LEADER ASSESSMENT, EVALUATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Prepared for:
Canadian Forces Leadership Institute

Prepared by:
Dr. Shaun Newsome, Dr. Arla L. Day,
& Dr. Victor M. Catano

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 3

BACKGROUND 5

INTRODUCTION 6

COMMON LEADERSHIP PERSPECTIVES 7

LEADER CHARACTERISTICS 8
THE INTERACTION OF LEADER AND FOLLOWERS 9
LEADERS AND ORGANIZATIONAL, SOCIETAL, AND OTHER EXTERNAL FACTORS 10

THE LEADERSHIP PERFORMANCE DOMAIN 12

GENERIC PERFORMANCE DIMENSIONS 16
THE LEADERSHIP PERFORMANCE DOMAIN 20
Table 1. Generic leader and manager performance domain 23
Table 2. U.S. Army leadership performance domain 24

LEADER ASSESSMENT 25

ASSESSMENT DEFINED 25
ASSESSMENT AREAS 25
Table 3: Leadership competencies 28
Table 4: General traits, values, and behaviours of effective leaders 29
Table 5. Executive leadership characteristics 30
ASSESSMENT METHODS 31
Table 6. Common cognitive ability & personality tests 33
VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY OF ASSESSMENT METHODS 40
Table 7. Criterion-related validity of assessment methods 41

DEVELOPMENT OF LEADERS 41

KEY FACTORS IN DEVELOPMENT MODELS 42
AREAS OF DEVELOPMENTAL 45
Table 8. Most common reasons for executive failure 47
METHODS OF DEVELOPMENT 49
Table 9. Executive developmental methods 50
OUTCOMES & EVALUATION 52
Table 10. Results of developmental activities 54

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR RESEARCH AND PRACTICE 55

CONCLUDING COMMENTS 56

REFERENCES 58

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Changing missions, new technology, new forms of organization, demographic changes, increasing diversity, and changes in socio-cultural values are all impacting leadership roles (Yukl, 1999). In order to gain a better understanding of future leadership requirements, the Canadian Forces have initiated a program of leadership research. In this paper, we provide the Canadian Forces Leadership Institute (CFLI) with information concerning current practices regarding leadership assessment and development.

Leadership assessment and development is discussed within the context of the leadership performance domain. In the first section of our paper we review the various conceptualizations of the leadership performance domain. Competency modeling procedures and job analysis approaches to describing the performance domain are presented. Each approach has unique strengths (Shippmann et al., 2000). The importance of gaining a clear understanding of leadership requirements is stressed.

Various leadership competency models are presented. Such models contain characteristics that can be categorized as: (1) Cognitive capacities; (2) Personality variables; (3) Social capacities and skills; (4) Motivation factors; and (5) Expertise and knowledge (Zaccaro, 1996). Paper and pencil tests, simulations and assessment centre exercises, interviews, and more recently multi-rater feedback instruments are the most common assessment methods. We discuss these methods and present information concerning criterion-related validity.

Assessment techniques are used for both selection and developmental purposes. Developmental experiences impact on five major areas of functioning: (1)

leaders ability to set and implement an agenda, (2) handling relationships, (3) basic values, (4) temperament, and (5) personal awareness (McCall, Lombardo, & Morrison, 1988). Multi-rater assessments and executive coaching are the two most popular methods of leadership development (Axel, 1999). We discuss these approaches and present information concerning common outcomes associated with participation in developmental programs.

In the last section of our paper we present recommendations concerning the assessment and development of military leaders. Recommendations center on the need to clearly articulate the leadership performance domain.

BACKGROUND

Military organizations have long recognized the importance of leadership in achieving operational objectives: Leadership doctrine is very salient and well entrenched. Recently, military organizations have addressed the topic of how changing operational objectives will impact future leadership roles (Shamir & Ben-Ari, 1999, Yukl, 1999). In order to meet future leadership challenges, the CFLI has been created to examine the nature of leadership within the CF and provide direction for the development of leaders.

New operational objectives may require new leadership competencies. When changes are made to the leadership performance domain it is necessary to examine leadership assessment practices. Towards this end, we were requested to provide the Canadian Forces Leadership Institute (CFLI) with information concerning practices regarding leadership assessment.

Our initial review of this literature indicated that a discussion of leader assessment practices would be more productive if placed within the context of the leadership performance domain. In addition, assessment practices are used for both selection and development. With this in mind, we addressed the issues of leadership assessment and development within the framework of the leadership performance domain.

INTRODUCTION

In 1996, a two-day symposium sponsored by the United States Army Research Institute for the Behavioural and Social Sciences addressed the evolution of military leadership roles and the impact of this evolution on military leadership doctrine. An edited book titled, Out of the Box Leadership: Transforming the Twenty-First-Century Army and other Top Performing Organizations (Hunt, Dodge, & Wong, 1999) was an outcome of this symposium. The book detailed the evolving nature of leadership within military organizations and its impact on training and development. Today's military leaders must operate in an increasing complex environment: Changing missions, new technology, new forms of organization, demographic changes, increasing diversity, and changes in socio-cultural values all serve to impact leadership roles (Yukl, 1999).

Tasks such as peace making, peace keeping, disaster relief, humanitarian aid, and environmental protection are now part of a military leader's repertoire (Shamir & Ben-Ari, 1999). Job functions must be carried out in environments where there is often reduced legitimacy, increased controversy, and increased exposure to the media. Current military organizations find themselves part of large multinational forces that require inter-organizational cooperation with many stakeholders including civilian bodies. Furthermore, the composition of the Armed Forces is becoming increasingly more diverse, and these personnel are better informed. Such changes are effecting military doctrine and the leadership development model (Sullivan, 1999).

The Canadian Forces (CF) are facing many of the same challenges as their U.S. counterparts. They are also seeking to understand the evolving role of leadership and how the challenges accompanying this change can be met in an effective manner. Our

goal in this paper is to provide the Canadian Forces Leadership Institute (CFLI) with information concerning current practices regarding leadership assessment, evaluation, and development in the private sector.

We begin our paper with a brief overview of current leadership perspectives and a more detailed discussion of the leadership performance domain. The particular performance domain of interest will determine the approach taken to assessment and development. We present details concerning both generic and leader-specific performance domains. In essence, we examine what it is that leaders do. After gaining an understanding of the complexity of the leadership performance domain, we address the issue of assessment, identify leader attributes and competencies, and discuss how they might be assessed. Finally, we turn our attention to the development of leader attributes and behaviours. In conclusion, we discuss how the CF might begin the process of creating an integrated assessment and development process for future military leaders.

COMMON LEADERSHIP PERSPECTIVES

We can cluster different leadership perspectives into three categories. That is, we can examine leadership in terms of: examining leadership traits, characteristics, and behaviours; examining the interaction between a leader and his or her followers; and examining the organizational, societal, and other external factors that may influence the emergence of leaders.

LEADER CHARACTERISTICS

A major assumption of assessing, evaluating and developing leaders is that leadership can be defined in terms of traits or behaviours of the leader. Much research has focused on identifying the individual characteristics of leaders. Throughout this literature, several traits and behaviours have been associated with effective leadership (e.g., honesty and integrity, supporting and motivating followers, intelligence, self-confidence, need for achievement, motivation to lead, emotional stability, and having the requisite knowledge; Greenberg, Baron, Sales, & Owen., 2000; Johns & Saks, 2001; Meyer, 1997; Yukl & Van Fleet, 1992). One of the most researched areas in leadership is that of charismatic and transformational leadership.

Charismatic and Transformational Leadership. The concepts of charismatic and transformational leadership evolved within the leader-trait literature. Charismatic leaders are defined as having high self-confidence and a clear vision (Shamir, Zakay, & Popper, 1998), engaging in unconventional behaviour, and acting as a change agent, and still being realistic about environmental constraints (Greenberg et al., 2000; Shamir et al., 1998).

Transformational leadership evolved from the charismatic literature. Transformational leaders are defined charismatic leaders that use intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration to “transform” their followers to transcend their own self -interests. Donohue & Wong (1994) outlined the required behaviours of transformational leaders: developing and communicating a vision that inspires the subordinates; using “unconventional strategies” to convey this message; paying

attention and showing sincere concern to individual followers; and demonstrating self-sacrifice.

Although Donohue and Wong (1994) discussed the behaviours that should be exhibited by transformational leaders, they also argued that simply displaying these behaviours does not necessarily mean that the leader will become a "transformational leader." Furthermore, they argue that transformational leadership should not be considered the solution to all of a leader's or organization's problems. In fact, transactional leadership tends to be more effective for the day-to-day operations (Donohue & Wong, 1994).

In addition to the importance of leader characteristics when assessing and developing leaders, it is also necessary to consider the characteristics of the followers, and the interaction between a leader and his or her followers. That is, certain leader characteristics or behaviours may only be effective with certain followers.

THE INTERACTION OF LEADER AND FOLLOWERS

The interaction of leaders and followers is important for two reasons. First, leader behaviours and characteristics are defined in terms of the perceptions of their followers. Although Bass (1985) claimed that "charisma is in the eye of the beholder" (p.40), few studies have examined how followers' perception influence a leader's leadership style. Second, the followers' characteristics and reactions influence leader behaviour. That is, the ability of leaders to influence their followers is affected by the characteristics of these followers (Lord, Brown, & Frieberg, 1999). The characteristics of followers may moderate the impact that leaders have on them (Lord et al., 1999). Different leader characteristics and behaviours may be required in different positions within an

organization, across different situations, and with different subordinates. For example, the focus of the leader (in terms of task or person) may be dependent upon the situation and the characteristics of the followers. According to the leader-member exchange, a leader has different relationships with different subordinates and the leader must focus on his or her relationship with individual subordinates involving mutual trust, respect, and influence (Greenberg et al., 2000).

Any assessment, evaluation, or development must be conducted within the context of type of followers. The assessment and development of leader behaviours and characteristics also depends on organizational and societal factors. It is necessary to examine the situations in which some people may rise to a leadership role in order to better understand how to evaluate and develop effective leaders.

LEADERS AND ORGANIZATIONAL, SOCIETAL, AND OTHER EXTERNAL FACTORS

Contingency or situational theories of leadership are based on the premise that successful leadership depends on environmental factors, such as task clarity and the degree of challenge offered by the task, which are both related to organizational level (Johns & Saks, 2001). For example, according to Fiedler's Contingency Theory (Fiedler, 1967), the orientation of leadership style (i.e., relationship vs. task-oriented) used is dependent on the favourability of the situation. Three factors can increase the favourableness of a situation: a good relationship between the leader and followers, having a highly structured task, and having more formal authority (Johns & Saks, 2001).

Popper, Landau, and Gluskinso (1992) argued that transformational leadership style may be more important in specific organizational situations. For example,

transformational leadership is much more critical in situations where the leader has a greater opportunity to express his or her vision and influence the followers' motivation level and behaviours (e.g., an infantry situation in which complicated technology and relatively simple instruments are being used). Conversely, transformational leadership is not critical in certain combat situations (e.g., relatively simple individual tasks, such as working in a tank, or in combat situations involving complicated technology and instruments, such as a fighter plane), because the leader does not have any opportunity to influence the individual (Popper et al., 1992). Therefore, transformational leaders should be evaluated and developed in situations in which transformational leadership would be effective.

Charismatic or transformational leadership may emerge during an acute crisis, during a longer term, chronic crisis, during times of change, or when new leaders are sought to solve old problems and encourage organizational survival (Bass, 1985). Similarly, Donohue and Wong (1994) noted several conditions in which transformational leadership may emerge: during an acute crisis or when the organizational culture is being attacked; when a general "malaise" exists; or when subordinates are disillusioned. These organizational, industry, environmental, and societal factors must all be taken into account when assessing, evaluating, and developing leaders.

