Theses Digitization Project   John M. Pfau Library

2004

Development of an in-basket exercise designed to measure potential leadership skills by Coleen Beth Dennison.

Colleen Beth Dennison

Bernard M. Bass

DEVELOPMENT OF AN IN-BASKET EXERCISE DESIGNED TO

MEASURE POTENTIAL LEADERSHIP SKILLS

A Thesis

Presented to the

Faculty of

California State University,

San Bernardino

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Science

in

Psychology:

Industrial/ Organizational

by

Colleen Beth Dennison

December 2004

DEVELOPMENT OF AN IN-BASKET EXERCISE DESIGNED TO

MEASURE POTENTIAL LEADERSHIP SKILLS

A Thesis

Presented to the

Faculty of

California State University,

San Bernardino

---

by

Colleen Beth Dennison

December 2004

Approved by:

Janet L. Kottke, Chair, Psychology   Date   11/22/2004

Janelle A. Gilbert

Diane J. Pfahler

ABSTRACT

Investigations into leadership have often been of high importance in research and one focus in recent years is on Bernard Bass' 1985 behavioral theory of transaction and transformational leadership focused on meeting the changing demands of organizations today. Because Bass' theory is based on behavioral attributes, the premise of this research is to develop In-Basket work samples to measure an individual's willingness and ability to display behaviors that are often associated with successful leadership in organizations as described by Bass.

A total of 95 applicants from the County of San Bernardino's Management and Leadership Academy participated in the study. Applicants completed the In Basket Test and scores were then compared to Bass' leadership survey. A total of five hypothesized relationships were evaluated, but the hypotheses were not supported. The In-Basket assessment had low internal reliability across constructs and that may have been the primary cause for the lack of support for the proposed hypotheses. Further investigation into the use of work samples as predictors of leadership warrants a redesign of this In-Basket.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE

THE NEED TO MEASURE LEADERSHIP

The challenges that face leaders have never been greater than they are today. Changes in organizations and technology occur so rapidly, that even individuals who make it their business to change, often fall behind (Koehler & Pankowski, 1997). In addition to changes in technology, organizations are changing structures, becoming flatter, lending to new communication processes and delegating practices. In the past, leaders and managers would be held responsible for those subordinates directly below them on the organizational hierarchy; today's leaders supervise staff at different levels and different departments throughout the organization (Koehler & Pankowski, 1997). Taking into consideration the rapid changes occurring in organizations, it becomes clear that changes in leadership strategies are also needed to continue the proper growth and direction of companies today. Leaders who are adaptive to these changing environments have the ability to generate creative solutions to better address a broad range of challenges (Bass, Avolio, Jung & Berson, 2003).

Leadership is a well-studied aspect of organizational culture and practice. Traditional approaches to leadership often limit the ability of organizations to change with the current trends. Traditional leadership approaches have been dependent on status, authority and reward contingent on performance. However, many leaders who are identified in organizations today as highly effective do not fit the traditional model (Skipton, 2003). Psychologists who study leadership have generated many theories that focus on the development or inherent abilities in leaders, rather than leadership dictated by status or hierarchy. Leadership research has primarily focused on identifying traits, behaviors, power base, influence tactics and personality patterns that differentiate leaders from non-leaders (Dvir & Shamir, 2003; Fiedler, 1996; Judge, Bono Ilies & Gerhardt, 2002). Among the most studied theories of leadership in the past 15 years has been the focus on transactional and transformational leadership styles as discussed by Bernard M. Bass from his research in 1985 (Bass, 1990; Bass, Avolio, Jung & Berson, 2003). The constructs defined by Bass include Charisma, Intellectual Stimulation, Individual Consideration, Contingent Reward and Management by Exception (Bass, 1990; Bass, Avolio, Jung

2

& Berson, 2003; Dvir & Shamir, 2003). These constructs

manifest behaviorally to the limits inherent in the leader.

Bass' theory is unique in this approach of combining both

trait and behavioral theories, using personal qualities and

behaviors to demonstrate leader effectiveness.

Statement of the Problem

Leaders who possess the personal qualities that

manifest behaviors identified by Bass articulate creative

ways for followers to accomplish their goals and can be

particularly effective in modern organizations (Skipton,

2003). The research presented by Bass supports that

through the characteristics inherent to transformational

leaders, including the ability to define the need for

change, create new visions, and mobilize the commitment to

these visions, leaders can ultimately transform the

organization (Hartog, Van Muijen & Koopman, 1997).

Identifying individuals who have the potential to develop

these qualities is of interest to many organizations with

particular importance to governmental organizations, which

currently have a high need for leaders who are agents of

change (Downes, 1998).

The measurements that are in current use in organizations to identify leadership characteristics are primarily cognitive, personality, self-report or interests tests along with various exercises(Kesselman, Lopez & Lopez, 1987). Assessment Centers (ACs) are often run utilizing a number of these measurements, allowing assessors to evaluate a participant using multiple methods. Leadership assessments, while effective, can be subject to types of bias associated with psychological measurement and include construct bias (unequal constructs across groups), method bias (problems with or differences in administration) and rater bias (Hoyt, 2000; Van de Vijer & Hambleton, 1996). Rater bias is of particular concern when using assessment center exercises to identify leaders because raters can be unreliable due to implicit ideas of leadership, and leniency or halo bias (Hoyt, 2000). These types of bias can result in unequal and unfair interpretation of assessment performance. Despite the risk of bias, ACs are one of the most successful methods used to identify and train individuals to develop leadership skills. The proposed solution is to make use of an in-basket (IB), commonly used in ACs. By using the constructs of Transformational Leadership identified by Bass in 1985,

4

it is possible to develop an instrument that will measure those constructs. Additional efforts to create an objectively scored behavioral IB may eliminate several types of rater bias associated with traditional rater scored IBs, while Bass' leadership theories add an additional dimension of predictability above and beyond standard leadership assessments.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this research is to extract from the trait and behavioral school of thought and add an additional component of performance work samples. Developing work samples, specifically an in-basket exercise often used in assessment centers, will focus on an individual's willingness and ability to make decisions that are often associated with successful leadership in organizations, as well as, those characteristics defined by Bass that characterize individuals as transformational leaders. The current study lends support to Bass' defined characteristics and additionally makes use of a proven and reliable instrument that is the in-basket task. By doing so, a link between the behavioral constructs of transformational leadership and actual performance samples

may be established, thus avoiding some bias that is often associated with other measures and increasing assessment series predictability.

CHAPTER TWO

LEADERSHIP: TRANSACTION AND TRANSFORMATION

One of the most important deciding factors of group

and organizational success is the effectiveness of

leadership. The social sciences have spent several decades

researching the topic as a result of its obvious

importance. It has been noted that in addition to the

increasing interest in studying the topic of leadership, it

is being accompanied by the acceptance of a differentiation

between transactional and transformational leadership, with

a strong emphasis on the latter (Bass, Avolio, Jung &

Berson, 2003; Hartog, Van Muijen & Koopman, 1997). Others

have confirmed many different paradigms of leadership, but

Bernard Bass' research in 1985 claims that the

transactional and transformational model is a new paradigm

that neither replaces nor is explained by other models

(Hartog, Van Muijen & Koopman, 1997).

Bass' model defines a transactional leader as one who

"engages in a transaction with their employees." Managers

inform their employees of "…what is expected of them and

what they will receive if they fulfill these requirements"

(Bass, 1990, p. 19). Bass' studies in transactional

leadership have resulted in three factors. The first factor, *contingent reward leadership*, is a process of active or passive exchange between leaders and subordinates, where subordinates are rewarded for performance that meets agreed upon standards (Bass, 1990; Fields & Herold, 1997; Howell & Avolio, 1993). The second and third factors are *passive management by exception* and *active management by exception*. The difference in these two factors lies in the timing of the manager's intervention of the subordinates' performance. *Active management by exception* occurs when the manager is continuously monitoring the performance, and anticipates problems before they happen (Bass, 1990; Fields & Herold, 1997; Howell & Avolio, 1993). Managers who intervene after mistakes are made and standards are not met characterize *passive management by exception* (Howell & Avolio, 1993). Transactional leadership typifies the ideology of managers in business today, but pointedly lacks the emotional component and commitment inspired by what Bass would describe as transformational leaders.

Bass (1990) defines transformational leaders as those "…who broaden and elevate the interests of their employees, generate awareness and acceptance of the purposes and

mission of the group, and stir their employees to look beyond their own self interests for the good of the group"(p. 21). Bass (1990) characterizes these leaders as "high energy, self- confident, determined, intelligent individuals with strong verbal skills and ego ideals" (p. 21). Additional characteristics of transformational leaders are that they: identify themselves as change agents, are courageous individuals, believe in people, are value-driven, are life long learners, have the ability to deal with complexity, ambiguity and uncertainty, and are often visionaries (Tichy & Devanna, 1986).

Bass has identified four primary factors that encompass transformational leaders. These factors or dimensions are *charisma, inspiration, individual consideration* and *intellectual stimulation* (Bass, 1990; Bass, Avolio, Jung & Berson, 2003; Dvir & Shamir, 2003; Seltzer & Bass, 1990). A *charismatic* leader is one who "provides vision and a sense of mission, instills pride, gains respect and trust, and increases optimism" (Hartog, Van Muijen & Koopman, 1997, p. 21). The second dimension of transformational leadership is *inspiration*, which is described as the ability of a leader to model behaviors for subordinates and communicate a vision through symbols to

9

keep efforts focused on the mission (Bass, 1990; Bass,

Avolio, Jung & Berson, 2003; Hartog, Van Muijen & Koopman,

1997). *Individual consideration*, the third factor of

transformational leadership identified by Bass, focuses on

the use of coaching, mentoring, providing continuous

feedback and linking the individual's current needs to the

organization's mission (Bass, 1990; Bass, Avolio, Jung &

Berson, 2003; Hartog, Van Muijen & Koopman, 1997). The

last dimension of transformational leadership is

intellectual stimulation (Bass, 1990; Bass, Avolio, Jung &

Berson, 2003). This type of leadership provides

subordinates with a model for challenging ideas to inspire

subordinates to rethink familiar ways of accomplishing

goals (Hartog, Van Muijen & Koopman, 1997).

The four dimensions differentiate transformational

leaders from transactional leaders, where the latter

approach stresses task orientation and lacks visionary

tactics. Transformational leadership is believed, however,

to augment the effects of transactional leadership. This

relationship is supported by research that has shown that

charisma contributed unique variance to effects of a

contingent reward system (Barling, Weber & Kelloway, 1996),

and that transformational leadership added to the

prediction of a leader's effectiveness ratings beyond

transactional leadership (Hater & Bass, 1988). In essence

the research demonstrated that leader's effectiveness

ratings could be better predicted when evaluated on his/her

transactional leadership skills *and* his/her

transformational leadership skills, rather than

transactional skills alone.

Leadership in Government Settings

Similar to the changes taking place in the private,

consumer-based industries, American government is

undergoing change. Taxpayers are demanding dramatic

changes in services offered by the government including,

but not limited to, Medicaid, Medicare, Social Services and

Social Security. The changes that are needed by government

will be carried out not by legislators, but by dedicated

leaders within the context of the government setting where

they can effect the changes necessary to decrease waste,

inefficiency and ineffectiveness (Koehler & Pankowski,

1997). Government agencies are also facing competition for

new talent to meet new, increasing demands and to create a

workplace that appeals to an individual's development

needs. In order to compete with the private sector for

11

talented employees, government needs to be more informal, creative and flexible than the traditional bureaucratic system (Gardner, De Mesme& Abrahamson, 2002).

