



HIGH POTENTIAL TALENT REPORT

# TECHNICAL MANUAL

Core competencies for emerging leadership



**Hogan High Potential Talent Report  
Technical Manual**

Hogan Assessment Systems  
Tulsa, OK 74120, USA

2017

© 2017 Hogan Assessment Systems, Inc.

No part of this work may be copied or transferred to  
any other form of expression without the expressed  
written consent of Hogan Assessment Systems, Inc.

Hogan Personality Inventory™

Hogan Development Survey™

Motives, Values, Preferences Inventory™

Are exclusive registered trademarks of  
Hogan Assessment Systems, Inc.

[hoganassessments.com](http://hoganassessments.com)



# CONTENTS

<b>1. Conceptual Background</b>	<b>9</b>
1.1 Introduction	9
1.2 The History Of Succession Planning	9
1.3 Succession Planning In Business	10
1.4 The Politics Of Potential	10
1.4.1 Emergence ≠ Effectiveness	11
1.5 The Science Of Potential	11
1.5.1 Bright-Side Personality	12
1.5.2 Personality Derailers	12
1.5.3 Motives, Values, & Preferences	12
1.6 Current State Of High-Potential Research	13
<b>2. The Hogan High Potential Model</b>	<b>14</b>
2.1 Potential For What?	14
2.2 What To Measure	14
2.3 Defining Competencies	15
2.4 Leadership Foundations	16
2.4.1 Getting Along	17
2.4.2 Thinking Broadly	17
2.4.3 Following Process	17
2.5 Leadership Emergence	17
2.5.1 Standing Out	18
2.5.2 Building Connections	18
2.5.3 Influencing Others	18
2.6 Leadership Effectiveness	18
2.6.1 Leading People	19
2.6.2 Leading The Business	19
2.6.3 Managing Resources	19
2.7 Assessing The Model	19
2.8 Developing Competency Algorithms	20
2.9 The Hogan Difference	21
2.10 Using The Hogan High Potential Model	21





<b>3. Psychometric Properties Of Hogan High Potential Model Competencies &amp; Dimensions</b>	<b>23</b>
3.1 Descriptive Statistics	23
3.2 Distribution Of Hogan High Potential Competency & Dimension Scores	24
3.3 Test-Retest Reliabilities	25
3.4 Intercorrelations Between Hogan High Potential Model Competencies & Dimensions	26
<b>4. Validity</b>	<b>28</b>
4.1 Construct Validity	28
4.1.1 Procedure And Sample	28
4.1.2 Instruments	28
4.1.3 Results Of Scale To Scale Correlates	30
4.2 Correlations With Others' Descriptions	36
4.2.1 Procedures, Samples, And Instruments	36
4.2.2 Results Of Observer Description Correlates	37
4.3 Criterion-Related Validity	47
4.3.1 Procedure	47
4.3.2 Criterion Results For Hogan High Potential Competencies	47
<b>5. Analysis Of Adverse Impact For The Hogan High Potential Model</b>	<b>50</b>
5.1 Introduction	50
5.2 Defining Adverse Impact	50
5.3 Adverse Impact And The Hogan High Potential Model	50
5.3.1 Age Differences	50
5.3.2 Sex Differences	52
5.3.3 Race/Ethnicity Differences	52
5.4 Adverse Impact Analysis in the Operational Use Of The Hogan High Potential Model	54
5.4.1 Selecting High-Potential Employees Using Foundations, Emergence, & Effectiveness	55
5.4.2 Selecting High-Potential Employees Using Emergence And Effectiveness	55
5.4.3 Selecting High-Potential Employees Using Leadership Emergence	56
5.4.4 Selecting High-Potential Employees Using Leadership Effectiveness	57
5.4.5 Selecting High-Potential Employees Using Leadership Foundations	57
<b>References</b>	<b>59</b>
<b>Appendix A: Sample Hogan High Potential Talent Report</b>	<b>66</b>
<b>Appendix B: Complete Correlation Matrices for Hogan High Potential Competencies and Dimensions</b>	<b>90</b>



## TABLES & FIGURES

Table 2.1 Initial Competency Mappings from Hogan Competency Model	15
Figure 2.1 Hogan High Potential Model	16
Table 3.1 Classical Scale Statistics for Hogan High Potential Model Competencies & Dimensions	23
Table 3.2 Distribution of Hogan High Potential Competency & Dimension Scores across Levels	24
Table 3.3 Test-Retest Reliability Estimates for Hogan High Potential Competency & Dimension Scores	25
Table 3.4 Correlations between Hogan High Potential Model Competencies & Dimensions	26
Table 4.1 Construct Validity Evidence for Getting Along Competency	30
Table 4.2 Construct Validity Evidence for Thinking Broadly Competency	30
Table 4.3 Construct Validity Evidence for Following Process Competency	31
Table 4.4 Construct Validity Evidence for Leadership Foundations Dimension	31
Table 4.5 Construct Validity Evidence for Standing Out Competency	32
Table 4.6 Construct Validity Evidence for Building Connections Competency	32
Table 4.7 Construct Validity Evidence for Influencing Others Competency	33
Table 4.8 Construct Validity Evidence for Leadership Emergence Dimension	33
Table 4.9 Construct Validity Evidence for Leading People Competency	34
Table 4.10 Construct Validity Evidence for Leading the Business Competency	34
Table 4.11 Construct Validity Evidence for Managing Resources Competency	35
Table 4.12 Construct Validity Evidence for Leadership Effectiveness Dimension	35
Table 4.13 Adjective Checklist Correlates for Constituent Scales of Getting Along Competency	37
Table 4.14 Hogan 360° Correlates of Getting Along Competency	38
Table 4.15 Adjective Checklist Correlates for Constituent Scales of Thinking Broadly Competency	38
Table 4.16 Hogan 360° Correlates of Thinking Broadly Competency	38
Table 4.17 Adjective Checklist Correlates for Constituent Scales of Following Process Competency	39
Table 4.18 Hogan 360° Correlates of Following Process Competency	39
Table 4.19 Hogan 360° Correlates of Leadership Foundations Dimension	40



Table 4.20 Adjective Checklist Correlates for Constituent Scales of Standing Out Competency	40
Table 4.21 Hogan 360° Correlates of Standing Out Competency	40
Table 4.22 Adjective Checklist Correlates for Constituent Scales of Building Connections Competency	41
Table 4.23 Hogan 360° Correlates of Building Connections Competency	41
Table 4.24 Adjective Checklist Correlates for Constituent Scales of Influencing Others Competency	42
Table 4.25 Hogan 360° Correlates of Influencing Others Competency	42
Table 4.26 Hogan 360° Correlates of Leadership Emergence Dimension	43
Table 4.27 Adjective Checklist Correlates for Constituent Scales of Leading People Competency	43
Table 4.28 Hogan 360° Correlates of Leading People Competency	44
Table 4.29 Adjective Checklist Correlates for Constituent Scales of Leading the Business Competency	44
Table 4.30 Hogan 360° Correlates of Leading the Business Competency	45
Table 4.31 Adjective Checklist Correlates for Constituent Scales of Managing Resources Competency	45
Table 4.32 Hogan 360° Correlates of Managing Resources Competency	45
Table 4.33 Hogan 360° Correlates of Leadership Effectiveness Dimension	46
Table 4.34 Criterion Validity Evidence for Leadership Foundations	48
Table 4.35 Criterion Validity Evidence for Leadership Emergence	48
Table 4.36 Criterion Validity Evidence for Leadership Effectiveness	49
Table 5.1 Mean Differences on Hogan High Potential Model Competencies & Dimensions by Age	51
Table 5.2 Mean Differences on Hogan High Potential Model Competencies & Dimensions by Sex	52
Table 5.3 Mean Differences on Hogan High Potential Model Competencies by Race/Ethnicity	53
Table 5.4 Recommended Selection Decision Rule for Using Leadership Foundations, Emergence, & Effectiveness	55
Table 5.5 Selection and Adverse Impact Ratios for Using Leadership Foundations, Emergence, & Effectiveness	55
Table 5.6 Recommended Selection Decision Rule for Using Leadership Emergence and Effectiveness	55
Table 5.7 Selection and Adverse Impact Ratios for Using Leadership Emergence and Effectiveness	56
Table 5.8 Recommended Selection Decision Rule for Using Leadership Emergence	56
Table 5.9 Selection and Adverse Impact Ratios for Using Leadership Emergence	56