The changing nature of military leadership roles provides support for the different leadership perspectives. As indicated by Shamir and Ben Ari (1999), enlisted personnel are better informed than in the past and are recruited from more diverse groups. Stakeholders include civilian as well as military personnel. The interaction patterns between leaders and followers must evolve to accommodate the changing nature of

these interactions. Because, leadership is exercised in an increasingly open system the interaction between leaders and followers must be given consideration. In essence, new patterns of interaction might require additional leadership skills. Contingency and situational leadership theorists would suggest that new military roles involving peace making, peace keeping, disaster relief, humanitarian aid, and environmental protection would also call for an adjustment in current leadership doctrine. The changes that are currently taking place in military organizations necessitates the need to carefully consider the nature of the leadership performance domain.

THE LEADERSHIP PERFORMANCE DOMAIN

In personnel selection, the traditional approach to identifying areas of assessment involves using job analysis information to map out applicable job performance dimensions (Gatewood & Field, 2001). A job analysis is conducted to identify expected job outputs and requisite work behaviours. Using this information, the knowledge, skills, abilities, and personal characteristics (KSAOs) necessary for executing the expected behaviours can be inferred. Evidence concerning the validity of this inference is determined by a criterion, content, or construct related strategy (Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection, 1978). In essence, the performance domain is used to identify requisite leader attributes.

In addition to the traditional methods of job analysis, organizations are increasingly turning towards competency modeling as a method of understanding what is required of employees in order to achieve organizational success. The rapid pace of change in the current business environment lends itself well to competency-modeling approaches. Such approaches are typically more generic and focus on organizational

as opposed to singular job objectives (Catano et al., 2001; Lawler, 1994). Results from a recent survey of 292 organizations indicated that between 75 and 85 percent of organizations use some form of competency-based applications (Cook & Bernthal, 1998, cited in Shippmann et al., 2000).These applications include identifying KSAOs and behaviours for successful job performance, designing performance management systems, creating multi-rater instruments, and designing development programs.

Despite the popularity of competency-based approaches, there is little agreement and much confusion over the terms competency and competency modeling. There are numerous definitions of what a competency is and competency lists typically contain a wide assortment of employee characteristics and behaviours. Catano et al. (2001) suggested that most definitions have three things in common: (1) competencies are the KSAOs that underlie effective job performance; (2) the KSAOs must be measurable or observable; and (3) the KSAOs are capable of distinguishing superior performers from others. Other authors have found little consistency in approaches to competency modeling or resulting definitions and have argued that the lack of meaningful competency definitions creates significant measurement difficulties. Furthermore, in many cases no quantitative linkages to work or organizational objectives can be demonstrated (Pearlman & Barney, 2000). Concern over the current state of practice in this area led the Professional Practice Committee and the Scientific Affairs Committee of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology to form the Job Analysis and Competency Modeling Task Force (JACMTF).The JACMTF was charged with reviewing the origins of competency modeling and current practices (Shippmann et al., 2000).

In a thorough review, the JACMTF found several major differences between the traditional job analysis method and competency modeling. In the first instance, competency approaches are less rigorous, because they collect the same information regardless of why the information is being collected. The type of information gathered in job analysis is typically dependent on why the information is needed (e.g., selection vs. compensation). At a minimum, information concerning job objectives, tasks, and KSAOs is collected. Competency-modeling efforts are also less likely to be concerned with the reliability of the results. Little effort is usually made to verify resulting information. In support of competency modeling, its emphasis on KSAOs and behaviours that lead to organizational success holds wide appeal to business and HR professionals. Competency approaches have higher levels of face validity for organizational decision-makers. Executives typically comment that competencies provide them with a common language (Briscoe & Hall (1999). Another important difference is that competency-modeling approaches are more likely to focus on values and personality characteristics as opposed to technical skills (Shippmann et al., 2000). Competency approaches are more closely aligned with worker orientated job analyses as opposed to task based analyses.

Briscoe and Hall (1999) presented several approaches to identifying competencies. In the first instance, a research-based approach can be used. In this approach, a behavioural event interview is used to identify behaviours that distinguish high performers from average performs. It is the most rigorous method for defining competencies. A strategy-based approach involves identifying competencies that will help the organization achieve strategic objectives. Lastly, a values-based approach

used organizational norms and values to create as competency model. The assumption is that the appropriate values drive organizational performance.

Regardless of the approach used to understand the performance domain and, ultimately, leader attributes, as span of control and level of responsibility increase so does the complexity of the role. In some sense, this complexity has led to the evolution of the broader-based competency-modeling approach. A leadership role often involves the constant shifting of business objectives, approaches, and strategic directions. A job in this type of environment is not static and, thus, the more generic approach to articulating important leader attributes is often viewed as more favourable. In essence, competency-modeling approaches often make more sense to organizations. However, both approaches have the capability of identifying what it is that a leader must have in order to be successful. It is the quality of the inference made concerning requisite KSAOs that is most important. In order to understand what KSAOs are required, we need information concerning the performance domain.

Identification and measurement of performance is said to be the most intractable measurement of all (Guion, 1991). As mentioned previously, it is a difficult to clearly articulate, with any level of specificity, what it is that leaders do. It is an equally arduous task to develop leadership performance measures that are neither uncontaminated nor deficient. In the military context, the evolving role of military leader makes it even more difficult to map out the performance domain. It is likely that a military leader performance domain will reflect generic performance dimensions and also include unique aspects. We begin this section by presenting a discussion of generic

performance dimensions and then progress towards more specific taxonomies of leadership performance.

GENERIC PERFORMANCE DIMENSIONS

Often, the need for a combination of job performance, effectiveness, and productivity measures contributes to the difficulty of assessing performance. Job performance is behaviour, it is something that is done and can be observed Effectiveness, also an important aspect of the performance domain, refers to the subjective evaluation of the outcomes resulting from job performance. Productivity is a measure of the costs associated with a particular level of effectiveness (Campbell, 1990). In order to evaluate outcomes associated with leadership positions, performance, effectiveness, and productivity are all critical.

The latent structure of job performance (behaviours) is thought to consist of eight dimensions (Campbell, 1990). Campbell argues that all performance behaviours fall within one of the following major dimensions:

1. Job-specific task proficiency is the extent to which an individual can perform the technical aspects of a job. All jobs have tasks that are specific; the complexity of a job will determine the importance of this dimension.
2. Non-specific task proficiency refers to executing work behaviours that are not central to the job but contribute positively to the organization (e.g., cleaning up common work areas, helping a coworker complete a task, and filling up the photocopier with paper).
3. Written and oral communication tasks form a part of many jobs (e.g., public presentations or a simple business memo).

4. Demonstrating effort reflects the level of motivation one brings to the job. It is the degree to which employees are willing to staying late to finish a project, work under adverse conditions, or perhaps increase their output to meet impending deadlines.
5. Maintaining personal discipline is the degree to which counterproductive workplace behaviours are not demonstrated (e.g., tardiness, absence, use of illicit drugs, or inappropriate interpersonal behaviour).
6. Facilitating peer and team performance refers to carrying out activities that help peers and groups achieve goals. It is the extent to which individuals contribute towards meeting group objectives (e.g., organizing work, clarifying goals, motivating other members).
7. Supervision is similar to the previous factor in regards to facilitating job performance of others. However, in this situation, it is a supervisor-subordinate relationship. Supervisors articulate goals, influence goal acceptance, model appropriate behaviour, motivate subordinates, and evaluate behaviour.
8. Management/Administration refers to other aspects of management that do not include supervision (e.g., allocating and distributing resources, planning activities, reporting to superiors, monitoring overall unit performance)

The above performance dimensions can be used to categorize behaviours performed in all jobs. All jobs, however, will not contain behaviours found in every dimension: Only the dimensions of demonstrating effort, job specific task proficiency,

and maintaining personal discipline are major performance dimensions of every job (Campbell, 1990).

Data collected as part of the long-term selection and classification project (Project A) for the U.S. Military were used to derive the performance dimensions. In the original research,5 factors were identified: core technical proficiency, general soldering proficiency, effort and peer leadership, personal discipline, physical fitness and military bearing. These factors represented the performance domain for enlisted personnel across nine jobs in the U.S. military. Furthermore, these jobs were selected to represent 275 entry-level military jobs (Campbell, McHenry, & Wise, 1990). The further expansion of the five-component model came about as a result of analyzing feedback interviews given to financial analysts and project managers (Campbell, 1990).

There has been concern that generic models of performance do not fully depict the performance domain. For example, 25 years ago Organ and his colleagues suggested that the performance domain should be expanded to encompass what they termed organizational citizenship behaviours (OCB; Bateman & Organ, 1983; Organ, 1977; Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983). Such behaviours were thought to be discretionary, and although they were not a formal part of an individual's job, they contributed to organizational effectiveness. Initially, two factors, altruism (e.g., include helping co-workers complete job duties, switching vacation days) and generalized compliance (e.g., attending meeting on time, coming to work early, finishing assignments) were used to describe OCB. At a later date, civic virtue (responsible involvement in the governance and political life of the organization), organizational courtesy (helping to prevent organizational problems), and sportsmanship (not complaining about minor

inconveniences) were added in order to explain the range of pro-social behaviours that are often demonstrated in organizations (Organ, 1988).

Borman and Motowidlo (1993) suggested that there are five categories of contextual behaviours that contribute to organizational effectiveness: (1) persisting with enthusiasm and extra effort; (2) volunteering to carry out tasks that are not part of one's job; (3) helping and cooperating with others; (4) following and supporting organizational policies and rules; and (5) actively supporting the organization's objectives. More recently, these five categories have been collapsed to three categories: (1) interpersonal citizenship performance (altruism, helping); (2) organizational citizenship performance (compliance, loyalty, endorsing organizational objectives, conscientiousness, civic virtue, following rules, etc.); and (3) and job/task citizenship performance (persisting, extra effort, etc.; Coleman & Borman, 2000).

These types of behaviours have been classified as aspects of contextual performance because they occur within the "context" of one's job. Borman and Motowidlo (1993) argued that task and contextual behaviours differ in important ways. First of all, unlike task behaviours, contextual behaviours contribute more to the organizational, social, and/or psychological environment than the actual job. Secondly, task activities vary as a function of the job whereas contextual activities are more likely to generalize across many jobs and positions. Another important difference is that variation in knowledge, skills, and abilities lead to differences in task performance. Differences in contextual behaviours, however, are primarily determined by motivational and predispositional factors. Lastly, task activities are more likely to be recognized and rewarded as formal parts of the job.

Contextual performance is very similar to the concept of OCB. In fact, according to Motowidlo (2000), a recent re-definition of OCB by Organ (1997) makes the construct very similar to contextual performance. Regardless of whether we choose to use the term contextual performance or OCB, there is evidence to suggest that the contextual performance dimensions are an important addition to the job performance domain. The robustness of Campbell' s performance domain and the efforts put forth in developing a model that represent both military and civilian occupations make the model an important addition to our understanding of the generic job performance domain. Such a model coupled with contextual performance dimensions underlies many of the forthcoming leadership performance dimensions.

