emerged as a result of instrument design.

Two types of validity have been ascertained by this study. Face validity and content validity were appraised by an item relevancy analysis using the responses of the ten subjects in the pilot study and the responses of 50 subjects in the experimental group.

Content validity emerges when prospective users of the instrument are able to make objective comparisons of the elements which the instrument measures against widely accepted theories of executive effectiveness. Thus, content validity exists in the eyes of the person receiving feedback from the instrument.

It was not the purpose of this research to conduct a construct validity analysis. This type of validity for this type of instrument is less important than face or content validity. The individual items are much more relevant to the needs of executives, with the scale titles serving only to point up a more general pattern of problem areas or strengths as seen by others. Also, an overall effectiveness ratio is not important at this time, since the instrument is not to be used for predictive purposes.

### Reliability

Reliability was measured through the calculation of a coefficient of stability. Interrater reliability was not measured, since the very nature of assessment instruments of this kind is to produce data from raters representing different organization levels and perspectives. Internal consistency also was not measured since the major emphasis of the instrument is on each individual item and scale scores are given only to highlight a potential overall trouble spot.

The instrument was intended to be a measure of executive effectiveness as perceived by the executive's chosen respondents. The instrument was therefore designed to meet the criteria of a superlative instrument as identified by Morrison, McCall, and DeVries (1978), and the Highly Important and Moderately Important aspects identified by Pfeiffer and Jones (1975). This attention to detail in the following areas served to enhance both validity and reliability.

### Number of Scales

The instrument measures nine scales. These scales represent a wide enough range of executive behaviors to show an executive's strength/weakness variability, if it exists. Nine scales have been constructed to measure executive effectiveness: Communication Skills, Courage, Integrity, Motivation, Performance Orientation, Problem Solving, Subordinate Development, Vision, and Work Facilitation.

### Response Format

The instrument consists of a combination of continuous scales and open-ended questions. This design overcomes the problems associated with a forced choice format or with open-ended questions when used alone. Variables are measured by a five-point Likert Scale: Highly Ineffective, Ineffective, Marginally Effective, Effective, Highly Effective. No attempt has been made to disguise the "social desirability" of a "highly effective" response. Meaningful disguise was felt to be impossible.

Also, respondents are given an opportunity to provide the subject with direct feedback in their own words through one open-ended question on each scale. These questions allow a respondent to clarify his/her responses to the statements in any given scale.

### Item/Scale Ratio

Each scale contains a minimum of five and a maximum of seven items. This number is in line with psychometric rules of thumb regarding the number of items necessary to show the reliability of a scale.

### Time Required to Complete

The instrument is designed with respondent time kept to a minimum. This is important since respondents in many cases will be asked by several different executives to complete instruments. The

instrument is designed to take less than 10 minutes to complete by respondents not wishing to give comments to open-ended questions, and less than 15 minutes for all other respondents.

#### Linkage to Leadership/Management Theory

The nine scales represent behaviors thought to be important indicators of executive effectiveness by leading management/leadership theorists. The instrument is not tied to any single theory or theorist. An eclectic mix of executive behaviors identified by a wide cross-section of leading theorists has been chosen. This was done to minimize the possibility that executives would be tempted to disregard the feedback because they may have disagreements with a particular theory and because no comprehensive theory has been adequately validated.

The instrument also has been designed to provide an executive with feedback on a wide variety of leadership/management behaviors—not just feedback on leader-subordinate interaction. While key insiders often do not observe these behaviors on a daily basis, they usually have formed an opinion as to the executive's effectiveness in a wide range of areas. This may be important feedback for an executive to have. These perceptions may be eroding an executive's effectiveness in other areas or provide a basis of credibility upon which to build a better one-to-one relationship with the key insider.



### Corrective Actions

The instrument has been designed so that an executive can easily see what corrective actions, if any, the various respondents suggest. This will be accomplished in two ways. First, respondents are asked to check one of three categories relating to each item: Do More, make No Change, or Do Less. This represents the respondent's ideal view of what the executive should do to increase his/her effectiveness. Second, space is provided at the end of each scale for respondents to make comments in their own words.

### Objectivity

Instructions and administration procedures are standardized, as is scoring.

### Data Analysis and Presentation

Raw data from respondents are collected and combined into four groupings: Superior(s), Subordinates, Peers, and Self. No data for a grouping are presented unless the following minimum number of responses are received: Superior—at least one; Self—obviously only one; Subordinates—at least three; Peers—at least two.

Subordinate data are combined with data from at least two other subordinates in order to provide a minimal level of confidentiality. As the number of subordinate responses increases, confidentiality becomes easier to protect.

Peer data are combined with data from at least one other peer to provide some confidentiality of an individual's responses. Because peers are on the same organization level with the subject, the need for confidentiality is slightly less than with subordinates.

Superior data are not necessarily combined. A subordinate executive has an implicit right to know where he/she stands with his/her superior. Since the superior is in a better power position than the subordinate, the risk of direct reprisal against the superior is low.

The data display includes nine scale effectiveness scores, scores for each item, recommended actions for each item, an index of variability of responses for each item, and a verbatim compilation of feedback from the open-ended questions. An illustrated sample follows.

<u>Subordinate Development</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Is</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Do More</u>	<u>No Change</u>	<u>Do Less</u>
1. Helps subordinates grow and develop						
Self	1	5.0	---	1		
Superior	1	3.0	---	1		
Subordinates	3	2.33	1-3	3		
Peers	2	3.0	2-4	1	1	

The N column represents the number of respondents per category. The Is column represents the summarized score by category. Values of 1-5 have been assigned to the Likert scale: Highly Ineffective = 1, Ineffective = 2, Marginally Effective = 3, Effective = 4, Highly

Effective = 5. The unable-to-rate responses are not included in the scoring.

Range represents the spread of responses by category. Do More, No Change, and Do Less are the number of respondents by category that checked that particular future action item.

The effectiveness ratio for each dimension is calculated by summing the scores of the individual items in each scale.

Data feedback of the finished instrument is part of a one-day workshop in which the feedback profile is interpreted for each executive. Theories of leadership and management that underlie the instrument are also discussed. Scoring is performed manually. Eventually, the goal will be to develop computer scoring of the profile.

#### Handouts

The instrument feedback profile contains definitions of the scales and a guide for interpreting the numerical scores (Appendix B).

#### Language/Noxiousness

The instrument items are written without technical jargon in a manner that at least 90 percent of the respondents rated as being either Clear or Very Clear. All items are written in sex neutral language. Potentially noxious items are not used.

### Behavior Orientation/Observability

Constructs such as intelligence or other cognitive areas are avoided in favor of descriptions of executive behavior observable by key insiders.

### Limitations

While the researcher has designed the instrument so that it can be used to assess subjects above first-level supervisor in all "for profit" business settings and locations, the generalizability of the instrument in relation to this study will be limited to middle managers (managers of supervisors) in "for profit" business settings.

### Fakeability

Any instrument of this kind relies heavily upon the state of mind of the respondent. It is always possible for a respondent with varying degrees of difficulty to manipulate his/her responses toward specific ends important to the respondent. While numerous steps have been taken to limit the fakeability of the instrument, such steps can never guarantee 100 percent success in eliminating fakeability. An implicit assumption beyond the steps taken to minimize fakeability is that respondents are able and willing to give honest and accurate responses to the items in the instrument. This burden is shared by the researcher in designing the instrument and setting the stage

through the administration process, with the executive, by intelligent choice of respondents.

### Significance of the Study

The research effort should contribute to the development of future leaders, to the future of research on executive effectiveness, and to the history and study of executive assessment/feedback instruments. These three contributions are timely and significant for several reasons. Leaders must recognize and understand the complexities and impact of their behavior on others in the organization and on the organization itself, yet providing executives with valid feedback on their performance is a tough proposition in most organizations (Morrison, McCall, & DeVries, 1978). In addition, the complexity of today's global society, the rapid rate of change in business organizations, and new studies of leadership demand different skills from today's business leaders (Burns, 1978; Drucker, 1985; Hickman & Silva, 1984; Naisbitt, 1985). According to Mills, "Today's managers experience a sense of unease. Though they have considerable capabilities, they wonder about those they may not have" (1985, p. 4). The requirement for valid and reliable feedback on executive performance seems to be stronger than ever before.

### Definitions

Assessment - Refers to one person's subjective opinion as to the existence of, effectiveness of, or importance of certain types of managerial or leadership behaviors of another person.

Executive - Refers to managers above first level supervisor up to and including the highest level decision maker in "for profit" business organizations.

Executive Effectiveness - An effective executive is a motivated person with vision and integrity. He/she recognizes the potential in people and strives to create and maintain an environment where people can develop, thereby maximizing their contribution. Within this developmental environment, the executive courageously exerts influence and mobilizes resources in competition with other forces to help people identify, clarify, pursue, and realize meaningful goals. These goals produce substantial short-term and longer-range results for the people, the executive, and the organization.

To clarify this definition, the instrument's scales are organized around nine fundamental statements which form the theoretical base of the instrument.

1. Executives use a wide variety of communication skills to influence others and get things done.
2. Executives have courage.
3. Executives have integrity.
4. Executives mobilize resources to motivate others.

5. Executives produce change and substantive results.
6. Executives solve problems.
7. Executives develop people.
8. Executives have a vision of the future which they are able to clarify and operationalize for followers.
9. Executives facilitate the accomplishment of results through other people.

First Level Supervisor - Refers to the lowest formal layer of management/supervision in an organization (i.e., all of a first level supervisor's direct subordinates would be nonmanagerial/supervisory personnel).

Instrument - Refers to surveys, questionnaires, inventories or opinionnaires which do not have a specific correct answer for any given item. This differs from a test which has correct answers defined by the test developer.

Key Organization Insider - Refers to an executive's superior(s), direct subordinates and selected peers.

Leader Observation System - Refers to a checklist developed by Dr. Fred Luthans at the University of Nebraska. The checklist contains broad behavioral categories of managerial behaviors as well as specific descriptions of each managerial activity. The behaviors listed resulted from 440 hours of free observation by trained observers of 44 managers from a wide variety of organizations. These

subjects were observed for an hour each day over a two-week period. The checklist is helpful in categorizing what managers do. It does not exist in assessment of effectiveness form. Several studies have confirmed the validity and reliability of the checklist as a general summary of managerial activities.

### Definitions of Scales

Communication Skills - Refers to a broad range of skills used to provide to and obtain from others various types of information. It includes writing, speaking, giving formal presentations, listening, persuading, and interpersonal relations.

Courage - Courage involves tackling tough issues and admitting mistakes. To have courage is to take calculated and defensible risks. It is to back up commitments. Courage is to demand followthrough from subordinates and constructively confront them when results are unacceptable. It is the ability to bounce back from adversity.

Integrity - Integrity means conducting oneself in an ethical manner. To have integrity is to be trusted by others, to follow through with and keep commitments, and to deal fairly with others. It involves dealing openly and candidly with people.

Motivating Others - Motivating others refers to creating a climate where others will enthusiastically strive to achieve goals. Motivation exists when high yet attainable standards of performance are set, when employees are involved in decisions which affect them, and when



a wide range of rewards are available and equitably distributed. Motivation is also giving recognition for good work, handling complaints in a timely fashion, and giving an accurate appraisal of employee performance.

Performance Orientation - Performance orientation means getting things done. Accomplishing both short-term (less than 1 year) and intermediate-term (1- to 5-year) goals. It is proactively implementing or facilitating positive change. It means managing time appropriately, completing projects on time and within budget, and quality targets.

Problem Solving - Problem solving refers to a wide range of behaviors surrounding problems and the decisions made to solve them. It includes identifying problems in their early stages and attempting to locate their root causes. It also refers to objectively weighing the risks and benefits of alternatives, including obtaining the support of the people responsible for implementing the solutions. Problem solving is showing good judgment and handling uncertainty and ambiguity without undue anxiety.

Subordinate Development - Subordinate development refers to actions an executive takes to help subordinates grow toward becoming self-sufficient: Allows subordinates the freedom to disagree on issues, encourages them to arrive at their own solutions to problems, trusts them to work without excess checking, and gives them assignments which expand their skills. It involves giving them the proper authority to effectively do their jobs.

**Vision** - Vision is leading and managing with a total business/big picture orientation. Vision includes clarification of an organization's purpose and values to subordinates. Vision also includes adhering the intent of policy instead of the legal letter, setting clear long-term objectives and considering the long-term impact of their decisions.

**Work Facilitation** - Work facilitation refers to helping others be more effective in obtaining organization results. To facilitate work is to clarify what is expected in terms of standards of conduct, priorities, and results. It is to clearly define roles and authority. It means developing an overall plan for goal accomplishment. It is getting subordinates to work as a team and coordinating activities with other business units. It often involves conducting meetings.

### **Conclusion**

Executives must increase their awareness of the impact of their behavior on key organization insiders if they are to have a chance of becoming maximally effective. The Executive Effectiveness Profile Instrument provides a vehicle for this diagnostic exercise. It can also serve as the foundation for a personal development plan.

The following chapter lays the groundwork for the instrument's theoretical and practical foundation. In it the literature is reviewed in three parts: (1) existing executive assessment/feedback instruments, (2) conceptual basis of the instrument, and (3) accepted principles of instrument design.

## CHAPTER TWO

### Review of the Literature

#### Introduction

The dearth of credible and useful assessment/feedback instruments stems from several factors: lack of agreement on key determinants of executive effectiveness, poorly conceived and designed instruments, failure to update sex-biased instruments, failure to update instruments to match advances in leadership research, and unreliable instruments. Consequently, existing instruments, while providing some value to executives who seek to better understand how others see their effectiveness, often fail to deliver the quality of results expected by those executives.

The first part of this chapter examines the problems inherent in existing assessment/feedback instruments.

The second portion of this chapter seeks to provide an understanding of the conceptual basis of the instrument. Models and categories of managerial and leadership behaviors are tapped and synthesized into the nine scales which make up the instrument. The third and final part of the chapter examines accepted principles of instrument design.

## Review of the Literature

### Review of Existing Executive Assessment/Feedback Instruments

Several strategies for identifying existing instruments were used. First, a computer search of the psychological and business literature was conducted using the LOCKHEED DIALOG RETRIEVAL SYSTEM.

Second, appropriate general reference books (e.g., Buros, The Ninth Mental Measurements Yearbook), technical reports, and journals were reviewed.

A third strategy involved examining catalogs of major publishers of related instruments (e.g., Consulting Psychologist Press, Palo Alto) and requesting copies of the most promising instruments.

A fourth strategy involved examining instruments in the University Associates reading room, a major cataloger, publisher, and broker of instruments.

The focus of the search centered around instruments yielding subordinate and/or peer assessment of management/leadership style/effectiveness published since 1976. The researcher relied heavily upon a comprehensive study of such assessment/feedback instruments done at The Center for Creative Leadership on instruments published prior to that time (Morrison, McCall, & DeVries, 1978). The researcher believes this study to be the most authoritative review of the literature on assessment/feedback instruments yet conducted.

The four strategies together yielded 24 related instruments developed since 1976 (Appendix C). When added to the 24 instruments reviewed in 1976 (Appendix D), the total review involved 48 instruments. To get to this number, it is estimated that the descriptions of nearly 1500 psychological and business-related instruments were examined.

#### Limitations of the Review

An intensive effort was made to identify available instruments which focus upon respondent assessment of managerial and leadership behaviors. Many such instruments have been developed in organizations but not formally published. Many others have been published for research purposes but are not available for applied use. Consequently, these measures are not included in this review.

The review of the literature was conducted during the third quarter of 1986. Instruments published since that time are not included in this review.

While there are some limitations on this review, the researcher believes that the instruments reviewed adequately represent the universe of available instruments.

### Discussion of Existing Assessment/Feedback Materials

Morrison, McCall, and DeVries (1978) judged existing instruments against four criteria: Instrument Design, Linkage to Leadership/Management Theory, Psychometric Properties, and Appropriateness for Executive Development. The researcher also used these four criteria to judge instruments published since 1976.

Instrument Design: Three important aspects are (1) the number of scales, (2) response format, and (3) number of items per scale.

Instruments measuring a small number of scales scan too narrow a slice of managerial/leadership behaviors. Assuming most executives have both strengths and weaknesses, instruments with relatively few scales will not be able to adequately represent the variability of strengths or weaknesses. Morrison, McCall, and DeVries (1978) stated that five scales are the minimum acceptable number.

Response Format is also important. Forced choice formats are weak because they almost always exclude other viable response alternatives. When used alone, open-ended questions produce responses too variable to make sense to an executive since the number of respondents providing feedback is usually low. Instruments using continuous scales alone or in combination with open-ended questions are thought to be best.

Item/Scale Ratio is important for psychometric purposes. A psychometric rule of thumb suggests that a minimum of five items should comprise a scale if adequate reliability is to be obtained.

### Linkage to Leadership/Management Theory

An instrument's linkage to accepted management and/or leadership theory is important. However, no single management or leadership theory is both comprehensive and adequately validated. Research conducted by Morrison, McCall, and DeVries (1978) indicates that eclectic instruments based on a cross-section of theories are more likely to be acceptable to executives than are instruments tied to a single theory—as long as there is evidence of support for each of the theories or behaviors assessed.

Better instruments are ones which go beyond a simple focus on leader-subordinate interaction. Other managerial and leadership activities are also important and therefore should be assessed. How others perceive a wide range of an executive's conduct (even if the behavior was not observed directly) is important feedback for any executive, since perception is reality in the eyes of the perceiver.

### Psychometric Properties

Validity and reliability of an instrument are important. Better instruments have reliability established through internal consistency or test-retest. Better instruments have demonstrated validity.

### Appropriateness for Executive Development

Three important aspects are (1) corrective actions, (2) necessity for a third party, and (3) face validity.

Corrective actions refer to the means by which an executive can use feedback to determine specific changes or actions necessitated by the feedback. Better instruments supply direct feedback where respondents identify specific improvement needs through checking an ideal behavior level or through open-ended questions.