Government leaders are calling for better strategic management, which requires executives to lead for results in all aspects of their work (Brower, Newell & Ronayne, 2002). Considering the changes required to address the needs of government today, leaders can no longer see themselves as administrators in the government setting. They must reevaluate their role and take on the position of leaders of change (Koehler & Pankowski, 1997). Adopting the principles of Bass' transformational leadership will direct government leaders toward viewing the organization as a system that should work towards reducing the need for services, rather than the traditional approach of viewing the government as a large, developing organization (Koehler & Pankowski, 1977). The goal of a leader in government does not rest in the strategies of growing and developing as used in business. However, many conservative government administrators today, still commonly believe that the government should use principles used in developing businesses (Koehler & Pankowski, 1977).

The transformational approach to leadership would be an effective method to address the new challenges of government. By adopting the systems approach, enabling employees, communicating the new visions for government, focusing on customer outcomes, and continually improving the processes, transformational leaders can clear the path for change in traditional governmental organizations (Koehler & Pankowski, 1977). Government organizations must undergo a transformation in both culture and leadership to effect the changes that are needed today (Brower, Newell & Ronayne, 2002).

How Leadership is Measured

Because transformational leadership has been found to have positive contributions to a work force, researchers are interested in measuring and predicting individuals who have or could potentially have these characteristics. Two measures discussed in the literature for measuring transformational leadership are the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) and the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ).

The LPI is both a self-report and other report of statements that measure each of five leadership practices.

The first practice measured is *challenging the process*,
which describes the leader as one who seeks challenges,
updates knowledge and takes risks. *Inspiring a shared
vision*, views the leader as one who communicates a vision
for the future and shows long term interest in setting
goals. *Enabling others to act* refers to the leaders'
ability to allow others to use discretion, trusts the
competence of their staff and develops cooperative working
relationships. *Modeling the way* for subordinates is
another practice these leaders use when setting goals and
establishing the organizational philosophy. Last,
encouraging the heart demonstrates the leaders' ability to
celebrate accomplishments and recognize subordinates for a
job well done (Posner & Kouzes, 1988). The LPI is intended
to be used as a developmental or diagnostic tool for
assessing an individual's leadership actions and behaviors
(Posner & Kouzes, 1994) in both transformational and
transactional leadership arenas (Fields & Herold, 1997).
The LPI consists of 30 statements that the respondent or
others in the organization respond to using a Likert type
scale of frequency of behaviors (Posner & Kouzes, 1994).
Internal consistencies range from .77 to .90 (Posner &
Kouzes, 1988). Since the LPI is a self and others report

of leader behavior, it is subject to effects of social desirability, which may increase positive ratings in the self-report (Posner & Kouzes, 1988).

The MLQ is most commonly used with the five-factor model of transformational and transactional leadership (Bass, 1990). The first three factors of *charismatic leadership, individualized consideration* and *intellectual stimulation* measure transformational leadership. The last two factors, *contingent reward* and *management by exception*, measure factors of transactional leadership (Bass, 1990; Bass, Avolio, Jung & Berson, 2003; Bycio, Allen, & Hackett, 1995; Seltzer & Bass, 1990). This measure is a report based on a scale that is answered by subordinates, peers or supervisors in the organization that work with the leader. Analysis of the MLQ has resulted in favorable support for the sub-dimensions. The alpha levels for the dimension of Charisma = .93; Intellectual stimulation = .81; Individualized consideration = .75; Contingent reward = .78; Active management by exception = .78 and Passive management by exception = .58 (Hartog, Van Muijen & Koopman, 1997).

The MLQ has been, in some instances, used to help identify management talent to promote individuals into

15

positions that prepare them for advancement in the organization (Englebrecht & Fischer, 1995). The five factors of the MLQ can be used as distinct contributors to the measurement of transformational leadership. The instrument is particularly useful because little crossover occurs in the measurement of the individual components, making it possible to evaluate an individual on separate strengths and weaknesses in their leadership profile (Hartog, Van Muijen & Koopman, 1997).

The MLQ and the LPI have the same goal of identifying transformational leaders in the organization. While both measures have the same goal, they often suffer from the same difficulties in that they are reports of behavior by others, and consequently they can be subject to bias of the implicit theories of leadership held by subordinates and others (Ross & Offerman, 1997). Additionally, the MLQ and the LPI do not take into consideration the contextual factors associated with leadership, while researchers have acknowledged "…that contextual factors have significant influence on the emergence, operation and effectiveness of transformational leadership" (Pawar & Eastman, 1997, p. 81). One solution to the problems of using self-reports and lack of contextual influence, could be the use of

objectively scored work samples to measure leadership. Work samples could provide feedback based on work actually performed by the leaders themselves, and nested in the context of interest. The MLQ does indicate evidence supporting it as an indication of the factors of interest over the LPI, and thus would make a credible source to validate additional measures. In using work samples often found in ACs, this study may be able to add a crucial link in describing actual performance of the constructs of interest without having the limitations of these previously noted biases.

CHAPTER THREE

ASSESSMENT CENTERS AND WORK SAMPLES

Assessment Centers are used as a means of identifying potential in those who are either current employees or new to the organization. ACs can also be used in a shorter version to select and process applicants, but are not generally cost effective as an initial selection tool. A number of activities or work samples can be combined to complete the assessment center, including leaderless group discussions, in-basket tasks, role playing, fact finding exercises and interviews (Howard, 1997). Each AC is designed to fit the needs of the organization but must contain a number of exercises to sufficiently observe a candidate's behavior related to the dimensions being assessed. Generally, AC users and applicants find ACs to be face valid and fair compared to other measures such as cognitive tests that can be prone to adverse impact (Howard, 1997). In addition to high face validity, work samples in ACs provide a more comprehensive analysis to help guide development and when combined with valid predictors their relative contribution can be increased (Howard, 1997).

Work samples are often used in ACs as a face valid technique for measuring planning and administrative skills (Hakstian, Woolsey & Schroeder, 1986, Smith & Clark, 1987). Work samples and the IB exercise in particular, are widely used for predicting first-level supervisory performance (Hakstian, Woolsey & Schroeder, 1986). The IB exercise is likely the most frequent and most valid technique used in assessment centers for the purpose of management selection (Hakstian, Woolley, Woosley & Kryger, 1991). The IB consists of a variety of materials of varying importance and priority. Individuals completing the IB work through a number of materials in a set amount of time and must describe their rationale after test completion (Joiner, 1984). IB work samples can be designed to measure varied constructs of management in different contexts, depending on the needs of the organization. Since the IB is an example of a work sample test, it appears to be a face and content valid method of measuring planning, organization and management skills.

Since its initial use, IBs have been used as training methods, research instruments and selection tests (Kesselman, Lopez & Lopez, 1987). Favorable results led to the use of IB tasks to assess administrative skills in

19

organizations such as IBM, the Bell System, Sears Roebuck, and the Port Authority (Kesselman, Lopez & Lopez, 1987). Current use of IBs in organizations focuses on the development of "…change directed efforts, planning courses of action, directing, coordinating, and managing the organizational responses to the rapid environmental changes" (Kanungo & Misra, 1992, p. 1320). Further use of IB techniques serve to identify managerial potential (Moses, 1973) and provide feedback on strengths and weaknesses for managerial development (Cochran, Hinckle & Dusenberry, 1987).

There are several advantages to the use of IBs over that of traditional measures such as cognitive paper and pencil, personality, and interest tests (Kesselman, Lopez & Lopez, 1987). Some advantages include requiring the participant to use higher mental processes including analytical and critical thinking, logical reasoning, and problem solving (Kesselman, Lopez & Lopez, 1987). Another major advantage is that IBs test a participant's ability to accurately judge a situation and to appreciate the social context that is often subtle in solving management problems (Kesselman, Lopez & Lopez, 1987). The IB measures not only an individual's ability to make decisions, but his/her

20

willingness to make decisions as well (Kesselman, Lopez & Lopez, 1987).

Considering the extensive use of IBs to predict and measure managerial success, tasks related to leadership could be feasibly measured as well. Because Bass' Transactional and Transformational Leadership MLQ has been a reliable and proven method for assessing leadership characteristics, the MLQ will serve as an excellent validation tool in the development of an IB that purports to measure leadership abilities such as developing a mission, empowering employees, considering individual needs and modeling. More specifically, the five factors of the MLQ could be redesigned and incorporated into the form of a paper and pencil IB exercise. This approach would be unique in that it would purport to measure transformational leadership dimensions: charisma, individual consideration, intellectual stimulation, contingent reward, and management by exception, through the use of work samples rather than self-reports and reports of others. Included in the IB is a description of the context that the leader would be operating under, as defined by the needs of the organization.

21

Designing an IB around the construct of a government setting, and utilizing the five factors of the MLQ would enable the assessor to predict a candidate's potential leadership abilities in a changing environment. The IB is generally one aspect of an AC and is not intended to be a single predictor of leadership potential. In combination with tools already in use in government settings (i.e. paper and pencil tests, interviews and essay exams) an IB designed to measure MLQ factors could augment the predictive validity of the entire assessment series. Additionally, developing the IB as an objectively scored measure, rather than the traditional rater scored measure would reduce the risk of potential rater error and allow organizations to utilize the tool quickly and with little expense compared to subjective tools.

The current research corresponds with existing research conducted by Bernard Bass in 1985. An in-basket will be developed with activities and behaviors being mapped to the five factors of transformational/ transactional leadership identified by Bass in the MLQ. It is hypothesized that for each of the five constructs of Transformational Leadership, as measured by the Leadership In-Basket task, there will be a significant positive

correlation with the MLQ construct ratings as given by the participant's supervisor. The relationship between MLQ and Leadership IB were hypothesized as follows:

1. Charisma as reported by Bass' MLQ constructs of Attributed Idealized Influence, Behavioral Idealized Influence and Inspirational Motivation will have positive correlations with Charisma as reported by the Leadership IB.

2. Intellectual Stimulation as reported by Bass' MLQ will have positive correlation with Intellectual Stimulation as reported by the Leadership IB.

3. Individual Consideration as reported by Bass' MLQ will have positive correlation with Individual Consideration as reported by the IB.

4. Contingent Reward as reported by Bass' MLQ will have positive correlation with Contingent Reward as reported by the IB.

5. Management by Exception, Active and Passive as reported by Bass' MLQ will have positive correlations with Management by Exception as reported by the IB.

CHAPTER FOUR

METHODOLOGY

Participants

Participants included 95 male and female employees who

were at the time employed with the County of San

Bernardino. All participants had applied to the Management

and Leadership Academy .(MLA) at San Bernardino County; 30

participants applied and were tested in 1999 and the

remaining 65 applied and were tested in 2000. A

prerequisite for application for the Academy required all

applicants to be given permission to apply by their

department director, to be at a manager or supervisor

level, to have been in that position for a minimum of 12

months prior to the application and to have not been placed

on any performance improvement plans or written warnings

during the prior 12 months. All participants completed an

application, submitted references and a Job Performance

Appraisal (JPA) from their supervisor. Participants were

administered a paper and pencil test and completed an essay

to evaluate basic managerial and communication skills. All

participants were advised of their participation in the

study and were not deceived in any way as to the purpose of

the study or their participation. All participants were treated with the 'Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct' (American Psychological Association, 1992).

Materials

A packet of work samples derived from the five MLQ factors was given to the participants to complete. All participants read and signed the informed consent (See APPENDIX A) to indicate their willingness to include their data in the study. Each packet included instructions, an overview of packet materials, a job description, an organizational chart, a list and brief description of subordinates, a description of the Department's objectives and various work samples to be reviewed by the participants (See APPENDIX B). The MLQ Short survey was completed by each candidate's direct supervisor and returned to the researcher (See APPENDIX C).