Table 5.10 Recommended Selection Decision Rule for Using Leadership Effectiveness	57
Table 5.11 Selection and Adverse Impact Ratios for Using Leadership Effectiveness	57
Table 5.12 Recommended Selection Decision Rule for Using Leadership Foundations	57
Table 5.13 Selection and Adverse Impact Ratios for Using Leadership Foundations	58
Table B.1 Correlations with International Personality Item Pool (IPIP) Scales	90
Table B.2 Correlations with HEXACO Honesty-Humility Scale & Subscales	90
Table B.3 Correlations with Inventory of Personality Characteristics (ICP-7) Scales	90
Table B.4 Correlations with MACH-IV Scale & Subscales	91
Table B.5 Correlations with Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI) Scale & Subscales	91
Table B.6 Correlations with Personality Inventory for DSM-5 (PID-5) Scales	92
Table B.7 Correlations with Grit Scale & Subscales	93
Table B.8 Correlations with Hogan Judgment Report Scales	93
Table B.9 Correlations with Long Term Strategic Thinking (LTST) Scores	93
Table B.10 Correlations with Hogan Business Reasoning Inventory (HBRI) Scales	93
Table B.11 Correlations with Relationship Questionnaire (RQ) Scales	94
Table B.12 Correlations between Getting Along Competency Scores and Hogan 360° Ratings	94
Table B.13 Correlations between Thinking Broadly Competency Scores and Hogan 360° Ratings	95
Table B.14 Correlations between Following Process Competency Scores and Hogan 360° Ratings	96
Table B.15 Correlations between Leadership Foundations Dimension Scores and Hogan 360° Ratings	97
Table B.16 Correlations between Standing Out Competency Scores and Hogan 360° Ratings	98
Table B.17 Correlations between Building Connections Competency Scores and Hogan 360° Ratings	99
Table B.18 Correlations between Influencing Others Competency Scores and Hogan 360° Ratings	100
Table B.19 Correlations between Leadership Emergence Dimension Scores and Hogan 360° Ratings	101
Table B.20 Correlations between Leading People Competency Scores and Hogan 360° Ratings	102
Table B.21 Correlations between Leading the Business Competency Scores and Hogan 360° Ratings	103
Table B.22 Correlations between Managing Resources Competency Scores and Hogan 360° Ratings	104
Table B.23 Correlations between Leadership Effectiveness Dimension Scores and Hogan 360° Ratings	105



# I. CONCEPTUAL BACKGROUND

## 1.1 Introduction

From ancient hunter-gatherer societies to modern high-tech, global organizations, succession planning has always been critical to the success and sustainability of groups and organizations. Hogan's High Potential Report provides information about the individual attributes that predict leadership success. This is particularly important when organizations identify individuals as high-potential employees or devote scarce resources to their development. Here we outline the history and theory behind the Hogan High Potential Report and the importance of formal succession planning.

## 1.2 The History of Succession Planning

From an evolutionary perspective, we know that people evolved as group-living and culture-using animals (Carson, 1969; Leary, 1957; Sullivan, 1953; Wiggins, 1979). This suggests that the most important human motives facilitate group living and enable individual survival. Group living consists of social interaction, which often involves negotiating for acceptance and status, and some people are more effective at these activities than others.

Socioanalytic theory (Hogan, 1983, 1991, 1996) tries to explain individual differences in interpersonal effectiveness and rests on two key generalizations: people always live and/or work in groups, and groups are always organized into status hierarchies. These generalizations imply that individuals are all fundamentally motivated to *get along* with others to gain social acceptance, and to *get ahead* or achieve status in the hierarchy. These are familiar themes in personality psychology (Adler, 1939; Bakan, 1966; Rank, 1945; Wiggins & Trapnell, 1996).

Human groups have always used formal and informal mechanisms to identify high-potential individuals and groom them for success. In hunter-gatherer civilizations, elders probably identified promising young hunter/warriors and developed them into future tribal leaders. If they succeeded, the tribe would flourish; if they failed, the tribe would either fracture from the inside or be conquered from the outside.

History highlights the importance of succession planning. In 323 BC, Alexander the Great died in Babylon with several wives but no living heir, leaving behind an enormous empire and a succession crisis. Because the Macedonian monarchy lacked rules of succession, Alexander's death ushered in a period of sustained infighting among key advisers, military leaders, and other political factions. Within ten years, Alexander's empire fragmented from within (Grainger, 2009).

Similarly, despite Abraham Lincoln's successes as President, he committed a leadership error with serious reverberations by selecting Andrew Johnson as his Vice President. Most historians agree that Lincoln's vice presidential choice was disastrous. Dissipated, self-indulgent, and dull-witted, President Johnson was ill-suited for the demands of the presidency and his signature accomplishment was narrowly (i.e., by one vote) averting impeachment. The fact that Lincoln, widely regarded as America's greatest President, made such an error shows that even the best leaders can make serious mistakes when identifying future leaders (Strock, 2015).





### 1.3 Succession Planning in Business

Although average CEO tenure is just six years (Boyle, 2009), news reports consistently highlight the struggles of the world's largest companies to appoint successful new CEOs (George, 2007). However, some companies take leadership development and CEO succession seriously and are more successful in their efforts. For example, The December 21, 2010 *Wall Street Journal* reported that "...3M rose 97 cents, or 1.1% to 87.34 following reports that the company is working with Chief Executive George Buckley on a succession plan" (Hagerty & Tita, 2010). This suggests that the marketplace rewards those companies that develop high-potential employees as future leaders and punish those that do not.

Most global companies (i.e., 98%) regard succession planning as a vital piece of overall corporate governance, but far fewer (i.e., 35%) have a formal succession plan in place (Korn/Ferry Survey, 2010). Why the disconnect? It is in part because many CEOs regard succession planning the same way they do personal estate planning. They love their job, it defines their identity, and consequently, they view building a cohort of future leaders as hastening their own exit. Some may even view talented subordinates as threats to purge, not talented leaders to develop (Ogden & Wood, 2008). In other cases, corporate boards may overlook developing future leaders if the current CEO accomplishes financial goals and pleases Wall Street (Nocera, 2010). Poor relationships between CEOs and board members, the lack of a well-defined process, poorly defined ownership over succession planning responsibilities, a scarcity of talent, or an inability to objectively assess potential internal candidates may also impede the talent development process (Cascio, 2011).

Nonetheless, succession planning is more important than ever. The 21st century workplace is smaller, faster, and more demanding due to globalization, the pace of technological innovation, and the war for talent. Recognizing these issues, many organizations prioritize talent identification and development to facilitate sustained organizational success (Burke, 1997). One might expect organizations would rely on assessment-based research to develop high-potential employees, but this has not always been the case. The problem is politics.

### 1.4 The Politics of Potential

Succession planning starts by identifying high-potential employees as candidates for future leadership roles. The organization then devotes time, material, personnel, and financial resources to develop them. However, this won't work if politics guide these decisions. Specifically, supervisors often only nominate employees who are socially skilled, visible, and pleasant to work with for leadership roles, overlooking other qualified candidates.