THE LEADERSHIP PERFORMANCE DOMAIN

There are many conceptions of leadership performance/effectiveness. Widely divergent views are responsible for the lack of progress towards a unified theory of effective leadership (Yukl & Van Fleet, 1992). The different conceptualizations reflect the complexity of the construct. The Centre for Creative Leadership in Greensboro, North Carolina has been conducting research on how to develop leaders for approximately 30 years. Their philosophy in regards to leadership is that a singular theory cannot explain all that is known about leadership (McCauley, Moxley, & Van Velsor, 1998). In some sense, the differences and commonalities found in descriptions of the leadership performance domains supports this view.

In this section we examine conceptualizations of what it is that leaders do. A complete review of all existing leadership performance models and their various dimensions is far beyond the scope of this paper. What we attempt to do is demonstrate

commonalities and differences. Indeed, many commonalities exist in the various descriptions of the leadership performance domain. The commonalities can serve to increase our confidence in the reliability of the resulting information. However, even with similar broad performance dimension labels that typically fall within the generic dimensions identified by previous researchers (e.g., Borman and Motowidlo, 1993; Campbell, 1990; Organ, 1988), the identification of lower order factors can lead to a more reasonable balance of fidelity and bandwidth in resulting assessment tools.

At the highest executive level, leaders are primarily responsible for initiating and sustaining lasting organizational change. Day (2001) argued that this responsibility reflects the essence of leadership. In this regard, an individual's ability to strategically manage organizational identity, image, and reputation reflects leadership effectiveness. An organization's long term success is strongly influenced by how employees view the character of the organization (identity), how they <u>believe</u> external stakeholders view the organization (image), and how the external stakeholders <u>actually</u> view the organization (reputation). Establishing the organization's credibility/reputation are key behaviours that reflect the leadership competencies of impact and influence (Spencer & Spencer, 1993).

Yukl and Van Fleet (1992) suggested that a leader's role is primarily one of influence. A leader must influence (1) the task objectives and strategies of groups or organizations, (2) the people in an organization to accept objectives and implement strategies, (3) the relations among groups, and (4) the culture of the organization. Kunungo (1998) suggested that leaders espouse a vision, formulate long-term objectives, offer strategies and tactics, cause change, and influence individual values,

attitudes and behaviours. Kayworth and Leidner (2002) suggested key leadership outcomes include creating and communicating a vision, providing meaningful goals, building confidence and commitment, ensuring an appropriate mix and level of skill among staff, managing outside relations, and creating a supportive environment. Furthermore, they argued that leaders should act as a role model, create opportunities for others, and do “real work”. There are commonalities in the various discussions of what are thought to be important outcomes of leadership behaviour. Work has also been compiled on describing the actual behaviours that lead to many of the above outcomes.

Yukl (1989) developed a taxonomy of 14 behavioural categories that reflect the behaviours of leaders and/or managers. The behavioural categories presented in Table 1 represent generic categories that are necessary for leader effectiveness. Another attempt at mapping the leadership performance domain can be found in the Field Manual 22-100 of the United States Army (1990). The U.S. Army leadership performance domain is presented in Table 2. Clement and Ayres (1976, cited in Gurstein, 1999) are credited with the original work in deriving these performance dimensions.

Silzer (1998) suggested that leadership involves recruiting and staffing, motivating and inspiring others, coaching and developing others, providing direction and vision, influencing and negotiating, and empowering others. Fogli and Whitney (1998) reiterate all of these behaviours and also include building and leveraging teams as an important leadership outcome.

Table 1. Generic leader and manager performance domain

Behavioural Categories	Behaviours
Planning/Organizing	Setting objectives, determining strategy to accomplish goals, allocating resources, increasing efficiency
Problem solving	Analyzing problems, determine appropriate solution, implementing solution, monitoring impact
Clarifying	Clearly communicating objectives strategies, work methods, and performance standards
Informing	Ensuring needed information that increases work effectiveness is passed onto subordinates
Monitoring	Evaluating individual and/or organizational performance, checking on work activities, gathering external information that is pertinent to work of organization
Motivating	Using appropriate strategies to increase task commitment of employees, role modeling appropriate behaviour, encouraging cooperation/teamwork
Recognizing	Acknowledging the inputs of others, offering praise, expressing appreciation
Supporting	Showing concern for staff, providing encouragement when needed, listening to employees
Managing conflict and team building	Encouraging individuals to work together in a productive manner, resolving disagreements
Networking	Establishing/nurturing strong and weak social ties that may impact the effectiveness of the organization
Delegating	Demonstrating confidence in subordinates by allowing them to take responsibility for tasks, allowing them to take responsibility for decisions
Developing and mentoring	Speaking with members about career aspirations, helping individuals with career planning activities, acting as a career related resource
Rewarding	Proving rewards for meeting objectives such as pay increases, bonuses, and making promotional decisions

Source: Yukl & Van Fleet (1992)

Tett, Guterman, Blier, and Murphy, (2000) identified 12 managerial performance taxonomies. They suggested that none of the models are specific enough to advance our understanding of the performance domain. Many of their arguments are equally

applicable to conceptualizations of the leadership performance domain. They argued that increased specificity will lead to a better understanding of the performance domain and result in: (1) more applicable measures of performance; (2) a greater understanding of common (generalizable) performance dimensions; (3) improvements in developmental programs; and (4) increased understanding of predictor constructs.

Table 2. U.S. Army leadership performance domain

Performance Dimension	Description
Communicating	Obtaining, evaluating, and distributing information.
Human relations	The capacity to work with staff in order to achieve the organizations objectives
Counseling	Emphasizing a concern for the well-being of staff members
Supervising	Setting goals and standards and ensuring staff members are proceeding towards completion of objectives and goals
Technical	Proficiency in job specific tasks
Management Science	Evaluating and monitoring unit, departmental, and/or organizational performance
Decision-making	Identifying and resolving problems in a decisive manner
Planning	Developing plans to meet objectives and ensuring adequate resources. Thinking ahead in order to ensure that objectives are met
Ethics	Carrying out activities in a manner that reflects espoused values

As reported, many conceptualizations of leadership exist and the leadership performance domain is complex. There are commonalities and differences depending on the context in which leadership is of interest. In examining the performance outcomes and behaviours, it is obvious that a leader will require a mixture of well-

developed cognitive, interpersonal, intrapersonal, and technical attributes. In the next section, we examine this issue in more detail.

LEADER ASSESSMENT

ASSESSMENT DEFINED

In the present context, assessment is defined as a process used to measure a person's knowledge, skills, abilities, personal characteristics, and behaviours that are relevant to successful job performance (Jeaneret & Silzer, 1998). At the most senior levels of organizations, this definition can be expanded to include KSAOs that are needed for organizational success. This change reflects the increasing emphasis being placed on leadership or executive level competencies (Briscoe & Hall, 1999). In fact, our review of the literature reveals that it was often difficult to distinguish between what has been traditionally called KSAOs and what is now called a competency. This lack of conceptual clarity concerning these terms is well documented by Shippmann et al. (2000). In this section we will attempt to tailor our discussion to the assessment of KSAOs and competencies that have been identified as relevant to the leader performance domain. However, leaders and managers do not possess vastly different characteristics. Leaders just use them in a qualitatively different manner (Spencer & Spencer, 1993).

ASSESSMENT AREAS

Many organizations, especially larger ones, have developed their own leadership competency profiles, or as they are sometimes referred to "success profiles", that reflect underlying assumptions of what is required in order to be an effective leader. Such models typically contain a mixture of behaviours, abilities, skills, personal

characteristics, and values. In most cases, these are generically called competencies. Silzer (1998) suggests that there are approximately sixty to eighty leadership competencies. In 1983, Spencer and Spencer published a book containing the McBer Competency Dictionary. Contents of the dictionary were derived from 286 studies of various jobs in a variety of occupations. Achievement and action orientation, organizational awareness, impact and influence, relationship building, and directiveness were the most important executive level competencies.

Yukl and Van Fleet (1992) identified three main categories of leadership skills: (1) the interpersonal category includes empathy, social sensitivity, tact, communication ability, and conflict resolution skills; (2) the conceptual skill set encompasses being able to analyzing complex events, perceive trends, recognize changes, identify problems and opportunities, ability to develop creative and practical solutions, ability to conceptualize complex issues, and the ability to use models, theories, and analogies; and (3) technical skills include knowledge of products, services, procedures, markets, clients, and competitors. A smaller fourth category, termed administrative, includes planning, delegating, and supervising personnel.

Fulkerson (1998) reports that PepsiCo leadership competencies are broken up into broad categories that reflect different types of leadership. The business leadership category contains factors such as being customer driven, results orientated, being able to take the initiative, thinking out of the box, analytical thinking, and intellectual curiosity. Operational leadership involves having people and organizational savvy, the propensity for organizational impact, team leadership skills, and a willingness to empower employees. The last category, personal leadership, requires self-confidence,

objectivity, respect for others, openness, the ability to leverage diversity, build relationship, and behavioural flexibility.

Of the 12 manager performance taxonomies identified by Tett et al., (2000), eight taxonomies were thought to contain components that reflected leadership. Based on three conceptualizations of leadership, the authors created a taxonomy of 35 leadership attributes. These are presented in Table 3.

Additionally, Day, Newsome, and Catano (2002)[1] reviewed the general leadership literature and the transformational leadership literature and identified attributes and behaviours commonly associated with effective leadership. These are presented in Table 4.

Yukl (1999) suggested that the skills, traits, and behaviours required by military leaders are not different from those required by civilian leaders. However, military leaders may require competencies not required by their civilian counterparts. Traits such as high energy level, stress tolerance, physical stamina, integrity, character, moral courage, emotional maturity, self confidence, composure, physical courage, flexibility, self-monitoring, an orientation towards learning from experience, and a socialized power orientation are related to effectiveness and advancement in military settings.

Pritchard (1999) argued that there are four identifiable levels of leadership in the US Army (first, middle, upper, and top) and that competencies are expressed in different ways depending on leadership level. Presently, leadership is categorized as junior or senior. Pritchard suggested that further differentiation of leadership level and required

[1] The various attributes and behaviours were taken from a variety of sources. See Day, Newsome, and Catano (2002) for complete list of sources.

competencies will provide more focus for the design of assessment and development systems.

Table 3: Leadership competencies

Traditional Functions • Problem awareness • Directing • Decision delegation • Short-term planning • Strategic planning • Coordinating • Goal setting • Monitoring • Motivating by authority • Motivating by persuasion • Team building • Productivity Person Orientation • Compassion • Cooperation • Sociability • Politeness • Political astuteness • Assertiveness • Seeking input Dependability • Rule orientation • Trustworthiness • Timeliness	Communication • Listening • Oral communication • Public presentation Developing Self and Others • Developmental goal setting • Developmental feedback • Job enrichment Occupational Acumen • Quality concern • Quantity concern • Financial concern • Safety concern Task Orientation • Initiative • Task focus • Urgency • Decisiveness Open Mindedness • Tolerance • Creative thinking • Cultural appreciation

Source: Tett et al., (2000)

Additionally Pritchard (1992) argued that existing competencies are not adequate to meet the diversity of tasks that future military leaders will face. Future core leadership competencies include: (1) tactical, technical, and technological; (2) cognitive ability; (3)

interpersonal skills and abilities; and (4) personal characteristics such as decisiveness and tenacity. Furthermore, differentiating competencies such as continuous learning, awareness, flexibility, resilience, initiative, creativity, entrepreneurship, influencing, partnering, and organizational commitment will distinguish between satisfactory and superior leaders.