Procedure

In Basket Development

The researcher generated work samples believed to be accurate representations of the five constructs of the MLQ: Charisma, Individual Consideration, Intellectual Stimulation, Contingent Reward and Management by Exception. Using the characteristic behaviors of leaders who exhibit Transformational and Transactional leadership styles, scenarios were created to invite participants to respond to the questions in ways that would clearly indicate their preference. For example, Bass describes an individual as a Transformational Leader when s/he challenges subordinates with new ideas and stimulates rethinking of old ways of doing things (*Intellectual Stimulation*). Two scenarios were written for the IB that gave the participant an opportunity to either reinforce old ways of doing things or support action and problem solving initiative, despite potential risks. The first scenario described a situation where an employee had developed a process that would decrease expenses and increase productivity. The employee had several times attempted to communicate the information to their direct manager and had been dismissed, so the

employee took it upon himself and submitted the idea to the higher manager.

The second scenario described a situation where an employee used an effective creative staffing approach to solve the problem of being short handed, despite having to navigate around stated staffing rules, but did not break them. There were four questions related to these scenarios of encouraging problem solving and rethinking old ways of doing things. Each question gave the participant a choice of either completely supporting the action taken, acknowledging the good idea but dismissing it for later or admonishing the employee for taking matters into their own hands. The actual questions and responses for both of these scenarios varied but stayed true to the relative options. Each of Bass' constructs were similarly mapped on to scenarios within the IB exercise in an effort to map each dimension of transformational and transactional leadership. The IB problems were developed to elicit a response that would be characteristic of one of the five MLQ factors. The IB problems were designed to require judgment and allow for a range of responses, generate a need for action or create a distraction. After the IB was developed, it was reviewed by Subject Matter Experts from

27

the San Bernardino County training department and two of their external training consultants to ensure accuracy and applicability to the MLQ constructs. Subject Matter Experts evaluated the content of the IB and the questions against the assessment objectives and the logic as it was mapped to related constructs of the MLQ. Several documents in the IB were edited or removed completely when the Subject Matter Experts consistently misinterpreted the purpose of the document or could not come to consensus as to the relevance of the document. IB questions and related materials were either removed or rewritten to adjust for changes to the IB materials.

The IB also included a 16-question prioritization task. Prioritization tasks were added after the pilot phase of the IB when feedback indicated confusion on the part of participants not having the prioritization piece that they were anticipating.

Application and Testing

Applicants were solicited by the MLA training personnel to apply for the program upon meeting the initial requirement of being employed as manager or supervisor at San Bernardino County. Each applicant completed a standard application, a written essay test, and a paper and pencil

test to determine managerial and communication skills. After completion of the paper and pencil test, applicants completed the IB test which took approximately one hour to complete. Participants reviewed and synthesized the information in the IB to draw conclusions about the answer that would most reflect how they would respond in the given situation. Each applicant's test scores, which included the paper and pencil cognitive exam, the JPA and an essay exam, were converted to percent scores and then averaged together for a final score. Individuals were ranked and those who achieved a place in the top 30 were admitted into the program. The scoring methodology was dictated by San Bernardino County's MLA and the IB was not calculated in the ranked score and did not contribute to determining admittance into the MLA program.

IB scores for each construct of the MLQ were calculated separately for each participant. The MLQ was completed by the participant's direct manager or supervisor in which they responded to the questionnaire regarding their knowledge of the participant. The MLQ ratings were compared to the scores that participants received on the corresponding IB MLQ constructs.

CHAPTER FIVE

FINDINGS AND RESULTS

Findings

In this study, a correlation analysis approach was

utilized to test the proposed hypotheses. The predictor

variable was the MLQ scores on each of the MLQ constructs

and the criterion variable was the Leadership IB

corresponding construct. The study focused on the

behavioral attributes identified by Bass as successful

leadership behaviors and whether those behaviors could be

captured reliably by work samples. The participant's work

sample behaviors were assessed through completion of the

Leadership IB, a tool developed specifically for this

study. The participant's observed work behaviors were

assessed through the MLQ survey that was completed by the

participant's supervisor or manager.

Leadership In Basket

Review of the literature showed no In Basket

assessment for the purpose of measuring transformational

leadership (Bass, 1990) behaviors; therefore the Leadership

IB was developed specifically for this study. Forty-one

items were written based on the participant's understanding

of the materials that were included in the IB (See APPENDIX D).

The first 16 items were items intended to assess that participants' ability to prioritize the materials in the IB. The set of responses included four answer options including: a. Highest Priority, address immediately before leaving; b. Important, should plan action prior to leaving; c. Not High Priority, can be addressed when you return; and d. Information, no action necessary. The next set of 25 items asked a series of questions with responses referring to materials found in the IB. All items were scored based on a polychotomous scoring theme to create a logical flow from incorrect to most correct, allowing participants a range of behaviors to choose from without inadvertently indicating the most correct response. Responses that most closely demonstrated the specific behavior resulting in higher points, and each construct was measured by multiple questions in the IB (See APPENDIX E). For example, the Leadership IB question #27 asks the participant to consider the scenario in which Mark and Ruth are having difficulty transitioning to a new division as a result of a merger. The question and scenario are designed to address Bass' construct of Individual Consideration and the respondents

can choose to send the employees to training, provide them with a transition mentor, transfer them out or do nothing. Participants who choose to provide employees with a transition mentor will receive a high score for Individual Consideration for that question. Each question related to the specific construct was summed and divided by the total number of questions in each construct, resulting in a score for each of the five factors. Higher scores represented higher tendencies toward transformational or transactional leadership characteristics and lower scores represented lower tendencies toward transformational or transactional leadership characteristics.

A panel of subject matter experts from the Management and Leadership Academy was utilized to assess each item for construct and content validity. The panel also verified the clarity of instructions and questions in the final survey. Based on the feedback from the panel, the appropriate adjustments were made and a pilot test was run. Thirty participants from the Management and Leadership Academy of San Bernardino County completed the IB pilot test. Because of the low number of participants, statistical analyses of the pilot were inconclusive and did not merit deleting items, but there were corrections to

grammar and typographical errors. In addition, the
recurring theme among the pilot group was confusion over
the lack of a prioritization task. Participants in this
group who had experience with IBs were anticipating the
standard format. A prioritization task was added to the IB
to alleviate confusion and adjust the perception of the
assessment.

Leadership In Basket Measurement Properties

In the current study, the forty-one items of the
Leadership IB and the alpha reliability of the 6 scales
were tested (See APPENDIX F). After analyzing the
Corrected − Item Total Correlations the 16 item
Prioritization task was reduced to 8 items, eliminating
item numbers 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 11, 14 and 16 due to negative
or poor correlations with the scale. The remaining 8
items, after deletion of 8 original items, strongly
represents the prioritization task as it was intended. The
new 8 item Prioritization task with N = 95, Mean = 1.24 and
Standard Deviation = 0.33, the alpha reliability was .44.

The 9 items for the Charisma scale was analyzed and
seven items were eliminated due to negative or poor
Corrected − Item Total Correlations, eliminated items were
numbers 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, and 23. In eliminating the

33

items, the remaining 2 item scale measures Charisma in the context of the IB, however may also be closely reflective of risk taking type behavior. The new 2 item Charisma scale was evaluated with N = 95, and Mean = 1.92, and Standard Deviation = 0.23, the alpha reliability was .67.

The Individual Consideration scale was analyzed and 2 items were eliminated due to negative or poor Corrected – Item Total Correlations. The items eliminated from the analysis were numbers 24 and 27 and the remaining items are strong representatives of the original scale and purported measurement. The new Individual Consideration scale included 2 items with N = 94, Mean = 1.73, and Standard Deviation = .38. The alpha reliability was .45.

Intellectual Stimulation included a 4 item scale that was reduced to two items after negative and poor Corrected – Item Total Correlations were found. The deleted items numbers were 28 and 29 with the remaining items being reflective of the original intent to measure Intellectual Stimulation, but may also contain elements of Management by Exception. The new Intellectual Stimulation scale had an N = 94, Mean = 1.24 and Standard Deviation = .68; alpha reliability of the scale was .44.

Next, the Contingent Reward scale was made up of 4 items and reduced to 3 items after analysis of the Corrected – Item Total Correlations demonstrated negative or poor results for item number 36. The new Contingent Reward scale, after deleting 1 item, remained representative of the original scale with N = 94, Mean = .89, and Standard Deviation = .53; resulted with the alpha reliability = .46.

Finally, the 6 item Management by Exception scale was reduced to 4 items after analyses of negative and poor Corrected – Item Total Correlations. Item numbers 33 and 34 were eliminated and the new scale remained consistent with the original measurement purpose. The new Management by Exception scale with N =. 94, Mean = .88 and Standard Deviation = .44, had an alpha reliability of .40. Results are summarized in Table 1.

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Short

The MLQ Short (Bass, 1990) survey (See APPENDIX D) measured perceived transformational leadership behaviors as reported by participants' supervisors. This is a paper and pencil survey that used a 5 point Likert-type scale ranging from 0 (Not at all) to 4 (Frequently, if not always). The

Table 1. Management and Leadership Academy Leadership In Basket Means, Standard Deviations and Alpha Reliability Coefficients

Subscale	Items	M	SD	alpha
1. Prioritization Task	8	1.24	.33	.44
2. Charisma	2	1.92	.23	.67
3. Individual Consideration	2	1.73	.38	.45
4. Intellectual Stimulation	2	1.24	.68	.44
5. Contingent Reward	3	.89	.53	.46
6. Management by Exception	4	.88	.44	.40

MLQ Short consisted of 45 questions with varying numbers of questions for each construct. Constructs included as the factors in Transformational Leadership included Idealized Influence - Attributed and Behavioral (Charisma), Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation and Individual Consideration. Additional constructs assessed by the MLQ Short include factors of Transactional Leadership (Contingent Reward and Management by Exception), Non Transactional (Laissez Faire Leadership) and Outcome factors (Extra effort, Effectiveness, and Satisfaction). Each question's score is summed and then divided by the

total number of questions in each construct to achieve an

average score (See APPENDIX G).

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Short
Measurement Properties

For the five transformational leadership scales of the

MLQ Short, alpha reliabilities were consistently lower than

prior research stating alpha reliability ranges from .75 to

.93 (See Table 2). The Idealized Influence - Attributed

(Charisma) 4 item scale, N = 85, Mean = 2.97 and Standard

Deviation = .677, reported alpha reliability = .66.

Idealized Influence - Behavioral (Charisma) included 4

items with N = 73, Mean = 2.73 and Standard Deviation =

.73. The reported alpha reliability = .73. Inspirational

Motivation was assessed with 4 items also. N = 76, Mean =

2.87 and Standard Deviation = .76, and reported an alpha

reliability of .75. With N = 80, and Mean = 2.65 and

Standard Deviation = .63, the alpha reliability for

Intellectual Stimulation was .69. Finally for the

Transformational Leadership Scale there is Individual

Consideration with N = 60, Mean = 2.69 and Standard

Deviation = .73, resulting in an alpha reliability of .58.