Better instruments rely upon a third party to compile and score data, keep information confidential, and interpret feedback.

Face validity refers to how executives are likely to react to the instrument items and feedback process. Better instruments contain items which are clear and relevant. They also use sex neutral language.

#### Overall Analysis of Existing Instruments

Combining these criteria, it is possible to provide an overall evaluation of feedback instruments. Morrison, McCall, and DeVries found no existing instrument to be judged better across all four relevant criteria. Their conclusion was that "no instrument can be called superlative. Each has some strengths and some weaknesses" (1978, p. 22).

The twenty-four additional instruments reviewed by the researcher yielded similar findings. None of the instruments could be judged better over all four criteria. Each of these instruments also had a balance of strengths and weaknesses.



Appendix C lists instruments reviewed which have been published since 1976. Appendix D lists instruments reviewed which were published prior to 1976.

To summarize, a superlative instrument would meet the following criteria: (1) measure at least five scales, (2) use continuous scales alone or in combination with open-ended questions, (3) contain at least five items per scale, (4) be linked to an eclectic mix of management and leadership theories, (5) measure both superior-subordinate interaction as well as a larger mix of managerial/leadership activities, (6) have demonstrated reliability, (7) have demonstrated validity, (8) provide executives with direct feedback through comparison of current behavior to an ideal or through open-ended questions, (9) require a third party to compile data, keep information confidential, score and interpret the instrument, (10) have face validity, and (11) use sex neutral language.

### Discussion

Based upon the above criteria for a superlative instrument, the researcher can say with no hesitation that there is a clear need for a better instrument than currently exists. Such an instrument would measure a broad spectrum of managerial/leadership behaviors and activities linked to solid theoretical bases. It would also meet the eleven criteria of a superlative instrument. The researcher has designed such an instrument.

## Review of the Literature

### Conceptual Basis of the Instrument

Executive effectiveness is a relational and interactive construct. This means that one can judge an executive's effectiveness only in relation to how his/her behavior affects other organization members. If one takes this view, an executive's key insiders would have to be considered as being in a good position to render judgments as to a particular executive's perceived effectiveness.

The instrument measures executive effectiveness from an attributional approach. This approach places little importance on whether an executive is actually responsible for producing outcomes. Of greater importance is whether organization members perceive the executive to be responsible for making outcomes occur (Pfeffer, 1977). "An attribution approach is particularly useful for describing events from the organization member's applied logic of cause-effect relations" (Davis & Luthans, 1984, p. 239).

Taking the attribution approach a step further, an executive does not actually have to exhibit a behavior or fail to exhibit a behavior to be declared effective or ineffective. Of real importance is whether key insiders perceive the executive to exhibit or not exhibit particular behaviors. There is real value in making an executive aware of how his/her behavior is perceived by key insiders.

The breakdown of respondents into categories (e.g., peers) allows the subject to perform a discrepancy analysis. This is where

the subject is presented with differences between his/her self-perception and that of key insiders. Such a process has been successful in reducing the probability of an unforeseen collision between an executive and key people in the organization (Thompson, 1985).

Some researchers argue that an organization's environment can place such enormous constraints upon an executive as to make individual leadership or management skill "inconsequential" (Hunt & Osborn, 1982). Environmental constraints do limit the personal discretion potential of executives at each organization level and type of job in widely varying ways. But, according to Rosemary Stewart, "Executives vary in their ability to operate effectively within these environmental constraints and in their ability to influence the parameters of these constraints" (1982, p. 112).

It is a commonly accepted fact that executives occupying similar positions within an organization do not perform their jobs with equal effectiveness. Some executives exert considerable influence in expanding their role, while others exert little influence and may even reduce the scope of their role. Consequently, this instrument will largely ignore the effects of the organizational environment upon an executive's effectiveness and instead focus upon perceived effectiveness regardless of cause.

None of the dimensions this instrument measures are conceptually categorized as being exclusively leadership or management behaviors. While the researcher takes the position that leadership and

management are conceptually distinct, he also takes the position that at times leadership and management behaviors may be evidenced in one person, an executive who is a leader.

Since there is no consensus on what constitutes leadership, management, or executive behavior, it is important to clearly articulate a basic framework for executive effectiveness which encompasses widely held theoretical premises. The researcher makes no defense as to the validity of his definition of executive effectiveness since none is possible. Thus, the researcher can only share his belief that certain behaviors are important and attempt to provide some justification for these behaviors from prior research.

Fortunately, numerous empirical studies of executives have isolated critical roles, functions, activities, and behaviors. In addition, leading theorists have contributed frameworks which provide a reasonably strong base for the design of an instrument. Lack of a universally accepted, general theory of leadership, management, or executive effectiveness supports the creation of an eclectic instrument.

As to the value of instrumented feedback to executives, the dramatic increase in the use of such instruments cited by Morrison, McCall, and DeVries (1978) and Peters (1985), coupled with the enthusiastic response the researcher has seen over the last five years, is a strong indicator of the value of these instruments.

Following is the theoretical justification of the nine scales:

### Communication Skills

Haiman and Scott define communication as "the process of passing information from one person to another. It entails imparting ideas and making oneself understood by others" (1970, p. 71). They believe that communication is important because people need information to do their jobs effectively and because people need social satisfaction. The overwhelming majority of an executive's day is spent either in sending or receiving information.

Executives write reports, letters, and memos. They receive and disseminate information. They talk with people over the telephone; attend and hold staff meetings; and have interaction with employees, customers, suppliers, and the general public (Stewart, 1982).

Mintzberg's research identified the roles of monitor, disseminator and figurehead, which managers fulfill. As a monitor "the manager perpetually scans the environment for information." As a disseminator "the manager must share and distribute much of this information." And as a figurehead the manager performs duties of a ceremonial nature involving formal presentations, informal persuasion, and interpersonal tact involving both organization insiders and important outsiders (1983, pp. 424-425).

According to Kotter, "Trying to control others solely by directing them will not work. First, because managers are always dependent upon some people over whom they have no formal authority and second, because no one in modern organizations will passively accept

and completely obey a constant stream of orders from someone just because he or she is the boss" (1983, p. 131). To the extent that a leader's communication skills permit him/her to respond to individual needs, the leader will be better able to create genuine interest in work. However, "while slick uses of social and psychological tricks can result in persuading another to do your bidding, they are unfit for a continuing human relationship" (Prentice, 1983, p. 149).

Top managers spend a large amount of time interacting with others. They attempt to create networks of cooperative relationships with subordinates and others, enabling them to exert influence and get things done (Kotter, 1982). Leaders empathize with people. They are aware of how their actions affect others. They are available; they listen, give advice, and know people's names (Tichy & DeVanna, 1986).

Insensitivity, abrasiveness, intimidating bullying style, cold aloofness, arrogance, and inflexibility are key factors identified as leading to executive derailment by McCall and Lombardo (1983).

According to Reddin (1970), style flexibility and situational sensitivity are vital to executive effectiveness, while Schein (1965) contends that the leader must have the personal flexibility to vary his/her own behavior when the situation calls for it. House (1978) sees supportiveness in difficult and stressful times while in general showing consideration for the needs of others as keys to success. According to Argyris, "Without interpersonal competence, the

organization is a breeding ground for mistrust, intergroup conflict, rigidity and so on which in turn lead to a decrease in organizational success" (1982, p. 53).

### Courage

Unsuccessful executives react to failure by going on the defensive. They attempt to keep bad news hidden or blame others. Successful executives admit their mistakes, forewarn others, then analyze the mistakes and correct them (McCall & Lombardo, 1983). Today's executives must tackle the tough issues and strive to eliminate poor performance (Naisbitt & Aburdene, 1985).

The effective executive is a prudent risk-taker who is not afraid to commit to specific courses of action. He/she confronts reality even when it is painful to do so. He/she reveals truth to others who may not want to hear it (Tichy & DeVanna, 1986). The executive career requires the subtle capacity to take personal risks and the courage to see them through (Zaleznik, 1983).

Successful people are not derailed by adversity. Hurt, disappointment, being lied to, verbal abuse, and misunderstandings are part of the job of a manager. Professionals quickly rebound and confront the next item on the agenda (Drucker, 1985).

### Integrity

The best executives "speak constantly of vision, values, and integrity. Throughout their work they emphasize the importance of high moral principles and an orientation to excellence in all facets of their day-to-day behavior" (Peters & Austin, 1985, p. xx). Cohen and March suggest that "a leader's primary responsibility is to virtue" (1974, p. 205).

Selznick (1957) contends that leaders are primarily experts in promoting and protecting values. Maccoby believes that "an executive must bring out the best in people if he/she is to be effective" (1981, p. 16). Hall and Thompson (1980) agree. And, according to Burns, "Followers armed by moral inspiration, mobilized and purposeful, become zealots and leaders in their own right" (1978, p. 34).

Hunsaker and Alessandra (1980) feel that the cornerstone to effective management is the "trust-bond" relationship built between the leader and those who are led. In their view, when executives keep commitments, engage in two-way communication, and treat people fairly, employees will be more likely to let down their guard without fear of being exploited. The establishment of this trust base is the key to maximum productivity.

### Motivation

"The effective manager creates conditions to increase the likelihood that organization members can become motivated in their work.



In part to accomplish this end, a manager has to handle disturbances and conflicts that arise which may be detrimental to the energizing and motivating of his associates" (Morse & Wagner, 1978, p. 28). In essence, they contend that effective motivation includes an enhancement of positive factors which lead to motivation, coupled with the elimination of negative factors which inhibit motivation. Mintzberg included motivation and coaching in his description of the "leader" role managers perform, saying that "every manager must motivate and encourage employees, somehow reconciling their individual needs with the goals of the organization" (1983, p. 422).

Many modern management theories are based on how people's needs influence their behavior. Executives who can meet these needs are believed to be in a better position to provide the proper motivation which will increase subordinate effectiveness. Herzberg (1966) identifies factors on the job which typically cause dissatisfaction as well as factors which lead to satisfaction. The two are not seen by Herzberg as being opposite sides of the same coin. In other words, removing dissatisfiers such as restrictive policies, close supervision, poor pay or working conditions does not satisfy workers. It ordinarily only means that workers will not restrict their output or seek alternative employment as readily. The satisfiers found by Herzberg are similar to those outlined by Maslow (1954) and McGregor (1960): achievement recognition, the work itself, and responsibility.

Motivation and reinforcement is listed as one of ten key categories of managerial activities in the Leader Observation System (Luthans, Rosenkrantz, & Hennessey, 1985). "Leader supportiveness is in itself a reward that the leader has at his/her disposal. The judicious use of the reward increases the motivation of subordinates" (House & Mitchell, 1978, p. 227). Bannister asserts that "feedback of performance information can be very important, serving two functional purposes for the recipient. One is motivation. In its second role, feedback can serve as an error detection and cueing device" (1986, p. 207).

A great deal of research has also repeatedly demonstrated the strong impact of consequences and reinforcement upon performance (Frederikson, 1982). "New behavior becomes habitual after it has been demonstrated and repeatedly reinforced. Reinforcement is any desirable consequence following a performance that results in performance being strengthened or maintained" (Miller, 1984, p. 117).

### Performance Orientation

"Styles of leadership that worked in the past will not necessarily work in the present or the future" (Toffler, 1980, p. 402). In the past, executives were charged to be staunch protectors of the status quo. Today's executive operates in uncertain and rapidly changing environments. Today's executives must be proactive. They must be leaders in creating change.

Tichy and DeVanna (1986) found that transformational leaders in their study consistently identified themselves as change agents. Burns (1978) theorized transformational change to be a key to his theory of leadership. This view is also shared by many of today's leading organization theorists, including Peters and Waterman (1982), Miller (1984), Bennis (1985), Drucker (1985), Naisbitt (1985), and Pinchot (1985).

Davis and Luthans write, "Leadership is most convincingly demonstrated when substantive changes are made in individual or organizational performance" (1984, p. 240). Mintzberg identified a managerial role which he called "entrepreneur." In this role the manager "seeks to improve the unit, to adapt it to changing conditions in the environment" (1983, p. 425).

### Problem Solving

"Effective problem solving seems to be a universally accepted cornerstone of effective management" (Morse & Wagner, 1978, p. 28). Problem solving is listed as one of ten key categories of managerial activities in the Leader Observation System (Luthans, Rosenkrantz, & Hennessey, 1985).

An executive's important priority should be to maximize the odds for overall success in the decision making process by striving for the best balance between the technical quality of the decision and the commitment of the implementers. "Exemplary leaders make effective

use of the information and analysis of their followers to define situations and make decisions. They take actions to develop follower commitment to the implementation of decisions. They are able to balance the often conflicting pressures of time and follower need for participation" (Brache, 1983, p. 120).

Executives deal in a world of increasing complexity, ambiguity, and uncertainty. A tolerance for working within these parameters therefore becomes essential (Tichy & DeVanna, 1986). Cleveland states that future leaders "will exude a style for complexity; intellectually more reflective and conceptually more skilled; low keyed, with a talent for consensus and a tolerance for ambiguity" (1972, p. 77).

Mintzberg identified the roles of disturbance handler, resource allocator, and negotiator, which are performed by managers in their decisional capacity. As a disturbance handler "managers respond to pressures that cannot be ignored." As a resource allocator "managers authorize the important decisions of the unit before they are implemented. And as a negotiator managers negotiate solutions to problems" (1983, pp. 426-427).

Systems must also be put in place to ensure effective decisions without requiring the constant intervention of the executive. Dubin (1979) calls this "leadership at a distance."

### Subordinate Development

Bennis and Nanus (1985) see subordinate development occurring through empowerment. Empowerment is the leader's ability to tap and harness the energy and commitment of others on behalf of the organization. They suggest that this is accomplished through trusting people and participating and delegating.

Miller (1984) sees employee development as a means of laying the groundwork so that subordinates feel capable of taking psychological ownership of their work. Through development and ensuing ownership, employees feel capable of and committed to achieving organizational objectives.

According to Levinson, development is a two-way street. Development "must meet the needs and expectations of people while simultaneously contributing to the vitality of the business" (1981, p. 118). He goes on to say, "The essence of their [the leaders] task is to enhance the capacities of their subordinates and to enable both themselves and their subordinates to accomplish their mutual goals and fulfill their joint needs" (1981, p. 171).

Developing employees is central to the management theories of Hersey and Blanchard (1982), Mintzberg (1973), and Morse and Wagner (1978). Their rationale is that people in organizations increasingly feel that the workplace should provide opportunities for them to continue to learn and develop. Training and development is also listed as one of the ten categories of key managerial activities

in the Leader Observation System (Luthans, Rosenkrantz, & Hennessey, 1986).

### Vision

Leaders see a vision and strive to articulate that vision in a compelling way (Peters, 1979). They are visionaries. The leader translates dreams into images so that others can see and share them (Tichy & DeVanna, 1986). The clearer the vision, the more concrete an action plan can be produced (Pinchot, 1985). The importance of clarifying both short- and longer-term goals has been a widely accepted executive function for many years (Drucker, 1954).

To be successful, an executive must create a "compelling vision" of a desired state of affairs and communicate this vision in a meaningful and convincing way (Bennis & Nanus, 1985). Belief in vision is a new precept in business philosophy. According to Naisbitt, "The idea is simply that by envisioning the future you want, you can more easily achieve your goal. Vision is the link between dream and action" (1985, p. 21).

Barnard states that "the inculcation of belief in the real existence of a common purpose is an essential executive function" (1958, p. 87). Vaill calls this "purposing," referring to "that continuous stream of actions by an organization's formal leadership which have the effect of inducing clarity, consensus, and commitment regarding the organization's basic purposes" (1984, p. 91).

A prime responsibility of leadership is to provide a focus in which organization members can find personal meaning and reward (Pascale & Athos, 1981). "Leaders have a noble vision of their purpose. They create energy by instilling purpose in others" (Miller, 1984, p. 34). Miller goes on to point out that the vision must be communicated to workers so that they may have the satisfaction of directing their energies toward something which enhances their own dignity.

#### Work Facilitation

According to Haiman and Scott, planning is a primary function which must occur before executives can intelligently perform any other functions regardless of the time span planned for. They also view coordination as a key element in work facilitation, defining coordination as "the conscious process of assembling and synchronizing differentiated activities so they function harmoniously in the attainment of organizational objectives" (1970, p. 163).

Planning and organizing have been widely accepted staples of executive work since the days when Fayol first emphasized their importance. Fayol writes that good plans have "unity" (an overall plan followed by specific plans for each activity); "continuity" (short- and longer-range); and "flexibility" (Wren, 1972, p. 222).

Planning and coordination is listed as one of ten key categories of managerial activities in the Leader Observation System (Luthans,

Rosenkrantz, & Hennessey, 1985). Koontz and O'Donnell (1972) talk of organization as involving the integration of people, capital, and equipment in the most effective way to achieve the organization's goals. Lawrence and Lorsch (1967) also point to the importance of integration, which they see as the end product of coordination and collaboration. Mintzberg (1983) identified the liaison and communicator roles which managers perform. In these roles, the manager makes contacts outside the vertical chain of command to find information from and exchange information with people who are key to the unit's success.

Evans (1974) argues that one of a leader's key functions is to clarify for subordinates the kinds of behaviors that lead to goal accomplishment and valued rewards. This he calls "path clarification." Likewise, House and Mitchell (1978) see the reduction of frustrating barriers that get in the way of subordinate goal attainment as a key leadership factor. Dorfman and Howell find "role clarification and support from leaders" as important predictors of a worker's job performance and commitment to the organization (1986, p. 29).

Peters and Austin define facilitation as: "to make easy—not less demanding, less interesting or less intense, but less discouraging, less bound up with excessive controls and complications" (1985, p. 326). Teamwork is also important. It is a rare executive who is



able to get by with only the unintegrated strengths of individual subordinates (Peters & Waterman, 1982; Miller, 1984; Naisbitt, 1985).