Table 4: General traits, values, and behaviours of effective leaders

• Charismatic	• Has the necessary knowledge, skills, & abilities	• Motivates followers
• Intelligent	• High self-confidence/ self-esteem	• Effective communicator (Clearly articulates, communicates, & instills commitment toward a common vision)
• Emotionally stable	• Has strong convictions & goals	• Builds confidence & stimulates enthusiasm
• Integrity	• High motivation to lead	• Supports, acknowledges, & rewards followers' inputs
• Self-determination	• Flexible	• Uses analogies & metaphors (to communicate & inspire)
• Supportive & empathic	• Sets objectives	• Develops new symbols & images
• High need for achievement	• Instills pride in followers	• Provides individual consideration
• Creative	• Establishes organizational identity	• Intellectually stimulates followers
• High need for influence	• Engages in impression management	• Develops & mentors followers
• Honest	• Encourages teamwork & establishes social ties	• Inspires followers to transcend own self-interests
• Ambitious	• Monitors, consults with, & delegates to followers	• Manages conflict
• Dominant		
• High energy		
• Effective problem solver		

Source: Day et al., (2002)

The number of characteristics that have been put forth and the variety of labels given to the characteristics are impressive. However, there is much overlap. Upon the completion of a comprehensive literature review for the U.S. Military, Zaccaro (1996) found that executive leader characteristics fall into five main categories (See Table 5).

Hogan and Hogan (1998) identified a group of competencies that should be included in any type of assessment process: intellectual competence, emotional stability, social acuity, originality, maturity and responsibility, interpersonal skills, and ambition. Such clusters of competencies are quite broad and encompass much of what we have already presented.

Table 5. Executive leadership characteristics

Cognitive Capacities	Personality
Intelligence	Openness
Analytical reasoning skills	Curiosity
Flexible integrative complexity	Self-discipline
Meta-cognitive skills	Flexibility
Verbal/written skills	Risk of propensity
Creativity	Locus of control
Social	Motivation
Social reasoning skills	Need for achievement
Behavioural flexibility	Self-efficacy
Negotiation/persuasion skills	Expertise and Knowledge
Conflict management skills	
	Expertise and Knowledge
	Functional expertise
	Social expertise
	Knowledge of environmental demands

Source: Zaccaro, 1996

An assessment process that includes measures of cognitive ability, industry/business knowledge, motivational related characteristics (e.g., need for achievement), communication and interpersonal skills, and emotional maturity will capture most of the characteristics discussed. A survey of SIOP members in 1987 indicated that the most common areas of generic assessment where interpersonal skills, judgment and analytical skills, organization and planning skills, intelligence, supervisory skills, emotional maturity, leadership, and energy/drive (Ryan & Sackett, 1987).

Obviously, the negative consequences of promoting such a generic set of KSAO's and behaviours is that we lose specificity. The usefulness of identifying a generic set is that it serves as a starting point from which to identify lower order factors. What is striking about much of the research on leader characteristics is the limited amount of information concerning how such characteristics were even identified. In the following section we review the most common methods used to assess KSAOs and competencies.

ASSESSMENT METHODS

According to Hogan et al. (1994), in order to predict leadership behaviour one needs to employ a combination of cognitive ability and personality tests, simulation exercises, and multi-rater assessment techniques. In addition to the above methods, selection of senior leaders typically involves an extensive background history questionnaire (Silzer, 1998). The actual methods used by practitioners are varied. In 1992, Ryan and Sackett surveyed SIOP, non-SIOP, and non-I/O APA members in order to gauge the frequency of use of various types of assessment methods. Although individuals were not directly asked about assessment methods used with leaders, the numbers provide us with a general idea of assessment trends.

Not surprisingly, a job interview (95.5%) was the most popular assessment method used. The collection of personal background information was the second most common assessment method (82%). Similar numbers of individuals reported using ability and personality tests (74.3% and 78.9% respectively). Surprisingly, projective tests were used by 41.7% of the sample. Finally, simulation exercises were used by 28.8% of individuals. Gathering background information, conducting an interview, and

administering a personality and ability-based tests characterizes most assessment programs (Ryan & Sackett, 1992).

Frisch (1998) suggested that simulations and assessment centre exercises, paper and pencil measures of KSAO's, and interviews and self-descriptions of background and accomplishments are broad categories of assessment methods used to assess leadership behaviour. Using data collected from a large consulting firm (Personnel Decision International), Howard (2001) reported that in the evaluation of succession candidates, recommendations were used 97 percent of the time, past performance records (95%), interviews (79%), analysis of work samples/outputs (67%), multi-rater info (57%), personality testing (39%), simulations and other assessment centre data (24%), and intelligence testing (24%). Although this sample of organizations is not random, the data provide some indication of assessment practices for succession purposes. The majority of data collection procedures can be categorized as paper and pencil tests, simulations and assessment centre exercises, interviews, and more recently multi-rater feedback tools.

Paper & Pencil Tests. Ability and personality based measures form the majority of paper and pencil tests. The choice of one specific test over another is dependent on what KSAOs need to be assessed, the psychometric properties of the test, and the user's familiarity with the test. The Mental Measurements Yearbooks contain independent test reviews and publisher information to help identify and evaluate tests. Table 6 lists some of the more common tests currently used in organizational settings. The 1992 survey of SIOP, non-SIOP, and non-I/O APA members found that the Watson Glaser Critical Thinking test was the most popular measure of cognitive skills among I/O

Psychologists (31%). The Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament survey was the most popular measure of personality (31.5%; Ryan & Sackett, 1992).

In leadership assessment, paper and pencil tests usually form part of a larger assessment package. For example, cognitive skills might be assessed using paper and pencil tests, a work simulation exercise, and the results of an interview. The various sources of information will be used to assign an overall rating for the dimension, or competency of thinking skills.

Table 6. Common cognitive ability & personality tests

Cognitive Ability Tests
Comprehensive Ability Battery
Differential Aptitude Tests
Employee Aptitude Series
General Aptitude Test Battery
Saville & Holdsworth Critical Thinking Tests
Watson Glaser Critical Thinking Test
Wechsler Adult Intelligence Test
Wonderlic Personnel Test
Personality Tests
California Personality Inventory
Comprehensive Personality Inventory
Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey
Hogan Personality Inventory
Hogan Leadership Forecast
Meyers Briggs Temperament Inventory
Personal Characteristics Inventory
Saville & Holdsworth Occupational Personality Questionnaire
Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire
Multi-Factor Leadership Questionnaire

Cognitive ability tests are one of our best predictors of performance (See Table 7). There is some debate, however, concerning the usefulness of such tests at the executive level. At the highest level of organizations, cognitive ability does not appear to

discriminate between successful and unsuccessful executives. In essence, cognitive ability is a necessary but not sufficient condition to ensure executive success (Van Veslor & Guthrie, 1998).

There is a growing research base establishing the link between aspects of personality and performance criteria. Traits such as high energy level, stress tolerance, integrity (conscientiousness), emotional maturity and self-confidence appear to be related to criteria such as effectiveness and advancement (Yukl & Van Fleet, 1992). McClelland's early research on leader motives reveals that a moderately strong need for achievement, a weak need for affiliation, and a socialized power orientation (strong need for power coupled with emotional maturity) characterize effective leaders (McClelland & Boyatzis, 1982).

The Multi-Factor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ; Bass & Avolio, 1990) is designed to evaluate leadership behaviour. More specifically, it is designed to assess four forms of transformational leadership behaviour (charisma, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration), transactional leadership behaviours (contingent reward and active and passive management by exception), and laissez faire behaviours (non-leadership). The MLQ has received wide spread research attention as a measure of transformational leadership behaviour. In addition, it is marketed to organizations as an effective development tool. The various components of transformational leadership have been found to be significantly related to both objective and subjective measures of performance (Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramanian, 1996).

Paper and pencil tests of KSAOs can play an important role in the assessment of leadership talent. However a more comprehensive picture of leadership potential can be

acquired by using additional assessment methods. In addition to gaining a more comprehensive view of the individual, the face validity of the entire assessment process is increased with multiple methods. Multiple measures and methods are needed to capture the complexity of leader behaviour.

Simulations/Situational & Assessment Centre Exercises. The assessment centre approach to identifying managerial and leadership talent has a long history dating back to World War I and World War II (Thornton & Byham, 1982). In Canada, the Public Service Commission and the CF Navy use the assessment centre approach. The Public Service Commission uses the methodology to select individuals into managerial positions and also as a means of gathering assessment data for developmental purposes. The CF Navy uses a Navel Officer Assessment Board to help select officers. The evolution of the assessment centre approach to assessment was largely a result of demand by business/industry for useful tools and techniques to assess executive and managerial talent (Bray, 1982).

Simulation and situational exercises are a typical part of assessment centre methodology. They are designed to assess work related KSAO's/competencies in situations that are as similar as possible to that which candidates will encounter on the job. Such exercises are typically used to assess senior level individuals. The various exercises are designed to mimic real life situations that executives will encounter on the job. Simulations include strategic planning and decision making exercises, role plays, visioning exercises, marketing challenges, media interview, business games, and group discussions (Howard, 2001).

In basket exercises and leaderless group discussions are common methods of simulating the work environment. In fact, they are the most common used performance tests in assessment centres (Gatewood & Feild, 2001). In essence, in-basket exercises are paper and pencil tests that are designed to mimic the administrative aspects of managerial/executive level jobs. The participant is presented with a set of documents that contains necessary organizational background information and a series of memos relating to various issues. Participants must make decisions and take action on the various issues that are presented. Often the instructions do not specifically indicate what issues need to be addressed; it is up to the participant to decide. Typical competencies assessed include decision-making, delegation, planning, organizing, strategic thinking, action orientation, etc.

Leaderless group discussions can be used to assess similar competencies but the focus is usually on leadership and interpersonal skills. In such an exercise, a group of individuals might be put on a task force to address a specific issue. There is no leader, individuals are usually told that they are at the same level in the organization. The task might be a competitive or collaborative one. Individuals may or may not be given specific roles (Gatewood & Field, 2001).

Despite a high degree of face validity, a typical validity coefficient for in-basket exercises is around r = .25 (Schippman, Prien, & Katz, 1990). Validity coefficients for leaderless group discussion are not much higher and range from r = .15 to r = .35 (Muchinsky, 2000). The predictive validity coefficients for such exercises are not impressive, yet the high degree of face and content validity of such exercises makes it likely their use will continue. There is conflicting research concerning the overall validity

of assessment centre ratings. Biographical data (personnel files) predict training success as well as an overall assessment centre rating (Drakely, Herriot, & Jones, 1988). Alternatively, Gaugler et al (1987) and Schmidt and Hunter (1998) report validity coefficients for assessment centres to be around .37.

Interviews. Perhaps the most widely used assessment method is the interview (Rowe, Williams, & Day, 1994). It is doubtful if any other assessment method in I/O psychology has received as much attention as the interview. Meta-analytic studies indicate validity coefficients for structured interviews are around r = .50 (See Table 7). Behaviour-based interview questions are designed to evaluate how candidates have dealt with a past situation in an attempt to predict future behaviour (Janz,1982). In situational interviews, individuals are presented with work-related scenarios and asked how they would respond (Latham, Saari, Pursell, & Campion, 1980).