The analysis of the MLQ Short also produced statistics

for Transactional and Non - Transactional, and Outcome

Factors. Transactional factors included Contingent Reward and Management by Exception Active and Passive. The 4 item Contingent Reward scale reported an alpha reliability of .76 (consistent with prior research averaging .78), with N = 56, Mean = 2.70 and Standard Deviation of .85. Active Management by Exception had an alpha reliability of .77 (consistent with prior research averaging .78), with N = 64, Mean = 1.47 and Standard Deviation = .84. Passive Management by Exception (4 items) with N = 81, Mean = .89 and Standard Deviation = .79, had an alpha reliability of .77 (slightly higher than prior research showing reliabilities averaging.58). Non-Transactional Leadership Factors included one scale for Laissez Faire Leadership with 4 items and N= 86, Mean = .57 and Standard Deviation = .73. It reported an alpha reliability of .80. Finally the Outcome Factors include three scales including Extra Effort, Effectiveness and Satisfaction. Extra Effort is a 3 item scale, N= 55, Mean = 2.30 and Standard Deviation = 1.14, with an alpha reliability of .87. Effectiveness indicated an alpha reliability of .71 with N = 52, Mean = 2.90 and Standard Deviation = .73. Last, for the MLQ Short, the Satisfaction scale of 2 items reports an alpha

reliability of .67, with N = 85, Mean = 3.22 and Standard
Deviation = .75 (See Table 2).

Results

Prior to analysis, each item from the Leadership IB
and the MLQ Short were examined for out of range values,
missing data, skewness and kurtosis. Of the 101
participants who volunteered for the study, 6 were found to
have significant missing data, with an excess of one third
of data from either the MLQ or the IB missing or blank, and
were subsequently removed from the sample. The new N = 95.
The items were examined separately for the 95 employees who
participated from San Bernardino County. No patterns of
missing data were identified. No missing data replacement
techniques were utilized. Items within each survey
contained mild skewness and kurtosis, but examination of
overall scale scores revealed no skewness or kurtosis
exceeding +/- 1.0. Therefore, no transformations were
necessary.

To test the hypotheses SPSS was used to run Bivariate
Correlation analyses. An alpha level of .05 was used for
all statistical tests. Hypothesis 1 predicted a

Table 2. Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Short Means,
         Standard Deviations and Alpha Reliability
         Coefficients

Subscale	M	SD	alpha
Idealized Influence – Attributed	2.97	.67	.65
Idealized Influence – Behavioral	2.73	.73	.73
Inspirational Motivation	2.87	.76	.75
Intellectual Stimulation	2.64	.63	.69
Individual Consideration	2.69	.73	.58
Contingent Reward	2.70	.85	.76
Management by Exception – Active	1.47	.84	.69
Management by Exception – Passive	.89	.79	.77
Laissez Faire	.57	.73	.80
Extra Effort	2.30	1.14	.87
Effectiveness	2.90	.73	.71
Satisfaction	3.22	.75	.67

significant positive relationship between the Leadership IB

Charisma (Subscale 2) and the MLQ Charisma scales of

Attributed – Idealized Behavior, Behavioral – Idealized

Behavior and Inspirational Motivation. The tests for

Hypothesis 1 were not statistically significant at $r = -$

.035, p= .75 for Attributed – Idealized Behavior; $r = -$

.028, p= .81 for Behavioral – Idealized Behavior; and r = –.197, p= .08 for Inspirational Motivation.

Hypothesis 2 predicted a significant positive relationship between the Leadership IB Intellectual Stimulation (Subscale 4) and the MLQ Intellectual Stimulation. Hypothesis 2 was not statistically significant with r = .040, p= .73. Hypothesis 3 predicted a significant positive relationship between Leadership IB Individual Consideration (Subscale 3) and MLQ Individual Consideration. Hypothesis 3 was not statistically significant with r = .201, p= .12. Hypothesis 4 predicted a significant positive relationship between Leadership IB Contingent Reward (Transactional Leadership construct)(Subscale 5) and MLQ Contingent Reward. Hypothesis 4 was not statistically significant with r = .119, p= .39. Last, Hypothesis 5 predicted that relationships between Leadership IB Management by Exception (Subscale 6) and MLQ Active Management by Exception and Passive Management by Exception would be significant and positive. Hypothesis 5 was not found to be statistically significant; Bivariate correlations indicated r = .240, p= .06 and r = –.056, p= .62 respectively (See Table 3). Significant relationships were noted between Leadership IB

Charisma and MLQ Individual Consideration, r = −.330, p<
.05, and Leadership IB Intellectual Stimulation and MLQ
Laissez Faire, r = .250, p< .05.

The MLA examination process included a paper and
pencil cognitive test, a Job Performance Assessment (JPA)
completed by the candidates' supervisor or manager, and an
essay exam scored by multiple raters. Due to the
sensitivity of the data, measurement properties and
individual responses were not made available for the
purpose of this research. The total score each candidate
received on each assessment were made available for
comparison and were evaluated for their relationship with
each other and the total score received by each candidate
on the Leadership IB and the MLQ as shown in Table 4.

Of the potential relationships between MLA assessments
and the total scores candidates received on the Leadership
IB and the MLQ, there were no significant relationships.
One significant relationship was found between the Job
Performance Assessment and the candidates' essay exams, r =
.243, p< .05. Of the potential relationships between MLA
assessments and the total scores candidates received on the
Leadership IB and the MLQ, there were no significant
relationships. One significant relationship was found

Table 3. Bivariate Correlations Between Management and
          Leadership Academy Leadership In Basket Subscales
          and Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Short
          Subscales

MLQ Subscales	Leadership IB Subscales				
	2	3	4	5	6
Attributed	-.035	.076	-.074	.049	.160
Behavior	-.028	.098	-.047	-.109	.088
Inspire	-.197	.078	-.059	.042	.201
Intellectual Stim.	.006	.091	.040	-.001	.103
Individual Consid.	-.330*	.201	.001	-.009	.157
Cont. Reward	-.192	.166	.184	.119	.205
Active Mgmt by Except	-.119	-.016	.210	.112	.240
Passive Mgmt by Except	.084	.052	.219	-.062	-.056
Laissez Faire	.049	.042	.250*	-.030	-.025
Extra Effort	-.102	.209	.219	.210	.263
Effective	-.198	.120	-.016	.083	.182
Satisfaction	-.048	-.025	.029	-.050	-.016

between the Job Performance Assessment and the candidates'
essay exams, $r = .243$, $p < .05$.

43

Table 4. Bivariate Correlations Between Management and
          Leadership Academy Assessments and Total Scores
          for the Leadership In Basket and Multifactor
          Leadership Questionnaire Short

Scales	1	2	3	4	5
1. Cognitive	--	.158	.153	.003	-.060
2. JPA		--	.243*	-.014	.176
3. Essay			--	-.002	-.124
4. IB Total				--	.142
5. MLQ Total					--

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2 tailed).

CHAPTER SIX

DISCUSSION

The current study was designed with the intent to
develop a tool that would allow organizations to better
identify potential leaders. The use of an objectively
scored IB has multiple advantages including assessing
actual work samples while avoiding some rater, contextual
or implicit leadership bias. The findings of this study
can be used to further research in the area of IB
assessments and act as a catalyst to thinking about methods
for evaluating behaviors that were thought not to be
applicable to work sample assessments, despite the lack of
support for the hypothesis.

In addition to aspiring to use an IB to predict
leadership potential, this study was designed to use an
objective scoring theme for the IB task. Traditional IBs
are often scored using a rater system, which can be subject
to issues of interrater reliability and performance
reliability sometimes resulting in lackluster conclusions;
interrater reliabilities studied over time have been
reported as low as .35 to as high as .94 (Schippmann,
1991). The internal reliabilities resulting from the

objective scoring theme were disappointing. Using an objective scoring theme seemed to have set the IB design up for good internal reliability, but internal reliabilities actually ranged from .44 to .67 for the transformational/ transactional leadership scales. The range of internal reliabilities that were used for the final test of the hypotheses was the result of eliminating several questions from each IB construct. The initial alphas were very weak and eliminated questions often came from different scenarios, a situation similar to the problems found when evaluating constructs across dimensions in other AC exercises. The relatively low alpha reliabilities may have contributed most to the lack of support for the construct validation against the MLQ. Interestingly, the only IB subscale that reported a fair reliability was the Charisma scale with .67, which also correlated with the MLQ Individual Consideration scale, thus suggesting that low reliabilities are largely to blame for the lack of significant outcomes. The Charisma scale was anticipated to be the most difficult construct to capture based on the dynamic nature of the construct and the objective scoring theme. While the alpha is the highest of the scales designed, it is difficult to determine if the two questions

that remained after item deletions adequately defined the construct.

The low internal reliability for the remaining IB subscales may have occurred for several reasons. Most likely, the mapping process used to link Bass' constructs to scenarios and then to objective questions may not have worked as had been intended. For example, if the transition from the Charisma MLQ scale to the Charisma IB scale was not adequately matched, then the validation of the IB construct would not be supported, as indicated. It is also possible that the complexity of the leadership behaviors may not have been adequately captured in the supporting documents. The scenarios may not have provided participants with a clear enough understanding of the situation or enough alternatives for their reaction. With traditional rater evaluated IBs, participants often write out their responses, allowing for a variety of answers. The Leadership IB was objectively scored and participants had to choose answers to the scenarios that most closely matched how they would respond and it is probable that the response options were not sufficient to capture the many complex responses leaders may have. Another possibility lending to the lack of internal reliability may have been

the government context and reward system. While most will agree that transformational leaders could lead change in government organizations, the kind of behavior that is rewarded may still be the more traditional managerial behaviors. Transactional behaviors such as Contingent Reward and Management by Exception remain the status quo even while the idea of vision and intellectually stimulating employees is thought to be more effective. The participants in this study were possibly completing the IB under the impression that it would be used in consideration of their admittance into the MLA, even though they were advised that it would not be used. It is conceivable that their responses were then geared more towards what they believed would be rewarded behavior in the context of their environment as it actually is rather than ideally would be.

Despite difficulties with the Leadership IB internal reliabilities, the MLQ performed within a normal range according to previous studies. MLQ internal reliabilities normally range from .58 to .93 (Hartog, Van Muijen & Koopman, 1997) across constructs, in this study the internal reliabilities ranged from .57 to .80 across constructs, only slightly lower on average than other studies. These results were based on the participants'

48

managers' observations of the participants' work behaviors. It is not surprising that the MLQ measurement properties were favorable as the tool has been tested in many studies over the last 20 years. What is not known and what was not tested was the predictive validity of the MLQ under the conditions of this study and how on average each participant scored in comparison to each other on transformational behavior constructs. The purpose of the study was not to evaluate the leadership abilities of participants as reported by the MLQ, but further research may look into whether or not MLQ factors are found to be prominent in successful leaders in the County.

The results of this study did not indicate support for any of the hypotheses tested. For Hypothesis 1, the relationship between the Leadership IB Charisma construct and the MLQ factor of Charisma was assessed. The MLQ Charisma Factor was built into the tool using three constructs, Attributed Idealized Behavior, Behavioral Idealized Behavior and Inspirational Motivation. Results indicated the Bivariate Correlations between Attributed Idealized Behavior and IB Charisma ($r = -.035$, $p= .75$), Behavioral Attributed Behavior and IB Charisma ($r = -.028$ $p= .81$) and Inspirational Motivation and IB Charisma ($r = -$

.197, p= .09) as having no significant relationships. All

three of the MLQ Charisma constructs that resulted in

reasonable internal reliability scores, ranging from .65

to.75, while the IB Charisma scale showed a reliability of

.67, based on a two item scale. There is no previous

research to support the expected relationship between these

two assessment tools on the construct of Charisma.

Charisma is thought to bring about a follower's emotional

attachment to a leader (Hartog, Van Muijen & Koopman, 1997)

and it is reasonable to think that a work sample such as an

IB may not adequately capture a purported emotional

response or the behaviors that would lead to such a

response from followers.