However, just because leaders find certain individuals rewarding to deal with doesn't mean they are future leaders. In a meta-analysis of personality and leadership perceptions, Lord, de Vader, and Alliger (1986) noted that high-potential nominations based on perceptions of leader emergence disproportionately identify dominant males, inadvertently stifling racial/ethnic diversity and gender equality. Also, such processes tend to identify politicians and overlook otherwise qualified employees who are less successful at getting themselves noticed by senior management. Thus, these processes devote too much attention to emergence and not enough attention to actual leadership effectiveness.



### 1.4.1 Emergence ≠ Effectiveness

Rising through the ranks of an organization resembles climbing a ladder: the skills needed to climb the ladder (e.g., strength) aren't the same as the skills needed to stay at the top (e.g., balance). Similarly, the skills required to emerge as a leader aren't the same as those required to perform effectively as one.

For example, Luthans and colleagues (e.g., Luthans, 1988; Luthans, Hodgetts, & Rosenkrantz, 1988; Luthans, Rosenkrantz, & Hennessey, 1985) compared the work activities of *successful* managers (i.e., those promoted quickly) versus *effective* managers (i.e., those with committed subordinates and high performing teams) by studying 437 managers for a year, gathering observations, ratings, and assessment data. They found that successful managers spent their time *managing up* by networking and politicking, whereas effective managers spent their time *managing down* by guiding subordinates and driving team performance. Moreover, only 10% of these groups overlapped. In other words, only 10% of managers who excel at networking and leveraging organizational politics are also effective at building and maintaining high-performing teams. These findings imply that organizations that confuse emergent behaviors for effective leadership with high-potential employees may overlook their most effective leaders.

Collins (2001) compared companies that had sustained above-average financial performance with those that had consistent below-average performance. He identified seven characteristics of high performing companies that made the transition from good to great, and leadership topped the list. Collins described persistence as one characteristic of great leaders. Somewhat surprisingly, he found that humility also characterized high performing leaders. Great leaders not only work tirelessly, but also direct attention to their employees rather than themselves. Humble leaders who put their people first tend not to stand out. As a result, some high-potential processes may actually *prevent* companies from identifying their best leadership talent.

As the foregoing discussion suggests, organizations may fail in their efforts to identify and develop high-potential employees if their processes identify emergent rather than effective leaders. The good news is that companies can use science to replace politics and increase the power of their high-potential programs.

## 1.5 The Science of Potential

Although the high-potential research literature is still growing and generalizability is limited, some studies suggest political processes are declining and assessment-based procedures are on the rise. In one of the few objective studies of high-potential programs conducted with a large independent sample of organizations, Church and Rotolo (2013) found that 70% of top companies use assessments to identify and develop key organizational talent, and commonly include personality, values/interests, multisource feedback inventories, and engagement surveys.

In a follow-up benchmark study, Church, Rotolo, Ginther, and Levine (2015) investigated the general characteristics, assessment practices, and outcomes of high-potential programs. They noted that, although past and current performance are still commonly used to define high performers, assessments are increasingly being used to identify high-potential employees, target their development needs, and facilitate succession planning. Most organizations reported that using assessments moderately improved performance within 12 to 18 months. In other words, top development companies use assessments, and the perceived impact of these practices is high. Because assessment of personality and other individual differences (e.g., values & interests) is a key factor in these programs, we discuss the value of these assessments next.



### 1.5.1 Bright-Side Personality

Decades of research show that the Five-Factor Model (FFM; Digman, 1990; Goldberg, 1992; John, 1990; McCrae & Costa, 1987) of personality predicts a range of workplace outcomes, including overall performance ratings, objective performance, and task performance across jobs (Barrick, Mount, & Judge, 2001; Dudley, Orvis, Lebiecki, & Cortina, 2006; Hogan & Holland, 2003; Hurtz & Donovan, 2000). Personality variables also predict teamwork and team performance (Barrick, Mount, & Judge, 2001; Hogan & Holland, 2003; Peeters, Van Tuijl, Rutte, & Reymen, 2006), with Agreeableness being the strongest predictor of group performance (Bell, 2007; Mount, Barrick, & Stewart, 1998). Bradley, Baur, Banford, and Postlethwaite (2013) report that highly agreeable teams outperform other teams through increased communication, which facilitates greater cohesion over time.

In high-potential populations, FFM measures predict leader emergence and effectiveness, transformational leadership behavior, overall managerial effectiveness, promotion, and managerial level (Bono & Judge, 2004; Hough, Ones, & Viswesvaran, 1998; Judge, Bono, Ilies, & Gerhardt, 2002).

### 1.5.2 Personality Derailers

V. Jon Bentz (1967, 1985a, 1985b, 1990) conducted the first serious study of managerial derailment. In a 30-year study of failed managers at Sears, he observed that otherwise intelligent and skilled managers failed due to "overriding personality defects" including difficulties building teams, delegating to subordinates, dealing with complexity, and maintaining relationships. Other problems concerned failing to learn from experience, being overly reactive, and making emotional decisions. McCall and Lombardo (1983) replicated these findings in interviews with successful versus failed executives across three U.S. based industrial organizations.

Hogan and colleagues (Arneson, Milliken-Davies, & Hogan, 1993; R. Hogan & Hogan, 2001; R. Hogan, Raskin, & Fazzini, 1990) added further empirical support to these insights, finding that scores on personality derailers predicted performance in professional and leadership jobs above and beyond Five-Factor Model scales, but in a negative direction. Moscoso and Salgado (2004) investigated relationships between personality derailers and task and contextual performance, and found seven dysfunctional personality styles (i.e. suspicious, shy, sad, pessimistic, sufferer, eccentric, risky) that negatively predicted job performance. Others found a link between narcissism and counterproductive work behaviors (Judge, LePine, & Rich, 2006; Lee, Ashton, & Shin, 2005; Penney & Spector, 2002).

Because identifying and developing high-potential employees as future organizational leaders is so important, any intervention for this population should include an assessment of personality derailers.

### 1.5.3 Motives, Values, & Preferences

Organizations often include measures of values and interests to assess core drivers and motivators with their high-potential employees. Over 80 years of research indicates that interest scores collected at time 1 predict occupational membership (Strong, 1935, 1943) several years later. Researchers have replicated these findings across a variety of samples and methods (e.g., Bartling & Hood, 1981; Brandt & Hood, 1968; Cairo, 1982; Campbell, 1966; Dolliver, Irvin, & Bigley, 1972; Dolliver & Will, 1977; Gade & Soliah, 1975; Hansen, 1986; Hansen & Swanson, 1983; Lau & Abrahams, 1971; Worthington & Dolliver, 1977; Zytowski, 1976).

Values and interests also predict productivity, job satisfaction, and satisfactoriness, or the degree to which others at work view a person's performance as satisfactory. For example, Barge and Hough (1988) used archival records to determine the relationships between interests and productivity, and found a median correlation



of .33. The authors also cite 18 studies showing a median correlation of .31 between personal interests and job satisfaction and .20 between interests and satisfactoriness.

Finally, high-potential employees will also influence an organization's climate once promoted to leadership positions. Holland (1985) noted that any work environment reflects the characteristics of its members. So if we know the values and interests of the members of a group, we can predict the type of climate the group will create. Similarly, Schneider (1987) argued that organizations attract, select, and retain particular types of people and that organizational climate is the key to this process. Thus, values and interest measures can help evaluate the alignment between individual values and organizational culture and forecast the type of culture that high-potential employees are likely to create as future leaders.

### 1.6 Current State of High-Potential Research

When identifying high-potential talent, we recommend assessing employees' bright-side personality characteristics, potential derailers, and core values and interests. Such an approach builds on key strengths and identifies gaps in the talent pipeline. Although work by Church and colleagues (Church & Rotolo, 2013; Church, Rotolo, Ginther, & Levine, 2015) demonstrates that companies are increasingly using assessments for these purposes, there is still much room for improvement.