The consulting firm of RHR International relies solely on interviews to assess executives (Howard, 2001). Data suggests that executive search firms are likely to use a clinical interviewing approach when interviewing executives (Clark, 1992). Levinson (1998) argued that the results of clinical interviews allow psychologists a more comprehensive picture. There is very little information concerning the use of the interview with senior level organizational members. Most interviews at this level have less structure than those for lower level positions: Questions are more likely to focus on background and past accomplishments in an attempt to assess fit. Intentions regarding strategic organizational issues are likely to be discussed. Furthermore, stakeholders such as the CEO, members of the Board of Directors, direct reports, and owners will likely interview potential senior organizational leaders. Each stakeholder will likely have

their own set of questions and ultimately form their own opinion of the candidate. It is difficult to interview senior leaders with a heavily structured interview. Senior leaders will likely expect an opportunity to express their views on a variety of issues in a relatively unstructured format. Although it may be difficult to impose as much structure as researchers call for, it is possible to structure the interview around key issues in order to assess specific competencies. For example, an actual organizational issue could be raised and candidates could be asked how they might resolve it. The answers could be used as an indicator of specific competencies such as problem solving and business acumen. The goal would be to ensure that the most important competencies were assessed across the various interviews. The most important aspect is that all the interviewers have a clear understanding of which KSAOs or competencies need to be addressed.

Gatewood and Field (2001) offered several recommendations for conducting better interviews and most apply equally to designing and conducting interviews with leaders and/or entry-level personnel. First, interview questions should focus on the most relevant KSAOs or competencies. Individuals often attempt to assess too many KSAOs or competencies in the interview. Similarly, interviews should contain several questions that assess each construct. Thus, a competency such as business acumen might be evaluated with several questions. Obviously the questions should be content valid and have a very high degree of face validity. Senior leaders will not have the patience to deal with fictitious situations.

The interview has the potential to provide assessors with useful data concerning leadership KSAOs or competencies. However, the usefulness of the information will

depend on many of the factors discussed above. Having a clear understanding of what leadership attribute(s) will be assessed and some sense of what constitutes a quality response will provide significant gains in the value of the assessment data. Using independent interviewers to assess the same competencies is similar to the rational underlying the usefulness of multi-rater tools.

Multi-rater tools. The increasingly popular 360-degree surveys are most often used for gathering developmental data (London & Tornow, 1998). This class of instruments is used to gather evaluative information from the employee's supervisor, colleagues, subordinates and perhaps external/internal customers on important work-related behaviours. Well-developed instruments contain behaviours derived from organizational specific competency models, success profiles or established leadership theories. The use of 360-degree implies that ratings are obtained from the employee's complete "circle" of influence. The theoretical rationale underlying such instruments is that no singular group has occasions to see all aspects of the performance dimensions. Thus, a more complete picture of strengths, developmental needs, and/or potential can be obtained.

Such instruments can also form part of an assessment-centre process. In such situations, information might be shared that bears on promotional and/or selection decisions. The use of these instruments to help make selection/promotional decisions is not without controversy. There is evidence that ratings change when the data is to be used to make important personnel decisions (London & Smither, 1995). As such, vendors of such instrument such as the Centre for Creative Leadership only use 360 instruments for developmental purposes (Chappelow, 1998).

There has also been concern over the lack of rater agreement (Carless, Mann, & Wearing, 1998). Individuals have argued that for the ratings to be valid there should be a reasonable degree of agreement across raters concerning competency level. Other researchers have argued that a lack of rater agreement does not have an impact on the validity of the ratings. Such discrepancies merely highlight the fact that different rater groups see qualitative and quantitative differences in performance levels (Salam, Cox. & Sims, 1997; Tornow, 1993). In fact, this lack of agreement is thought to be useful in the development process. No information could be found concerning the use of these instruments for selection purposes. We will return to the topic of 360-degree instruments when we address the topic of leadership development.

VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY OF ASSESSMENT METHODS

Ryan and Sackett (1998) presented a discussion of the validity and reliability of overall assessment results. They stated that there are three linkages where criterion related validity should be demonstrated: (1) single test scores, (2) dimensional judgements resulting from combining test scores, and (3) overall recommendations. An examination of unpublished research reports from consulting firms indicates that dimensional judgements and overall recommendations have acceptable levels of criterion-related validity. In regard to the criterion-related validity of single assessment scores, it depends on the particular method or test and the criterion of interest. Meta-analysis results indicating average corrected validity coefficients for various assessment methods are presented in Table 7.

Leadership behaviour is complex, requiring the use of multiple assessment methods. As indicated in Table 7, there is plenty of evidence that data resulting from

various assessment processes predict work outcomes. Most organizations, however, select senior leaders without professional assistance (Howard, 2001). Formal assessment procedures for selection are seen as intrusive and senior leaders see themselves as being above those assessment procedures. Howard suggests this is unfortunate given that 30% to 50% of CEOs fail. By the time organizational members are ready to be considered for a senior leadership role, many are likely to have been through some form of assessment process as they moved up the corporate ladder. Thus, assessments for selection purposes are often viewed as lacking face validity. Assessments, however, remain a central aspect of leadership development programs and interest in leadership development is at an all time high (Day, 2001). In the next section, we present information concerning recent trends in the development of leaders.

Table 7. Criterion-related validity of assessment methods

Assessment Method	Mean Validities
Work samples	.54[1]
Cognitive ability	.51[1], .53[4]
Structured interview	.51[1], .57[2]
Integrity tests	.41[1]
Unstructured interviews	.38[1,].20[2]
Assessment Center	.37[1], .36[3]
Biographical data	.35[1],
Conscientiousness	.31[1], .23[5]
Reference checks	.26[1]
Job experience	.18[1], .27[6]
Education	.10[1,]
Graphology	.02[1]

Sources: [1]Schmidt and Hunter (1998); [2]Huffcutt & Arthur (1994); [3]Gaugler et al., (1987); [3]Hunter and Hunter (1984), [5]Barrick & Mount (1991); [6]Quinones et al. (1995).

DEVELOPMENT OF LEADERS

Leadership development is an on-going focus of interest in military organizations and as such, military doctrine regarding leadership development is well entrenched. The

three pillars of the U.S. Army leader development philosophy are:(1) Institutional training and education; (2) Operational Assignments; and (3) Self-development (Sullivan, 1999). Meyer (1997) argued that the U.S. military's primary concern must be to develop and sustain effective leadership. The importance of this topic is reflected in military-related journals such as Military Review. Leadership and its development is a consistent theme. Shamir and Ben-Ari (1999) have discussed how changing military objectives and leadership roles have an impact on developmental needs. They carefully mapped out developmental needs as a function of changing leadership objectives and roles. In the following section we discuss key factors that need to be present in leadership development models, common developmental areas, methods, and outcomes associated with participation in developmental activities.

KEY FACTORS IN DEVELOPMENT MODELS

Leadership development has been defined as the expansion of a person's capacity to be effective in leadership roles and processes (Van Velsor, McCauley, & Moxley, 1998). A survey sponsored by the Conference Board and Centre for Creative Leadership found that of 125 organizations on the Fortune 100 and the Financial Times Europe 100 lists, 95% reported having a strategy and structure in place for executive or leadership development (Axel, 1999). Organizations that are members of the American Management Association report spending between $6,000 and $7,000 per participant on leadership development. For 33 percent of the surveyed organizations, this reflects 25 percent of their training budgets (Delahoussaye, 2001). On a broader level, Fulmer (1997) reports that the management development industry is worth $45 billion annually and that this figure has increased 25 percent from a decade earlier.

According to Van Veslor and her colleagues (1998) there are three key elements of any developmental program: (1) assessment, (2) challenge, and (3) support. The basic goal of the assessment process is to provide individuals with accurate information concerning strengths and developmental needs. As we discussed in the assessment section, the starting point of an assessment program is to gain an understanding of what needs to be assessed. Hopefully, requisite leadership KSAOs or competencies will have been defined by the organization. On a positive note, three-fourths of the HR executives surveyed by Axel (1999) reported having organizational competency models. The second required element of developmental activities is challenge. Challenge refers to providing individuals with developmental opportunities that stretch current capabilities. Little is to be learned by dealing with the familiar. Organizational and individual support is the final element. Success of the various programs is increased when the CEO is personally involved. Furthermore, senior management must see participation as being in their self-interest. In other words, participants need to see the benefits of the process (Van Veslor et al., 1998).

Developmental programs should also be embedded within the strategic plan of the organization. Developmental activities and experiences should reflect the strategic goals of the organization and make an operational contribution to the business of the organization (Ready, Vicere, & White, 1994; Seibert, Hall, & Kram, 1995; Zenger, Ulrich, & Smallwood, 2000). In fact, a common shortcoming of executive development programs is that they often start with a list of competencies and then focus on the individual. Jack Zenger and his colleagues (2000) argued that development should start with business objectives and then work backwards to competencies. Additionally,

Zenger et al., (2000) feel the following characteristics typify successful development programs:

- Highest-ranking members go through the program first in order to demonstrate commitment
- Start out by identifying what business objectives need to be achieved
- Build scorecards so results can be monitored
- Link competencies to the business objectives
- Employ learning techniques that reflect practical skills and realistic application contexts
- Make development an on going process not an event
- Build in accountability
- Leaders trained to turn complexity into simplicity
- Realistic situations where leaders can try, fail, and try again
- Train everyone to lead

The need to build developmental programs into the business context is clear. For example, the Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing Co. (3M) decided that part of their strategic plan included increasing international market share. Given this goal, there was an obvious need to develop leaders with international experience. Thus, part of their leadership development program entailed an overseas assignment with targeted business objectives (Seibert et al., 1995). Such a program held more face validity than classroom learning and was seen by participants as an important career move that resulting in tangible career rewards. This type of learning experience has the potential to address a wide range of leadership attributes and competencies.

Shamir and Ben-Ari (1999) advocated using military organizational objectives to guide developmental content. In order for leaders to gain a better understanding of foreign customs, norms, and aspirations, more emphasis needs to be placed on cross-cultural training. Because of the increased emphasis on inter-organizational missions, more attention needs to be devoted to the principles of teamwork. Additional development in using the consensus building approach to decision making will also be necessary. It is also suggested that because of the increasing emphasis on peacemaking objectives, an increased level of development in negotiation and mediation skills will be beneficial.

In addition to using business or organizational objectives to help guide the identification of developmental content, existing competency models should also be consulted. Most of the leader attributes and behaviours presented in the previous section will be found in such models. Thus, to a large extent development activities will be designed to develop many of the previously identified competencies. There is, however, some research indicating generic areas that should be targeted for development. In addition, some development programs are guided more by leadership theory than business objectives or competency models. In the next section, we examine some generic areas for development and discuss recent attempts to use transformational leadership theory to develop leaders.

AREAS OF DEVELOPMENTAL

In an extensive survey of executive developmental experiences, McCall, Lombardo, and Morrison (1988) reported that developmental experiences have an impact on five major areas of functioning: (1) leader’s ability to set and implement an

agenda, (2) handling relationships, (3) basic values, (4) temperament, and (5) personal awareness.

Based on their experience at the Centre for Creative Leadership, Van Veslor et al. (1998) suggested that the following characteristics can and must be developed in order for leaders to be successful:

- Self-awareness
- Self-confidence
- Ability to take a broad systematic view
- Ability to work effectively in a social system
- Ability to think creatively
- Ability to learn from experience

Popper and Lipshitz (1993) argued that successful programs enhance self-efficacy, increase knowledge of motivational techniques, and provide specific skills training. Increasing self-efficacy impacts a leader's ability to influence. As noted earlier, influencing is a central part of the leadership domain. The ability to motivate followers is also an important aspect of leader performance; thus, increased knowledge of motivational theory and techniques is important. More specific skills training is also required. Increasing a leaders' written and oral communication skills, their ability to conduct meetings, to carry out interviews, and to give feedback leads to more effective interpersonal processes through which leaders motivate followers. Although increasing the effectiveness of specific skills is important, it is only a small part of well-designed programs (Popper & Lipshitz, 1993).