### Discussion

An extensive review of management and leadership theories lends overwhelming justification to including the preceding scales in an instrument measuring executive effectiveness. While other scales could probably be included, the researcher feels somewhat less confident in his ability to demonstrate a widespread consensus of leading theorists in support of such scales. Therefore, other scales are not included.

### Review of the Literature

#### Accepted Principles of Instrument Design

Instrument design is a function of the end use of the instrument. The importance of specific aspects of an instrument's design vary considerably, depending upon whether the instrument is to be used for selection, research, assessment or training.

This review reflects the judgment of instrumentation experts at University Associates, a widely acknowledged leader in the use of instrumentation for Human Resources Development purposes, as to the amount of concern each aspect of instrument design warrants when the end use of the instrument is for training and/or assessment purposes (Pfeiffer & Jones, 1975).

### Highly Important

Validity - Validity takes on different meanings in different contexts. In assessing perceived executive effectiveness for developmental purposes, the key focus is on generating useful data on important dimensions that can help executives learn more effective behavior.

Objectivity - The more standardized the scoring, the more useful it tends to be for assessment and training.

Theoretical Base - As mentioned earlier, an instrument linked to accepted premises of executive effectiveness is a vital aspect of instrument design.

Behavioral Orientation - Items derived from descriptions of behavior are preferable to items based upon judgments of cognitive traits such as intelligence.

Language - Items must be clear, at an appropriate reading level, and minus special jargon.

Time Required - As mentioned earlier, at some point a psychological barrier is created for respondents because of too many items. The optimum time required to complete an instrument varies but should be kept in the 10-15 minute range.

Noxiousness - The scales and items must not offend intended respondents.

Data Reduction/Presentation - Keeping down the number of scales to a manageable number and displaying the data for ease of interpretation are important aspects of instrument design.

Moderately Important

Reliability - The accuracy and stability of scores.

Observability - The ability to relate scores to the observable behavior of executives.

Fakeability - The ease with which respondents can manipulate their responses to fit their ends.

Handouts - Easily read interpretive materials that accompany feedback in the executive's scores.

Relatively Unimportant

Transparency - The obviousness of the rationale or social desirability underlying the items.

Norms - The availability of relevant norms.

## CHAPTER THREE

### The Executive Effectiveness Profile Experiment

#### Introduction

The purpose of this research is to develop a valid and reliable instrument which will provide an executive with insight into how a broad spectrum of his/her management and leadership practices are viewed by key organization insiders. The procedures that were followed to design and validate this instrument are based on the process described by Borg and Gall (1983). This process is summarized in the first chapter of this study. The procedures used to design the Executive Effectiveness Profile Instrument are explained in the first section of this chapter. This chapter also describes the experimental group and the process used to validate the instrument. Generally, this chapter is a chronological synopsis of the instrument's validation and reliability study.

#### Instrument Design: Basic Process

Executive assessment/feedback instruments focus on particular dimensions of behavior thought to be important determinants of managerial effectiveness. Thus, any behaviors assessed should have strong support from the literature as to their importance to executive success. As first constructed, the Executive Effectiveness Profile Instrument had 11 behavioral dimensions and contained 74 items.

After consultation with experts in instrumentation, nearly two-thirds of the items were either changed in some way or dropped from the instrument. Two of the original scales, Coordination/Control and Interpersonal Skills, were combined with the Work Facilitation and Communication Skills scales, respectively. Neither scale was seen as conceptually distinct enough to warrant its own scale. The final nine scales are listed in an abbreviated format in Appendix E and in their complete form as follows:

Communication Skills - Refers to a broad range of skills used to provide to and obtain from others various types of information. It includes writing, speaking, giving formal presentation, listening, persuading, and interpersonal relations.

Courage - Courage involves tackling tough issues and admitting mistakes. To have courage is to take calculated and defensible risks. It is to back up commitments. Courage is to demand followthrough from subordinates and constructively confront them when results are unacceptable. It is the ability to bounce back from adversity.

Integrity - Integrity means conducting oneself in an ethical manner. To have integrity is to be trusted by others, to follow through with and keep commitments, and to deal fairly with others. It involves dealing openly and candidly with people.

Motivating Others - Motivating others refers to creating a climate where others will enthusiastically strive to achieve goals. Motivation exists when high yet attainable standards of performance are set,

when employees are involved in decisions which affect them, and when a wide range of rewards are available and equitably distributed. Motivation is also giving recognition for good work, handling complaints in a timely fashion, and giving an accurate appraisal of employee performance.

Performance Orientation - Performance orientation refers to getting things done. Accomplishing both short-term (less than one year) and intermediate-term (one- to five-year) goals. It is proactively implementing or facilitating positive change. It means managing time appropriately, completing projects on time and within budget, and quality targets.

Problem Solving - Problem solving refers to a wide range of behaviors surrounding problems and the decisions made to solve them. It includes identifying problems in their early stages and attempting to locate their root causes. It also refers to objectively weighing the risks and benefits of alternatives, including obtaining the support of the people responsible for implementing the solutions. Problem solving is showing good judgment and handling uncertainty and ambiguity without undue anxiety.

Subordinate Development - Subordinate development refers to actions an executive takes to help subordinates grow toward becoming self-sufficient: Allows subordinates the freedom to disagree on issues, encourages them to arrive at their own solutions to problems, trusts them to work without excess checking, and gives them

assignments which expand their skills. It involves giving them the proper authority to effectively do their jobs.

Vision - Vision is leading and managing with a total business/big picture orientation. Vision includes the clarification of an organization's purpose and values to subordinates. Vision also includes adhering the intent of policy instead of the legal letter, setting clear long-term objectives and considering the long-term impact of their decisions.

Work Facilitation - Work facilitation refers to helping others be more effective in obtaining organization results. To facilitate work is to clarify what is expected in terms of standards of conduct, priorities, and results. It is to clearly define roles and authority. It means developing an overall plan for goal accomplishment. It is getting subordinates to work as a team and coordinating activities with other business units. It often involves conducting meetings.

The final number of items was 56 close-ended questions with nine open-ended questions. Each scale ended up with one open-ended question and the following number of close-ended questions: Communications Skills 7, Courage 7, Integrity 5, Motivating Others 7, Performance Orientation 6, Problem Solving 6, Subordinate Development 6, Vision 5, and Work Facilitation 7.

Two additional changes resulted from conversations with instrumentation experts. The scale called Motivation was changed to the current scale, Motivating Others, to better reflect the intent of the

scale. The intent of the scale was to measure an executive's ability to motivate others and did not refer to his/her personal motivation. Thus the change.

The scale originally called Employee Development was changed to Subordinate Development. The former term was thought to be too broad, encompassing people not under an executive's direct control. The intent was to create a scale that measured an executive's behavior in developing his/her direct or indirect subordinates only. Also, for possible future applications to the military sector, it was felt that the term Subordinate was a more accurate descriptor than Employee.

#### Pilot Tryout

The pilot group of 10 executives described in Chapter One pretested the prototype instrument for clarity and face validity. Each executive in the pilot group also was interviewed by the researcher to ascertain his/her general feelings about the instrument and the clarity of the instructions.

Based upon the results of the study, the prototype itself was left intact except for the following minor revisions:

1. The page of General Instructions was changed to separate the purpose of the instrument from the directions. This change made the instrument look cleaner and increased the focus on the directions section.



2. At the bottom of the General Instructions page, the respondent was asked to check the box which best described his/her relationship to the person rated: Self, Superior, Subordinate, Peer. This was felt to be misleading and so was changed. Nonrespondents are asked to check the box after the following phrase:

The person rated is your Superior \_\_\_\_\_  
 Subordinate \_\_\_\_\_  
 Peer \_\_\_\_\_  
 Self \_\_\_\_\_

No other changes were made. The final design of the instrument appears in Appendix F.

#### Experimental Group Subjects

The instrument was designed for use by executives in "for profit" business organizations above the first supervisory level who desire feedback from key insiders on their perceived effectiveness. An experimental group of 100 such executives representing a diverse cross-section of business and industrial organizations was used in the study. All subjects were volunteers. The subjects represented the 100 percent participation (all volunteer) of four separate groups of executives that were already assembled as part of four separate management development programs being conducted by the researcher.

The first group included 30 executives from 11 "for profit" business organizations in the San Diego area. The second group of

20 executives were all employed by a small computer software defense contractor consulting firm in the San Diego area. Together these two groups, which added up to 50 subjects, were used for both a face validity study as well as part of the 100 executives that made up the reliability study.

The third group included 38 executives from a San Diego computer peripherals company. The fourth group comprised 12 executives from a wide cross-section of "for profit" business organizations geographically dispersed. Two of the 12 executives were from the public sector; another two were from the military but were included in the study in order to keep the group intact.

Typical job titles of the subjects were: Vice President Marketing, Director Manufacturing Engineering, Director of Quality Assurance, Manager of Material, Purchasing Manager, Human Resources Manager, Director of Environmental Engineering, Vice President of Administration.

To recap, the experimental group consisted of 100 executives. Subgroup A represented 50 executives who participated in both the face validity and reliability studies. Subgroup B represented 50 executives who participated in the reliability study only. None of the 100 were part of the pilot group which tested the prototype instrument. Thus the validity study totaled 50 subjects, while the reliability study totaled 100 subjects.

### Administration

The instrument was administered under controlled conditions. The subjects were given a copy of the Executive Effectiveness Profile Instrument and asked to read along as the General Instructions on page one were read out loud by the researcher. The subjects were then asked to record the name of their direct superior on the line where it asked for the name of the person being rated. Subjects were allowed to substitute the name of Subordinate or Peer if for some reason they had not been working for their direct superior long enough to have knowledge of his/her behavior. The object was to create in their minds an actual target upon which they could base their assessment just as if they were requested to fill the instrument out in real life.

The subjects were then asked to assess that person's behavior as if they had actually been handed the instrument by the person whose name appeared on the instrument. No other instructions were given, and no questions were permitted.

Upon completion of the instrument, the instruments were collected. The 50 executives in Subgroup A were asked to complete a face validity survey (Appendix G). To help them complete the study, they were given a copy of the Scale Definitions (Appendix H). The instructions were verbal and essentially consisted of telling the subjects to compare each item to its relevant scale and decide which

choice on the four-point Likert Scale best represented their feeling as to the relevancy of the item to the scale.

For the reliability study the 100 subjects were reassembled at periods ranging from three days to three weeks. The breakdown was as follows:

		<u>Initial Test</u>	<u>Retest</u>
32 subjects	2 days	3/02/87 2/23/87	3/04/87 2/25/87
30 subjects	7 days	2/03/87	2/10/87
38 subjects	24 days	1/13/87	2/06/87

The subjects were reminded of the name of the person they had originally rated. They received a second copy of the Executive Effectiveness Profile Instrument and were instructed to complete it as before. The instruments were collected upon completion, and a series of reliability coefficients showing reliability over the various periods of time were calculated. The data were then combined for all periods of time to provide an overall coefficient of stability for all intervals between test and retest combined. This is the classic test-retest method of establishing reliability and has been used extensively to determine the reliability of instruments of this type (Benson & Clark, 1982).

One of the most important considerations in using the test-retest method of establishing reliability of an instrument is choice of the

time period between test and retest. Essentially a dilemma is created. The shorter the time period between test and retest, the greater the possibility that a respondent will remember the instrument well enough to recall from memory the actual ratings he/she had previously given. On the other hand, longer time periods between test and retest open up increasing possibilities for a subject's (instrument target) actual behavior to have measurably changed.

The literature provides no clear guidelines as to the exact time that works best for this type of instrument—except that the period should be longer than one day but less than one month. A review of similar instruments that have been tested for reliability also showed no commonly accepted interval. The most common intervals among the instruments reviewed were one week, two weeks, and two days. Several instruments used multiple intervals, with reliability reported both separately by interval and collectively over all intervals.

The researcher chose to follow this latter method of selecting multiple intervals and reporting separate and collective results. The intervals between test and retest selected were 2 days, 7 days, and 24 days. These intervals fell between the general guidelines and closely matched the intervals commonly selected by other developers of similar instruments. In addition, the times fit in with the length of time between training sessions, which had already been established for the various groups of subjects used in the study.

### Scoring Key Development

Scoring of the Executive Effectiveness Profile Instrument is standardized. Each of the 56 close-ended statements ask for responses on the five-point Likert Scale, as follows:

Highly Ineffective	Ineffective	Moderately Effective	Effective	Highly Effective
-----------------------	-------------	-------------------------	-----------	---------------------

Point values have been assigned to each of the five choices. Highly Ineffective = 1.0, Ineffective = 2.0, Moderately Effective = 3.0, Effective = 4.0, and Highly Effective = 5.0. A five-point scale was chosen to permit a reasonable variation of responses. In addition, the five descriptors chosen effectively cover the identifiable range of effectiveness possibilities.

Previous experience with instruments of this type, coupled with the observations of several other heavy users of these types of instruments, led to the expectation that despite the descriptors, the distribution of responses would be skewed toward the Highly Effective end of the scale. This natural skew occurs for two main reasons. First, there is a tendency to view total satisfaction with an item as the highest possible response. Anything less than total satisfaction would be recorded as something less than the highest rating. Rarely would someone be so dissatisfied as to check the lowest possible rating. This same phenomenon has been observed in training program satisfaction evaluations. Second, performance ratings of any

kind show a natural tendency toward overevaluation or "grade inflation" (Peters, 1985).

Though not an official part of this study, the researcher actually used the final version of the Executive Effectiveness Profile Instrument with over 100 executives in training programs between January and April of 1987. With an average number of respondents per executive at about 6.5, over 650 completed instruments were received. Based on the summarized data, the following appear to be general norms for the instrument items:

Highly Effective	4.5 - 5.0
Average	4.0 - 4.5
Below Average	1.0 - 3.9

While not scientific, these results tended to confirm the researcher's hypothesis that the expected results would be skewed toward the high end of each item. Additional confirmation seemed to come from the portion of the instrument which asked respondents to check whether the subject should Do More, make No Change, or Do Less of the 56 behaviors. In about two-thirds of the cases, where respondents checked "Effective," they also indicated they would like to see the subject Do More or Do Less of that behavior—as opposed to less than three percent, where respondents checked "Highly Effective."

In summary, scoring for the 56 items requiring a close-ended response was standardized. Written comments for the open-ended items at the end of each scale receive no score but are provided to subjects in verbatim form by scale. There is no breakdown of which

category of respondent (Peer, Superior, or Subordinate) provided the written comments.

In the "real world" use of this instrument since January 1987, roughly one-third of all completed instruments contains written comments to the open-ended questions (split about in half between positive and negative comments).

Executives rated also receive a range of responses for each item. This allows them to make a more informed judgment as to the meaning of the average. Also, it allows them to see the severity of a problem they may be having in the eyes of some of their respondents.

The final portion of the scoring lists the number of respondents by category (Peers, Superiors, Subordinates) who would like to see the executive rated Do More, make No Change, or Do Less of the 56 behaviors.

Respondents are instructed via the General Instructions not to answer any item that they feel they are, for any reason, unable to rate. This blanket statement removed the need for an extra point on the five-point Likert Scale devoted to "unable to answer." Results with the "real world" use of the instrument indicates that the blanket statement has produced its intended results. In most cases where items have been left blank, the respondent has indicated either through N/A or through written comments that he/she is unable to rate the executive in this area.



### Research Subjects Consent/Ethical Considerations

In volunteering for this research project, the participants were assured of confidentiality of their responses. They were asked to sign a consent form listing the purpose of the research, anticipated risk and benefits, and the estimated time requirements for participation (Appendix I). The research study received prior approval from the University of San Diego committee on Protection of Human Subjects (shown in Appendix J).

Participants were given sample copies of the instrument and scale definitions; they were promised profiles of themselves at no charge if they so desired.

Participants were found to be at minimal risk since (1) no participant information was released to anyone, (2) no participant was identified by name, and (3) no actual feedback profile was given to the executives they rated. Their only participation was in the study of validity and reliability.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### Results of the Experiment

#### Introduction

The results of the Executive Effectiveness Profile Instrument development and validation lie chiefly in the face validity and reliability scores themselves. These scores are discussed in this chapter.

#### Face Validity

The face validity study of 50 subjects' responses to the relevancy of each item along a four-point Likert Scale (Irrelevant, Moderately Relevant, Relevant, and Highly Relevant) yielded favorable results. On each of the 56 items, over 90% of the subjects answered Relevant or Highly Relevant when asked to determine how relevant the items were to their respective scale definitions. The results are summarized by item in Table A. In no case was an item felt to be irrelevant to its scale definition by even a single subject.

Since a wide body of literature on management and leadership support the inclusion of the nine scales in an instrument which purports to measure executive effectiveness, and since each of the 56 items was determined to be relevant to the scales, it can be concluded that the Executive Effectiveness Profile Instrument is face valid.