For example, Church and colleagues note that organizations still rely heavily on past and current performance to determine potential levels for their employees. As Martin and Schmidt (2010) noted, the old saying "past performance is the best predictor of future performance" may be true for lateral shifts with similar requirements, but it is not necessarily true for promotion into positions with very different requirements. Although performance and potential often trend together, employees may sometimes underperform because they are not sufficiently challenged by their current work. In other instances, excellent work in current roles may represent an employee's maximum potential, and they may fail at higher levels of responsibility. Researchers refer to this as the performance-potential paradox (Church & Wacławski, 2009).

Regarding high-potential research, Silzer and Church (2009) note that, although organizations are increasingly replacing potentially biased supervisor nominations with scientifically valid assessments, concepts of potential still vary widely across organizations. The components of potential also vary widely, and include such constructs as leadership competencies, motivation, learning agility, executive presence, communication skills, and functional/technical skills.

There is also disagreement about whether to share designations of potential with employees, which might engage those tapped as high-potential at the expense of disengaging the employees not so designated. Some also question being able to assess a construct (i.e., potential) that may exist only as *possibility*. Finally, professionals continue to debate about what elements of potential are common across cultures, industry sectors, organizations, and jobs, as opposed to the elements that are specific to them.

What is needed is a rigorous, assessment-based solution to identify high-potential employees based on foundational leadership skills, emergent behaviors, and key metrics of leadership effectiveness. Such a solution should also be flexible to industry-, organization-, or job-specific elements. Organizations can then leverage this information to ensure that future leaders are rewarding to deal with, viewed by others as a natural leader, and able to build and lead teams that can consistently outperform the competition.



## 2. THE HOGAN HIGH POTENTIAL MODEL

### 2.1 Potential for What?

Before organizations can identify and develop high-potential employees for future leadership roles, they must define *potential*. Does potential mean the ability to perform at one level above an employee's current role? Two levels? Does potential mean the ability to lead a different functional area, to lead the entire organization, or something else? By trying to answer this question in a manner that satisfies people across all departments and job levels, many organizations develop complex concepts of potential that satisfy no one.

We define leadership *potential* as the ability to build and lead teams that can consistently outperform the competition. This requires a set of personal attributes that form the basis for career effectiveness. Before people can lead others, they must first demonstrate their ability to contribute to a team and establish a reputation for being dependable and productive. Next, they must cultivate a leader-like impression by standing out, building connections with others, and exercising influence. Finally, they must be able to attract, retain, and develop talented team members, secure and allocate resources effectively, and move the team toward strategic business goals. In terms of the Pareto principle, these leaders are the 20% of employees who do 80% of the work.

Recent research (Church & Rotolo, 2013; Church, Rotolo, Ginther, & Levine, 2015; Silzer & Church, 2009) demonstrates the value of using validated assessments to identify leadership potential. This involves assessing individual differences in normal and derailing personality dimensions, and core motives, values, and interests as part of identifying and developing talent. Because supervisory nominations tend to favor dominant males and stifle gender equality and racial/ethnic diversity (Lord, de Vader, & Alliger, 1986), replacing supervisor ratings with assessments also helps promote social justice in high-potential programs.

### 2.2 What to Measure

The first question to ask in developing a high-potential assessment is, "What should we measure?" To answer this question, we assembled a group of eight Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) with advanced degrees in Industrial-Organizational Psychology and related fields who met for three days to discuss the topic. These experts, with 175 years of combined applied experience, discussed high-potential solutions currently available to practitioners, gaps in those models, and a tentative Hogan model. They compared current high-potential models to research on high-potential employees and personality, values, and leadership. From this, they identified strengths, weaknesses, and key areas missing from existing high-potential models.

For example, most existing models overlook key capabilities identified in the research literature (e.g., being rewarding to deal with, thinking strategically, and being conscientious and dependable). These themes are foundational attributes that help employees get noticed – they represent Leadership Foundations, the first broad dimension of our model.

In addition, many existing models focus on the characteristics needed to build professional networks, influence others, stand out from peers, and leverage organizational politics. These concern Leadership Emergence, the second broad dimension of our model.

Finally, many models ignore actual performance as a leaders, despite the fact that being *successful* versus *effective* as a manager involves different activities (Luthans, 1988; Luthans, Hodgetts, & Rosenkrantz, 1988;





Luthans, Rosenkrantz, & Hennessey, 1985). This includes the ability to build and maintain high-performing teams to accomplish key business goals. These activities concern Leadership Effectiveness, the third broad dimension of our model.

## 2.3 Defining Competencies

Next, the project team identified the specific competencies that define (a) Leadership Foundations, (b) Leadership Emergence, and (c) Leadership Effectiveness. They reviewed the comprehensive set of competencies contained in the Hogan Competency Model (Hogan Assessment Systems, 2009a) and aligned them with Leadership Foundations, Emergence, and Effectiveness. Four experts with advanced degrees in Industrial-Organizational Psychology and a combined 33 years of applied experience independently mapped the competencies to each dimension. Then the entire team met to discuss mappings and reach consensus. Table 2.1 presents the initial competency mappings from the Hogan Competency Model to the Hogan High Potential Model.

**Table 2.1** Initial Competency Mappings from Hogan Competency Model

Leadership Foundations	Leadership Emergence	Leadership Effectiveness
Accountability	Competing with Others	Attracting Talent
Caring About People	Displaying Confidence	Decision Making
Dependability	Driving for Results	Delegating
Detail Focus	Influencing Others	Developing People
Flexibility	Negotiating	Driving Change
Handling Stress	Networking	Driving Performance
Leveraging People Skills	Political Savvy	Driving Strategy
Organizational Citizenship	Presenting to Others	Leading Others
Overcoming Obstacles	Relationship Building	Managing Conflict
Positive Attitude	Taking Initiative	Managing Resources
Professionalism	Taking Smart Risks	Planning & Organizing
Rule Compliance		Setting Goals
Self Development		Team Building
Self-Management		
Solving Problems		
Teamwork		
Working Hard		

Next, the team identified the competencies that are most critical for performance in professional, managerial, and executive jobs. They used information from our Job Evaluation Tool (JET), an extensively researched, reliable, and valid worker-oriented job analysis tool (Foster, Gaddis, & Hogan, 2012). The JET archive includes data from over 18,000 respondents representing thousands of jobs (Hogan Assessment Systems, 2009b). The JET includes a Competency Evaluation Tool (CET), which contains items representing the 62 competencies in the Hogan Competency Model. The CET asks SMEs to rate the degree to which each competency is needed for successful performance in a particular job. SME ratings allow us to compare competencies across jobs (J. Hogan, Davies, & R. Hogan, 2007). Using the CET, raters evaluate each competency using a five-point scale ranging from 0 (*Not associated with job performance*) to 4 (*Critical to job performance*). Competencies deemed job-critical must receive an average score of at least 3 (*Important to performance*) across SMEs.



Using JET data, we calculated mean ratings for each of the 62 competencies within each study for managerial and executive performance, and then aggregated these study-level results. This means that each study contributed only one data point for each competency. This produced average criticality ratings for all 62 competencies; we used these ratings to identify the most critical competencies for the Leadership Foundations, Leadership Emergence, and Leadership Effectiveness dimensions of our model. Figure 2.1 presents the Hogan High Potential Model, and we explain the broad dimensions and specific competencies of the model next.

**Figure 2.1** Hogan High Potential Model



### 2.4 Leadership Foundations

Leadership Foundations concern the degree to which people are rewarding to deal with and good organizational citizens. These attributes form the building blocks for career effectiveness. Before people can lead others, they must be able to contribute to a team and be seen as dependable and productive. These attributes capture behaviors that get an employee noticed as a promising employee in whom the organization should devote developmental resources.