McCall and Lombardo (1983) initiated a research project aimed at investigating executive failures. They conducted in-depth interviews with individuals who were familiar with the details of specific executive failures and successes. By examining reasons that executives fail, we are provided with information concerning developmental needs (See Table 8).

Table 8. Most common reasons for executive failure

1. Performance problem with the business
2. Insensitivity to others, aggressiveness, intimidating, bullying style
3. Cold, aloof, arrogant
4. Betrayal of trust
5. Over-managing, failing to delegate, or build team
6. Overly ambitious, thinking of next job, playing politics
7. Failing to staff effectively
8. Unable to think strategically
9. Unable to adapt to new boss
10. Over-dependent on advocate or mentor

Source: McCall & Lombardo (1983)

Van Veslor and Leslie (1995) reexamined this issue. Executives in the 1990's failed for many of the same reasons as their earlier counterparts. In general, derailment occurs because of problems with interpersonal relationships, failure to meet business objectives, failure to build and lead a team, and inability to change or adapt during transitions. Additionally, today's executives are increasingly more likely to derail because of their lack of ability to build and lead a productive team, and their lack of ability to adapt to changing circumstances (Van Veslor & Leslie, 1995).

Generally, the reasons for executive failure can be mapped onto one of the many leadership attributes or behaviours we identified in the assessment section. Such commonality is encouraging; it indicates that there is some consistency between the KSAOs and competencies that are thought to be important and what is commonly found

in developmental programs. Existing competency models and business objectives allow for further tailoring developmental programs. Using leadership theory to guide development increases the effectiveness of such programs.

Transformational leadership theory is the focus of much research attention. Charismatic leadership is associated with subordinate ratings of leader effectiveness and increased organizational performance (Lowe et al, 1996). Transformational leaders engender higher levels of follower commitment (Avolio, 1999). Transformational leadership behaviours can be developed to a point where we see increases in follower commitment and job performance (Barling, Weber, & Kelloway, 1996). Popper et al. (1992) described a six-month leadership development program created by the Israeli Defence Forces. The main thrust of the program was to improve a leader's ability to formulate goals and visions and to communicate goals and visions to followers. The program involved institutionalizing "real leadership roles", creating command situations requiring transformational leadership, creating simulations and case studies; and developing expertise in existing trainers to mentor and coach these transformational leadership characteristics and behaviours. Trainees perceived the program to be significantly more positive than the traditional leadership training program. These positive reactions lasted up to 18 months after the transformational training session.

The use of leadership theory provides direction for what leader attributes and competencies should be included in developmental programs. Existing competency models and business objectives should also be used to guide content related decisions. After decisions have been made regarding content some attention needs to be given to the methods that will be used to deliver the developmental experience.

METHODS OF DEVELOPMENT

Developmental experiences come in many forms, both informal and formal (Van Veslor et al., 1998). We have previously noted that overseas work assignments have the potential to be powerful learning experiences. In fact, McCall, Lombardo, & Morrison (1988) suggested that career experiences such as challenging job assignment, facing adversity, working with other individuals and course work provide most of the learning experiences for leaders. This reflects the military philosophy that institutional education and training and operational assignments are necessary components of development. Akin (1987) has identified several ways that leaders can develop:

- Emulation of a mentor: Informal, often unconscious learning by association
- Role learning: Formal, conscious process of observation and imitation
- Learning by doing : Learning through on the job experiences
- Learning by validation: Contrasting own leadership behaviour in light of that taught through works, etc.
- Learning of concepts: Traditional learning by being taught concepts and theories by subject matter experts.

Such learning methods have been incorporated into many of the current development methods. Table 9 describes the percentage of U.S. and European companies that use various types of executive developmental methods for senior executives.

A discussion of all the current developmental methods is beyond the scope of this paper. However, we do feel that as the two most popular developmental methods, multi-rater feedback and executive coaching deserve some attention.

Table 9. Executive developmental methods

Developmental Activity	U.S Companies (%)	European Companies (%)
Training Programs	72	72
Multi-Rater feedback	79	53
Assessment Centres	20	25
Individual Developmental Plans	65	64
Developmental Job Assignments	72	47
Executive Coaching	76	61
Formal Mentoring	13	17
Informal Mentoring	39	17
Action Learning Models	22	8
Team Building Activities	34	25

Source: Axel (1999)

Atwater and Waldham (1998) have called 360-degree feedback the most notable management innovation of the 1990's. In this section we outline what is considered to be best practices regarding the use of such tools in a developmental context. Individual performance can be improved using 360-degree feedback (Atwater, Rousch, & Fischtal, 1995; Smither et al., 1995). However, meta-analysis results based on over six hundred feedback studies indicate that one-third of the time feedback had a negative impact, one-third of the time it improved performance, and for the remaining third performance stayed the same (Kluger & DeNisi, 1996). In addition to issues surrounding rater agreement that were discussed previously, there are also psychometric concerns with respect to 360-degree feedback. In one study the instrument used did not measure the competencies it was purported to measure, there was massive redundancy among items, and scores failed to correlate with any other measure of performance (Fletcher, Baldry, & Cunningham-Snell, 1998).

It is obvious that many variables can influence the effectiveness of feedback based interventions. How the process is introduced to individuals, how the feedback process is handled, and the types and amount of follow-up support that is offered can all have an

impact on the effectiveness of the process (Alimo-Metcalfe, 1998). Dalton and Hollenbeck (1997) provided a series of best practice recommendations, many of which touch on these issues. They suggest that the process must be clearly and repeatedly communicated. Adequate communication is especially important in situations where it is being introduced for the first time. The Centre for Creative Leadership recommends that 360-degree feedback be used only for developmental purposes. This is a vital communication piece that deserves a lot of emphasis. The integrity of the feedback process is also very important. Chappelow (1998) recommended giving participants access to a trained feedback facilitators. Organizational support for developmental activities is mandatory if the 360-degree feedback process is going to result in developmental gains. Organizational support can take many forms. Perhaps most obvious is financial support for developmental activities. However, Day (2001) suggested that the effectiveness of 360-degree interventions is directly related to follow-up activities such as executive coaching.

One-on-one mentoring, peer coaching, group coaching, and executive coaching are all types of developmental relationships (MacCauley & Douglas, 1998). The approach taken to executive coaching typically falls in one of three categories: (1) feedback coaching; (2) in-depth development coaching; and (3) content coaching (Thach & Heinselman, 1999). Feedback coaching involves an assessment, a feedback session, and several follow-up meetings to help the executive create and implement a developmental plan. In-depth development coaching involves a more thorough assessment. It usually includes several psychological tests and some type of multi-rater assessment. It may also include interviews with colleagues, direct reports, vendors,

customers, friends, and even family members. The relationship between the coach and the executive can last up to 12 months. Meetings are used to monitor developmental progress and address issues that arose as a result of the assessment. Content coaching represents the final category. This type of coaching typically focuses on a specific aspect of business and attempts to increase knowledge and skills (Thach & Heinselman,1999).

Most major consulting firms and numerous private practitioners offer coaching services. The differences in approaches reflect the diverse backgrounds of individuals calling themselves executive coaches. There is very little academic research available on the topic of executive coaching. However, with more than 10,000 coaches registered with the International Coaching Federation there is plenty of discussion of the subject in trade journals (Bolch, 2001). As with many developmental activities it is difficult to calculate the impact of coaching on individual and organizational performance. As the popularity of coaching increases, so will the pressure to demonstrate return on investment.

OUTCOMES & EVALUATION

The extent to which positive outcomes can be expected as a result of participating in developmental activities is hard to estimate. Designing development programs using business objectives, properly designed competency models, and knowledge of existing leadership theories will increase the probability that outcomes will be more closely tied to important aspects of the leadership performance domain.

Kirkpatrick's (1983) framework for evaluating the impact of training activities has become the standard for categorizing type of evaluation initiative. At the most simplistic

level, we have reaction evaluation. This type of evaluation inquires whether participants felt that the development activity was useful. Participant reaction is by far the most common type of evaluation. Estimates are that 50% to 80% of organizations depend on this type of evaluation (Grider,1990). Obviously it is the easiest type of evaluation data to collect. The evaluation of actual learning through some form of pre and post testing is the second level of evaluation. Grider (1990) reports that 20% to 30% of organizations use this type of evaluation. At the third level, we have an evaluation of behavioural outcomes associated with the developmental activity. This type of evaluation concerns itself with behavioural changes on the job. Thus, if a developmental activity were targeted towards project planning skills, the evaluation would centre on evaluating behaviours that operationalize this competency. The final level of evaluation, also the most difficult to conduct, is whether there have been any improvements in organizational outcomes as a result of the develop program.

In reality, few organizations measure the actual business impact of developmental activities (Axel, 1999; Delahoussaye, 2001). Although 80% of organizations use some means of assessing outcomes, nearly half of organizations with development programs rely on informal processes (Axel, 1999). A survey conducted by the American Management Association and Training Magazine found 50% of respondents reacted positively to their development programs and were satisfied that their developmental programs were in fact targeting important skills and competencies (Delahoussaye, 2001). In fact, participants' reactions to the program were considered the most important aspect of program success. These reactions even outranked performance evaluations by superiors, peers and subordinates as important in gauging

program success. Increased profitability, greater efficiency, increased stock price reflect Kirkpatrick's (1983) fourth level. It is these outcomes that one would expect to be most important to executives. Unfortunately, assessing organizational outcomes is not realistic (Van Veslor,1998).There are multitude of factors other than a single leadership development program that effects organizational effectiveness.

Table 10 provides an overview of the frequency of commonly reported outcomes associated with developmental experiences. In most situations, individuals reported modest gains, except for increased awareness of leadership concepts where 59% of participants felt that developmental activities produced an increased understanding of leadership concepts.

Table 10. Results of developmental activities

Outcome	Major Improvement	Modest Improvement	No Change
Satisfaction with process	46	47	7
Skills improvement	32	66	2
Behaviour change	26	70	4
Increased recruitment/retention	15	67	18
Understanding leadership concept	59	39	2
Adequacy of succession pool	18	71	11
Increased organizational profitability	42	49	9

Source: Axel,1999.

Participation in developmental activities can realistically lead to positive outcomes in five areas: (1) knowledge acquisition, (2) increased self-awareness, (3) perspective change, (4) skill development, and (5) behaviour change (Van Veslor, 1998). The latter outcomes take place over longer periods of time. Furthermore, it is these outcomes that are expected to increase the productivity of workgroups and increase their ability to meet organizational objectives.

Steele and Walters (2001) reported that preparing future military leaders is a growing concern. A recent survey of training and development practices in the U.S. Army indicated that several firmly held beliefs about leadership development were, in practice, contradicted. Recommendations resulting from the survey called for more focus on a systems approach, better quality training and development material, and clearer articulation of training standards (Steele & Walters, 2001). Private sector trainers are optimistic about the future of leadership development. As indicated earlier, the industry is thriving. Private organizations are moving away from viewing development as a one-time event and moving towards considering it an important on-going process.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR RESEARCH AND PRACTICE

Our recommendations concerning the development of a leadership assessment and development programs revolve around the need to clearly articulate the knowledge, skills, abilities, and personal characteristics required of present and future leaders. These recommendations include:

- Develop a detailed understanding of the leadership performance domain. Leadership performance requirements will be a function of both organizational objectives and functional level. Attention needs to be devoted to linking the leadership performance requirements to both CF organizational objectives and functional level. A junior leader will not be required to perform the same tasks as a senior leader.
- Identify the leader KSAOs that are required at different functional levels. Furthermore, determine required level of leader KSAOs. All leaders will need some level of critical thinking. However, the level required will vary by functional level.