**TABLE A**  
**Relevancy Distribution of 50 Cases**

Profile Item	%	%	%	%
	Irrelevant	Moderately Relevant	Relevant	Highly Relevant
1. Write clearly and concisely.	0	0	8	92
2. Listen attentively.	0	0	12	88
3. Speak clearly and concisely.	0	0	8	92
4. Is persuasive in selling ideas.	0	0	24	76
5. Conduct effective formal business presentations.	0	0	10	90
6. Adjust language/communication style to those being communicated with.	0	6	28	66
7. Express feelings/concerns with tact.	0	2	14	84
8. Take calculated and defensible risks.	0	6	24	70
9. Tackle the tough issues.	0	0	12	88
10. Admit mistakes.	0	2	24	74
11. Back up subordinates once a commitment has been made to them.	0	0	18	82

Profile Item	% Irrelevant	% Moderately Relevant	% Relevant	% Highly Relevant
12. Demand follow-through from subordinates on their commitments.	0	0	8	92
13. Bounce back from adversity.	0	6	50	44
14. Constructively confront subordinates when results are unacceptable.	0	0	2	98
15. Exhibit a high ethical standard of personal conduct.	0	0	2	98
16. Is open/candid with people.	0	0	28	72
17. Deal fairly with others.	0	0	8	92
18. Follow through with and keep commitments.	0	0	6	94
19. Is trusted by others.	0	0	0	100
20. Set high yet attainable standards of subordinate performance.	0	0	26	74
21. Provide an accurate appraisal of subordinate performance.	0	2	22	76

Profile Item	% Irrelevant	% Moderately Relevant	% Relevant	% Highly Relevant
22. Give credit/ recognition for good work.	0	0	2	98
23. Allocate rewards (monetary and nonmonetary) to achievers.	0	4	42	54
24. Consult subordinates when making plans/decisions which affect them.	0	2	48	50
25. Handle complaints in a timely fashion.	0	2	46	52
26. Provide ongoing feedback to subordinates on performance.	0	0	34	66
27. Complete projects on time.	0	0	4	96
28. Complete projects within budget/quality constraints.	0	0	4	96
29. Manage time well.	0	0	0	100
30. Achieve short-term (less than 1 year) organizational goals.	0	0	0	100
31. Achieve intermediate term (1 to 3 year) organizational goals.	0	0	12	88

Profile Item	% Irrelevant	% Moderately Relevant	% Relevant	% Highly Relevant
32. Implement/facilitate positive change.	0	2	22	76
33. Identify problems in their early stages.	0	0	0	100
34. Attempt to locate the root cause of problems.	0	0	0	100
35. Objectively weigh the risks and benefits of alternatives before choosing one.	0	0	8	92
36. Obtain the support of people implementing the solutions.	0	4	14	82
37. Show good judgment (i.e., make accurate decisions).	0	0	8	92
38. Handle uncertainty and ambiguity without undue anxiety.	0	6	36	58
39. Give subordinates enough authority to effectively do their jobs.	0	2	54	44
40. Allow subordinates the freedom to disagree on issues.	0	0	30	70
41. Develop subordinates toward becoming self-sufficient.	0	0	0	100

Profile Item	% Irrelevant	% Moderately Relevant	% Relevant	% Highly Relevant
42. Give assignments which expand subordinate skills.	0	0	0	100
43. Encourage subordinates to arrive at their own solutions to problems.	0	0	22	78
44. Trust subordinates to do work without excess checking on performance.	0	0	28	72
45. Clarify the organization's purpose and values to subordinates.	0	0	28	72
46. Manage with a total organization/big picture orientation.	0	0	0	100
47. Consider long-term impact of decisions.	0	0	8	92
48. Set clear, long-term objectives.	0	0	20	80
49. Strictly adhere to the <u>intent of</u> vs. the <u>letter of</u> policy.	0	4	20	76
50. Develop an overall plan for goal accomplishment.	0	0	16	84

<b>Profile Item</b>	<b>% Irrelevant</b>	<b>% Moderately Relevant</b>	<b>% Relevant</b>	<b>% Highly Relevant</b>
<b>51. Clearly define subordinates' roles/authority.</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>88</b>
<b>52. Determine each subordinate's capabilities and assign work accordingly.</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>80</b>
<b>53. Clarify what is expected (i.e., results, standards, priorities).</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>98</b>
<b>54. Get subordinates to work together as a team.</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>78</b>
<b>55. Coordinate work activities/information exchange with other units.</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>80</b>
<b>56. Conduct effective meetings.</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>82</b>



### Reliability

Reliability was established through the test/retest format. Coefficients of reliability (Pearson "r") were calculated using three subgroups of subjects, with each subgroup taking the retest at a different interval between test/retest. The total number of subjects in the study was 100. Subjects recorded the name of their direct superior on the line where the instrument asked for the name of the person being rated. Subjects then assessed that person's behavior as if they had actually been handed the instrument by the person whose name appeared on the instrument. At the end of various intervals of time, subjects were reminded of the person whom they had previously assessed. They then recorded a second copy of the Executive Effectiveness Profile with instructions to complete it as before.

Subgroup 1 comprised 32 subjects. The interval between test/retest was 2 days. Table B displays the coefficients for each item and level of significance at .001. Subgroup 2 comprised 30 subjects. The interval between test/retest was 7 days. Table C displays the coefficients for each item and level of significance at .001. Subgroup 3 comprised 38 subjects. The interval between test/retest was 24 days. Table D displays the coefficients for each item and level of significance at .001.

Table E is a summation of the reliability coefficients for the three subgroups over all time intervals. Coefficients are displayed for each item and the level of significance is at .001. These results are discussed in the concluding chapter.

TABLE B

Test-Retest Reliability Scores of 1st Subgroup (2-day interval):  
Means, Standard Deviations, Pearson "r" Coefficients

Profile Item	Mean X <sup>a</sup>	Mean Y <sup>b</sup>	SDX <sup>a</sup>	SDY <sup>b</sup>	Pearson "r"
<b><u>COMMUNICATION SKILLS</u></b>					
1. Write clearly and concisely.	4.063	4.031	1.190	1.177	.9659*
2. Listen attentively.	3.875	3.938	1.157	1.162	.9535*
3. Speak clearly and concisely.	4.000	3.875	1.107	1.185	.9101*
4. Is persuasive in selling ideas.	3.875	3.875	.554	.609	.8132*
5. Conduct effective formal business presentations.	3.969	3.969	.740	.822	.9223*
6. Adjust language/communication style to those being communicated with.	3.656	3.469	.971	.950	.8951*
7. Express feelings/concerns with tact.	4.000	3.938	.842	1.014	.7118*
<b><u>COURAGE</u></b>					
8. Take calculated and defensible risks.	4.094	4.094	.734	.734	.8154*
9. Tackle the tough issues.	3.844	3.813	1.194	1.230	.9569*
10. Admit mistakes.	3.844	3.844	1.194	1.273	.9596*

Profile Item	Mean X <sup>a</sup>	Mean Y <sup>b</sup>	SDX <sup>a</sup>	SDY <sup>b</sup>	Pearson "r"
11. Back up subordinates once a commitment has been made to them.	4.281	4.250	.924	.916	.9435*
12. Demand follow-through from subordinates on their commitments.	3.844	3.813	.920	.965	.9109*
13. Bounce back from adversity.	3.938	3.938	.759	.759	.8881*
14. Constructively confront subordinates when results are unacceptable.	4.000	3.875	.842	.833	.9117*
<b><u>INTEGRITY</u></b>					
15. Exhibit a high ethical standard of personal conduct.	4.531	4.500	.621	.622	.9305*
16. Is open/candid with people.	4.000	3.969	.950	.967	.9480*
17. Deal fairly with others.	4.406	4.438	.875	.878	.9797*
18. Follow through with and keep commitments.	4.219	4.156	.906	.884	.9044*
19. Is trusted by others.	4.219	4.156	.906	.884	.9223*
<b><u>MOTIVATES OTHERS</u></b>					
20. Set high yet attainable standards of subordinate performance.	3.844	3.875	1.019	1.040	.9428*

Profile Item	Mean X <sup>a</sup>	Mean Y <sup>b</sup>	SDX <sup>a</sup>	SDY <sup>b</sup>	Pearson "r"
21. Provide an accurate appraisal of subordinate performance.	3.969	3.969	.822	.822	.9523*
22. Give credit/recognition for good work.	4.094	4.156	.530	.574	.9038*
23. Allocate rewards (monetary and nonmonetary) to achievers.	3.625	3.594	1.264	1.241	.9601*
24. Consult subordinates when making plans/decisions which affect them.	3.781	3.688	1.039	1.030	.9431*
25. Handle complaints in a timely fashion.	4.313	4.313	.821	.821	.9766*
26. Provide ongoing feedback to subordinates on performance.	3.750	3.625	1.047	1.008	.9299*
<b>PERFORMANCE ORIENTATION</b>					
27. Complete projects on time.	4.156	4.156	.954	.954	.9291*
28. Complete projects within budget/quality constraints.	4.344	4.281	.701	.729	.9132*
29. Manage time well.	3.656	3.656	1.208	1.208	.8575*
30. Achieve short-term (less than 1 year) organizational goals.	4.125	4.125	.707	.707	.7509*

Profile Item	Mean X <sup>a</sup>	Mean Y <sup>b</sup>	SDX <sup>a</sup>	SDY <sup>b</sup>	Pearson "r"
31. Achieve intermediate term (1 to 3 year) organizational goals.	3.875	3.844	1.385	1.394	.9752*
32. Implement/facilitate positive change.	3.844	3.781	.920	.906	.9638*
<b><u>PROBLEM SOLVING</u></b>					
33. Identify problems in their early stages.	4.281	4.219	.991	1.008	.9207*
34. Attempt to locate the root cause of problems.	4.188	4.187	.859	.896	.8099*
35. Objectively weigh the risks and benefits of alternatives before choosing one.	4.188	4.031	.693	.647	.3953
36. Obtain the support of people implementing the solutions.	4.094	4.000	.963	1.078	.9330*
37. Show good judgment (i.e., make accurate decisions).	4.438	4.438	.669	.669	.8012*
38. Handle uncertainty and ambiguity without undue anxiety.	4.031	3.938	.822	.840	.9128*
<b><u>SUBORDINATE DEVELOPMENT</u></b>					
39. Give subordinates enough authority to effectively do their jobs.	3.938	3.875	1.294	1.289	.8883*

Profile Item	Mean X <sup>a</sup>	Mean Y <sup>b</sup>	SDX <sup>a</sup>	SDY <sup>b</sup>	Pearson "r"
40. Allow subordinates the freedom to disagree on issues.	4.250	4.188	.880	.896	.9562*
41. Develop subordinates toward becoming self-sufficient.	4.156	4.156	.884	.884	.8543*
42. Give assignments which expand subordinate skills.	4.125	4.094	.793	.856	.9324*
43. Encourage subordinates to arrive at their own solutions to problems.	4.094	4.125	.995	.942	.9505*
44. Trust subordinates to do work without excess checking on performance.	4.000	3.906	.916	.928	.9485*
<b>VISION</b>					
45. Clarify the organization's purpose and values to subordinates.	3.906	3.719	.963	.991	.8842*
46. Manage with a total organization/big picture orientation.	3.781	3.750	1.070	1.078	.9585*
47. Consider long-term impact of decisions.	3.938	3.906	.914	.963	.9469*
48. Set clear, long-term objectives.	3.906	3.906	.641	.588	.8324*
49. Strictly adhere to the <u>intent of</u> vs. the <u>letter of</u> policy.	3.844	3.750	.884	.880	.9436*

Profile Item	Mean X <sup>a</sup>	Mean Y <sup>b</sup>	SDX <sup>a</sup>	SDY <sup>b</sup>	Pearson "r"
<b><u>WORK FACILITATION</u></b>					
50. Develop an overall plan for goal accomplishment.	4.000	3.875	1.047	1.040	.8889*
51. Clearly define subordinates' roles/authority.	4.063	4.000	.759	.762	.7805*
52. Determine each subordinate's capabilities and assign work accordingly.	4.000	4.063	.803	.801	.8527*
53. Clarify what is expected (i.e., results, standards, priorities).	3.938	3.844	.716	.847	.7820*
54. Get subordinates to work together as a team.	4.375	4.344	.609	.653	.9631*
55. Coordinate work activities/information exchange with other units.	4.219	4.125	.706	.660	.9082*
56. Conduct effective meetings.	3.781	3.750	1.157	1.244	.9694*

**NOTES**

n = 32

a = Test

b = Retest

\*Significant at .001

TABLE C

Test-Retest Reliability Scores of 2nd Subgroup (7-day interval):  
Means, Standard Deviations, Pearson "r" Coefficients

Profile Item	Mean $\bar{X}^a$	Mean $\bar{Y}^b$	SDX <sup>a</sup>	SDY <sup>b</sup>	Pearson "r"
<b>COMMUNICATION SKILLS</b>					
1. Write clearly and concisely.	3.967	4.033	1.159	1.189	.9519*
2. Listen attentively.	4.033	4.033	1.273	1.273	.9787*
3. Speak clearly and concisely.	3.800	3.833	.961	.950	.9441*
4. Is persuasive in selling ideas.	3.867	3.867	1.042	1.279	.9177*
5. Conduct effective formal business presentations.	3.933	3.833	.828	.834	.9326*
6. Adjust language/communication style to those being communicated with.	3.800	3.767	.887	.971	.9448*
7. Express feelings/concerns with tact.	3.667	3.633	.959	.964	.9447*
<b>COURAGE</b>					
8. Take calculated and defensible risks.	3.933	3.833	.907	1.053	.9263*
9. Tackle the tough issues.	3.867	3.833	1.106	1.147	.9604*
10. Admit mistakes.	4.167	4.167	.699	.791	.9454*



Profile Item	Mean X <sup>a</sup>	Mean Y <sup>b</sup>	SDX <sup>a</sup>	SDY <sup>b</sup>	Pearson "r"
11. Back up subordinates once a commitment has been made to them.	4.000	3.900	1.083	1.094	.9316*
12. Demand follow-through from subordinates on their commitments.	3.767	3.633	1.006	1.098	.9497*
13. Bounce back from adversity.	4.000	4.000	.788	.788	1.000*
14. Constructively confront subordinates when results are unacceptable.	3.733	3.733	.868	.868	1.000*
<b><u>INTEGRITY</u></b>					
15. Exhibit a high ethical standard of personal conduct.	4.367	4.300	.928	.952	.9639*
16. Is open/candid with people.	4.267	4.267	.740	.740	1.000*
17. Deal fairly with others.	4.467	4.433	.776	.817	.9751*
18. Follow through with and keep commitments.	4.300	4.200	.837	.925	.9448*
19. Is trusted by others.	4.367	4.300	.765	.837	.8999*
<b><u>MOTIVATES OTHERS</u></b>					
20. Set high yet attainable standards of subordinate performance.	4.000	3.900	1.050	1.062	.9274*

Profile Item	Mean X <sup>a</sup>	Mean Y <sup>b</sup>	SDX <sup>a</sup>	SDY <sup>b</sup>	Pearson "r"
21. Provide an accurate appraisal of subordinate performance.	4.000	4.033	.983	.999	.9481*
22. Give credit/recognition for good work.	4.000	4.033	.983	.999	.9832*
23. Allocate rewards (monetary and nonmonetary) to achievers.	3.900	3.867	1.213	1.224	.9656*
24. Consult subordinates when making plans/decisions which affect them.	3.667	3.633	1.155	1.129	.9346*
25. Handle complaints in a timely fashion.	4.300	4.300	.877	.877	.9103*
26. Provide ongoing feedback to subordinates on performance.	3.633	3.533	1.098	1.042	.9607*
<b>PERFORMANCE ORIENTATION</b>					
27. Complete projects on time.	4.067	4.033	.907	.850	.9358*
28. Complete projects within budget/quality constraints.	4.300	4.267	.702	.740	.9029*
29. Manage time well.	3.733	3.700	1.112	1.179	.9890*
30. Achieve short-term (less than 1 year) organizational goals.	4.100	4.100	.607	.662	.9179*

Profile Item	Mean $X^a$	Mean $Y^b$	SDX <sup>a</sup>	SDY <sup>b</sup>	Pearson "r"
31. Achieve intermediate term (1 to 3 year) organizational goals.	3.967	3.900	1.159	1.115	.9502*
32. Implement/facilitate positive change.	3.800	3.800	1.095	1.126	.9724*
<b><u>PROBLEM SOLVING</u></b>					
33. Identify problems in their early stages.	4.033	3.933	1.098	1.143	.9362*
34. Attempt to locate the root cause of problems.	4.033	4.033	1.033	.850	.4344
35. Objectively weigh the risks and benefits of alternatives before choosing one.	4.000	3.933	.983	1.081	.7469*
36. Obtain the support of people implementing the solutions.	4.067	3.933	.944	.944	.9330*
37. Show good judgment (i.e., make accurate decisions).	4.267	4.200	.691	.887	.8661*
38. Handle uncertainty and ambiguity without undue anxiety.	4.167	4.033	.834	.999	.8206*
<b><u>SUBORDINATE DEVELOPMENT</u></b>					
39. Give subordinates enough authority to effectively do their jobs.	4.100	4.067	1.062	1.048	.8922*

Profile Item	Mean X <sup>a</sup>	Mean Y <sup>b</sup>	SDX <sup>a</sup>	SDY <sup>b</sup>	Pearson "r"
40. Allow subordinates the freedom to disagree on issues.	4.233	4.133	.817	.819	.9305*
41. Develop subordinates toward becoming self-sufficient.	3.967	4.033	.964	.999	.9315*
42. Give assignments which expand subordinate skills.	3.967	3.967	1.129	1.129	.9729*
43. Encourage subordinates to arrive at their own solutions to problems.	4.033	4.033	.890	.850	.9555*
44. Trust subordinates to do work without excess checking on performance.	3.900	3.867	.885	.900	.9792*
<b><u>VISION</u></b>					
45. Clarify the organization's purpose and values to subordinates.	4.000	3.933	1.114	1.143	.9750*
46. Manage with a total organization/big picture orientation.	3.833	3.833	1.053	.913	.8668*
47. Consider long-term impact of decisions.	3.900	3.833	.885	.874	.9585*
48. Set clear, long-term objectives.	3.833	3.867	.913	.937	.9809*
49. Strictly adhere to the <u>intent</u> of vs. the <u>letter</u> of policy.	4.000	3.933	.871	.868	.9575*

Profile Item	Mean X <sup>a</sup>	Mean Y <sup>b</sup>	SDX <sup>a</sup>	SDY <sup>b</sup>	Pearson "r"
<b>WORK FACILITATION</b>					
50. Develop an overall plan for goal accomplishment.	3.833	3.867	.913	.937	.9406*
51. Clearly define subordinates' roles/authority.	3.800	3.700	.887	.877	.8958*
52. Determine each subordinate's capabilities and assign work accordingly.	3.900	3.800	1.062	1.186	.9144*
53. Clarify what is expected (i.e., results, standards, priorities).	4.100	4.100	.995	.995	.8955*
54. Get subordinates to work together as a team.	4.400	4.267	.675	.907	.8902*
55. Coordinate work activities/information exchange with other units.	4.400	4.300	.563	.750	.8493*
56. Conduct effective meetings.	3.633	3.733	1.189	1.081	.9414*