Hypothesis 2, the relationship between the IB

Intellectual Stimulation and MLQ Intellectual Stimulation

constructs was assessed and there was no significant

relationship found (r = .040, p= .72). The MLQ

Intellectual Stimulation scale had an internal reliability

of .69, which is slightly lower than reliabilities found in

previous research averaging .81. The IB Intellectual

Stimulation scale showed an internal reliability of .44,

which may have adversely affected the researcher's ability

to assess the relationship between this construct on the

two methods in question. While it seems clear that Charisma may not be an appropriate construct to measure with a work sample, the contrary is true for Intellectual Stimulation. It seemed reasonable to assess a leader's motives or behaviors pertaining to Intellectual Stimulation as they would most readily be identified in an IB. Limitations as they are related to the inconsistency of the IB may be the primary reason that there was no relationship found. Another possible reason for the lack of statistical support may be the government context of the IB and the participant's experience in the environment. The IB was developed to represent a scenario that a leader in a government setting may encounter, but in setting the scenario in such a way, it may have encouraged participants to respond the way the believe they should respond in the environment that they actually work in.

Hypothesis 3, also not supported, examined the relationship between the IB Individual Consideration and the MLQ Individual Consideration scales with no significant relationship found(r = .201, p= .12). The MLQ Individual Consideration scale had an internal reliability .58, lower than previously reported averages of approximately .75, while the IB Individual Consideration scale showed and

internal reliability of .45. The internal reliability of the IB scale was not impressive, potentially affecting the ability to test the relationship. Individual Consideration is a construct in the IB that was measured through various scenarios. It is possible that not having focused on one particular scenario to assess this construct resulted in questions that did not capture the behavior that was intended.

Hypothesis 4, the relationship between IB Contingent Reward and MLQ Contingent Reward also was not supported ($r = .119$, $p = .39$). Internal reliabilities for MLQ Contingent Reward were consistent with previous research at .76, while the IB Contingent Reward resulted in a .46 internal reliability. Lastly, Hypothesis 5 was not supported, showing no relationship between IB Management by Exception and MLQ Active Management by Exception ($r = .240$, $p = .06$) or MLQ Passive Management by Exception ($r = -.056$, $p = .62$). Reliabilities for the MLQ Active Management by Exception were consistent with prior research at .69 and Passive Management was also consistent with .77. The IB Management by exception internal reliability was .40. Of the five constructs being evaluated by the current study and compared to scenarios in the IB, Hypothesis 4 and

Hypothesis 5 presented the most likely possibilities of finding a significant relationship. Both Contingent Reward and Management by Exception are transactional leadership constructs and by definition should be considerably more straight forward in their evaluation. Contingent Reward occurs when leaders "reward followers for attaining specified performance levels" (Hartog, Van Muijen & Koopman, 1997). By a similar theme, Management by Exception occurs when "a leader only takes action when things go wrong and standards are not met" (Bass & Avolio, 1989). Both transactional types of behavior depict traditional types of responses by managers, increasing the likelihood that one could predict the behavior. Because of this, the IB scenarios were written in a manner that allowed the participants to choose from a series of responses that would clearly identify transactional types of behavior as opposed to transformational. This was not the case and the IB did not sufficiently differentiate the two types of leadership.

There were two significant relationships found through the analyses process, although these results are not in support of proposed hypotheses. A significant negative relationship was found between Leadership IB Charisma and

MLQ Individual Consideration (r = -.330, p< .05). The more

a participant demonstrated IB Charisma, the less he/she

demonstrated MLQ Individual Consideration. The result

suggests that a person who is highly charismatic is less

likely to demonstrate consideration of their followers,

which is not in support of Bass' 1985 theory of

Transformational Leadership and does not support the

proposed hypothesis of this study. The second significant

relationship was found between Leadership IB Intellectual

Stimulation and MLQ Laissez Faire (r = .250, p< .05). The

higher a participant scored on IB Intellectual Stimulation,

the higher they scored on MLQ Laissez Faire. The

significance of this relationship and the IB Charisma and

MLQ Individual Consideration may be spurious results and

any conclusions made about these relationships would not

likely be supported in future studies.

Limitations of the Study

The current study is limited in how the IB can be

generalized and the population that it is used to assess.

All participants for this study are San Bernardino County

managers or supervisors who have been identified as

potential leaders in their work place. Therefore the tool

has been developed specifically to relate to their
environment in a government setting and to the type of
decision making capacity that they are currently in line to
receive. The study would have also benefited from a more
extensive pilot, which may have been proactive in better
assessing item and scale reliabilities and stronger alphas
overall.

Future Implications

There are two primary areas of focus in the current
study that invite opportunities for future research.
First, the development of objectively scored IBs should
continue to be pursued in an effort to make a general
administrative or managerial IB that can be reliably scored
and accessible to organizations. Second, there should be
continued effort to develop an IB that can be used in
conjunction with traditional tests to augment the
predictability of leadership success. In combination, an
accessible objectively scored IB used to identify desired
leadership behaviors can be a critical tool in the changing
workforce. The IB tool used in this study is a good
beginning to the desired end state, further development and

a clear focus for the internal constructs can result in positive outcomes in the future.

Further development for the Leadership IB would include a more thorough mapping process of the MLQ constructs to ensure that all scenarios undoubtedly capture the true nature of the construct. The validation process may warrant considering using subordinate MLQ ratings as opposed to supervisor ratings, as subordinates are more likely to have been exposed to a participants leadership skills in the role of a follower. The design of the IB could also be improved by assessing each construct with a single scenario and using a scale that identifies a behavior on a continuum from transformational to transactional.

APPENDIX A

INFORMED CONSENT

Leadership In-Basket Exercise
Informed Consent

The study in which you are about to participate is designed to generate a profile of leadership potential in a government setting. This study is being conducted by Colleen Dennison, under the supervision of Dr. Jan Kottke, professor of Psychology, as part of a thesis for the completion of a Masters Degree in Industrial/Organizational Psychology.

The Institutional Review Board of California State University, San Bernardino, has approved this study.

In this study you will be asked to review and complete the packet of information contained in the Leadership In-Basket. Following reviewing and gathering the information as instructed, you will be asked to respond to the multiple-choice questions at the end of the task. The task should take about 1 ½ hours to complete. Your responses will be scored and assessed by the researcher and the staff at the Management and Leadership Academy of San Bernardino County. All of your responses will be held in the strictest of confidence by the researchers. Your name will not be reported with your responses for the purpose of this study. All data will be reported in group form only. If you are interested in the results of this study, they will be available to you after January 1, 2001.

Your participation in this study is totally voluntary. Your participation (or non participation) in this study will not influence your being accepted into the program of the Management and Leadership Academy. Please also note that you are free to withdraw your participation at any time during this study and remove your data from the study without penalty. If you have any questions about the study, or wish to receive a report of the results at the conclusion of the study, please contact Dr. Jan Kottke at (909) 880-5585.

By signing in the space provided below, I acknowledge that I have been informed of, and that I understand the nature and purpose of this study, and freely consent to participate. I also acknowledge that I am at least 18 years of age.

Signature _____   Today's Date_____

APPENDIX B

LEADERSHIP IN BASKET TASK

Management and Leadership Academy

In-Basket Exercise
(41 questions)

INSTRUCTIONS

The forty-one questions at the back of this test -In-basket Exercise- are based on the packet of materials contained in the large envelope in front of you. These materials describe and simulate everyday work situations that you may encounter.

This particular type of work simulation is sometimes called an in-basket exercise because it contains letters, notes and memorandums similar to those generally found on an office desk.

This exercise is completely self-contained and does not ask any questions that would require you to have any specific technical knowledge or prior experience in supervision or management as a San Bernardino County employee. It does however, require you to be able to read, prioritize and demonstrate your ability to think and exercise judgment.

When you are told to begin, open the envelope in front of you and remove the contents.

Read **All** of the materials in the packet carefully. Then read and answer each of the forty-one questions based on the materials contained in the packet. Do not assume any circumstances beyond those stated or directly implied by the materials in your packet. **Base your answers solely on the information provided.** For each question, mark the answer you choose directly on the test at the back of this packet.

You will have <u>one and a half (1 ½)</u> <u>hours</u> to complete this part of the test. If you finish before time is called, you may go back and review your work, or you may begin working on the next test. However, if you want to review any of your work in the in-basket, you <u>must</u> do so before time is called.

Please read and sign the informed c onsent if you wish your in-basket data to be included in the research study being conducted at this time.

In Basket Contents

Please review your packet of materials to ensure you have all of the following pieces of information.

1. In Basket Exercise
2. Job Description
3. Department Description and Objectives
4. Summary of Employees and Assigned Duties
5. Memo: Parking Permits
6. Letter from Rachel Dennis
7. Phone Message from Margie Smith (#1)
8. Updated list of employees from Preschool Services
9. Memo: Early Education Manager
10. List of Suggestions
11. Request for New Personnel
12. Phone Message from Erin Cole
13. Memo: Early Bees Fund Raiser
14. Memo: Mission/Objectives
15. Memo: Children's Conference in Florida
16. Fax from Anton Stewart
17. Memo: Duplicate Paperwork
18. Phone Message from Margie Smith (#2)
19. Letter from Margie Smith
20. Memo: Sick Leave Policy

Questions 1-41

In Basket Exercise

Instructions and Background

Who are you? You are Chris Schuller. You have successfully worked as the Deputy Director of the Department for Children's Services in Dexter County for eight years. Your contributions have included several well-known innovative programs and increased public support for the work being done in your department.

Department Status. The departments of Children's Services and Preschool Services have been merged to form the Department of Children's & Preschool Services. As a result of the merger many employees from Preschool Services have been laid off or transferred to other positions in the County. Approximately 10 new employees are being transferred into your department to work along with your existing staff in Children's Services. All other hiring needs are being frozen until July 1, 1999. The new combined department will take on the responsibilities of both previous departments in an effort to reduce expenses, improve customer service and streamline overlapping County services.

Your Job. As Deputy Director of the newly structured Children's and Preschool Services Department, your job includes directing, planning, and organizing all social services for Dexter County. You have specific responsibilities under these new conditions to develop and implement new policies and procedures for your department. You oversee employee performance standards and evaluations, achievement of goals and effectiveness of operations. Special consideration is to be taken in the training needs of new and experienced employees, maintaining motivation and encouraging employee commitment to the new objectives for the department.

Your Current Task. Today's date is Friday, May 14, 1999. You will be leaving on a previously planned trip this afternoon and will not be returning until Tuesday, May 18. Additionally you have been away from the office for the last three days while attending a professional conference. Your supervisor, Karen Novak is out of the office today, but has requested that you summarize your current projects for her to review and consult with you on Tuesday when you return.

Please read ALL of the contents of the In-Basket and respond to the multiple-choice questions at the end of this packet. All questions are based on the information contained in this In-Basket. This is a contrived scenario and does not necessarily represent your experience in this County or the responsibilities of the example departments herein.

Deputy Director of Children's and Preschool Services Job Description

Definition

Under general direction, plans, organizes, and directs the delivery of all social service programs. Has specific responsibility for county-wide training, policy development, and operations of designated social service programs, delivery of the program or components thereof; performs related duties as required. Positions in this class are characterized by responsibility to administer and direct through subordinates, either department-wide administrative functions, or early education programming, and all the departmental social services programs and operations in several offices.