- Determine methods for assessing leader attributes such that the CF has a clear indication of the level of the KSAO for each person. Specific tools and procedures acceptable to the CF for assessing KSAOs need to be identified.
- Develop evaluation tools to assess leader performance and effectiveness. These tools should be designed so that resulting information clearly identifies developmental needs.
- Design developmental activities that address developmental needs.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

The effectiveness of the CF leadership assessment and development processes is dependent on a thorough understanding of the leadership performance domain. The specific dimensions within the performance domain will vary as a function of organizational objectives and functional level. As CF objectives evolve so will leadership roles. These roles need to be clearly described in order to make inferences concerning requisite KSAOs. We have presented numerous conceptualizations of the leadership performance domain. It is likely that research aimed at mapping out the performance domain of leaders within the CF will identify many of the same behaviours and outcomes already presented. Despite this, the research is still necessary. Determining leader attributes is an inferential process. These inferences need to be based on the actual performance domain in question and not on a performance domain from another organization.

Leadership assessment processes must be constructed based on several factors. Most importantly, is the need to ensure that instruments and processes are selected that measure clearly defined attributes. Other factors to consider include the

acceptable of various assessment methods to organizational members, and the need to use processes that are administratively acceptable. Leadership assessments can be expensive and time consuming. An on-going process for many candidates needs to be manageable.

A systems approach must be utilized in order to gain the most benefit from assessment and development efforts. Low assessment scores in a particular area need to be linked to specific developmental activities. Assessment and development processes need to become part of an organization's culture. In this way, it becomes more acceptable and is viewed as an on-going positive process.

REFERENCES

Akin, J. (1987). Varieties of managerial learning. Organizational Dynamics, 16, 36-48.

Alimo-Metcalfe, B. (1998). 360 degree feedback and leadership development. International Journal of Selection and Development, 6, 35-44.

Atwater, L., Rousch, P., & Fischtal, A. (1995). The influence of upward feedback on self and follower ratings of leadership. Personnel Psychology, 48, 35-59.

Atwater, L., & Waldham, D. (1998). 360 degree feedback and leadership development. Leadership Quarterly, 9, 423-426.

Axel, H. (1999). Developing Leaders. HR Executive Review, 7, 1-19.

Avolio. B. J. (1999). Full Leadership Development: Building the Vital Forces in Organizations. Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage.

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

Bolch, M. (2001). Proactive coaching. Training & Development, 38, 58-66.

Barrick, M. R., Day, D. V., Lord, R.G. & Alexander, R. A. (1991). Assessing utility of executive leadership. Leadership Quarterly, 2, 9-22.

Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The big five personality dimensions and job performance. A meta-analysis. Personnel Psychology, 44, 1-26.

Bateman, T.S., & Organ, D.W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee “citizenship”. Academy of Management Journal, 26, 587-595.

Bass, B. M. (1985). Leadership and performance beyond expectations. New York: The Free Press.

Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. Organizational Dynamics, 18(3), 19-36.

Bass, B. M. & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership: A response to critiques. In M. M. Chemers & R. Ayman (Eds.), Leadership theory and research: Perspectives and directions (pp. 49-80). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1990). Transformational Leadership Development Manual for the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Benedict, M. E., & Levine, E.L. (1988). Delay and distortion: Tacit influences on performance appraisal effectiveness. Journal of Applied Psychology, 73, 507-514.

Best Practices in Performance Appraisals. (2000). HR Focus 2:8.

Bolch, M. (2001). Procative coaching. Training, 38, 58-66.

Borman, W.C. (1991). Job behaviour, performance, and effectiveness. In M.D. Dunette and L.M. Hough, (Eds.). The Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, (Vol. 2, 272-397). San Diego: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In N. Schmitt, & W. C. Borman (Eds.). Personnel Selection in Organizations,(pp. 71-98). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Bray, D. W. (1982). The assessment centre and study of lives. American Psychologist, 37, 180-189.

Briscoe, J. P., & Hall, D. T. (1999). Grooming and picking leaders using competency frameworks: Do they work? An alternative approach and new guidelines for practice. Organizational Dynamics, Autumn, 37-52.

Campbell, J.P., McHenry, J.L., & Wise, L.L. (1990). Modeling job performance in a population of jobs. Personnel Psychology, 43, 313-333.

Campbell, J.P. (1990). Modeling the performance prediction problem in industrial and organizational psychology. In M.D. Dunette and L.M. Hough, (Eds.). The Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, (Vol. 1, 688-732). San Diego: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Cameron, K. S., & Whetton, D. A. (1983). Some conclusions about organizational effectiveness. In K. S. Cameron and D. A. Whetton (Eds.). Organizational Effectiveness: A Comparison of Mulitple Models., 261-277. Orlando, FL: Academic press.

Campion, M. A., Pursell, E. D., & Brown, B. K. (1988). Structured interviewing: Raising the psychometric properties of the employment interview. Personnel Psychology, 41, 25-42.

Carless, S. A., Mann, L., & Wearing, A.J. (1998). Leadership, managerial performance and 360 feedback. Applied Psychology: An International Review, 47, 481-496.

Catano, V. M., Cronshaw, S. F., Wiesner, W. H. Hackett, R. D., & Methot, L. L. (2001). Recruitment and Selection in Canada (2nd ed.). Scarborough, ON: Nelson.

Chan, K., & Drasgow, F. (2001). Toward a theory of individual differences and leadership: Understanding the motivation to lead. Journal of Applied Psychology, 86 (3), 481-498.

Chappelow, C. T. (1998). 360 – Feedback. In McCauley, D. C., Moxley, R. S., & Van Velsor, E. (Eds.) (1998). The Centre for Creative Leadership Handbook of Organizational Development, 29-65. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Clement, S. D., & Ayres, D. (1976). A matrix of organizational leadership dimensions. (United States Army Leadership Monograph Series, Monograph 8A). Ft. Benjamin Harrison, IN: U.S. Army Administrative Centre.

Coleman, V. I., & Borman, W. C. (2000). Investigating the underlying structure of the citizenship performance domain. Human Resource Management Review, 10(1), 25-44.

Cook, K. W. & Bernthal, P. (1998). Job/role Competency Practices Survey. Bridgeville, PA: DDI.

Clark, T. (1992). Management selection by executive recruitment companies: A survey and explanation of selection methods. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 7, 3-10.

Dalton, M. A., & Hollenbeck, G. P. (1997). Best practices in 360-degree feedback processes. Presentation, Tools, for Developing Successful Executives, Centre for Creative Leadership. NC: Centre for Creative Leadership.

Day, A., Newsome, S., & Catano, V. (2002). Emotional intelligence and leadership. Kingston, ON: Canadian Forces Leadership Institute.

Day, D. V. (2001). Leadership development: A review in context. Leadership Quarterly, 11, 581-613.

Day, D.V. & Lord, R.G. (1988). Executive leadership and organizational performance: Suggestions for a new theory and methodology. Journal of Management, 14, 453-464.

Delahoussaye, M. (2001). Leadership in the 21st century. Training, 38, 60-72.

Donohue, K. S. & Wong, L. (1994). Understanding and applying transformational leadership. Military Review, 74(8), 24-31.

Drakely, R. J., Herriot, P., & Jones, A. (1988). Biographical data, training success and turnover. Journal of Occupational Psychology, 61, 145-162.

Fiedler, F. (1967). A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Fletcher, C., Baldry, C., & Cunningham-Snell. (1998). The psychometric properties of 360 degree feedback: An empirical study and cautionary tale. International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 47, 89-102.

Frisch, M. H. (1998). Designing the individual assessment process. In R. Jeanneret and R. Silzer (Eds.), Individual Psychological Assessment, 135-177. NY: Jossey-Bass.

Fogli, L., & Whitney, K. (1998). Assessing and changing managers for new organizational roles. Individual Psychological Assessment, 285-329. NY: Jossey-Bass.

Fuller, J. B., Patterson, C. E. P., Hester, K., & Stringer, D. Y. (1996). A quantitative review of research on charismatic leadership. Psychological Reports,78, 271-287.

Fulkerson, J. R. (1998). Assessment across cultures. In R. Jeanneret and R. Silzer (Eds.), Individual Psychological Assessment, 330-362. NY: Jossey-Bass.

Fulmer, R. M., (1997). The evolving paradigm of leadership development. Organizational Dynamics, Spring, 59-72.

Gatewood, R.D. & Feild, H.S. (2001). Human Resource Selection. (3rd ed.). TX: Dryden Press.

Gaugler, B. B., Rosenthal, D. B., Thornton, G. C., Bentson, C. (1987). Meta-analysis of assessment centre validity. Journal of Applied Psychology, 72, 493-511.

Geyer, A. L., & Steyrer, J. M. (1998). Transformational leadership and objective performance in banks. Applied Psychology: An International Review, 47, (3), 397-42

Graen, G. B. (1976). Role making processes within complex organizations. In M.D. Dunnette (Ed.), Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology pp. 1201-1245). Chicago, IL: Rand-McNally.

Greenberg, J. (1996). The Quest for Justice on the Job. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Greenberg, J., Baron, R. A., Sales, C. A., & Owens, F. A. (2000). Behaviour in organizations. Don Mills, ON: Pearson Education Canada, Inc.

Grider (D. T. (1990). Training evaluation. Business Magazine, 17, 20-24.

Guion, R. (1990). Personnel assessment, selection, and placement. In M.D. Dunette and L.M. Hough, (Eds.). The Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, (Vol. 2, 327-333). San Diego: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Gurstein, M. (1999). Leadership in the peacekeeping army of the future. In J. G. Hunt, G. E. Dodge, & Wong, L. (Eds.), Out of the Box Leadership: Transforming the Twenty-First-Century Army and Other Top-Performing Organizations. (195-218). Stamford, CT: JAI.

Hogan, R., Curphy, G. J. & Hogan, J. (1994). What we know about leadership effectiveness and personality. American Psychologist, 49(6), 493-504.

Hogan, J., & Hogan, R. (1998). Theoretical frameworks for assessment. Individual Psychological Assessment, 27-53. NY: Jossey-Bass.

House, R. J. (1977). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. In J. G. Hunt & L. L. Larson (Eds.), Leadership: The cutting edge. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Howard, A. (2001). Identifying, assessing and selecting senior leaders. In S. J. Zaccaro and R. J. Klimoski (Eds.), The Nature of Organizational Leadership, 305-346. SF: Josey-Bass.

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

Howell, J. M. & Hall-Merenda, K. E. (1999). The ties that bind: the impact of leader-member exchange, transformational and transactional leadership, and distance on predicting follower performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 84, 680-694.

Huffcutt, A. I., & Arthur, W. (1994). Hunter and Hunter (1984) revisited: Interview validity for entry level jobs. Journal of Applied Psychology, 79(2), 184-190.

Hunt, J. G., Dodge, G. E., & Wong, L. (1999). Out of the Box Leadership: Transforming the Twenty-First-Century Army and other Top Performing Organizations. Stamford, CT: JAI.

Hunter J. E., & Hunter, R. F. (1984). Validity and utility of alternative predictors of job performance. Psychological Bulletin, 96, 72-98.

Janz, T. (1982). Initial comparisons of patterned behaviour descriptive interviews versus unstructured interviews. Journal of Applied Psychology, 67, 577-580.

Jeanneret, R, & Silzer, R. (1998). An overview of individual psychological assessment. In R. Jeanneret and R. Silzer (Eds.), Individual Psychological Assessment, 3-26. NY: Jossey-Bass.