**NOTES**

n = 30

a = Test

b = Retest

\*Significant at .001

TABLE D

Test-Retest Reliability Scores of 3rd Subgroup (24-day interval):  
Means, Standard Deviations, Pearson "r" Coefficients

Profile Item	Mean X <sup>a</sup>	Mean Y <sup>b</sup>	SDX <sup>a</sup>	SDY <sup>b</sup>	Pearson "r"
<b>COMMUNICATION SKILLS</b>					
1. Write clearly and concisely.	3.579	3.684	1.348	1.416	.9617*
2. Listen attentively.	3.868	3.921	1.189	1.194	.9820*
3. Speak clearly and concisely.	3.921	3.947	.912	1.012	.9326*
4. Is persuasive in selling ideas.	3.947	3.974	.733	.822	.8949*
5. Conduct effective formal business presentations.	3.763	3.763	.971	1.025	.9200*
6. Adjust language/communication style to those being communicated with.	3.684	3.579	.962	.976	.9486*
7. Express feelings/concerns with tact.	3.947	3.921	.899	.941	.9535*
<b>COURAGE</b>					
8. Take calculated and defensible risks.	3.921	4.000	.850	.697	.9112*
9. Tackle the tough issues.	4.079	4.158	1.024	.945	.9646*
10. Admit mistakes.	4.000	3.868	.930	1.018	.9421*

Profile Item	Mean X <sup>a</sup>	Mean Y <sup>b</sup>	SDX <sup>a</sup>	SDY <sup>b</sup>	Pearson "r"
11. Back up subordinates once a commitment has been made to them.	4.342	4.342	.781	.815	.9159*
12. Demand follow-through from subordinates on their commitments.	3.632	3.684	1.076	1.093	.9784*
13. Bounce back from adversity.	4.132	4.132	.665	.665	1.000*
14. Constructively confront subordinates when results are unacceptable.	3.842	3.842	.823	.823	1.000*
<b><u>INTEGRITY</u></b>					
15. Exhibit a high ethical standard of personal conduct.	4.553	4.526	.724	.762	.9774*
16. Is open/candid with people.	4.053	4.053	1.012	1.012	1.000*
17. Deal fairly with others.	4.395	4.368	.823	.852	.9818*
18. Follow through with and keep commitments.	4.132	4.079	1.070	1.050	.9774*
19. Is trusted by others.	4.026	4.105	1.102	1.110	.9695*
<b><u>MOTIVATES OTHERS</u></b>					
20. Set high yet attainable standards of subordinate performance.	3.895	3.895	1.181	1.158	.9606*

Profile Item	Mean $X^a$	Mean $Y^b$	SDX <sup>a</sup>	SDY <sup>b</sup>	Pearson "r"
21. Provide an accurate appraisal of subordinate performance.	4.158	4.105	.789	.798	.9594*
22. Give credit/recognition for good work.	4.053	4.079	1.038	1.075	.9646*
23. Allocate rewards (monetary and nonmonetary) to achievers.	3.921	3.895	.997	.953	.9587*
24. Consult subordinates when making plans/decisions which affect them.	3.816	3.737	1.205	1.223	.9564*
25. Handle complaints in a timely fashion.	4.289	4.263	.768	.760	.9775*
26. Provide ongoing feedback to subordinates on performance.	3.789	3.763	1.069	1.051	.9163*
<b><u>PERFORMANCE ORIENTATION</u></b>					
27. Complete projects on time.	4.079	4.079	1.024	1.024	.9484*
28. Complete projects within budget/quality constraints.	4.579	4.500	.683	.688	.8630*
29. Manage time well.	3.921	3.921	1.171	1.171	1.000*
30. Achieve short-term (less than 1 year) organizational goals.	4.158	4.132	.886	.906	.9165*



Profile Item	Mean $X^a$	Mean $Y^b$	SDX <sup>a</sup>	SDY <sup>b</sup>	Pearson "r"
31. Achieve intermediate term (1 to 3 year) organizational goals.	4.079	4.026	.818	.822	.9217*
32. Implement/facilitate positive change.	3.895	3.842	.863	.855	.9654*
<b><u>PROBLEM SOLVING</u></b>					
33. Identify problems in their early stages.	4.000	3.947	.870	.868	.9303*
34. Attempt to locate the root cause of problems.	4.053	3.842	.733	.945	.2670
35. Objectively weigh the risks and benefits of alternatives before choosing one.	4.026	3.947	.854	.899	.8822*
36. Obtain the support of people implementing the solutions.	3.921	3.868	1.100	1.212	.9449*
37. Show good judgment (i.e., make accurate decisions).	4.316	4.263	.702	.760	.9045*
38. Handle uncertainty and ambiguity without undue anxiety.	4.132	4.105	.963	.953	.9857*
<b><u>SUBORDINATE DEVELOPMENT</u></b>					
39. Give subordinates enough authority to effectively do their jobs.	4.000	3.895	.838	1.008	.9278*

Profile Item	Mean X <sup>a</sup>	Mean Y <sup>b</sup>	SDX <sup>a</sup>	SDY <sup>b</sup>	Pearson "r"
40. Allow subordinates the freedom to disagree on issues.	4.237	4.132	.883	.906	.9061*
41. Develop subordinates toward becoming self-sufficient.	4.105	4.000	1.034	1.065	.9320*
42. Give assignments which expand subordinate skills.	4.105	4.105	.924	.924	.9367*
43. Encourage subordinates to arrive at their own solutions to problems.	4.000	3.947	.959	.899	.9410*
44. Trust subordinates to do work without excess checking on performance.	3.816	3.816	.896	.896	1.000*
<b><u>VISION</u></b>					
45. Clarify the organization's purpose and values to subordinates.	4.000	3.868	1.208	1.189	.9405*
46. Manage with a total organization/big picture orientation.	4.000	3.974	1.040	1.000	.9621*
47. Consider long-term impact of decisions.	4.053	3.947	1.012	1.012	.9528*
48. Set clear, long-term objectives.	4.079	3.921	.818	.818	.8172*
49. Strictly adhere to the <u>intent of vs. the letter of</u> policy.	4.184	4.000	.766	.986	.8227

Profile Item	Mean X <sup>a</sup>	Mean Y <sup>b</sup>	SDX <sup>a</sup>	SDY <sup>b</sup>	Pearson "r"
<b><u>WORK FACILITATION</u></b>					
50. Develop an overall plan for goal accomplishment.	4.000	3.974	.986	.972	.9300*
51. Clearly define subordinates' roles/authority.	4.132	4.053	.991	.928	.9322*
52. Determine each subordinate's capabilities and assign work accordingly.	4.289	4.211	.802	.875	.9120*
53. Clarify what is expected (i.e., results, standards, priorities).	4.132	4.026	.741	.788	.8728*
54. Get subordinates to work together as a team.	4.184	4.132	.801	.811	.9190*
55. Coordinate work activities/information exchange with other units.	4.263	4.132	.685	.844	.8735*
56. Conduct effective meetings.	3.816	3.737	1.111	1.223	.9771*

**NOTES**

n = 38

a = Test

b = Retest

\*Significant at .001

TABLE E

Test-Retest Reliability Scores of Total Experimental Group:  
Means, Standard Deviations, Pearson "r" Coefficients

Profile Item	Mean X <sup>a</sup>	Mean Y <sup>b</sup>	SDX <sup>a</sup>	SDY <sup>b</sup>	Pearson "r"
<b>COMMUNICATION SKILLS</b>					
1. Write clearly and concisely.	3.85	3.90	1.250	1.275	.9598*
2. Listen attentively.	3.92	3.96	1.195	1.197	.9723*
3. Speak clearly and concisely.	3.91	3.89	.986	1.043	.9233*
4. Is persuasive in selling ideas.	3.90	3.91	.785	.922	.8945*
5. Conduct effective formal business presentations.	3.88	3.85	.856	.903	.9231*
6. Adjust language/communication style to those being communicated with.	3.71	3.60	.935	.964	.9287*
7. Express feelings/concerns with tact.	3.88	3.84	.902	.972	.8859*
<b>COURAGE</b>					
8. Take calculated and defensible risks.	3.98	3.98	.829	.829	.8709*
9. Tackle the tough issues.	3.94	3.95	1.099	1.104	.9582*
10. Admit mistakes.	4.00	3.95	.964	1.048	.9498*

Profile Item	Mean X <sup>a</sup>	Mean Y <sup>b</sup>	SDX <sup>a</sup>	SDY <sup>b</sup>	Pearson "r"
11. Back up subordinates once a commitment has been made to them.	4.22	4.18	.927	.947	.9321*
12. Demand follow-through from subordinates on their commitments.	3.74	3.71	1.001	1.047	.9485*
13. Bounce back from adversity.	4.03	4.03	.731	.731	.9622*
14. Constructively confront subordinates when results are unacceptable.	3.86	3.82	.841	.833	.9716*
<b><u>INTEGRITY</u></b>					
15. Exhibit a high ethical standard of personal conduct.	4.49	4.45	.759	.783	.9614*
16. Is open/candid with people.	4.10	4.09	.916	.922	.9821*
17. Deal fairly with others.	4.42	4.41	.819	.842	.9785*
18. Follow through with and keep commitments.	4.21	4.14	.946	.954	.9474*
19. Is trusted by others.	4.19	4.18	.950	.957	.9390*
<b><u>MOTIVATES OTHERS</u></b>					
20. Set high yet attainable standards of subordinate performance.	3.91	3.89	1.083	1.081	.9443*

Profile Item	Mean $X^a$	Mean $Y^b$	SDX <sup>a</sup>	SDY <sup>b</sup>	Pearson "r"
21. Provide an accurate appraisal of subordinate performance.	4.05	4.04	.857	.864	.9523*
22. Give credit/recognition for good work.	4.05	4.09	.880	.911	.9638*
23. Allocate rewards (monetary and nonmonetary) to achievers.	3.82	3.79	1.149	1.131	.9618*
24. Consult subordinates when making plans/decisions which affect them.	3.76	3.69	1.129	1.125	.9461*
25. Handle complaints in a timely fashion.	4.30	4.29	.810	.808	.9539*
26. Provide ongoing feedback to subordinates on performance.	3.73	3.65	1.062	1.029	.9338*
<b>PERFORMANCE ORIENTATION</b>					
27. Complete projects on time.	4.10	4.09	.959	.944	.9388*
28. Complete projects within budget/quality constraints.	4.42	4.36	.699	.718	.8942*
29. Manage time well.	3.78	3.77	1.160	1.179	.9482*
30. Achieve short-term (less than 1 year) organizational goals.	4.13	4.12	.747	.769	.8667*

Profile Item	Mean X <sup>a</sup>	Mean Y <sup>b</sup>	SDX <sup>a</sup>	SDY <sup>b</sup>	Pearson "r"
31. Achieve intermediate term (1 to 3 year) organizational goals.	3.98	3.93	1.119	1.121	.9567*
32. Implement/facilitate positive change.	3.85	3.81	.947	.950	.9672*
<b><u>PROBLEM SOLVING</u></b>					
33. Identify problems in their early stages.	4.10	4.03	.980	1.000	.9303*
34. Attempt to locate the root cause of problems.	4.09	4.01	.866	.904	.2466
35. Objectively weigh the risks and benefits of alternatives before choosing one.	4.07	3.97	.844	.881	.7339*
36. Obtain the support of people implementing the solutions.	4.02	3.93	1.005	1.085	.9372*
37. Show good judgment (i.e., make accurate decisions).	4.34	4.30	.685	.772	.8604*
38. Handle uncertainty and ambiguity without undue anxiety.	4.11	4.03	.875	.926	.9120*
<b><u>SUBORDINATE DEVELOPMENT</u></b>					
39. Give subordinates enough authority to effectively do their jobs.	4.01	3.94	1.059	1.108	.8936*

Profile Item	Mean X <sup>a</sup>	Mean Y <sup>b</sup>	SDX <sup>a</sup>	SDY <sup>b</sup>	Pearson "r"
40. Allow subordinates the freedom to disagree on issues.	4.24	4.15	.854	.869	.9290*
41. Develop subordinates toward becoming self-sufficient.	4.08	4.06	.961	.983	.9076*
42. Give assignments which expand subordinate skills.	4.07	4.06	.946	.962	.9502*
43. Encourage subordinates to arrive at their own solutions to problems.	4.03	4.03	.942	.893	.9474*
44. Trust subordinates to do work without excess checking on performance.	3.90	3.86	.893	.899	.9759*
<b><u>VISION</u></b>					
45. Clarify the organization's purpose and values to subordinates.	3.97	3.84	1.096	1.108	.9364*
46. Manage with a total organization/big picture orientation.	3.88	3.86	1.047	.995	.9336*
47. Consider long-term impact of decisions.	3.97	3.90	.937	.948	.9517*
48. Set clear, long-term objectives.	3.95	3.90	.796	.785	.8809*
49. Strictly adhere to the <u>intent of</u> vs. the <u>letter of</u> policy.	4.02	3.90	.841	.916	.8950*



Profile Item	Mean X <sup>a</sup>	Mean Y <sup>b</sup>	SDX <sup>a</sup>	SDY <sup>b</sup>	Pearson "r"
<b>WORK FACILITATION</b>					
50. Develop an overall plan for goal accomplishment.	3.95	3.91	.978	.975	.9162*
51. Clearly define subordinates' roles/authority.	4.01	3.93	.893	.868	.8873*
52. Determine each subordinate's capabilities and assign work accordingly.	4.08	4.04	.895	.963	.8982*
53. Clarify what is expected (i.e., results, standards, priorities).	4.06	3.99	.814	.870	.8561*
54. Get subordinates to work together as a team.	4.31	4.24	.706	.793	.9119*
55. Coordinate work activities/information exchange with other units.	4.29	4.18	.656	.757	.8701*
56. Conduct effective meetings.	3.75	3.74	1.140	1.177	.9592*

#### NOTES

n = 100

a = Test

b = Retest

\*Significant at .001

## CHAPTER FIVE

### Understanding Executive Effectiveness in Business Organizations

#### Introduction

The purpose of this research is to design and validate an instrument that measures the effectiveness of an executive as perceived by key organization insiders. The Executive Effectiveness Profile Instrument accomplishes that purpose and offers fresh insights into the changing role of business executives. This final chapter evaluates the instrument itself. Concluding remarks address the significance of this research, particularly in relation to the study of organizational leadership.

#### Instrument Evaluation

Two questions can be posed to the architect of any instrument: (1) Is the instrument a valid and reliable measure of the characteristics it is intended to assess? and (2) Does the instrument fulfill the purpose for which it was designed? Regarding the Executive Effectiveness Profile Instrument, the answer is yes on both counts.

#### A Measure of an Executive's Perceived Effectiveness - Validity

Strongly verified was the hypothesis that the instrument measures specific behaviors which are tied to general scales that are

proven to be important indicators of executive effectiveness. Each of the 56 items were carefully matched to the scale which best provided a logical fit. The scales themselves were painstakingly constructed to individually provide a well-rounded picture of an executive's perceived performance in the targeted area assessed. In combination the scales present an executive with a wide array of important measures that provide a rather complete look at the executive's overall perceived effectiveness.

Face validity of the Executive Effectiveness Profile is underpinned with the presupposition that communication skills, courage, integrity, behaviors which motivate others, a performance orientation, problem solving behaviors, subordinate development, vision, and work facilitation are important indicators of executive effectiveness. This presupposition can be made because four of the scales (communication skills, behaviors which motivate others, problem solving behaviors, and work facilitation) are classically accepted behaviors which have been proven over time to be important elements of executive effectiveness.

Contemporary studies and models destined to become classics in their own right support the emerging point of view that the remaining five scales (courage, integrity, performance orientation, subordinate development, and vision) are important considerations for today's business executive. A paradigm shift is clearly occurring. The traditional view of an executive being primarily responsible for

planning, organizing, directing, influencing, and controlling has been embellished. The emerging paradigm encompasses the basic elements of the traditional paradigm but includes a whole lot more.

Subjects in the face validity study not only overwhelmingly saw a connection of the 56 items with their respective scales but were also quite enthusiastic in follow-up interviews and discussions about the scales themselves. One subject in particular, the head of executive development for a division of one of the United States' five largest corporations, pronounced the scales "the most significant collection of behaviors ever measured by an instrument."

In summary, face validity was carefully built upon a precise definition of executive effectiveness that included classical and emergent elements. The resulting scales provide a contemporary view of executive effectiveness, combining in an eclectic way the contributions of many important researchers and theorists. Important behavioral determinants of executive success were matched to appropriate scales and proven to be relevant to the scale selected. The end result is an instrument based upon a state-of-the-art face valid foundation of literature: a measurement tool to assess the perceived effectiveness of today's business executives in light of today's real world challenges.

### A Measure of an Executive's Perceived Effectiveness - Reliability

The hypothesis that the instrument is a stable and reliable indicator of the behaviors it purports to measure was also strongly verified. Fifty-five of the 56 items passed the test of stability as measured by the test-retest reliability study over all periods of time. Collectively, the 56 reliability coefficients merged to form a series of overall reliability coefficients for the entire instrument over various periods of time. These coefficients were all significant. Thus the instrument was found to be reliable.

Underpinning the statistical coefficients are other important factors which theoretically enhance the value of the correlation coefficient but which also are significant indicators of a sort of face reliability. Such things as the clear and relatively transparent nature of the items, the simple yet objective scoring system, the attention to detail in the instrument's instructions, the inoffensiveness of the items, the language level used in the instrument, the short time required to complete the instrument, and the extensive interpretive materials all add to the feeling an executive gets that the instrument is indeed reliable.