Low scores on Leadership Foundations do not predict an inability to lead. Instead, they indicate that others may find a person abrasive, rebellious, or overly tactical. When such people assume leadership roles, they tend to alienate their staff because they are hard to get along with, unpredictable, and/or micro-manage others. That is, they may have difficulty establishing and maintaining relationships with subordinates.

Conversely, high scores on Leadership Foundations will facilitate a person's transition into leadership roles. They often have a reputation for being easy to talk to, strategic, and committed to the organization and its members. In leadership roles, these individuals may find it easier to build teams of highly committed subordinates.

The three competencies that define Leadership Foundations are Getting Along, Thinking Broadly, and Following Process.



### 2.4.1 Getting Along

Getting Along concerns being cooperative, pleasant, and rewarding to deal with in interpersonal interactions. Others often view people with low scores on this competency as blunt, direct, willing to challenge others, and perhaps even confrontational. They seem candid and willing to disagree with those above them. People with higher scores seem friendly, tactful, diplomatic, and savvy when dealing with others, who often see them as warm and charming.

### 2.4.2 Thinking Broadly

Thinking Broadly concerns being able to solve a wide range of business-related problems by adopting a strategic perspective and thinking outside the box. People with lower scores often seem grounded, pragmatic, tactical, and less visionary. Others see them as action-oriented, preferring to learn from experience and to work on detailed tasks. People with higher scores seem inventive, open-minded, strategic, and visionary. Others see them as curious, imaginative, well-informed, and likely to stay up-to-date with new developments in business and technology.

### 2.4.3 Following Process

Following Process concerns complying with organizational rules and respecting conventions. People with lower scores often seem flexible, fast-moving, limit-testing, and perhaps impulsive or reckless. Others see them as unpredictable, but adaptable and comfortable with ambiguity. People with higher scores often seem conscientious, dedicated, dependable, hard-working, careful with details, and reliable.

The Leadership Foundations competencies provide the necessary groundwork on which to build leadership capabilities, but they are insufficient for emergence or effectiveness as a leader. Many people are rewarding to deal with and good organizational citizens, but don't become leaders because they don't stand out from their peers. To become a leader, one must first *look* like a leader. This is the essence of Leadership Emergence, our next dimension.

## 2.5 Leadership Emergence

Leadership Emergence concerns the degree to which people stand out from their peers, build business relationships and networks, exercise influence, and seem leader-like.

Low scores on Leadership Emergence competencies do not mean people can't lead. Rather, lower scores characterize people who tend to keep their heads down, rarely network, and lack a significant voice in organizational decisions. As leaders, they may do best when their subordinates can work independently. If given the opportunity, these individuals may be effective leaders, and in some cases they may be the hidden gems of the organization. However, they require coaching on how to seem leader-like.

Conversely, people with high scores on the Leadership Emergence competencies tend to be regarded as potential or natural leaders. Others see them as self-promoting, well-connected, and influential. In leadership roles, these individuals are likely to stand out from the crowd and draw others to them. However, they should be careful to actually accomplish key objectives to avoid becoming known as a loud but empty suit.

The three competencies that define Leadership Emergence are Standing Out, Building Connections, and Influencing Others.



### 2.5.1 Standing Out

Standing Out concerns making others aware of one's contributions. People with lower scores on this competency often seem more interested in getting results than in being recognized for doing so. They may even be reluctant to call attention to or promote themselves at work. People with higher scores often seem charismatic and comfortable with taking credit for their own – and sometimes others' – work. They seem charming, outgoing, confident, and willing to publicize their accomplishments.

### 2.5.2 Building Connections

Building Connections concerns creating networks and business relationships. People with lower scores often seem independent, self-reliant, and reluctant to depend on others. They tend to have smaller networks and, despite their talent, may be disadvantaged by their low profiles. People with higher scores seem gregarious, outgoing, and concerned about developing and maintaining their network of strategic business contacts.

### 2.5.3 Influencing Others

Influencing Others concerns persuading co-workers to pursue certain desired outcomes. People with lower scores often seem competent and self-reliant, but unable or unwilling to nudge others in a particular direction. Others may think they lack a sense of urgency or are reluctant to push others out of their comfort zones when needed. People with higher scores are willing to take charge, make suggestions, and try to persuade others to follow certain courses of action. They may seem impatient with delays and act with purpose and urgency.

The Leadership Emergence competencies alone won't make a person an effective leader. Many employees may seem leader-like but never succeed in leadership roles, either because they are unrewarding to deal with, or because they are unable to achieve results through others. To lead, one must marshal resources and pursue others to pursue and achieve shared goals. This concerns Leadership Effectiveness, our last but most important dimension.

## 2.6 Leadership Effectiveness

Leadership Effectiveness concerns the degree to which people are able to build and maintain high-performing teams and push those teams to accomplish organizational outcomes. Effective leaders attract, retain, develop, and motivate team members, secure and deploy key resources, remove obstacles to success, and achieve strategic business goals. These activities capture the essence of leadership – moving the business into the future.

People with low scores on Leadership Effectiveness risk potential failure because they tend to struggle to build effective teams and meet critical business objectives. People with high scores may be effective leaders, but only if they are also recognized as high-potentials through their emergent behaviors.

The three competencies that define Leadership Effectiveness are Leading People, Leading the Business, and Managing Resources.



### 2.6.1 Leading People

Leading People concerns persuading people to put aside personal agendas and pursue shared goals. People with lower scores on this competency often seem independent and task-oriented, and perhaps even uninterested in or unable to galvanize others toward common objectives. Others may see them as hardworking, brusque, and intimidating. Others tend to view people with higher scores as engaging and patient, and able to inspire commitment and identify appropriate group goals. They hold people accountable and push subordinates for results.

### 2.6.2 Leading the Business

Leading the Business concerns achieving critical business unit or organizational outcomes. People with lower scores often seem to lack interest in organizational goals or in selling these objectives to others. They seem unassertive and disinterested in steering the corporate agenda. People with higher scores often want to take charge, to set or influence business unit or organizational goals, provide direction, and push others to achieve company goals. Others may tend to see them as action-oriented and competitive with high standards for themselves and others.

### 2.6.3 Managing Resources

Managing Resources concerns securing, optimizing, and deploying key material, financial, and personnel assets effectively. People with lower scores often want to minimize risks, struggle to forecast resource needs, and tepidly commit to plans. Others see them as uninterested in planning and reluctant to change when standard methods don't yield desired effects. People with higher scores often seem decisive, comfortable taking calculated risks, effective in planning for resource needs, and flexible in making changes to these plans as needed to accomplish goals.

## 2.7 Assessing the Model

To identify the most predictive scales for each competency in our model, we used the Hogan research archive (Hogan Assessment Systems, 2010a). The archive contains information from over 1,000 research studies conducted since 1981, and each year we update it with evidence from 10 - 15 new criterion studies. This allows us to continuously improve synthetic validity benchmarks, which we used to identify the best predictors of performance for each competency in the Hogan High Potential Model.

We reviewed prior criterion research predicting each competency in our model and aggregated findings across studies using meta-analysis (J. Hogan, Davies, and R. Hogan, 2007; Scherbaum, 2005) using scales from the Hogan Personality Inventory (HPI; R. Hogan & Hogan, 2007), Hogan Development Survey (HDS; R. Hogan & Hogan, 2009), and Motives, Values, Preferences Inventory (MVPI; J. Hogan & Hogan, 2010) as predictors.

