

CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION	1
General Description	1
Definitions and Conceptions of Leadership	3
Purpose and Uses	6
Limitations	6
CHAPTER 2. ADMINISTRATION AND SCORING	8
Administration	8
Scoring	9
Computing the Total Score	9
Computing Cluster Scores	9
CHAPTER 3. INTERPRETATION AND USE	13
Interpreting Total and Cluster Scale Scores	13
Total Score	13
Cluster Scale Scores	14
CHAPTER 4. QUESTIONNAIRE AND CLUSTER SCALE DEVELOPMENT	17
Rationale and Theoretical Background	17
Questionnaire Development	17
Item Analysis	17
Development of the Scoring System	18
Scores from Samples Studied	21
Total Score	21
Cluster Scores	21
CHAPTER 5. PSYCHOMETRIC PROPERTIES	24
Reliability	24
Test-Retest Reliability	24
Internal Consistency	24
Validity	26
Content Validity	26
Relationship to Peer Nominations	27
Relationship to Other Self-Concept and Personality Measures	30
Factor Structure	32
Intercorrelations Among the Cluster Scores	32
Moderator Variables	35
Grade Level Differences	35
Sex Differences	35
Intelligence and Achievement	36
Directions for Future Research	36
REFERENCES	37
APPENDICES	39

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.	Characteristics of Judkins' Leaders	4
Figure 2.	Example for Computing Total Score	10
Figure 3.	Example of Completed Leadership Strengths Profile	12
Figure 4.	Leadership Strengths Profile Displaying Mean Cluster Scores and 68% Confidence Intervals	15
Figure 5.	Sociogram Score Distributions in Community A	29
Figure 6.	Sociogram Score Distributions in Community B	30

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	Item Content of the Cluster Scales	2
Table 2.	Total Score Means, Standard Deviations, Medians and Ranges in the Samples Studied	14
Table 3.	Item-Total Score Correlations in Communities A and B	18
Table 4.	Factor Loadings for the Cluster Items in Each of the Samples Studied	20
Table 5.	Factor Loadings for Potential Item Clusters in Each of the Samples Studied	21
Table 6.	Cluster Scale Score Means and Standard Deviations for Community A (Grouped by Sex)	22
Table 7.	Cluster Scale Score Means and Standard Deviations for Community B (Grouped by Sex)	23
Table 8.	Intercorrelations Among Cluster Scale Scores and Total Score in Community A	25
Table 9.	Intercorrelations Among Cluster Scale Scores and Total Score in Community B	26
Table 10.	Correlations Between the LSI and the Piers-Harris Scores	31
Table 11.	Correlations Between the LSI and the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator	32
Table 12.	Item-Cluster Scale Correlations in Communities A and B	34
Table 13.	Means and Standard Deviations for Total Scores Grouped by Achievement Level Within Sex	35

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The Leadership Strengths Indicator (LSI) is a brief, self-report measure designed to aid in the identification and analysis of leadership ability among adolescents. This instrument is in the early stages of its development and therefore is not recommended for screening or identification purposes at this time. Instead it is provided as a self-assessment instrument that students can complete as a means for initiating group discussion about: leadership styles, the component behaviors and attitudes which comprise leadership, and ways in which specific leadership characteristics can be strengthened. The LSI may be of interest for this purpose in leadership development programs or in health and guidance classes for grades 6 to 12.

The LSI is also made available for others who are interested in conducting research related to leadership ability in adolescents. This manual provides a summary of results from research already completed with this instrument. Directions for further research are also outlined.

General Description

The Leadership Strengths Indicator is a 40-item self-report questionnaire designed to obtain students' evaluations of their own leadership skills, behaviors, aptitudes, or predispositions. The questionnaire may be administered either individually or in groups. Students are shown a number of phrases describing behaviors, abilities, or attitudes and are asked to compare themselves with other people their age in order to rate themselves on each of these as being excellent, very good, better than most, okay, or not so good.

The responses are then hand scored to evaluate both overall assessment and specific dimensions of leadership. The scores 4, 3, 2, 1, and 0 are assigned respectively for the responses "excellent", "very good", "better than most", "okay", and "not so good". These scores are added to yield a total score which reflects an overall assessment. A higher score indicates a higher overall assessment of leadership ability. Descriptive statistics for Total Scores obtained in previous studies are reported in Chapter 3 of this manual.

To support more detailed diagnostic self-assessment discussions, the LSI also provides eight cluster scales: Enjoys Group Activities, Key Individual in Group Activities, High Level Participator in Group Activities, Journalistic, Sympathetic, Courageous, Conscientious, and Self-Confident (see Table 1). These cluster scales were developed from studies conducted in two different towns and include 26 of the 40 items in the questionnaire. All cluster scales are scored in the direction of positive self-evaluation so that a high score on a particular cluster scale indicates a high level of self-assessment on that dimension.

The LSI is easy to administer and score and can be used by teachers of guidance or leadership training classes. It is desirable, in fact, for students to score their own questionnaires and plot their cluster scale scores on the Leadership Strengths Profile sheets. A class should be able to complete both administration and scoring in a 40-minute period.