Examples of Duties:

1. Plan, organize and direct the delivery of all social services programs relating to Children's and Preschool Services.

2. Write operational policies and procedures; develop and recommend program goals.

3. Ensure compliance with federal and state laws as well as the quality and effectiveness of programs.

4. Interface and coordinate with other agencies and county departments to develop and/or maintain relevant social services programs.

5. Supervise and train subordinate management and supervisory staff; evaluate performance, achievement of goals, compliance with procedures, and effectiveness of operations.

6. Identify subordinate training needs and make recommendations with regard to personnel matters.

7. Participate and provide leadership in planning activities with the Policy Council, delegate agencies, County departments and regional Early Education agencies.

8. Investigate and resolve complaints from employees, agents of participants or representatives of other governmental agencies.

9. Prepare reports and correspondence as required.

10. Act for the Director during absences.

Provide vacation and temporary relief as required.

Department of Children

And Preschool Services

Department Description and Objectives

The Children's and Preschool Services Department seeks to provide comprehensive child development programs, including: education, increasing social competence, case management, diagnosis and treatment services for children from low income families or for those who need special assistance due to a handicap or potential handicap.

This department strives to deliver comprehensive, high quality customer service in order to encourage healthy development in children in our community. It is the desire of this department to be responsive and supportive to each child and their family, while remaining sensitive to developmental, ethnic, and cultural backgrounds.

Services provided to recipients include medical, dental and behavioral health; financial supplements and parent counseling. The Early Education program is an example of one of the programs offered through the department to help improve the child's social and educational development.

Summary of Employees

Children's & Preschool Services

Position	Incumbent
Director	Karen Novak
Deputy Director	Chris Schuller (You)
Personnel Officer	Margie Smith
Personnel Technician	Kathy Elliot
Executive Secretary	Diane Sharp
Counselor	Erin Cole
Eligibility Worker II	Joe Gattone
Eligibility Worker I	Mark Dyer
Eligibility Worker I	Ruth Sanchez
Clerk III	Liz Turner
Clerk II	Alan Nazarian
Fiscal Clerk	Michelle Renendez
Early Education Manager	Rachel Dennis
Early Education Teacher	Lee Mercer
Early Education Teacher	Andy Mueller

Memo

To: Administrative Group

From: Parking Services

Re: Parking Permits

May 12, 1999

Please be advised that a number of new employees do not
have parking passes. There are a limited number of
temporary passes available, but all employees should be
displaying permanent parking passes by June 1, or they will
start receiving tickets for parking in employee stalls.
Please get in your requests for permanent passes ASAP.

Dean Howard

Parking Services

Early Education Program

Dexter County

May 06, 1999

Dear Chris:

As you know I have recently turned in my regretful resignation as Manager of the Early Education program to take a position in another County. I appreciate all of the opportunities I have had here and will surely miss working with the great staff employed in this County.

I would like to take this opportunity to recommend Lee Mercer as my replacement. I have worked closely with Lee for over seven years and have always been satisfied with Lee's work in our department. Lee is dependable, conscientious and has been a good friend to all. The initial performance was not representative of Lee's ability. In your review of Lee's performance history, I think you will find that Lee gave an effort in all assigned tasks and has continued to improve throughout the past years.

Sincerely,

Rachel Dennis
Early Education Manager

PHONE MESSAGE

Margie Smith called and wants you to call her regarding the Early Education Manager position. She needs your recommendation by Monday for the interim manager.

D.S.

Department of Children and Preschool Services

May 04, 1999

Chris,

Here is the updated list of employees coming over from Preschool services to our office:

Rachel Dennis	Early Education Manager
Lee Mercer	Early Education Teacher
Andy Mueller	Early Education Teacher
Kathy Elliot	Personnel Technician
Mark Dyer	Eligibility Worker I
Ruth Sanchez	Eligibility Worker I
Michelle Renendez	Fiscal Clerk
Alan Nazarian	Clerk II

Memo

Date: 05/12/ 99

To: Chris Schuller

From: Andy Mueller

RE: Early Education Manager

Dear Chris,

I know that Rachel Dennis has turned in her resignation and that you now are looking for an Early Education manager.

I would like to take this opportunity to nominate myself as possible candidate for the manager position. I believe that my experience working with Rachel has more than prepared me for the position. I have some great ideas for improving and expanding the program to meet the needs of our customers.

I know that some of my more risky project ideas have not worked out. However, some of my risk taking has resulted in innovative ideas, such as the "Give a Bear" drive, that have contributed to the success of the Early Education program.

I truly would appreciate an opportunity to talk with you.

Thank you – Andy

Department of Children and Preschool Services

May 14, 1999

Here is a list of the suggestions we have received from our internal and external customers regarding issues they think we should address in order to achieve our organizational objectives. - DS

<u>Suggestions</u>

Increase technology

Increasing productivity

Hire more qualified staff

Reduce aid to recipients

Personal growth

Teamwork

Increasing program awareness to the public

Customer Service

Reduce number of recipients

Employee Training

Request for New Personnel

Department: Children's and Preschool Services

Requested By: Joe Gattone

Position to be filled: Eligibility Worker I

Number of Positions to be filled: Two

Date Needed: ASAP by June 1, 1999

Today's Date: May 13, 1999

Signature: Joe Gattone

Authorized By: _____

Comments:

With the merging of Children's and Preschool Services, our eligibility workload has increased significantly. We are in desperate need to fill these positions and immediate response on part of Human Resources to accommodate us would be greatly appreciated.

PHONE MESSAGE

Erin Cole called to confirm your lunch meeting on Tuesday when you return.

D.S.

Memo

Date: 5/10/99

To: Chris Schuller

From: Liz Turner

RE: Early Bees Fund Raiser

It's that time for our yearly fundraiser and spring party. Once again we will put together the spring pageant.

Would you be willing to wear the bee-costume again? Please let me know as soon as possible - Liz

Memo

Date: 5/13/99

To: Chris Schuller

From: Karen Novak

RE: Mission/ Objectives

The Board of Supervisors has requested that we draft a
Mission Statement for the new Department. In an effort to
include everyone in the process, we have requested input
from our internal and external customers. See the list of
suggestions and use your judgment as to which organizational
objectives we should include in our Mission Statement.

-KN

Dexter County School District

Interoffice Memorandum

to: Karen Novak

from: Susan Nunn, Director

subject: Children's Conference in Florida

cc: Chris Schuller

Karen,

I know we have talked about this before, but I need to know if you will come with us to the conference. My assistant is getting ready to book the flights and make room reservations. Please let her know what your plans are.

Also, I had the pleasure to work with one of your employees, Andy Mueller, last week at the workshop. I was very impressed with Andy's ideas and enthusiasm about the Early Education Program. You are fortunate to have such employees in your department.

Susan

FAX

To: Chris Schuller

Company: Children's &
Preschool Services Dept.

Fax number: 555-8000

Phone number: 555-8001

From: Anton Stewart,

Personnel Clerk

Date: 05/13/99

Total no. of pages including
cover: 1

RE: Lee Mercer

□ URGENT X FOR REVIEW   □ PLEASE COMMENT

□ PLEASE REPLY   □ PLEASE RECYCLE

Notes/Comments:

Chris,

As per Margie's request I am sending over Lee Mercer's
employment history to your office Monday 5-17-99. I think
you will find the record satisfactory. There have been no
disciplinary incidents or write ups of any kind. Lee has
performed to the expectation of the supervisors, but
without exceptional or excellent comments.

-Anton

Interoffice Memo

Date: 05/12/ 99

To: Chris Schuller

From: Mark Dyer

RE: Duplicate paperwork

Having observed the flow of paperwork in the eligibility
department, it has come to my attention that there are
numerous forms we are required by the department to complete
for each case. In particular, the background information is
duplicated three times on different forms. I do not quite
understand why that is necessary. This duplication wastes
time and effort, neither of which we have. It would be much
easier to make copies of one document.
It is not my intention to cause a problem or ``go over'' Joe
Gattone's head, but I feel that my voice is not being heard
as constructive, but rather disruptive. - Mark

PHONE MESSAGE

Margie Smith is sending over a personnel request for new Eligibility Workers. It needs your immediate attention.

D.S.

Department of Children and Preschool Services

May 12, 1999

Dear Chris,

Regarding our conversation on Tuesday, it seems that Mark Dyer and Ruth Sanchez are still reporting difficulty in transitioning from Preschool Services. They seem to be having problems following proper procedures in our department and the situation is becoming frustrating for their supervisors and coworkers. Please advise me on how you wish to proceed with this situation; I understand it is a challenging transition for all of us.

Second, the County Administrators Office has approved the appointing of a new Early Education Manager. Considering our urgency and the recent hiring freeze, we are being allowed to bypass the recruitment process. I need your decision soon!

Sincerely,

Margie Smith

Personnel Officer

Memo

Date: 05/10/ 99

To: Chris Schuller

From: Karen Novak

RE: Sick leave policy

Chris,

We need to get together on this issue of the employees' excessive use of sick leave. Since the merger was announced, sudden requests for vacation, administrative and sick leave have increased dramatically. I believe that there is some degree of job insecurity that they are experiencing and we need to address the issue before it gets out of hand and we start losing good people to other departments. Schedule a meeting for Wednesday of next week in the conference room, a few others from personnel will be attending also.

Thank You

Karen

APPENDIX C

MULTIFACTOR LEADERSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE

MLQ   Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire
Rater Form (5x - Short)

Name of Leader: _____   Date: _____

Organization ID #: _____ Leader ID #: _____

This questionnaire is to describe the leadership style of the above-mentioned individual as you perceive it. Please answer all items on this answer sheet. **If an item is irrelevant, or if you are unsure or do not know the answer, leave the answer blank.** Please answer this questionnaire anonymously.

IMPORTANT (necessary for processing): Which best describes you?
___ I am at a higher organizational level than the person I am rating.   ___ The person I am rating is at my organizational level.   ___ I am at a lower organizational level than the person I am rating.   ___ I do not wish my organizational level to be known.

Forty-five descriptive statements are listed on the following pages. Judge how frequently each statement fits the person you are describing.
Use the following rating scale:

Not at all	Once in a while	Sometimes	Fairly often	Frequently, if not always
0	1	2	3	4

The Person I am Rating...