The HPI is a well-known and extensively validated measure examining “bright-side” personality, and was the first such inventory specifically developed for occupational contexts with working adults. It contains seven scales that align with the Five-Factor Model (FFM; Digman, 1990; Goldberg, 1992; John, 1990; McCrae & Costa, 1987) of personality. The HPI reflects a person's normal, day-to-day behavior, and is backed by a global archive of evidence confirming its validity for predicting individual, leadership, and team performance.

Setting ourselves apart from other assessment providers, Hogan also offers the Hogan Development Survey (HDS) to measure the “dark side” of personality. The HDS is also well-known and extensively validated, but reflects a





person's behavior under conditions that challenge self-regulation. These characteristics reflect negative tendencies that may inhibit a person's performance or derail their success. Like the HPI, the HDS is intended for use in normal populations of working adults, and supported by a global archive of research supporting its validity in predicting workplace outcomes. The HDS contains 11 scales aligned with Horney's (1950) flawed interpersonal strategies of moving away from people, moving against people, and moving toward people in response to stress.

Finally, the Motives, Values, Preferences Inventory (MVPI) assesses "the inside", or a person's core values. Organizations use this assessment to evaluate person-organization fit and other occupational purposes. Dozens of criterion studies have used the MVPI to predict occupational performance across a range of jobs and industries (Shin & Holland, 2004). As with the HPI and HDS, the MVPI is intended for use in normal populations of working adults, and is supported by a global archive of criterion research evidence. The MVPI includes 10 scales that align with previous values and motives taxonomies offered by Spranger (1928), Allport (1961), Murray (1938), Allport, Vernon, and Lindzey (1960), and Holland (1966, 1985).

We used meta-analysis to identify HPI, HDS, and MVPI scales that predict each competency. Meta-analysis is a statistical method for examining relationships among variables based on data from multiple studies. Meta-analysis controls for error due to sampling, measurement, range restriction, and potential moderating variables (Smith & Glass, 1977). We followed procedures described by (a) Hunter and Schmidt (1990) for correcting range restriction, (b) Barrick and Mount (1991) for correcting criterion unreliability, and (c) Viswesvaran, Ones, and Schmidt (1996) for the mean inter-rater reliability coefficient of .52. In addition, we reverse coded negatively oriented criterion variables to ensure that validity coefficients were consistently interpreted. Hunter and Schmidt (1990) argue that samples should contribute the same number of correlations to meta-analysis results to avoid bias. Thus, we selected one criterion variable per competency per study, ensuring that each sample contributed only one point estimate per predictor scale.

The synthetic validity results from these meta-analyses provide stable estimates of relationships between HPI, HDS, and MVPI scales and our competencies. With predictive scales identified for each competency, we developed algorithms to score each competency in our model.

## 2.8 Developing Competency Algorithms

For most work-related outcomes, combinations of scales are better predictors than single scales (Ones, Dilchert, Viswesvaran, & Judge, 2007; Tett & Christiansen, 2007). As such, we combined personality and values scale scores to maximize the prediction of each competency.

Based on our synthetic validation evidence, we chose the three scales that best predicted each competency. Project team members then reviewed the results and made revisions as needed to ensure appropriate rational/theoretical linkages to each competency. They also limited the number of times a scale could be used to ensure that no one would score universally low or high across all competencies because of a score on one predictor scale. The resulting algorithms balanced qualitative expert judgment with quantitative data-driven results. As an example, we score Getting Along as follows:

$$\text{Getting Along} = (\text{Adjustment} + \text{Interpersonal Sensitivity} + \text{Altruistic})/3$$

These algorithms are both predictive and interpretable. In addition, they are flexible and compensatory, meaning that participants will not "fail" a competency as they would with more traditional profile-based approaches by scoring low or high on any given scale. Scoring for our algorithms defaults to global normative percentile scores instead of raw scores, which unit weights the scales included in each algorithm and further



facilitates interpretation worldwide by using a common framework. However, clients can also score our algorithms using local norms, thereby facilitating the use of the High Potential Talent Report within local business markets.

Finally, we calculate overall dimension scores for Leadership Foundations, Leadership Emergence, and Leadership Effectiveness by averaging scores across the three competencies under each dimension. Each competency contributes the same weight to the overall dimension score. The dimension scores indicate a person's strength or development need associated with each broad dimension of leadership potential.

To make the report easier to use and interpret, we report scores in terms of four levels (i.e., low, below average, above average, high). We determined scoring ranges for these levels by running simulations using a global working population of professionals, managers, and executives, and placing them into quartiles on each competency and dimension. These scoring levels facilitate score interpretation and the creation of Individual Development Plans (IDPs) by identifying employees' greatest strengths and development needs.

### 2.9 The Hogan Difference

In what ways does our High Potential Report differ from other available solutions? The answer lies in the rigorous scientific research behind our model and the way we conceptualize leadership performance.

First, our model takes the notion that certain interpersonal skills provide the foundation for leadership seriously. Many existing leaders are deeply unrewarding to work for and, as a result, often alienate talented employees. By evaluating these key interpersonal capabilities, we help clients lay the groundwork for future leadership success.

Second, our model lays out a comprehensive leadership development sequence. By helping high-potential employees understand the foundations for leadership, then how to emerge as a potential leader, and finally how to perform the key functions of leadership effectively, the Hogan High Potential Model helps put talented employees on the road to leadership success.

Finally, many high-potential models focus on helping people develop the confidence, social skills, and other capabilities needed to *look* like leaders. These attributes are important, but they are not crucial for leadership success. Instead, effective leadership depends on the ability to build and maintain high-performing teams that can out-perform the competition. This is the key function of leadership and the goal of the Hogan model. Unlike models that help people *seem* more leader-like, our model helps high-potential employees *become* leaders.

### 2.10 Using the Hogan High Potential Model

The Hogan High Potential Model is beneficial for both high-potential employees and their organizations. Although organizations can use this model to assist with identification of high-potential employees, we advise clients to use our model primarily for development. The process of identifying high-potential employees is delicate and organizationally-specific, involving industry-, organization-, and job-specific information not completely captured in *any* off-the-shelf report. Hogan offers a range of scientifically rigorous and organizationally specific research solutions for clients interested in using our assessments to identify high-potential employees.

Hogan's High Potential Model is most useful for developing key organizational talent by helping high-potential employees identify their leadership strengths and most pressing development needs. Through this process, these future leaders can better prioritize their development activities to focus on the areas of greatest need



and the areas with the greatest potential return for their investment of effort. As such, although the Hogan High Potential Talent Report is an off-the-shelf solution, it still facilitates custom and individualized development to meet each high-potential employee's needs.

For example, some high-potential employees may have a reputation for being too tactical for leadership, difficult or unrewarding to deal with, or poor organizational citizens. By providing concrete development recommendations regarding how to change these attributes, our model can help these individuals mitigate these tendencies before they become career enders. For high-potential employees who already enjoy a reputation for being visionary and strategic, rewarding to work with/for, and excellent corporate citizens, our model provides a sense of confidence in building on these key strengths to facilitate future leadership.

Other high-potential employees may excel at standing out from their peers and influencing others at work, but may have the reputation for not being rewarding to work with/for or not accomplishing important goals valued by the organization. Taken to extremes, such individuals may earn the reputation of being “empty suits” because they appear leader-like but cannot organize or maintain a high-performing team. The Hogan model can help these emergent leaders to shore up foundational deficiencies and become more effective leaders by providing specific development recommendations in these areas.

Finally, some individuals may excel at leading high-performing teams but struggle to stand out from their peers. Organizations often overlook these individuals because others outside their own teams do not view them as natural leaders. To help them gain recognition, we provide concrete development content regarding how to stand out, build a network, and exercise influence appropriately at work. Every organization has people who could lead if given the opportunity. Unfortunately, many of them remain undetected by traditional high-potential solutions. Our model can help these employees gain leadership opportunities to benefit themselves and their organizations.