In summary, face reliability was also built into the instrument during construction. The factors that produce this feeling of reliability undoubtedly contributed to the relatively high statistical reliability coefficients which provided a more objective measure of reliability.

### Limitations

Validity as a process is almost never accomplished through one study or by one researcher (Benson & Clark, 1982). Reliability also can be improved with larger studies and future revisions. Typically, some items over time will be shown to be less reliable than others once a large data base from instrument users becomes available. As a new instrument, the Executive Effectiveness Profile is extremely promising, yet limitations are recognized.

An instrument of this kind depends heavily on the honesty of the individual respondents who complete the assessment. Little can be done to ensure a respondent's honest assessment. A guarantee of a minimal level of confidentiality is about the best an instrument designer can do. A respondent's honesty depends on many factors, not the least of which includes such things as the perceived fear of retribution, the respondent's feelings about the subject personally, past history, and the perceived importance/usefulness of an honest evaluation. Nevertheless, instruments of this type provide unique opportunities for subordinates and peers to express their views on an executive in an organizationally accepted way with at least some degree of confidentiality. These instruments also provide superiors with an opportunity to provide more targeted feedback to their subordinate executives than standard vehicles such as performance appraisals and coaching sessions. In short, instruments of this type provide the potential for more valuable feedback to executives than is ordinarily found in most business organizations.

A related and second limitation concerns the attention to accuracy which a respondent will give when completing the instrument. Once again, little can be done to ensure a respondent will provide an accurate account of his or her perceptions. Reducing the number of items measured and thus keeping the amount of time necessary to complete the instrument to an acceptable level is the only design option available to the instrument developer. Nevertheless, instruments of this type can often provide respondents with the opportunity to provide more accurate and targeted feedback to the subject executives than the conventional performance appraisal system, coaching sessions, or meetings of most organizations.

A nondesign-related option can be used to further minimize these two inherent limitations. It is strongly suggested that organizations embarking on the use of instruments of this kind take every step to communicate to respondents the importance of their attention to accuracy. This can be done via memorandum and/or meetings. A related step is to recognize that respondents will usually be asked to complete instruments on numerous executives during concentrated periods. Thus organizations can seek to provide adequate lead time in the way of notices or deadlines so that respondents do not feel rushed. Two weeks seems to be a reasonable time.

As to the issue of honesty, the organization and subject executives can further minimize the possibility of dishonest responses. It should be made quite clear that retribution in any way against

subordinates or peers by the subject executive will be dealt with in the harshest possible way by the organization. This is critical if open communication is to be preserved for the future. Also, the executive should make it a point to talk with each respondent and express the importance with which he/she views the feedback, promising no changes but also no retribution. Follow-through on this is essential for preserving integrity.

A third limitation questions the experimental group and, consequently, the generalizability of the findings. The experimental group was chosen by collectively summing subgroups which were already assembled for another purpose, namely, as participants in various management development programs. In a few instances participation in the management development program itself was mandatory. Although a voluntary consent form was signed by each participant in the experimental group, the fact that all participants volunteered may have put some pressure on those participants who may have been less than willing to cooperate. This pressure may have caused biased responses. The researcher had little control over how the participants came to be selected for the training program and thus for the experimental group itself. As in most studies, researchers deal with experimentally accessible populations and make generalizations from that group.

A compensating factor which minimizes the impact of this limitation is that the experimental group was selected in a manner



almost identical to the selection of actual participants in a program that uses the Executive Effectiveness Profile. In real world use of the instrument, participants are chosen by an organization or allowed to self-volunteer to attend a program that provides feedback on perceived effectiveness as an executive. Thus the experimental group was comprised of exactly the type of people toward which an instrument of this kind is directed, even though the researcher had little choice over their selection.

A final limitation concerns the laboratory conditions under which the validity and reliability studies were conducted. The experimental group was told of the importance of the study, which in itself may have motivated them to give greater attention to the instrument than can be expected in the real world. In addition, there were no interruptions from visitors or phones to break their concentration as there possibly could be in a "live" use of the instrument. Thus the reliability coefficients probably represent the "best case scenario." Actual reliability might be expected to be slightly lower.

For the most part, these four limitations constitute shortcomings with the use of any instrument of this type and not just the Executive Effectiveness Profile. Such limitations, while real, should nonetheless pose a relatively minor price to pay for the depth and breadth of the feedback participants would receive.

### The Purpose of the Instrument:

#### Executive Development

Should the instrument be used for its proposed purpose? This is a second question that an instrument developer must answer. The purpose of this instrument is to generate a profile of an executive's effectiveness across a wide spectrum of executive activities/behaviors as perceived by key organization insiders for two reasons: (1) as an executive development activity, and (2) as a new instrument to be added to and further validated by future research.

#### Executive Development Activity

Feedback from an executive's key insiders as to the executive's perceived effectiveness is not part of a typical management development program. Feedback instruments, if used, concentrate on an executive's own perceptions of his/her effectiveness and/or behaviors. Without such real world feedback, it is unlikely an executive could be sufficiently "unfrozen" (to use Lewin's terminology). Without confronting objective external reality, executives are often not sufficiently disturbed by their behaviors to see any value in making changes. Even in such instances where executives are found to have few weaknesses or where their self-perceptions match external perceptions, feedback is valuable confirmation to the executive, thus serving to keep him/her on the right track. The value of the instrument as a developmental activity thus seems obvious.

From respondents' answers to the profile, a personal training needs analysis is generated. When an organization as a whole uses the instrument, an outside consultant can get a good feel for an overall organizational training needs analysis. When needs surface, each executive can judge the significance of those needs against general norms and the definition of an effective executive.

The instrument can also be used as an organizational development activity. If senior management of an organization buys into the definition of executive effectiveness, to such an extent that it becomes a dominant operational value objective to reward executives whose behavior matches the definition, several possibilities surface.

First the organization can eventually choose to use the instrument to formally assess each of its executives as to their perceived effectiveness in the eyes of their subordinates. This assessment can carry some weight in the executive's overall performance appraisal. Such "subordinate assessment of superiors" is rapidly becoming accepted practice in organizations such as IBM, who hold to the view that an executive's job is to make subordinates more productive (Tichy & DeVanna, 1986). Second, the organization can use the instrument outside the formal performance appraisal system as a separate but ongoing process to evaluate executives. By paying attention to management-style issues, the organization can effect a culture change. Research has consistently proven that what gets measured and rewarded (positive) or punished (negative) gets done

in priority to those things not measured or rewarded/punished (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982).

Finally, an organization can use the instrument in a way that forces coaching sessions to be held between superiors and subordinates. Superiors can ask the subordinate executives who are profiled to discuss areas of potential development opportunities with an eye toward constructing a personal improvement plan that the superior can monitor. Then the superior can place himself/herself in an organizationally sanctioned position of helping the subordinate improve.

The results of an instrument such as the Executive Effectiveness Profile are an exciting event in any executive development program. Executives frequently compare scores with each other at the end of programs, often giving testimonials that incorporate such instruments as among the most meaningful pieces of learning to which they have ever been exposed. That the instrument is a valuable developmental activity is clear.

#### New Instrument to Expand Upon

It is apparent that new models of executive effectiveness are surfacing at a rapid rate. Theorists such as Schein (1985), Hickman and Silva (1984), Mills (1985), Boyatzis (1982), Leavitt (1986), Bradford and Cohen (1984), Bennis and Nanus (1985), Deal and Kennedy (1982), Peters and Waterman (1982), and Naisbitt (1985), to

name a few, have charted the changes in the roles of executives to meet the demands of a new age. Each of their studies and theories is exploratory in nature.

This research endeavored to synthesize and build upon these studies by utilizing their broad hypotheses to strengthen the face validity of feedback instruments of this type. In addition, the Executive Effectiveness Profile Instrument endeavored to avoid the pitfalls inherent in existing instruments as identified by Morrison, McCall, and DeVries (1978). Although the theoretical foundation of this instrument is also exploratory and eliminates most of the limitations inherent in existing instruments, it will provide a solid tool for future refinement. The following recommendations could make the instrument more valuable:

1. The data presentation could be enhanced to provide an executive with a list of the five strongest and five weakest scores. This would allow the subject to hone in on potential areas of opportunity.
2. A second section listing adjectives to describe interpersonal style or behavior could be added. This would further embellish the feedback an executive would receive on the impact of his/her style.
3. Research could add other important items/scales as they became accepted by a wider body of academics and practitioners.
4. Problems with inaccuracy could be addressed by better controlling the conditions of administration.

Utilizing the instrument for future research is limited only by the imagination of the future researcher. For example, studies correlating actual executive effectiveness (as measured by the organization) with perceived effectiveness (as measured by this instrument) could prove extremely fertile ground. The audience could be widened to the public sector, with a researcher compiling statistics by demographics of age, sex, occupation, length of service, and so forth. Part of the significance of the Executive Effectiveness Profile Instrument is its value as a base for further refinement and research.

### Significance of the Research

#### Leadership Studies

The overwhelming majority of all people in developed societies are employees of organizations. They earn their livelihood in direct measure from the success of those organizations. Each of these organizations succeeds to one degree or another largely due to the quality of the executives of the organizations. Executives bring order out of chaos and give life to their organizations (Drucker, 1986).

It has become painfully apparent that success in today's fast-paced, complex and dynamically changing business organizations requires a much different kind of executive leadership than business organizations of even 10 years ago. Mergers, intensified domestic

competition, deregulation, technological advances, compressed product development cycles, rapidly decaying product life cycles, strong foreign competition, macro-economic uncertainty, and the changing composition of the work force are but a few of the major forces which have reshaped the role of the executive.

In times of dynamic change, feedback as to the effect of environments, decisions, and behaviors becomes a crucial determinant of an executive's ability to make appropriate interventions. When feedback to executives is lacking, the likelihood that perceptual blind spots regarding the effects of their behaviors on their organization's performance will develop. Such blind spots repeatedly have been found to be major causes of individual and organizational derailment (Morrison, McCall, & DeVries, 1978).

Traditional methods of providing feedback to executives—such as performance appraisals, MBO programs, staff meetings, "all-hands" meetings, and even "managing by wandering around"—have proven woefully inadequate. People in organizations inherently dislike conflict situations and seek to avoid them if possible. Thus verbal face-to-face confrontations, whether in large groups or in one-to-one performance appraisal settings, fail to provide the proper "environment" necessary for constructive feedback. Also, because of the relatively focused nature of these "discussions," the underlying factors which lead to the performance are often overlooked.

Executives in increasing numbers have been turning to the relatively impersonal assessment/feedback instruments as a way to solicit more confidential feedback on the underlying aspects of their performance. At least in theory, the impersonal and confidential nature of these types of instruments enhance the likelihood that an executive will receive more objective feedback on his/her effectiveness in working with and through others.

A proliferation of instruments has been developed to meet this surging demand. Most are based on outdated concepts of executive effectiveness that no longer match the realities of today's executive role. Those few instruments that are grounded in wide-ranging and more updated theoretical constructs often suffer from lack of reliability due to instrument design. For earnest executives needing meaningful and reliable feedback on their perceived effectiveness, the shelf is not well stocked. The results of the study to develop this instrument, and its potential to fill the void, are promising.

Effective executives in business organizations are increasingly approaching their duties as professional managers in more innovative ways. They now are more likely to understand and appreciate the difference between leaders and managers, can see the need for both, and attempt to combine the two as leaders charged with managerial responsibilities. A valid, up-to-date, reliable instrument which can help this process along is therefore a potentially valuable contribution to the field of leadership studies.



### Future Implications of the Study

The instrument development and validation process raises numerous questions about executive effectiveness that need further attention. Is it reasonable to expect, for example, an executive to get enough concrete data about his/her strengths and shortcomings from instruments of this type to form a solid foundation upon which he/she can build a performance improvement program?

Perhaps a more basic question might be, Do these types of instruments actually work? That is, to result in stimulating an executive to want to change, putting him/her in a position to know what needs changing, or actually resulting in tangible changes being made.

Up to this point we have been forced to take at face value the logical assumption that awareness is better than nonawareness. But are we relying too heavily on this assumption? Studies that can prove the worth of assessment/feedback instruments in general are sorely needed.

This problem is not easy to address. Since any instrument can only be as useful in producing meaningful data as it is valid and reliable, and since validity shifts as the job of an executive changes, it may not be possible to confirm the usefulness of assessment feedback instruments in general. Perhaps that is only possible in relation to a specific instrument at a specific time for a specific place. Nonetheless, it is prudent to begin somewhere. The Executive

Effectiveness Profile Instrument offers unlimited research applications in both the quantitative and qualitative realms. Future researchers should seek to expand the number of scales and items as more consensus emerges surrounding executive roles. Interviews could be performed to obtain the insights of executives as to the value of such instrumentation. A longitudinal study of the instrument could be performed seeking to correlate perceived effectiveness via the instrument with career success or organizational performance. As a developmental activity the instrument could serve as a point of discussion on executive roles and behaviors as well as the concept of applied leadership.

"The progress of any science is closely linked to the development of new and better measures of the phenomena that are its concern. The rigorous development and validation of a new measure therefore can be a significant contribution to knowledge" (Borg & Gall, 1983, p. 301). The Executive Effectiveness Profile Instrument provides a new look at executive effectiveness in a better, more reliable way. Its contribution is therefore significant.

## REFERENCES

- Adizes, I. How to Solve the Management Crisis. Homewood, IL: Dow-Jones, 1979.
- Argyris, C. Management and organization development. In Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H., Management of Organization Behavior: Utilizing Human Resources. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1982.
- Bass, B. Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations. New York: Free Press, 1985.
- Benson, J., & Clark, F. A guide for instrument development and validation. American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 36, 789-800, 1982.
- Bannister, B. B. Performance outcome feedback and attributional feedback: Interactive effects on recipient responses. Journal of Applied Psychology, 71:2, 203-210, 1986.
- Barnard, C. The Functions of the Executive. Boston: Harvard University Press, 1958 (first published in 1938).
- Bennis, W. G., & Nanus, B. Leaders: The Strategies for Taking Charge. New York: Harper & Row, 1985.
- Bonfield, P. U.S. Business Leaders: A Study of Opinions and Characteristics. New York: The Conference Board, 1980.
- Borg, W. R., & Gall, M. D. Educational Research: An Introduction (4th ed.). New York: Longman, Inc., 1983.
- Boyatzis, R. E. The Competent Manager: A Model for Executive Performance. New York: Wiley & Sons, 1982.
- Brache, A. Seven prevailing myths about leadership. Training & Development Journal, 37:6, 120-126, 1983.
- Bradford, D. L., & Cohen, A. R. Managing for Excellence. New York: Wiley & Sons, 1984.
- Bray, D. W., Campbell, R. J., & Grant, D. L. Formative Years in Business: A Long-Term AT&T Study of Managerial Lives. New York: Wiley-Interscience, 1974.
- Burns, J. M. Leadership. New York: Harper & Row, 1978.
- Buros, O. K. The Ninth Mental Measurements Yearbook. Highland Park, NJ: Gryphon Press, 1985.

- Chun, K. T., Cobb, S., & French, J. Measures for Psychological Assessment: A Guide to 3,000 Original Sources and Their Applications. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1974.
- Cleveland, H. The Future Executive. New York: Harper & Row, 1972.
- Cohen, M. D., & March, J. G. Leadership and Ambiguity. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.
- Davis, T. R., & Luthans, F. Defining and researching leadership as a behavioral construct: An idiographic approach. The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 20:3, 237-251, 1984.
- Deal, T. E., & Kennedy, A. A. Corporate Cultures: Rites and Rituals of Corporate Life. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1982.
- Dorfman, P. W., & Howell, J. P. Leadership and substitutes for leadership among professional and nonprofessional workers. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 22:1, 29-46, 1986.
- Drucker, P. F. Innovation & Entrepreneurship: Practices and Principles. New York: Harper & Row, 1985.
- Drucker, P. F. The Practice of Management. New York: Harper & Row, 1954.
- Dubin, R. Metaphors of leadership: An overview. In Hunt, J. G., & Larson, C. L. (Eds.), Cross Currents in Leadership. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1979.
- Evans, M. G. Effects of supervisory behavior: Extensions of a path goal theory of motivation. Journal of Applied Psychology, 59, 172-178, 1974.
- Ferguson, C., & Doig, R. When interests collide: Corporate growth versus human needs. Chief Executive, 18(1), 18-19, 1982.
- Fitzpatrick, A. R. The meaning of content validity. Applied Psychological Measurement, 7(1), 3-13, 1983.
- Frederiksen, L. W. Handbook of Organizational Behavior Management. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1982.
- Grove, A. High Output Management. New York: Random House, 1983.
- Haimann, T., & Scott, W. G. Management in the Modern Organization. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1970.

- Hall, B., & Thompson, H. Leadership Through Values. New York: Paulist Press, 1980.
- Hayes, J. R. The Complete Problem Solver. Philadelphia: Franklin Institute Press, 1981.
- Hickman, C., & Silva, M. Creating Excellence. New York: Signet Books, 1984.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. Management of Organizational Behavior. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1982 (first published in 1969).
- Herzberg, F. Work and the Nature of Man. Cleveland, OH: World Publishing Co., 1966.
- Heslin, J., Jones, J., & Pfeiffer, J. W. Instrumentation in Human Relations Training (2nd ed.). San Diego, CA: University Associates, 1976.
- Hornstein, H. Managerial Courage. New York: Wiley & Sons, 1986.
- House, R. J., & Mitchell, T. R. Path goal theory of leadership. In Natemeyer, W. E. (Ed.), Classics of Organizational Behavior. Oak Park, IL: Moore Publishing Co., 1978.
- Hunsaker, P. L., & Alessandra, A. J. The Art of Managing People. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1980.
- Hunt, J. G., & Osborn, R. N. Toward a macro-oriented model of leadership: An odyssey. In Hunt, J. G., Sekaran, U., & Schriesheim, C. A. (Eds.), Leadership: Beyond Establishment Views. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1982.
- Kanter, R. Men and Women of the Corporation. New York: Basic Books, 1977.
- Koontz, H., & O'Donnell, C. Principles of Management. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972.
- Kotter, J. P. The General Managers. New York: The Free Press, 1982.
- Kotter, J. P. Power, dependence, and effective management. In Allen, R. W., & Porter, L. W. (Eds.), Organizational Influence Processes. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman & Co., 1983.
- Lawrence, P. R., & Lorsch, J. W. Organization and Environment. Boston: Harvard University Press, 1967.