Definitions and Conceptions of Leadership

Leadership has been defined as:

. . . the force by which an individual exerts an influence in releasing, channeling, and controlling the thoughts, energies, and emotions of others. This force may be direct or indirect; constructive or destructive. (Dumas et al 1979, p. 76)

Fiedler (1972, 1973) believes that leadership is inherent in everyone. Every person can be called upon for leadership behavior in one situation or another. Further, in any group, every person exerts an influence, either positively or negatively, towards the goals of the group. Thus each person has leadership potential and responsibility in a group whether or not he/she is the visible or appointed head of the group.

Hodgkinson (1983) reminds us that since time immemorial people have organized themselves about purposes. It is the explosion of scale, size, complexity, and technology of human organization that is new. Hodgkinson also points out that the essential administrative dilemma in human organizations has remained unchanged: to resolve the continuous tension between the human concerns of individual organization members and the overriding organizational purposes.

Zenger (1985) has written about the difference between management and leadership. While competent management is essential to organizations, people resist being “managed” because it is too much like being controlled. People want to join in the pursuit of goals and values they perceive as worthwhile. Leaders provide visionary inspiration, motivation, and direction. Managers squirt oil on the existing machinery of an organization whereas leaders envision and build new machinery. Managers may be sufficient when organizations are able to coast along maintaining the status quo. In a fast-changing environment, however, organizations must continually undergo real change and that requires leadership.

Bennis (1984) studied 90 of the most effective, successful leaders in the United States and identified four areas of competence shared by all 90. These were: (1)management of attention, that is, they communicate an extraordinary focus of commitment to a compelling vision and others want to join in with them and their vision; (2)management of meaning, that is, they communicate their vision clearly to others using metaphors, words, or models and others are then able to align with them; (3)management of trust, that is, they exhibit reliability and constancy so that others know what they stand for and “where they are coming from” whether it is liked or not; and (4)management of self, that is, knowing one’s skills and deploying them effectively which entails nurturing strengths, correcting faults, and not worrying about failure.

Parnes (1979) has written about leadership for creative behavior as opposed to creative leadership suggesting that a group can be creative because its leader subtly stimulates the creative productivity of the individual members. This is in contrast to the group simply implementing the leader’s creative idea. The term, “facilitator”, is used to connote the leader who draws out and reinforces the creative problem solving of the people with whom he or she is working. Maier et al (1962) has classified human relations problems that occur in organizations and outlined specific steps for facilitating creative behavior and solutions with each type of problem.

Leadership training programs in schools have emphasized the development of social action leaders, those who are visible, active heads of committees and projects (Kitano

Kirby, 1986). There is, however, growing recognition of the need to identify and nurture students with potential for reflective leadership (e.g., Roderick, 1987), those who engage in thoughtful production rather than activism, who are gifted in providing ideas for thought and for social change. Reflective leaders are characterized by high intelligence and broad vision. Less visible than social action leaders, they function as value shapers, clarifiers, codifiers, teachers, inspirers, and role models as delineated by former HEW secretary John Gardner (Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs). They are greatly concerned with values and draw their ideas from across disciplines (Kitano Kirby, 1986).

There are a large number of competing conceptualizations and theories of leadership (e.g., Stogdill, 1974; Moreno & Moreno, 1976; Pfeffer, 1978; Bass, 1981; Foster, 1981). Against this backdrop, and believing both that leadership qualities are inherent in and can be enhanced in all individuals and that some individuals are particularly talented in leadership, should know it and be nurtured, the author undertook to develop a leadership ability identification and analysis instrument for adolescents. The characteristics of leaders identified by Judkins (1979, see Figure 1) were used as an anchor or guide for the development of items for the self-report questionnaire.

In the context of a Ford Foundation Project called the Leadership Development Program, Judkins worked with 126 individuals who were identified as leaders in education and community development. This group was narrowed to ten who would be thought of as leaders by any objective observer. The ten included 2 women, 8 men (3 of whom were native Americans); the rest were white male. Judkins identified the specific characteristics which members of this group held in common. These are the characteristics shown in Figure 1.

This basis for the construction of the *Leadership Strengths Indicator* implies that the instrument is geared to the social action style of leadership. It is expected, however, that there may be considerable overlap in characteristics between social action and reflective leaders. Further work is intended to clarify how the instrument can be modified or interpreted to discern styles or strengths of leadership such as social action, reflective, creative and/or facilitative.

Figure 1 Characteristics of Judkins' Leaders

"Leader: a person with a following and a cause"

Intelligence

- more than average "native" intelligence.
- firm grasp of the data base of their surroundings.
- sense of what they do not know and what they need to know.
- ability to use factual material for the purpose of deduction and decision-making.
- knowing when additional facts are needed to reach a decision, knowing where to find them and possessing enough curiosity or drive to seek them out.
- ability to deal with abstract concepts.
- ability to project oneself into the future, or to predict operational demands of a future period, determining possibilities on the basis of experiences to date.