### 3. PSYCHOMETRIC PROPERTIES OF HOGAN HIGH POTENTIAL MODEL COMPETENCIES & DIMENSIONS

#### 3.1 Descriptive Statistics

Table 3.1 presents descriptive statistics for each of the competencies and dimensions in the Hogan High Potential Model, including minimum and maximum observed scores, mean scores, standard deviations, and skewness and kurtosis statistics.

Skewness refers to departure from symmetry in a distribution of scores. When a distribution is normal and symmetrical, skewness values are around zero. Positive skewness values indicate that most scores fall at the bottom end of a distribution, and negative skewness values indicate that most scores fall on the top end of a distribution. Skewness values greater than +1.0 or less than -1.0 generally indicate a significant departure from symmetry.

Kurtosis refers to how peaked or flat a score distribution is relative to the normal distribution. When scores are normally distributed, kurtosis values are around zero and we refer to them as mesokurtic. When the distribution is sharper than the normal distribution, kurtosis values are positive and we refer to them as leptokurtic. When the distribution is broader than the normal distribution, kurtosis values are negative and we refer to them as platykurtic. Kurtosis values of more than twice the standard error indicate a significant departure from the normal distribution.

To examine the descriptive statistics for our competencies and dimensions, we obtained data from a global sample of nearly 21,000 professionals, managers, and executives. This group represents the intended population for this report. Most of the sample (70.9%) completed the HPI, HDS, and MVPI as part of employee development or leadership coaching efforts, and a smaller number completed the assessments for applicant screening (29.1%) or research (6.6%). On average, participants were 38.98 years old ( $SD = 8.85$ ), and the sample included 59.9% male participants and 34.7% female participants (5.4% of participants did not indicate their sex).

**Table 3.1** Classical Scale Statistics for Hogan High Potential Model Competencies & Dimensions

Competency	Min	Max	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Skew	Kurt
Getting Along	0	100	52.98	20.78	-.16	-.70
Thinking Broadly	1	100	52.64	20.19	-.05	-.65
Following Process	0	99	52.44	19.10	-.07	-.58
LEADERSHIP FOUNDATIONS	9	94	52.68	13.05	.00	-.30
Standing Out	0	100	52.89	22.99	-.06	-.86
Building Connections	0	99	48.42	22.16	-.09	-.80
Influencing Others	0	91	48.79	22.74	-.19	-.91
LEADERSHIP EMERGENCE	2	95	50.04	17.27	-.16	-.58
Leading People	0	94	48.04	20.82	-.12	-.75
Leading the Business	0	100	53.31	22.17	-.14	-.81
Managing Resources	1	98	47.96	18.91	.06	-.55
LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS	7	86	49.77	11.90	-.11	-.35

*Note:* *N* = 20,828; Competencies listed in Title Case, Dimensions CAPITALIZED; Min = Minimum score; Max = Maximum score; *M* = Mean; *SD* = Standard Deviation; Skew = Skewness statistic; Kurt = Kurtosis statistic.



As shown in Table 3.1, minimum and maximum observed scores cover nearly the entire range of possible scores from 0 to 100. All but two competencies and dimensions show score ranges of 90 or more, and only Leadership Effectiveness falls below 80 with a range of 79 points.

Average scores range from 47.96 (Managing Resources) to 53.31 (Leading the Business), averaging 50.83 across all 12 competencies and dimensions in the model. Standard deviations range from 11.90 (Leadership Effectiveness) to 22.99 (Standing Out), with an overall average of 19.34, indicating that all competencies and dimensions in our model contain appropriate variance.

Skewness statistics indicate that score distributions are adequately symmetrical, with results ranging from -.19 (Influencing Others) to .06 (Managing Resources), averaging -.09 across the competencies and dimensions in our model. Most notably, none fall below -1.00 or above +1.00. Kurtosis statistics indicate that score distributions for our competencies and dimensions are not abnormally peaked or flat, with results ranging from -.91 (Influencing Others) to -.30 (Leadership Foundations), averaging -.65 across competencies and dimensions.

## 3.2 Distribution of Hogan High Potential Competency & Dimension Scores

During development of our model, we used a visual binning function to separate competency and dimension score distributions into four levels, each containing approximately 25% of our sample of professionals, managers, and executives. Specific cutoff scores varied across competencies and dimensions, but were consistent enough that we arrived at common cutoff scores we could apply to all 12 competencies and dimensions in our model. As a result, we designate scores of 0-35 as low, 36-50 as below average, 51-65 as above average, and 66-100 as high.

Using these interpretive ranges, we examined score distributions for all competencies and dimensions using the same sample of professionals, managers, and executives previously described. Table 3.2 below presents these results.

**Table 3.2** Distribution of Hogan High Potential Competency & Dimension Scores across Levels

Competency	Low	Below Average	Above Average	High
Getting Along	22.2%	21.8%	25.7%	30.2%
Thinking Broadly	21.9%	23.8%	25.8%	28.5%
Following Process	20.3%	25.6%	27.5%	26.6%
LEADERSHIP FOUNDATIONS	9.9%	33.8%	39.3%	17.0%
Standing Out	25.2%	21.1%	21.2%	32.5%
Building Connections	29.6%	22.4%	23.0%	25.0%
Influencing Others	29.5%	21.4%	22.2%	26.9%
LEADERSHIP EMERGENCE	21.7%	27.7%	30.3%	20.4%
Leading People	28.6%	23.4%	25.5%	22.4%
Leading the Business	23.7%	20.5%	23.0%	32.7%
Managing Resources	27.3%	28.6%	25.2%	18.9%
LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS	12.5%	39.2%	39.0%	9.4%

*Note:* N = 20,828; Competencies listed in Title Case, Dimensions CAPITALIZED; Low scores = 0-35; Below Average scores = 36-50; Above Average scores = 51-65; High scores = 66-100.





Score distributions do not significantly depart from expected levels. The percentage of low scores ranged from 9.9% (Leadership Foundations) to 29.6% (Building Connections), with an average of 22.7% across all competencies and dimensions in our model. The percentage of below average scores ranged from 20.5% (Leading the Business) to 39.2% (Leadership Effectiveness), with an average of 25.8% across components of our model. The percentage of above average scores ranged from 21.2% (Standing Out) to 39.3% (Leadership Foundations), with an average of 27.3% across our competencies and dimensions. Finally, the percentage of high scores ranged from 9.4% (Leadership Effectiveness) to 32.7% (Leading the Business), with an average of 24.2% across components of our model.

### 3.3 Test-Retest Reliabilities

Professional standards compel assessment providers to supply evidence that individual results do not vary widely across time. Because we score our competencies and dimensions using scale scores from the HPI, HDS, and MVPI, we obtained this evidence by administering the assessments to the same sample of people twice over time, scoring their results on our model, and correlating scores from the first administration with those from the second administration. Higher correlations indicate that scores are consistent across time; lower correlations reflect inconsistencies that may signal problems with construct measurement.

Table 3.3 provides test-retest reliability estimates for all competencies and dimensions included in our model. We collected these data from a sample of 126 professionals employed by a large global pharmaceutical organization. This sample included 3% Individual Contributors, 2% Entry-Level Supervisors, 43% Middle Managers, and 29% Executives (23% did not report their job level). Most (i.e., 81%) completed the assessments in English, with small percentages of participants completing them in French (5%), Spanish (4%), and Chinese (3%). Ages ranged from 29 to 56, with an average of 41.49 years ( $SD = 5.81$ ). The interval between assessment administrations ranged from 4.37 to 7.01 months, with an average interval of 6.46 months.