1. Provides me with assistance in exchange for my efforts...   0 1 2 3 4

2. Re-examines critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate...   0 1 2 3 4

3. Fails to interfere until problems become serious...   0 1 2 3 4

4. Focuses attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions and deviations from standards...   0 1 2 3 4

5. Avoids getting involved when important issues arise...   0 1 2 3 4

6. Talks about their most important values and beliefs...   0 1 2 3 4

7. Is absent when needed...   0 1 2 3 4

8. Seeks differing perspectives when solving problems...   0 1 2 3 4

9. Talks optimistically about the future...   0 1 2 3 4

10. Instills pride in me for being associated with him/her...   0 1 2 3 4

11. Discusses in specific terms who is responsible for achieving performance targets...   0 1 2 3 4

12. Waits for things to go wrong before taking action...   0 1 2 3 4

13. Talks enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished...   0 1 2 3 4

14. Specifies the importance of having a strong sense of purpose...   0 1 2 3 4

15. Spends time teaching and coaching...   0 1 2 3 4

83

Not at all	Once in a while	Sometimes	Fairly often	Frequently, if not always
0	1	2	3	4

16. Makes clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved... 0 1 2 3 4

17. Shows that he/she is a firm believer in "If it ain't broke, don't fix it."... 0 1 2 3 4

18. Goes beyond self-interest for the good of the group... 0 1 2 3 4

19. Treats me as an individual rather than just as a member of the group... 0 1 2 3 4

20. Demonstrates that problems must become chronic before taking action... 0 1 2 3 4

21. Acts in a way that builds my respect... 0 1 2 3 4

22. Concentrates his/her full attention on dealing with mistakes, complaints, and failures... 0 1 2 3 4

23. Considers the moral and ethical consequences of decisions... 0 1 2 3 4

24. Keeps track of all mistakes... 0 1 2 3 4

25. Displays a sense of power and confidence... 0 1 2 3 4

26. Articulates a compelling vision of the future... 0 1 2 3 4

27. Directs my attention toward failures to meet standards... 0 1 2 3 4

28. Avoids making decisions... 0 1 2 3 4

29. Considers me as having different needs, abilities and aspirations from others... 0 1 2 3 4

30. Gets me to look at problems from many different angles... 0 1 2 3 4

31. Helps me develop my strengths... 0 1 2 3 4

32. Suggests new ways of looking at how to complete assignments... 0 1 2 3 4

33. Delays responding to urgent questions... 0 1 2 3 4

34. Emphasizes the importance of having a collective sense of mission... 0 1 2 3 4

35. Expresses satisfaction when I meet expectations... 0 1 2 3 4

36. Expresses confidence that goals will be achieved... 0 1 2 3 4

37. Is effective in meeting my job-related needs... 0 1 2 3 4

38. Uses methods of leadership that are satisfying... 0 1 2 3 4

39. Gets me to do more than I expected to do... 0 1 2 3 4

40. Is effective in representing me to higher authority... 0 1 2 3 4

41. Works with me in satisfactory way... 0 1 2 3 4

42. Heightens my desire to succeed... 0 1 2 3 4

43. Is effective in meeting organizational requirements... 0 1 2 3 4

44. Increases my willingness to try harder... 0 1 2 3 4

45. Leads a group that is effective... 0 1 2 3 4

APPENDIX D

LEADERSHIP IN BASKET TEST

Before You Begin

Be sure to provide the following information:

Name: _____

Social Security Number: _____

Envelope Number: _____

Thank You

In-Basket Instructions

<u>Please mark all of your answers on this document – Only</u>

<u>mark one answer per question.</u>

Based ONLY on the information you have read in this packet,

please rate the priority/ importance of each of the

following issues or pieces of information.

Key:

a. Highest Priority, address immediately before leaving.

b. Important, should plan action prior to leaving.

c. Not High Priority, can be addressed when you return.

d. Information, no action necessary.

1. Parking permit memo from Dean Howard.

2. Resignation letter from Rachel Dennis.

3. Appointing an Early Education Manager.

4. Margie Smith's request that you send her your

   recommendation for Early Education Manager.

5. List of updated employees.

6. Andy Mueller's request for consideration as Early

   Education Manager.

7. List of suggestions for organizational objectives.

8. Joe Gattone's request for new personnel.

9. Phone message from Erin Cole.

10. Early Bees Fund Raiser memo.

11. Memo from Karen Novak requesting you to review the Mission Statement suggestions.

12. Memo from Susan Nunn, Children's Conference in Florida.

13. Fax from Anton Stewart, regarding Lee Mercer.

14. Memo from Mark Dyer regarding duplicate paperwork.

15. Phone message from Margie Smith, regarding personnel request for Eligibility Workers.

16. Letter from Margie Smith regarding Ruth Sanchez and Mark Dyer.

Based on the overall goals of the Preschool and Children's Services Department, identify what you think are the three most important issues, in order of importance, to include in the Mission Statement.

17. Which of the following suggestions would you choose as the most important goal for the mission of the Department? Suggestions:

a. Teamwork

b. Personal growth

c. Customer service

d. Employee training

e. Improve technology

f. Increase productivity

g. Reduce aid to recipients

h. Hire more qualified staff

i. Increase program awareness

j. Reduce number of recipients

18. Which of the following suggestions would you choose as the second most important goal for the mission of the Department?

Suggestions:

a. Teamwork

f. Increase productivity

b. Personal growth

g. Reduce aid to recipients

c. Customer service

h. Hire more qualified staff

d. Employee training

i. Increase program awareness

e. Improve technology

j. Reduce number of recipients

19. Which of the following suggestions would you choose as the third most important goal for the mission of the Department?

Suggestions:

a. Teamwork

f. Increase productivity

b. Personal growth

g. Reduce aid to recipients

c. Customer service

h. Hire more qualified staff

d. Employee training

i. Increase program awareness

e. Improve technology

j. Reduce number of recipients

In the following three questions, identify the most important goals suggested, to include in your Personal Mission Statement as a leader for the Preschool and Children's Services Departments.

20. Which of the following suggestions would you choose as the most important goal for a leader working within the department?

a. Teamwork   f. Increase productivity

b. Personal growth   g. Reduce aid to recipients

c. Customer service   h. Hire more qualified staff

d. Employee training   i. Increase program awareness

e. Improve technology   j. Reduce number of recipients

21. Which of the following suggestions would you choose as the second most important goal for a leader working within the department?

a. Teamwork   f. Increase productivity

b. Personal growth   g. Reduce aid to recipients

c. Customer service   h. Hire more qualified staff

d. Employee training   i. Increase program awareness

e. Improve technology   j. Reduce number of recipients

22. Which of the following suggestions would you choose as the third most important goal for a leader working within the department?

a.   Teamwork   f.   Increase productivity

b.   Personal growth   g.   Reduce aid to recipients

c.   Customer service   h.   Hire more qualified staff

d.   Employee training   i.   Increase program awareness

e.   Improve technology   j.   Reduce number of recipients

23. Of the options listed below, what do you believe is the most effective way to communicate the Department Mission to your employees?

a. Use yourself as a model for them to follow.

b. Hand out copies of the Mission Statement for each employee to post in their office.

c. Communicate the importance of the goals in relation to the success of the department.

d. Remind employees to refer to their Mission Statement daily, as a reminder of our goals.

24. In the letter from Margie Smith, regarding Mark and

Ruth, how would you characterize the behavior of these two

employees?

a. Defiant.

b. Expected.

c. Unacceptable.

d. Unrelated to their work.

e. A result of poor management.

f. A result of misunderstanding.

25. In a situation such as the one mentioned above, where a

potential conflict exists, which of the following options

would most closely match your reasoning in dealing with the

situation?

a. Steps to prevent potential problems should be taken

   immediately.

b. Personal conflicts at work are common and should be

   allowed to work themselves out over time.

26. To further assess the situation, how would you address

the possible conflict with Mark, Ruth and their coworkers?

   a. Refer to Karen Novak.

   b. No action necessary at this time.

   c. Interview Ruth and Mark to get their input.

d. Allow their lead supervisor to handle the situation at that level.

e. Request a meeting with the entire staff to discuss problems in that department.

27. In reference to Mark and Ruth, which of the following courses of action would most closely match what you would recommend?

a. Training on department standards and goals.

b. Provide them with a mentor to facilitate their transition.

c. Transfer to a different department where they would feel more familiar to their previous working conditions.

d. Wait it out, give them time to get used to their surroundings and follow up at a later date to ensure there are no more problems.

28. How would you handle the memo received from Mark Dyer?

a. Implement the change in the department.

b. Meet with Joe and Mark to discuss the issue.

c. Forward the memo to Joe for him to review.

d. Meet with Mark to find out more, then talk to Joe.

e. Encourage Joe to consider implementing the change in the department.

29. Mark Dyers suggestion about reducing paperwork was a bold move on his part because he bypassed his supervisor in the process. Would you:

a. Encourage him to continue taking the initiative.

b. Ask that he continue to do his job the way it has been done in the past.

c. Discipline this behavior so as not to set an example of insubordination to other employees.

30. How should you respond to the request made by Joe Gattone to hire two more eligibility workers to handle the increased workload?

a. Forward to Human Resources for immediate action.

b. Show support for Joe's initiative and sign the request.

c. Encourage Joe to generate a list of possible alternative solutions for handling the workload.

d. Place the request on hold until July 1, 1999 and then process through Human Resources.

e. Set the request aside until after July 1, and encourage Joe to come to you before making decisions about hiring for his department.

31. Do you perceive any problems with the action taken by Joe Gattone in solving the workload problem in the Eligibility Department by contacting Human Resources to hire additional staff?

    a. Yes, he should have cleared the request with you.

    b. Yes, he should have tried to implement other alternatives first.

    c. No, he identified a problem and tried to remedy it.

    d. No, he should be able to hire as many people as he needs.

32. As the Director over the Eligibility Department, would you prefer that the supervisors when faced with this workload problem:

    a. Consult you immediately to avoid future problems.

    b. Generate their won solutions and consult you before implementing them.

    c. Generate their own solutions and implement them, as long as they abide by departmental policy.

    d. Refer to departmental policy manual on structuring workloads for guidance before consulting you.

33. Based on the information provided about Lee Mercer's job performance and history with the County, how likely

would it before you to recommend Lee as Manager for the Early Education Program?

  a. Very likely.

  b. Likely.

  c. Somewhat likely.

  d. Not likely at all.

34. Based on the information provided about Andy Mueller, how likely would it be for you to recommend Andy as Manager for the Early Education Program?

  e. Very likely.

  f. Likely.

  g. Somewhat likely.

  h. Not likely at all.

35. Do you believe Lee's performance comments and recommendations would provide enough support to appoint Lee under time sensitive conditions?

  a. Yes, Lee has enough experience to be able to do a satisfactory job.

  b. Yes, since the outgoing manager recommended Lee.

  c. No.

36. What would be your next step when deciding whom to appoint as Manager of the Early Education Program?

  a. No further steps, I will appoint Lee.

b. No further steps, I will appoint Andy.

c. Refer the matter to Karen Novak.

37. Karen Novak has asked you to attend a meeting regarding the excessive use of sick, vacation and administrative leave in the department. From the options listed below, what do you feel would most closely match how you would handle this situation?

a. Allow the vacations and develop an intervention to increase morale.

b. Schedule a meeting with staff to remind them of the department's policy on taking leave.

c. Allow employees to adjust to the merger and see if this problem can alleviate itself without unnecessary intervention.

d. Route a sign up sheet and have everyone indicate when he or she will be planning to be away in order to ensure you have adequate coverage.

38. With regard to the sick leave issues, would you most likely:

a. Expect that there will be some changes among the staff's attitude and simply wait it out.

b. Accept the situation as long as there are not any negative repercussions to the workload.

c. Intervene only when problems have started to affect the service to your customers in the department.

d. Implement some method to communicate the value of your employees to the department before they start to leave.

39. In the meeting you will be attending next Wednesday regarding the sick leave problem, what issue would you most likely address most?

a. Strengthening leave policies.

b. Increasing employee commitment.

c. Ensuring that customer service is not affected by the absences.

d. Preparing to recruit new employees to replace those who will most likely be leaving.

40. In considering the effects of the merging Children's and Preschool Services, how likely would it be that you would want to participate in this changing departmental structure?

a. Very likely.

b. Somewhat likely.

c. Not at all.

41. Of the options listed below, which would most closely match your reasoning for the answer you gave in the question above?

   a. This would be a good opportunity to try new ideas, but it would require a great deal of energy.

   b. This merger would be a bad idea because it would cause too much confusion for the employees and the customers.

   c. This would be an exciting opportunity to develop and implement changes that would benefit the departments customers.

   d. This would require a great deal of energy and would most likely result with few changes and little improvement to services.