- Leavitt, H. J. Corporate Pathfinders. Homewood, IL: Dow-Jones Irwin, 1986.
- Levinson, H. Executive. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1981.
- Levinson, H., & Rosenthal, S. CEO: Corporate Leadership in Action. New York: Basic Books, 1984.
- Lindbloom, C. E. The Policy-Making Process (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1980.
- Luthans, F., Rosenkrantz, S. A., & Hennessey, H. W. What do successful managers really do? An observation study of managerial activities. The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 21:3, 255-270, 1986.
- Maccoby, M. The Leader. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1981.
- Margerison, C., & Kakabadse, A. How American Chief Executives Succeed. New York: American Management Association, 1984.
- Marshall, J., & Stewart, R. Managers' job perceptions: Their overall frameworks and working strategies. Journal of Management Studies, 18, 177-190, 1981.
- Maslow, A. H. Motivation & Personality. New York: Harper & Row, 1954.
- McCall, M. W., Jr., & Lombardo, M. M. Off the Track: Why and How Successful Executives Get Derailed. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership, Technical Report #21, 1983.
- McGregor, D. V. The Human Side of Enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.
- Miller, D. Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement. New York: Mikay and Company, 1964.
- Miller, L. M. American Spirit: Visions of a New Corporate Culture. New York: William Morrow & Company, 1984, 23-122.
- Mills, D. Q. The New Competitors. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1985.
- Mintzberg, H. The Nature of Managerial Work. New York: Harper & Row, 1973.

- Mintzberg, H. The Manager's Job: Fact and Folklore. In Collins, E. G. (Ed.), Executive Success: Making It In Management. New York: John Wiley, 1983, 414-435.
- Morrison, A., McCall, M., & DeVries, D. Feedback to Managers: A Comprehensive Review of Twenty Four Instruments. Greenboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership, Technical Report #8, 1978.
- Morse, J. J., & Wagner, F. R. Measuring the process of managerial effectiveness. Academy of Management Journal, 21:1, 23-35, 1978.
- Naisbitt, J. Re-Inventing the Corporation. New York: Warner, 1985, 45-79.
- O'Toole, P. Corporate Messiah: The Hiring and Firing of Million-Dollar Managers. New York: William Morrow & Co., 1984.
- Pascale, R. T., & Athos, A. G. The Art of Japanese Management. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1981, 177-188.
- Peters, D. Directory of Human Resource Development Instrumentation. San Diego, CA: University Associates, 1985.
- Peters, T. J. Leadership: Sad facts and silver linings. Harvard Business Review, 57, 164-172, 1979.
- Peters, T. J., & Waterman, R. H., Jr. In Search of Excellence. New York: Harper & Row, 1982.
- Peters, T. J., & Austin, N. K. A Passion for Excellence: The Leadership Difference. New York: Random House, 1985.
- Pfeffer, J. The ambiguity of leadership. Academy of Management Review, 2:3, 104-112, 1977.
- Pfeiffer, J. W., & Jones, J. E. The 1975 Annual Handbook for Group Facilitators. San Diego, CA: University Associates, 1975.
- Pinchot, G. Intrapreneuring: Why You Don't Have to Leave the Corporation to Become an Entrepreneur. New York: Harper & Row, 1985, 37-40.
- Prentice, W. C. H. Understanding leadership. In Executive Success: Making It in Management. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1983.



- Quinn, J. B. Strategies for Change: Logical Incrementalism. Homewood, IL: Irwin, 1980.
- Reddin, W. J. Managerial Effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.
- Richetto, G. M. Feedback in the executive suite. Training & Development Journal. Alexandria, VA: ASTD Press, 39:2, 1985.
- Roberts, K. H., & O'Reilly, C. Some correlation of communication roles in organizations. Academy of Management Journal, 22, 42-57, 1979.
- Sargent, A. G. The Androgynous Manager. New York: Amacon, 1981.
- Sayles, L. R. Managerial Behavior. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.
- Sayles, L. R. Leadership: What Effective Managers Do and How They Do It. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1979.
- Schein, E. H. Organizational Psychology. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965.
- Schein, E. H. Organizational Culture and Leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1985.
- Selznick, P. Leadership in Administration. New York: Harper & Row, 1957, p. 28.
- Stewart, R. Choices for the Manager: A Guide to Understanding Managerial Work and Behavior. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1982.
- Stogdill, R. M. The Handbook of Leadership. New York: Free Press, 1974.
- Sweetland, R. C., & Keyser, D. J. (Eds.). Tests: A Comprehensive Reference for Assessments in Psychology, Education and Business. Kansas City, MO: Test Corporation of America, 1983, pp. 814-834. (Supplement August 1984, pp. 224-247.)
- Thompson, J. T. Executive profiles: A feedback system for senior executives. In Warrick, D. D. (Ed.), Contemporary Organization Development: Current Thinking and Applications. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman & Co., 1985, pp. 340-349.
- Tichy, N. M., & DeVanna, M. A. The transformational leader. Training & Development Journal, 40:7, 27-32, 1986.

- Toffler, A. The Third Manager. New York: William Morrow & Co., 1980.
- Tornow, W. W., & Pinto, P. R. The development of a managerial job taxonomy: A system for describing, classifying, and evaluating executive positions. Journal of Applied Psychology, 61, 410-418, 1976.
- Vaill, P. B. The purposing of high performing systems. In Sergioivanni, T. J., & Corbally, J. E. (Eds.), Leadership and Organizational Culture. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1984.
- Vroom, V. H., & Yelton, P. W. Leadership and Decision Making. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1973.
- Wren, D. A. The Evolution of Management Thought. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1972.
- Yukl, G. Leadership in Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1981.
- Zaleznik, A. Management of disappointment. In Executive Success: Making It in Management. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1983.

## APPENDIX A

CLARITY

RELEVANCY

Not Clear      Moderately Clear      Clear      Very Clear

Not Relevant      Moderately Relevant      Relevant      Very Relevant

COMMUNICATION

1. Writes clearly and concisely
2. Listens attentively
3. Speaks clearly and concisely
4. Is persuasive in selling ideas
5. Conducts effective formal business presentations
6. Adjusts language/communication style to those being communicated with
7. Expresses feelings/concerns with tact

COURAGE

8. Takes calculated and defensible risks
9. Tackles the tough issues
10. Admits mistakes
11. Backs up subordinates once a commitment has been made to them
12. Demands follow-through from subordinates on their commitments
13. Bounces back from adversity
14. Constructively confronts subordinates when results are unacceptable

CLARITY

RELEVANCY

Not  
Clear

Moderately  
Clear

Clear

Very  
Clear

Not  
Relevant

Moderately  
Relevant

Relevant

Very  
Relevant

INTEGRITY

- 15. Exhibits a high ethical standard of personal conduct
- 16. Is open/candid with people
- 17. Deals fairly with others
- 18. Follows through with and keeps commitments
- 19. Is trusted by others

MOTIVATING OTHERS

- 20. Sets high yet attainable standards of subordinate performance
- 21. Provides an accurate appraisal of subordinate performance
- 22. Gives credit/recognition for good work
- 23. Allocates rewards (monetary and nonmonetary) to achievers
- 24. Consults subordinates when making plans/decisions which affect them
- 25. Handles complaints in a timely fashion
- 26. Provides ongoing feedback to subordinates on performance

CLARITY

RELEVANCY

Not  
Clear

Moderately  
Clear

Clear

Very  
Clear

Not  
Relevant

Moderately  
Relevant

Relevant

Very  
Relevant

PERFORMANCE ORIENTATION

- 27. Completes projects on time
- 28. Completes projects within budget/quality constraints
- 29. Manages time well
- 30. Achieves short-term (less than 1 year) organizational goals
- 31. Achieves intermediate-term (1 to 3 year) organizational goals
- 32. Implements/facilitates positive change

PROBLEM SOLVING

- 33. Identifies problems in their early stages
- 34. Attempts to locate the root cause of problems
- 35. Objectively weighs the risks and benefits of alternatives before choosing one
- 36. Obtains the support of people implementing the solutions
- 37. Shows good judgment (i.e., makes accurate decisions)
- 38. Handles uncertainty and ambiguity without undue anxiety

CLARITY

RELEVANCY

Not Clear    Moderately Clear    Clear    Very Clear

Not Relevant    Moderately Relevant    Relevant    Very Relevant

SUBORDINATE DEVELOPMENT

- 39. Gives subordinates enough authority to effectively do their jobs
- 40. Allows subordinates the freedom to disagree on issues
- 41. Develops subordinates toward becoming self-sufficient
- 42. Gives assignments which expand subordinate skills
- 43. Encourages subordinates to arrive at their own solutions to problems
- 44. Trusts subordinates to do work without excess checking on performance

VISION

- 45. Clarifies the organization's purpose and values to subordinates
- 46. Manages with a total organization/big picture orientation
- 47. Considers long-term impact of decisions
- 48. Sets clear, long-term objectives
- 49. Strictly adheres to the intent of vs. the letter of policy

CLARITY

RELEVANCY

Not  
Clear

Moderately  
Clear

Clear

Very  
Clear

Not  
Relevant

Moderately  
Relevant

Relevant

Very  
Relevant

WORK FACILITATION

50. Develops an overall plan for goal accomplishment

51. Clearly defines subordinates' roles/authority

52. Determines each subordinate's capabilities and assigns work accordingly

53. Clarifies what is expected (i.e., results, standards, priorities)

54. Gets subordinates to work together as a team

55. Coordinates work activities/ information exchange with other units

56. Conducts effective meetings



## **APPENDIX B**

## INTRODUCTION TO THE EXECUTIVE EFFECTIVENESS PROFILE

This profile represents a summary of the responses to the Executive Effectiveness Profile which was distributed to the people you selected. These results can give you useful information about yourself by making you aware of how others perceive your effectiveness as an executive.

You may find that others perceive your actions as an executive differently than you intend them. This is because people react to their perceptions of your behavior rather than to your intent.

A description of each of the nine scales measured is given here. The scales measure behaviors which numerous studies of leadership and management have found to be important indicators of executive effectiveness. In any organization and position, some scales may be more or less important indicators of success than others.

### Executive Effectiveness

Effective executives are motivated people with vision and integrity who recognize the potential in subordinates and strive to create and maintain an environment where subordinates can develop, thereby maximizing their contribution. Within this developmental environment they courageously exert influence and mobilize resources to help subordinates identify, clarify, pursue, and realize meaningful goals which produce both short-term and long-term results for both the subordinates and the organization.

To clarify this definition, the instrument's scales are organized around nine fundamental statements which form the theoretical base of the profile.

#### Effective Executives . . .

1. Use a wide variety of formal and interpersonal communication skills to influence others to get things done.
2. Have courage.
3. Exhibit integrity.
4. Mobilize resources to motivate others.
5. Produce change and substantive results.
6. Solve problems.

7. Develop people.
8. Have a vision of the future which they are able to clarify and operationalize for followers.
9. Facilitate the accomplishment of results through other people.

### Definitions of Scales

**Communication Skills** - Refers to a broad range of skills used to provide to and obtain from others various types of information. It includes writing, speaking, giving formal presentations, listening, persuading, and interpersonal relations.

**Courage** - Courage involves tackling tough issues and admitting mistakes. To have courage is to take calculated and defensible risks. It is to back up commitments. Courage is to demand followthrough from subordinates and constructively confront them when results are unacceptable. It is the ability to bounce back from adversity.

**Integrity** - Integrity means conducting oneself in an ethical manner. To have integrity is to be trusted by others, to follow through with and keep commitments, and to deal fairly with others. It involves dealing openly and candidly with people.

**Motivating Others** - Motivating others refers to creating a climate where others will enthusiastically strive to achieve goals. Motivation exists when high yet attainable standards of performance are set, when employees are involved in decisions which affect them, and when a wide range of rewards are available and equitably distributed. Motivation is also giving recognition for good work, handling complaints in a timely fashion, and giving an accurate appraisal of employee performance.

**Performance Orientation** - Performance orientation refers to getting things done. Accomplishing both short-term (less than one year) and intermediate-term (one- to five-year) goals. It is proactively implementing or facilitating positive change. It means managing time appropriately, completing projects on time and within budget, and quality targets.

**Problem Solving** - Problem solving refers to a wide range of behaviors surrounding problems and the decisions made to solve them. It includes identifying problems in their early stages and attempting to locate their root causes. It also refers to objectively weighing the risks and benefits of alternatives, including obtaining the support of the people responsible for implementing the solutions. Problem solving is showing good judgment and handling uncertainty and ambiguity without undue anxiety.

**Subordinate Development** - Subordinate development refers to actions an executive takes to help subordinates grow toward becoming self-sufficient: Allows subordinates the freedom to disagree on issues, encourages them to arrive at their own solutions to problems, trusts them to work without excess checking, and gives them assignments which expand their skills. It involves giving them the proper authority to effectively do their jobs.

**Vision** - Vision is leading and managing with a total business/big picture orientation. Vision includes the clarification of an organization's purpose and values to subordinates. Vision also includes adhering the intent of policy instead of the legal letter, setting clear long-term objectives, and considering the long-term impact of their decisions.

**Work Facilitation** - Work facilitation refers to helping others be more effective in obtaining organization results. To facilitate work is to clarify what is expected in terms of standards of conduct, priorities, and results. It is to clearly define roles and authority. It means developing an overall plan for goal accomplishment. It is getting subordinates to work as a team and coordinating activities with other business units. It often involves conducting meetings.

## Executive Effectiveness Profile

### Interpreting the Results

This section explains your profile. It should answer any questions you have about your results and what they mean.

#### Section 1 – PERCEPTIONS: SELF AND OTHERS

This profile is designed to provide insight into how others see your effectiveness as an executive. A sample display of feedback on a question is listed below:

<u>Communication</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Do More</u>	<u>No Change</u>	<u>Do Less</u>
<b>2. Listens attentively</b>						
Self	1	5.0				
Superior	1	4.0			1	
Subordinates	5	2.8	1-3	4	1	
Peers	3	3.33	3-4	1	2	

N = The number of responses received by respondent category. In the example, the Self profile, one profile from a superior, five profiles from Subordinates, and three profiles from Peers have been received.

Score =

The score is the numerical average of the responses of the respondents by category. A rating of Highly Effective = 5.0, Effective = 4.0, Moderately Effective = 3.0, Ineffective = 2.0, Highly Ineffective = 1.0.

In the example, the person rated sees himself/herself as being a highly effective listener. The person's superior sees the person rated as being effective. The subordinates see the person rated as being slightly less than moderately effective. The peers see the person rated as being slightly higher than moderately effective.

Range = the distribution of responses that make up the score.

In the example, there is no range given for superiors since only one filled out the profile. The scores of subordinates ranged from 1.0 to 3.0, meaning that at least one subordinate checked Highly Ineffective and at least one subordinate checked Moderately Effective.

The scores of peers ranged from 3.0 to 4.0, meaning that at least one peer checked Moderately Effective and at least one peer checked Effective.

Do More/No Change/Do Less =

The number of respondents by category who checked each box for suggestions for improvement. These respondents are attempting to give suggestions to the person rated as to how much emphasis should be placed upon a score.

In the example, the superior indicated that the person rated should make no change in listening behavior from his/her perspective. However, four of the five subordinates would like to see the person rated do more listening, as would one of the peers.

Interpretation

A complete set of norms by specific item is not yet available. Obviously, however, an executive should strive to be perceived as being highly effective by each respondent with no suggested changes in behavior. Few people, however, ever attain this level of perfection across all nine scales. Each of us has relative strengths and weaknesses. A score of 4.5 or higher can generally be regarded as a current strength. A score of 4.0 to 4.5 can generally be regarded as being average performance. Below 4.0 as an average should be a clear indication that there is significant room for improvement. In addition, a rating from any individual respondent of 3.0 or less on an item indicates a potential area of concern for that item with that respondent. An overall score of less than 3.0 is usually a sign of a very significant weakness.

Low to average ratings coupled with suggestions to Do More or Do Less of an item should also be a clear area of concern. The respondents may be trying to send you a signal that a change in behavior could significantly increase your effectiveness as an executive.

#### Interpretation of Example

Consider the example given at the beginning of this section. The person rated feels that he/she is a highly effective listener. His/her superior feels that the person rated is about average as a listener but sees no need for a change in behavior. The subordinates see a significant problem. Not only is the average quite low, but at least one subordinate sees the person rated as being highly ineffective as a listener. Four of five would like to be listened to more often. The peers fall somewhere in the middle with at least one seeing listening as a concern.

A possible way to interpret this disparity in views between Superior, Subordinates and Peers is that the person rated does a reasonably good job of listening to those in authority but listens less to peers and even less to subordinates. This pattern is quite common, since executives often seek to please the boss but may feel less of a need to pay attention to people at other levels. This, of course, is often counterproductive since it is through subordinates and peers that the executive will have the opportunity to meet the needs of his/her superior.

## EXECUTIVE EFFECTIVENESS PROFILE

### Practical Applications

Now that you have reviewed your profile, you may want to follow up in some way. As a matter of courtesy, you should thank those who participated in filling out the Executive Effectiveness Profile.

Perhaps you will want to go further and share some of your feedback with your superior and/or subordinates. Before you do, it is helpful to determine exactly what you want to accomplish. Do you want to clarify some points? Present a broad overview of your feedback? or Share a plan for making some changes?