Johns, G. & Saks, A. M. (2001). Organizational behaviour: Understanding and managing life at work. Toronto: Addison, Wesley, Longman.

Judge, T. A., & Bono, J. E. (2000). Five factor model of personality and transformational leadership. Journal of Applied Psychology, 85(5), 751-765.

Kane, T. D., & Tremble, T.R. (2000). Transformational leader effects at different levels of the army. Military Psychology, 12 (2), 137-160.

Kayworth. R., & Leidner, D. E. (2002). Leadership effectiveness in virtual teams. Journal of management Information Systems, 18, 7- 40.

Kirkpatric, D. L. (1983). Four steps to evaluating training effectiveness, Personnel Administrator, 28, 19-25.

Kirkpatrick, S. A. & Locke, E. A. (1996). Direct and indirect effects of three charismatic leadership components on performance and attitudes. Journal of Applied Psychology, 81, 36-51.

Kluger, A. N., & DeNisi, A. (1996). The effects of feedback on performance: A historical review, a meta-analysis, and a preliminary feedback intervention. Psychological Bulletin, 119, 254-284.

Kunungo, R. N. (1998). Leadership in organizations: Looking ahead to the 21st century. Canadian Psychology, 39, 77- 84.

Latham, G. P., L. M. Saari, E. D., Pursell, & Campion, M. A. (1980). The situational interview. Journal of Applied Psychology, 65, 422-427.

Latham, G. P. & Wexley, K. N. (1981). Increasing Productivity Through Performance Appraisal. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Lawler, E. 91994). From job-based to competency-based organizations. Journal of Organizational behaviour, 15, 3-15.

Levinson, H. (1998). A clinical approach to executive selection. In R. Jeanneret and R. Silzer (Eds.), Individual Psychological Assessment, 228-242. NY: Jossey-Bass.

London, M. & Smither, J. L. (1995). Can multi – source feedback change self-evaluations, skill development, and performance? Theory based applications and directions for research. Personnel Psychology, 48, 803-840.

London, M., & Tornow, W. W. (1998). 360-Degree feedback: More than a tool. In W. W. Tornow and M. London (Eds.), Maximizing the Value of 360 – Degree Feedback, 1-8, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Lord, R. G., Brown, D. J., Freiberg, S. J. (1999). Understanding the dynamics of leadership: The role of follower self-concepts in the leader/follower relationship. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 78(3), 167-203.

Lowe, K. B., Kroeck, K. G., & Sivasubramanian, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review. Leadership Quarterly, 7, 385-425.

McCall, M. W., Jr., Lombardo, M. M., & Morrison, A.M. (1988). The Lessons of Experience: How Successful Executives Develop on the Job. San Franciso: New Lexington Press.

McCauly, C. D., & Douglas, C. A. (1998). Developmental relationships. In McCauley, D. C., Moxley, R. S., & Van Velsor, E. (Eds.) (1998). The Centre for Creative Leadership Handbook of Organizational Development, 160-193. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

McCauley, C. D., Moxley, R. S., & Van Velsor, E. (Eds.) (1998). The Centre for Creative Leadership Handbook of Organizational Development, preface, xiv. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

McClelland, D. C., & Boyatzis, R. E. (1982). Leadership motive pattern and long term success in management. Journal of Applied psychology, 67, 737-743.

Meyer, E. C. (1997). Leadership: A return to basics. Military Review, 77(1), 58-61.

Motowidlo, S. J. (2000). Some basic issues related to contextual performance and organizational citizenship behaviour in human resource management. Human Resource Management Review, 10 (1). 115-126.

Muchinsky, P. M. (2000). Psychology Applied to Work, 6th Ed. CA: Wadsworth.

Meyer, E. C. (1997). Leadership: A return to basics. Military Review, 77(1), 58-61.

Organ, D.W. (1977). A reappraisal and reinterpretation of the satisfaction-causes-performance hypothesis. Academy of Management Review, 2, (1), 46 –53.

Organ, D.W. (1988). Organizational citizenship behaviors: the good soldier syndrome. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Organ, D.W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct clean-up time. Human Performance, 10 (2), 85 –97.

Pearlman, K., & Barney, M.F. (2000). Selection for a changing workplace. In J. Hehoe (Ed.). Managing Selection in Changing Organizations (pp. 3-72). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Pfeffer, J. (1977). The ambiguity of leadership. Academy of Management Review, 2, 104-112.

Pritchard, K. H. (1999). Competency-based leadership for the 21st century. Military Review, May-June, 23-26.

Popper, M., Landau, O., & Gluskinso, U. M. (1992). The Israeli Defence Forces: An example of transformational leadership. Leadership and Organization Development Journal 13(1), 3-8.

Popper, M., & Lipshitz, R. (1993). Putting leadership theory to work: A conceptual framework for theory-based leadership development. Leadership and organizational Development Journal, 14, 23-27.

Quinones, M. A., Ford, J. K., Teachout, M. S. (1995). The relationship between work experience and job performance. A conceptual and meta-analytic review. Personnel Psychology, 48(4), 887-910.

Ready, D. A., Vicere, A. A., & White, A. F. (1994). Linking executive education to strategic Imperatives. Management Learning, 25, 563-578.

Rowe, P. M., Williams, M. C., & Day, A. L. (1994). Selection procedures in North America. International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 2, 74-79.

Ryan, A. M., & Sackett, P.R. (1987). A survey of individual assessment practices by I/O psychologists. Personnel Psychology, 40, 455-488.

Ryan, A. M., & Sackett, P.R. (1992) Relationship between graduate training, professional affiliation, and individual psychological assessment practices for personnel decisions. Personnel Psychology, 45, 363-385.

Ryan, A. M., & Sackett, P.R. (1998). Individual assessment: The research base. In R. Jeanneret and R. Silzer (Eds.), Individual Psychological Assessment, 54-87 NY: Jossey-Bass.

Salam, S., Cox, J. F., & Sims, H. P. (1997). In the eye of the beholder: How leadership relates to 360-degree performance ratings. Group and Organizational management, 22, 185-209.

Schippman, J. S., Prien, E. P., & Katz, J. A. (1990). Reliability and validity of in-basket performance. Personnel Psychology, 43, 837-859.

Schmidt, F. L., & Hunter, J. E. (1998). The validity and utility of selection models in personnel psychology: Practical and theoretical implications of 85 years of research findings. Psychological Bulletin, 124, 262-274.

Seibert, K. W., Hall, D. T., & Kram, K. E. (1995). Strengthening the weak link in executive development: Integrating individual development and global business strategy. Human Resource Management, 34(4), 549-567.

Siebold, G. L., & Lindsay, T.J. (2000). The relation between demographic descriptors, and solder perceived cohesion and motivation. Military Psychology, 11(1), 109-128.

Silzer, R. (1998). Shaping organizational leadership: The ripple effect of assessment. In R. Jeanneret and R. Silzer (Eds.), Individual Psychological Assessment, 391-444. NY: Jossey-Bass.

Shamir, B., & Ben-Ari, E. (1999). Leadership in an open army? Civilian connections, interorganizational frameworks, and changes in military leadership. In J. G. Hunt, G. E. Dodge, & Wong, L. (Eds.), Out of the Box Leadership: Transforming the Twenty-First-Century Army and Other Top-Performing Organizations. (15-40). Stamford, CT: JAI.

Shamir, B., Zakay, E., Breinin, E., Popper, M. (1998). Correlates of charismatic leader behavior in military units: Subordinates' attitudes, unit characteristics, and superiors' appraisals of leader performance. Academy of Management Journal, 41(4), 387-409.

Shippmann, J.S., Ash, R.A., Battista, M., Carr, L., Eyde, L.D., Hesketh, B., Kehoe, J., Pearlman, K., & Prien, E.P. (2000). The practice of competency modeling. Personnel Psychology, 53, 703-740.

Smith, C.A., Organ, D.W., & Near, J.P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. Journal of Applied Psychology, 68 (4), 653-663.

Smither, J. L., London, M., Vasilopoulos, N., Reilly, R.R., Millsap, R.E., & Salvemini,N. (1995). An examination of the effects of an upward feedback program over time. Personnel Psychology, 48, 1-34.

Spencer, L. M., & Spencer, S. M. (1993). Competence at Work. NY: John Wiley.

Steele, W. M., & Walters, R. P. (2001). Training and developing leaders in a transforming army. Military Review, September-October, 2-11.

Sullivan, G. R. (1999). Forward: From theory to Practice. In J. G. Hunt, G. E. Dodge, & Wong, L. (Eds.), Out of the Box Leadership: Transforming the Twenty-First-Century Army and Other Top-Performing Organizations. (xv-xxiii). Stamford, CT: JAI.

Tett, R. P., Guterman, H. A., Bleier, A., & Murphy, P. J. (2000). Development and content validation of a hyperdimensional taxonomy of managerial competence. Human Performance, 13, 205-251.

Thach, L., & Heinselman, T. (1999). Executive coaching defined. Training and Develolopment, 53, 34-40.

Thornton, G., & Byham, W. (1982). Assessment Centres and Managerial Performance. New York: Academic Press.

Tornow, W. W. (1993). Perspectives of reality: Is multi-perspective measurement a means or an end? Human Resource Management, 32,221-229.

Tziner, A. (1999). The relationship between distal and proximal factors and the use of political considerations in performance appraisal. Journal of Business and Psychology, 1, 217-231.

Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection. (1978). Federal Register 43: 38290-315.

United States Army (1990). Field Manuel 22-100, Military Leadership, 31 July 1990. Washington, DC: Headquaters, Department of the Army.

Van Velsor, E., & Guthrie, V. A. (1998). Enhancing the ability to learn from experience. In C. D. McCauley, R. S. Moxley & E. Van Velsor (Eds.). The Centre for Creative Leadership Handbook of Leadership Development, 242-261. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Van Veslor, E., & Leslie, J. B. (1995). Why executives derail: perspectives across time and culture. Academy of Management Executive, 9, 62-72.

Van Velsor, E., McCauley, C .D., & Moxley R. S. (1998). Our view of leadership development. In C. D. McCauley, R. S. Moxley & E. Van Velsor (Eds.). The Centre for Creative Leadership Handbook of Leadership Development, 1-25. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Waldham, D.A., Bass, B.M., & Einstein, W.O. (1987). Leadership and outcomes of the performance appraisal process. Journal of occupational Psychology, 60, 177-186.

Wong, L., & Duran, C. A. (1999). Postscript: Leadership and organizational overtones of the twenty-first-century army. In J. G. Hunt, G. E. Dodge, & Wong, L. (Eds.), Out of the Box Leadership: Transforming the Twenty-First-Century Army and Other Top-Performing Organizations. (277-283). Stamford, CT: JAI.

Yukl, G. (1999). Leadership competencies required for the new army and approaches for developing them. In J. G. Hunt, G. E. Dodge, & Wong, L. (Eds.), Out of the Box Leadership: Transforming the Twenty-First-Century Army and Other Top-Performing Organizations. (255-276). Stamford, CT: JAI.

Yukl, G., & Van Fleet, D. (1992). Theory and research on leadership in organizations. In M.D. Dunette and L.M. Hough (Eds.). Handbook of I/O Psychology Vol 3. 147-199. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists.

Yukl, G. (1989). Leadership in Organizations (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Zaccaro, S. J. (1996). Models and theories of executive leadership. A conceptual/empirical review and integration. Alexandria, VA: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioural and Social Science.

Zenger, J., Ulrich, D., & Smallwood, N. (2000). The new leadership development. Training and Development, March, 22-27.