End of Questions

APPENDIX E

LEADERSHIP IN BASKET SCORING GUIDE

LEADERSHIP IN BASKET SCORING GUIDE

Question Number	Points Awarded Based on Response(s)	
	Optimal (2 points)	Suboptimal (1 point)
1	C or D	B
2	E	C or D
3	B	A
4	A	B
5	E	C or D
6	C	B
7	C	B
8	B	C
9	E	C or D
10	C or D	B
11	C or D	B
12	C or D	B
13	C or D	E
14	C or D	B
15	B	C
16	B	A
17	C, F or I	A, B or D
18	C, F or I	A, B or D
19	C, F or I	A, B or D
20	A, B or D	C, F or I
21	A, B or D	C, F or I
22	A, B or D	C, F or I

	Points Awarded Based on Response(s)	
Question Number	Optimal (2 points)	Suboptimal (1 point)
23	A	C
24	B	C
25	A	C
26	C	D
27	B	A
28	D	E
29	A	B
30	C	B
31	B	C
32	C	B
33	C	B
34	A	B
35	C	A
36	B	A
37	A	D
38	D	C
39	B	C
40	A	B
41	C	A

APPENDIX F

LEADERSHIP IN BASKET CORRECTED ITEM CORRELATIONS

Leadership In Basket item Means, Standard Deviation,

Corrected Total Item Correlations and Alpha if Deleted

Subscale	Item #	M	SD	Total Item Corr.	Alpha of Deleted
Priority Task (alpha = .4354)					
	1	1.5	.71	.1622	.4139
	2	.9	.98	.1516	.4303
	5	1.8	.47	.1380	.4229
	8	1.3	.76	.2713	.3643
	10	1.8	.5	.1750	.4121
	12	1.0	.92	.2242	.3861
	13	.6	.49	.0968	.4340
	15	.9	.91	.2998	.3421
Charisma (alpha = .6735)					
	40	1.9	.22	.5336	—
	41	1.9	.31	.5336	—
Individual Consideration (alpha = .4353)					
	25	1.9	.29	.3705	—
	27	1.5	.6	.3705	—
Intellectual Stimulation					
	30	1.5	.81	.2792	—
	31	.94	.88	.2792	—
Contingent Reward (alpha = .4554)					
	33	1.1	.76	.2285	.4458
	34	.51	.68	.3272	.2893
	35	1.1	.85	.2941	.3348
Management by Exception (alpha = .3995)					
	32	.96	.64	.2508	.3067
	36	1.1	.79	.1793	.3756
	37	.51	.68	.2937	.2580
	38	.96	.85	.1723	.3951

APPENDIX G

MULTIFACTOR LEADERSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE SCORING GUIDE

MLQ

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire
Rater Form (5x - Short)

Name of Leader: _____ Date: _____

Organization ID #: _____ Leader ID #: _____

Scoring: The MLQ scale scores are average scores for the items on the scale. The score can be derived by summing the items and dividing by the number of items that make up the scale. All of the leadership style scales have four items. Extra Effort ahs three items. Effectiveness has four items, and Satisfaction has two items.

Not at all	Once in a while	Sometimes	Fairly often	Frequently, if not always
0	1	2	3	4

Idealized Influence (Attributed) total/4=   Management-by-Exception (Active) total/4=
Idealized Influence (Behavioral) total/4=   Management-by-Exception (Passive) total/4=
Inspirational Motivation total/4=   Laissez-faire Leadership total/4=
Intellectual Stimulation total/4=   Extra Effort total/3=
Individual Consideration total/4=   Effectiveness total/4=
Contingent Reward total/4=   Satisfaction tota/2=

1. Contingent Reward...   0 1 2 3 4
2. Intellectual Stimulation...   0 1 2 3 4
3. Management-by-Exception (Passive)...   0 1 2 3 4
4. Management-by-Exception (Active)...   0 1 2 3 4
5. Laissez-faire Leadership...   0 1 2 3 4
6. Idealized Influence (Behavioral)...   0 1 2 3 4
7. Laissez-faire Leadership...   0 1 2 3 4
8. Intellectual Stimulation...   0 1 2 3 4
9. Inspirational Motivation...   0 1 2 3 4
10. Idealized Influence (Attributed)...   0 1 2 3 4
11. Contingent Reward...   0 1 2 3 4
12. Management-by-Exception (Passive)...   0 1 2 3 4
13. Inspirational Motivation...   0 1 2 3 4
14. Idealized Influence (Behavioral)...   0 1 2 3 4
15. Individual Consideration...   0 1 2 3 4
16. Contingent Reward...   0 1 2 3 4
17. Management-by-Exception (Passive)...   0 1 2 3 4
18. Idealized Influence (Attributed)...   0 1 2 3 4
19. Individual Consideration...   0 1 2 3 4
20. Management-by-Exception (Passive)...   0 1 2 3 4
21. Idealized Influence (Attributed)...   0 1 2 3 4
22. Management-by-Exception (Active)...   0 1 2 3 4
23. Idealized Influence (Behavioral)   0 1 2 3 4

Not at all	Once in a while	Sometimes	Fairly often	Frequently, if not always				
0	1	2	3	4				
24. Management-by-Exception (Active)…				0	1	2	3	4
25. Idealized Influence (Attributed)…				0	1	2	3	4
26. Inspirational Motivation…				0	1	2	3	4
27. Management-by-Exception (Active)…				0	1	2	3	4
28. Laissez-faire Leadership…				0	1	2	3	4
29. Individual Consideration…				0	1	2	3	4
30. Intellectual Stimulation…				0	1	2	3	4
31. Individual Consideration…				0	1	2	3	4
32. Intellectual Stimulation…				0	1	2	3	4
33. Laissez-faire Leadership				0	1	2	3	4
34. Idealized Influence (Behavior)…				0	1	2	3	4
35. Contingent Reward…				0	1	2	3	4
36. Inspirational Motivation…				0	1	2	3	4
37. Effectiveness…				0	1	2	3	4
38. Satisfaction…				0	1	2	3	4
39. Extra Effort				0	1	2	3	4
40. Effectiveness…				0	1	2	3	4
41. Satisfaction…				0	1	2	3	4
42. Extra Effort…				0	1	2	3	4
43. Effectiveness…				0	1	2	3	4
44. Extra Effort…				0	1	2	3	4
45. Effectiveness…				0	1	2	3	4

REFERENCES

American Psychological Association. (1992). Ethical principles of psychology and code of conduct. *American Psychologist, 47,* 1597-1611.

Barling, J., Weber, T., & Kelloway, E. (1996). Effects of transformational leadership training on attitudinal and financial outcomes: A field experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81,* (6), 827-832.

Bass, B. (1990). From transactional to Transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics, 18,* 19-31.

Bass, B., Avoliio, B., Jung, D., & Berson, Y. (2003). Predicting Unit Performance by Assessing Transformational and Transactional Leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88,* (2), 207-218.

Brower, D., Newell, T., & Ronayne, P. (2002). The imperative of developing global leaders. *The Business of Government, Winter.*

Bycio, P., Allen, J., & Hackett, R. (1995). Further assessment of Bass's (1985) conceptualization of transactional and transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 80,* (4), 468-478.

Cochran, D. S., Hinckle, T.W., Dusenberry, D. (1987). Designing a developmental assessment center in a government agency: A case study. *Public Personnel Management, 16,* (2), 145-152.

Dvir, T. & Shamir, B. (2003). Folower developmental characteristics as predicting transformational leadership: a longitudinal study. *The Leadership Quarterly, 14,* (3), 327-344.

Engelbrecht, A., & Fischer, A. (1995). The managerial performance implications of a developmental assessment center process. *Human Relations, 48,* (4), 387-404.

Fiedler, F. (1996). Research on Leadership Selection and Training: One View of the Future. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 41,* (2), 241-251.

Fields, D., & Herold, D. (1997). Using the leadership practices inventory to measure transformational and transactional leadership. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 57,* (4), 569-579.

Hakstian, A., Woolley, R., Woosley, L., & Kryger, B. (1991). Management selection by multiple-domain assessment: 1. Concurrent validity. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 51,* 883-899.

Hakstian, A., Woolsey, L., & Schroeder, M. (1986). Development and application of a quickly scored in-basket exercise in an organizational setting. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 46,* 385-396.

Hartog, D., Van Muijen, J., & Koopman, P. (1997). Transactional versus transformational leadership: An analysis of the MLQ. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 70,* (1), 19-37.

Hater, J. & Bass, B. (1988). Superiors' evaluations and subordinates' perceptions of transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 73,* (4), 695-702.

Howard, A. (1997). A Reassessment of Assessment Centers: Challenges for the 21st Century. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 12,* (5), 13-53.

Howell, J., & Avolio, B. (1993). Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, locus of control, and support for innovation: Key predictors of consolidated-business- unit performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78,* (6), 891-902.

Hoyt, W. (2000). Rater bias in psychological research: when is it a problem and what can we do about it? *Psychological Methods, 5,* (1), 64-86.

Joiner, D. (1984). Assessment centers in the public

sector: A practical approach. *Public Personnel Management,*

13, (4), 435-450.

Judge, T., Bono, J., Ilies, R. & Gergardt, M. (2002).

Personality and leadership: a qualitative review. *Journal*

of Applied Psychology, 87, (4), 765-780

Kanungo, R., & Misra, S. (1992). Managerial

resourcefulness: A re-conceptualization of management

skills. *Human Relations, 45,* (12), 1311-1332.

Kesselman, G.A., Lopez, F.M., Lopez, F.E. (1987). The

development and validation of a self-report scored in-

basket test in an assessment center setting. *Public*

Personnel Management Journal, 16, (4), 144-178.

Koehler, J., & Pankowski, J. (1997). *Transformational*

Leadership in Government. Delray Beach, FL: St. Lucie

Press.

McGill, M., & Slocum, J. (1998). Recent Literature on

Leading and Managing Change in Public Service

Organizations. Organizational Dynamics, 26, (3), 39-49.

Moses, J.L. (1973). The development of an assessment

center for the early identification of supervisory

potential. *Personnel Psychology, 23,* (26), 569-580.

Pawar, B., & Eastman, K. (1997). The nature and implications of contextual influences on transformational leadership: a conceptual examination. *Academy of Management Review, 22,* (1), 80-109.

Podsakoff, P., MacKenzie, S., & Bommer, W. (1996). Transformational leader behaviors and substitutes for leadership as determinants of employee satisfaction, commitment, trust, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Management,22,* (2), 259-298.

Posner, B., & Kouzes, J. (1988). Development and validation of the leadership practices inventory. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 48,* 483-496.

Posner, B., & Kouzes, J. (1994). An extension of the leadership practices inventory to individual contributors. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 54,* (4), 959-966.

Ross, S., & Offermann, L. (1997). Transformational leaders: Measurement of personality attributes and work group performance. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 23,* (10), 1078-1086.

Schippmann, J. (1991). Reliability and Validity of In-Basket Performance Measures. *Personnel Psychology, 44,* (4), 23-41.

Seltzer, J., & Bass, B. (1990). Transformational leadership: Beyond initiation and consideration. *Journal of Management, 16,* (4), 693-703.

Skipton, L. (2003). Leadership development for the postindustrial, postmodern information age. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 55,* (1) 3-14.

Smith, K., & Clark, R. (1987). Taking the guesswork out of staff selection. *Journal of Extension,25,* (4), 1-5.

Tichy, *N., & Devanna, M. (1986). The transformational leader. Training and Development Journal, July,* 27-32.

Van de Vijjver, F. & Hambleton, R. (1996). Translating tests: some practical guidelines. *European Psychologist, 1,* (2), 89-99.

Willenz Gardner, N., Butler DeMesme, R. & Abramson, M. (2002). The human capital challenge. *The Business of Government, Spring.*