Following are some helpful hints:

- Do not overwhelm others with data. Your profile will never mean as much to them as it does to you. Pick three to five key strengths and three to five key developmental needs upon which to focus the discussion.
- Use start-stop-continue. Say "Based upon my feedback profile, these are the things I plan to start doing that I apparently am not doing enough of now, these are the things I plan to stop doing, and these are the areas that seem to be my strengths and therefore will continue to do so."
- Ask subordinates and/or superiors to help you understand the meaning behind any data you might be unsure of. For instance, you might ask, "There seems to be an indication that I am not trusted as much as I would like to be. Could you give me some idea of the things I'm doing or not doing that might be creating this kind of perception?" Tell them to write down some examples of specific situations that relate to the area in question.
- Give subordinates and/or superiors a chance to suggest additional start-stop and continue actions or areas that they think you should work on.
- Do not under any circumstances get defensive or vindictive. It is the one sure way of cutting off feedback channels in the future.
- You might try making a verbal or written contract with one or more of your respondents. From time to time you could check their perceptions to see if you are improving.

- **If you are truly interested in changing your behavior, it is especially important to set performance improvement goals, ask for feedback on your behavior, and keep a record of your progress.**
- **A highly successful approach to being an effective executive is to establish a climate of open communication with your superiors and subordinates—one in which perceptions, needs and objectives can be discussed and clarified.**



## **APPENDIX C**

**APPENDIX C****Instruments Reviewed 1976-1986**

1. **Leadership Development Profile (LDP)**
2. **Leadership Style Indicator (LSI)**
3. **Leadership Scale (LS)**
4. **Management Coaching and Relations Test (MCRT)**
5. **Management Appraisal Survey (MAS)**
6. **Life Styles Inventory (LS)**
7. **Management Effectiveness Profile System (MEPS)**
8. **Leadership and Self Development Scale (LSDS)**
9. **Executive Profile Survey (EPS)**
10. **Appraisal Report for Management Personnel (ARMP)**
11. **Leadership Appraisal Survey (LAS)**
12. **Leadership Effectiveness Profile (LEP)**
13. **Leadership Style Evaluation (LSE)**
14. **Leadership Style Survey (LSS)**
15. **Management Practices Audit (MPA)**
16. **Leadership Growth Opportunity Survey (LGOS)**
17. **Management Practices Survey (MPS)**
18. **Management Skills Profile (MGT)**
19. **Manager Appraisal Profile (MA)**
20. **Survey of Management Practices (SMP)**
21. **Survey of Peer Relations (SPR)**
22. **Birkman Method (BM)**
23. **Sterling System of Management Style Analysis (SS)**
24. **Styles of Management Inventory (SMI)**

## APPENDIX D

**APPENDIX D****Instruments Reviewed Prior to 1976**

1. **Coaching Practices Survey (CPS)**
2. **Desirable Motivational Characteristics, Version II (DMC-II)**
3. **Job Satisfaction Questionnaire for Workers, Version V (JSQW-V)**
4. **Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, Form XII (LBDQ-XII)**
5. **Leader Effectiveness and Adaptability Description (LEAD)**
6. **Leader Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ)**
7. **Manager Feedback Program (MFP)**
8. **Grid Feedback from a Subordinate to a Boss (MG)**
9. **Multi-Level Management Survey (MLMS)**
10. **Management Profiling: As Others See You (MP)**
11. **Management Practices Questionnaire (MPQ)**
12. **Management Relations Survey (MRS)**
13. **Management Style Diagnosis Test (MSDT)**
14. **Managerial Style Questionnaire (MSQ)**
15. **Organizational Behavior Describer Survey (OBDS)**
16. **Opinion-Information Survey (OIS)**
17. **Open End Change Measures (OPCM)**
18. **Management Styles Profile (Profile)**
19. **RCA Missile Survey (RCA)**
20. **Rate Your Supervisor Evaluation Form (RYS)**
21. **Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire (SBD)**
22. **Styles of Leadership Survey (SLS)**
23. **Survey of Organizations (SOO)**
24. **Science Research Associates Attitude Survey (SRA)**

## APPENDIX E

## **APPENDIX E**

### **Dimensions Measured by the Instrument**

- 1. Communication Skills**
- 2. Courage**
- 3. Integrity**
- 4. Motivating Others**
- 5. Performance Orientation**
- 6. Problem Solving**
- 7. Subordinate Development**
- 8. Vision**
- 9. Work Facilitation**

## APPENDIX F

# THE EXECUTIVE EFFECTIVENESS PROFILE

## General Instructions

### Purpose

To give the person rated a summary of his/her perceived effectiveness as an executive, and to suggest how this person should behave to be more effective in the future. The goal is to provide useful feedback that the person can use to grow and develop.

The instrument measures 9 key areas of executive effectiveness. Feedback to the executive will be in the form of a composite of the responses received. Only the person's self-responses and those of his/her immediate superior will be identified in the final report. The responses of subordinates and peers will be summarized as groups (minimum 3 subordinates or 2 peers), with individual responses kept completely confidential. Therefore, if you are a peer or subordinate, you will not be individually identified.

### Directions

Your name should not appear anywhere on the questionnaire, but please make certain that the name of the person you are rating and your relationship to that person are identified at the bottom of this page.

The statements listed under each of the 9 areas describe executive behaviors. For each statement please give your opinion of how effectively the person rated does these things by placing a check mark in the appropriate column. Then, for each item, decide whether the person should Do More, make No Change, or Do Less of the activity/behavior to increase his/her effectiveness. If for any reason you are unable to rate the person on an item, please leave the item blank.

Please take your time and give your answers some thought. It is important to be as honest as possible. Below each of the 9 areas is room for any comments you would like to make regarding the person's effectiveness in that area. These comments are often the most valuable feedback an executive can receive.

### When Completed

Mail to Effectiveness Dimensions, Inc. in the enclosed envelope. If you have any questions, please call (619) 436-5245.

### Deadline

We must receive this instrument no later than \_\_\_\_\_.

The person rated is your (choose 1):

_____	Superior	_____
_____	Subordinate	_____
_____	Peer	_____
_____	Self	_____

Name of Person Rated



How effectively does this person do the following?

**COMMUNICATION**

1. Write clearly and concisely.
2. Listen attentively.
3. Speak clearly and concisely.
4. Is persuasive in selling ideas.
5. Conduct effective formal business presentations.
6. Adjust language/communication style to those being communicated with.
7. Express feelings/concerns with tact.

Current Effectiveness					Suggestions for Improvement		
Highly Ineffective	Ineffective	Marginally Effective	Effective	Highly Effective	Do More	No Change	Do Less

Additional comments on communication:

**COURAGE**

8. Take calculated and defensible risks.
9. Tackle the tough issues.
10. Admit mistakes.
11. Back up subordinates once a commitment has been made to them.
12. Demand follow-through from subordinates on their commitments.
13. Bounce back from adversity.
14. Constructively confront subordinates when results are unacceptable.


Additional comments on courage:

How effectively does this person do the following?

**INTEGRITY**

- 15. Exhibit a high ethical standard of personal conduct.
- 16. Is open/candid with people.
- 17. Deal fairly with others.
- 18. Follow through with and keep commitments.
- 19. Is trusted by others.

Additional comments on integrity:

Current Effectiveness					Suggestions for Improvement		
Highly Ineffective	Ineffective	Marginally Effective	Effective	Highly Effective	Do More	No Change	Do Less

**MOTIVATING OTHERS**

- 20. Set high yet attainable standards of subordinate performance.
- 21. Provide an accurate appraisal of subordinate performance.
- 22. Give credit/recognition for good work.
- 23. Allocate rewards (monetary and nonmonetary) to achievers.
- 24. Consult subordinates when making plans/decisions which affect them.
- 25. Handle complaints in a timely fashion.
- 26. Provide ongoing feedback to subordinates on performance.

Additional comments on motivating others:


How effectively does this person do the following?

**PERFORMANCE ORIENTATION**

- 27. Complete projects on time.
- 28. Complete projects within budget/ quality constraints.
- 29. Manage time well.
- 30. Achieve short-term (less than 1 year) organizational goals.
- 31. Achieve intermediate term (1 to 3 year) organizational goals.
- 32. Implement/facilitate positive change.

Current Effectiveness					Suggestions for Improvement		
Highly Ineffective	Ineffective	Marginally Effective	Effective	Highly Effective	Do More	No Change	Do Less

Additional comments on performance orientation:

**PROBLEM SOLVING**

- 33. Identify problems in their early stages.
- 34. Attempt to locate the root cause of problems.
- 35. Objectively weigh the risks and benefits of alternatives before choosing one.
- 36. Obtain the support of people implementing the solutions.
- 37. Show good judgment (i.e., make accurate decisions).
- 38. Handle uncertainty and ambiguity without undue anxiety.


Additional comments on problem solving:

How effectively does this person do the following?

**SUBORDINATE DEVELOPMENT**

- 39. Give subordinates enough authority to effectively do their jobs.
- 40. Allow subordinates the freedom to disagree on issues.
- 41. Develop subordinates toward becoming self-sufficient.
- 42. Give assignments which expand subordinate skills.
- 43. Encourage subordinates to arrive at their own solutions to problems.
- 44. Trust subordinates to do work without excess checking on performance.

	Current Effectiveness					Suggestions for Improvement		
	Highly Ineffective	Ineffective	Marginally Effective	Effective	Highly Effective	Do More	No Change	Do Less

Additional comments on subordinate development:

**VISION**

- 45. Clarify the organization's purpose and values to subordinates.
- 46. Manage with a total organization/ big picture orientation.
- 47. Consider long-term impact of decisions.
- 48. Set clear, long-term objectives.
- 49. Strictly adhere to the intent of vs. the letter of policy.


Additional comments on vision:

How effectively does this person do the following?

**WORK FACILITATION**

- 50. Develop an overall plan for goal accomplishment.
- 51. Clearly define subordinates' roles/authority.
- 52. Determine each subordinate's capabilities and assign work accordingly.
- 53. Clarify what is expected (i.e., results, standards, priorities).
- 54. Get subordinates to work together as a team.
- 55. Coordinate work activities/information exchange with other units.
- 56. Conduct effective meetings.

Current Effectiveness					Suggestions for Improvement		
Highly Ineffective	Ineffective	Marginally Effective	Effective	Highly Effective	Do More	No Change	Do Less

Additional comments on work facilitation:

## **APPENDIX G**

**CLARITY**

**RELEVANCY**

**Not  
Clear**

**Moderately  
Clear**

**Clear**

**Very  
Clear**

**Not  
Relevant**

**Moderately  
Relevant**

**Relevant**

**Very  
Relevant**

**COMMUNICATION**

1. Writes clearly and concisely
2. Listens attentively
3. Speaks clearly and concisely
4. Is persuasive in selling ideas
5. Conducts effective formal business presentations
6. Adjusts language/communication style to those being communicated with
7. Expresses feelings/concerns with tact

**COURAGE**

8. Takes calculated and defensible risks
9. Tackles the tough issues
10. Admits mistakes
11. Backs up subordinates once a commitment has been made to them
12. Demands follow-through from subordinates on their commitments
13. Bounces back from adversity
14. Constructively confronts subordinates when results are unacceptable

CLARITY

RELEVANCY

Not  
Clear

Moderately  
Clear

Clear

Very  
Clear

Not  
Relevant

Moderately  
Relevant

Relevant

Very  
Relevant

INTEGRITY

- 15. Exhibits a high ethical standard of personal conduct
- 16. Is open/candid with people
- 17. Deals fairly with others
- 18. Follows through with and keeps commitments
- 19. Is trusted by others

MOTIVATING OTHERS

- 20. Sets high yet attainable standards of subordinate performance
- 21. Provides an accurate appraisal of subordinate performance
- 22. Gives credit/recognition for good work
- 23. Allocates rewards (monetary and nonmonetary) to achievers
- 24. Consults subordinates when making plans/decisions which affect them
- 25. Handles complaints in a timely fashion
- 26. Provides ongoing feedback to subordinates on performance



CLARITY

RELEVANCY

Not  
Clear

Moderately  
Clear

Clear

Very  
Clear

Not  
Relevant

Moderately  
Relevant

Relevant

Very  
Relevant

PERFORMANCE ORIENTATION

- 27. Completes projects on time
- 28. Completes projects within budget/quality constraints
- 29. Manages time well
- 30. Achieves short-term (less than 1 year) organizational goals
- 31. Achieves intermediate-term (1 to 3 year) organizational goals
- 32. Implements/facilitates positive change

PROBLEM SOLVING

- 33. Identifies problems in their early stages
- 34. Attempts to locate the root cause of problems
- 35. Objectively weighs the risks and benefits of alternatives before choosing one
- 36. Obtains the support of people implementing the solutions
- 37. Shows good judgment (i.e., makes accurate decisions)
- 38. Handles uncertainty and ambiguity without undue anxiety

CLARITY

RELEVANCY

Not  
Clear

Moderately  
Clear

Clear

Very  
Clear

Not  
Relevant

Moderately  
Relevant

Relevant

Very  
Relevant

SUBORDINATE DEVELOPMENT

- 39. Gives subordinates enough authority to effectively do their jobs
- 40. Allows subordinates the freedom to disagree on issues
- 41. Develops subordinates toward becoming self-sufficient
- 42. Gives assignments which expand subordinate skills
- 43. Encourages subordinates to arrive at their own solutions to problems
- 44. Trusts subordinates to do work without excess checking on performance

VISION

- 45. Clarifies the organization's purpose and values to subordinates
- 46. Manages with a total organization/big picture orientation
- 47. Considers long-term impact of decisions
- 48. Sets clear, long-term objectives
- 49. Strictly adheres to the intent of vs. the letter of policy

CLARITY

RELEVANCY

Not  
Clear

Moderately  
Clear

Clear

Very  
Clear

Not  
Relevant

Moderately  
Relevant

Relevant

Very  
Relevant

WORK FACILITATION

- 50. Develops an overall plan for goal accomplishment
- 51. Clearly defines subordinates' roles/authority
- 52. Determines each subordinate's capabilities and assigns work accordingly
- 53. Clarifies what is expected (i.e., results, standards, priorities)
- 54. Gets subordinates to work together as a team
- 55. Coordinates work activities/ information exchange with other units
- 56. Conducts effective meetings

## APPENDIX H

### Definitions of Scales

Communication Skills - Refers to a broad range of skills used to provide to and obtain from others various types of information. It includes writing, speaking, giving formal presentation, listening, persuading, and interpersonal relations.

Courage - Courage involves tackling tough issues and admitting mistakes. To have courage is to take calculated and defensible risks. It is to back up commitments. Courage is to demand followthrough from subordinates and constructively confront them when results are unacceptable. It is the ability to bounce back from adversity.

Integrity - Integrity means conducting oneself in an ethical manner. To have integrity is to be trusted by others, to follow through with and keep commitments, and to deal fairly with others. It involves dealing openly and candidly with people.

Motivating Others - Motivating others refers to creating a climate where others will enthusiastically strive to achieve goals. Motivation exists when high yet attainable standards of performance are set, when employees are involved in decisions which affect them, and when a wide range of rewards are available and equitably distributed. Motivation is also giving recognition for good work, handling complaints in a timely fashion, and giving an accurate appraisal of employee performance.

Performance Orientation - Performance orientation refers to getting things done. Accomplishing both short-term (less than one year) and intermediate-term (one- to five-year) goals. It is proactively implementing or facilitating positive change. It means managing time appropriately, completing projects on time and within budget, and quality targets.

**Problem Solving** - Problem solving refers to a wide range of behaviors surrounding problems and the decisions made to solve them. It includes identifying problems in their early stages and attempting to locate their root causes. It also refers to objectively weighing the risks and benefits of alternatives, including obtaining the support of the people responsible for implementing the solutions. Problem solving is showing good judgment and handling uncertainty and ambiguity without undue anxiety.

**Subordinate Development** - Subordinate development refers to actions an executive takes to help subordinates grow toward becoming self-sufficient: Allows subordinates the freedom to disagree on issues, encourages them to arrive at their own solutions to problems, trusts them to work without excess checking, and gives them assignments which expand their skills. It involves giving them the proper authority to effectively do their jobs.

**Vision** - Vision is leading and managing with a total business/big picture orientation. Vision includes the clarification of an organization's purpose and values to subordinates. Vision also includes adhering the intent of policy instead of the legal letter, setting clear long-term objectives and considering the long-term impact of their decisions.

**Work Facilitation** - Work facilitation refers to helping others be more effective in obtaining organization results. To facilitate work is to clarify what is expected in terms of standards of conduct, priorities, and results. It is to clearly define roles and authority. It means developing an overall plan for goal accomplishment. It is getting subordinates to work as a team and coordinating activities with other business units. It often involves conducting meetings.

## **APPENDIX I**

**RESEARCH SUBJECT'S  
CONSENT FORM**

**Purpose of Research**

The purpose of your participation in the research study is to determine the reliability and validity of an instrument designed to appraise executive effectiveness. You will be asked to fill out a copy of the instrument. After completing the instrument, you will be asked to determine the clarity and relevancy of each item in relation to a definition of the scale to which the item is associated.

After a period of one week, you will be asked to fill out a second copy of the instrument. This will be used as part of a reliability study.

**Risk and Benefits**

There is no anticipated risk to the subject in this study. All information received will be kept confidential or used for statistical purposes only. No data will be identified by name. As a benefit for participating in this study, the researcher will provide each subject with the opportunity to receive a completed executive effectiveness profile on himself/herself at a later date at no charge.

**Participation**

Participation in this study is voluntary, and you may withdraw from the study at any time. Participation is expected to require up to 45 minutes of your time on two separate occasions. By signing this form, you are indicating that you were given the opportunity to ask questions about the research and procedures, and that they were answered prior to your agreement to participate in the study.

There is no agreement, written or verbal, between the subject and researcher beyond that expressed in this consent form.

I, the undersigned, understand the above explanations and, on that basis, give consent to my voluntary participation in this research.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Subject

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Location (e.g., San Diego, CA)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Researcher

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Witness

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date