**Table 3.3** Test-Retest Reliability Estimates for Hogan High Potential Competency & Dimension Scores

Competency	Test-Retest Reliability
Getting Along	.84
Thinking Broadly	.84
Following Process	.75
LEADERSHIP FOUNDATIONS	.79
Standing Out	.83
Building Connections	.86
Influencing Others	.81
LEADERSHIP EMERGENCE	.88
Leading People	.77
Leading the Business	.81
Managing Resources	.71
LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS	.74

*Note:*  $N = 126$ ; Competencies listed in Title Case, Dimensions CAPITALIZED; Test-retest reliabilities computed using Pearson correlations between competency scores based on first and second assessment administrations; average assessment interval = 6.46 months.



Test-retest reliabilities for competencies range from .71 (Managing Resources) to .86 (Building Connections), with an average of .80. Test-retest reliabilities for the broad dimensions in our model range from .74 (Leadership Effectiveness) to .88 (Leadership Emergence), also averaging .80. These results demonstrate that participant scores across components of our model are appropriately stable across time.

## 3.4 Intercorrelations Between Hogan High Potential Model Competencies & Dimensions

We computed correlations between the competencies and dimensions of our model using our global sample of professionals, managers, and executives previously described. Table 3.4 presents these results.

**Table 3.4** Correlations between Hogan High Potential Model Competencies & Dimensions

Competency	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. Getting Along	1.00	.18**	.28**	.76**	.07**	.45**	.50**	.45**	.75**	.18**	.13**	.62**
2. Thinking Broadly		1.00	-.06**	.58**	.42**	.25**	.26**	.41**	.03**	.37**	-.47**	.00
3. Following Process			1.00	.61**	-.01	.02**	-.08**	-.03**	.15**	.03**	.44**	.34**
4. LEADERSHIP FOUNDATIONS				1.00	.25**	.38**	.36**	.43**	.49**	.30**	.04**	.49**
5. Standing Out					1.00	.44**	.25**	.74**	-.08**	.58**	-.40**	.10**
6. Building Connections						1.00	.44**	.81**	.39**	.37**	-.17**	.36**
7. Influencing Others							1.00	.73**	.59**	.56**	-.05**	.67**
8. LEADERSHIP EMERGENCE								1.00	.39**	.66**	-.27**	.49**
9. Leading People									1.00	.05**	.26**	.75**
10. Leading the Business										1.00	-.31**	.48**
11. Managing Resources											1.00	.49**
12. LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS												1.00

*Note:* N = 20,828; \*\*Correlation is significant at .01 level; Competencies listed in Title Case, Dimensions CAPITALIZED.

Correlations between competencies under the same dimension tell a common story. Correlations range from -.06 to .28 for Leadership Foundations competencies, from .25 to .44 for Leadership Emergence competencies, and from -.31 to .26 for Leadership Effectiveness competencies. These patterns of results suggest that components in our model are conceptually related but empirically distinct within dimensions.

Correlations between competencies across different dimensions of our model provide some interesting insights. First, correlations between Leadership Foundations competencies and Leadership Emergence competencies range from -.08 (Following Process & Influencing Others) to .50 (Getting Along & Influencing Others). Of the nine correlations between these competencies, three are .40 or greater. These results make intuitive sense and show that these constructs are conceptually related but still distinct. For example, the correlation between Thinking Broadly and Standing Out is .42, suggesting that employees with a strategic vision are likely to separate themselves from their peers as potential leaders. Likewise, the correlation between Getting Along and Building Connections is .45, suggesting that employees who are rewarding to deal with tend to reach out and build strategic business networks. Finally, the correlation between Getting Along and Influencing Others is .50, indicating that people who are interpersonally skilled can also exercise influence at work, although the constructs are distinct.

Correlations between Leadership Foundations competencies and Leadership Effectiveness competencies range from -.47 (Thinking Broadly & Managing Resources) to .75 (Getting Along & Leading People). Of the nine correlations between these competencies, three are .40 or greater. The correlation of -.47 between Thinking Broadly and Managing Resources suggests that those who are adept at promoting a strategic vision may



struggle to obtain, optimize, and deploy key material, financial, and personnel resources to accomplish work tasks. The correlation of .44 between Following Process and Managing Resources suggests that people who respect organizational procedures also make effective use of organizational resources. Finally, the correlation of .75 between Getting Along and Leading People suggests that these competencies are substantially related. Nonetheless, although being interpersonally skilled can facilitate the process of attracting, retaining, and motivating people, some effective leaders may still struggle to get along with their subordinates.

Correlations between Leadership Emergence competencies and Leadership Effectiveness competencies range from -.40 (Standing Out & Managing Resources) to .59 (Influencing Others & Leading People). Of the nine correlations between these competencies, four are .40 or greater. The correlation of -.40 between Standing Out and Managing Resources suggests that people who are more adept at emerging from one's peer group as potential future leaders may struggle to obtain, optimize, and deploy key resources to accomplish work tasks. The correlation of .56 between Influencing Others and Leading the Business suggests that the ability to persuade others toward a particular course of action may also facilitate driving critical business unit or organizational outcomes. Likewise, the correlation of .58 between Standing Out and Leading the Business suggests that being recognized as a leader relative to one's peers is positively associated with taking charge, providing direction, and pushing toward strategic company objectives. Finally, the correlation of .59 between Influencing Others and Leading People indicates that the ability to persuade others to pursue certain outcomes is associated with the process of motivating people to put aside personal agendas and pursue organizational goals.

The correlations between the overall dimensions in our model indicate that they are conceptually related but empirically distinct. The correlation between Leadership Foundations and Leadership Emergence is .43, suggesting a moderate positive association between having a firm foundation for leadership and emerging as a leader. However, this correlation also indicates that some employees with a solid foundation for leadership still will not emerge as leaders, and that some who do emerge may lack some foundational attributes. Leadership Foundations and Leadership Effectiveness correlate at .49, indicating that having a firm foundation for leadership is helpful, though not required, for effective leadership. Not all those who are rewarding to deal with are effective leaders, and some highly effective leaders are not rewarding to work for as employees. Leadership Emergence and Leadership Effectiveness also correlate at .49, suggesting that standing out from one's peers, networking, and exercising influence can assist the process of effectively motivating subordinates, marshalling resources, and driving critical business outcomes. However, not everyone who emerges as a leader will be successful in leadership roles, and some effective leaders may not effectively stand out from their peers to emerge as leaders.



## 4. VALIDITY

Validity concerns the degree to which scores predict meaningful behavioral outcomes. As such, the validity of our high-potential solution depends on the relationships between scores on each component of the model and data from other sources (cf. R. Hogan, Hogan, & Roberts, 1996). These sources include other assessments (construct validity), adjective checklists (others descriptions of the person), and job performance ratings (criterion-related validity).

### 4.1 Construct Validity

Information concerning construct validity includes correlations with relevant scales from assessments measuring personality, cognitive ability, and relationship styles, as well as relationships with job performance ratings.

The following section presents selected results from 11 such assessments. Appendix B presents full correlation matrices between competencies from the Hogan High Potential Model and scales from these assessments.

#### 4.1.1 Procedure and Sample

We collected data from 384 U.S. working adults who participated in an eight-week online, unproctored testing series. All participants completed the Hogan Personality Inventory (HPI), Hogan Development Survey (HDS), Motives, Values, Preferences Inventory (MVPI), and 11 additional assessments described below. The sample included 171 males, 210 females, and 3 participants who did not report their gender. Participant ages ranged from 18 to 64 years with a mean of 34.17 years ( $SD = 10.43$ ). Participants received compensation for their time, and all participants completed the assessments as part of low-stakes testing where results did not impact hiring, promotion, or any other personnel decisions.

#### 4.1.2 Instruments

*IPIP.* The International Personality Item Pool (IPIP; Goldberg, 1999; Goldberg, Johnson, Eber, Hogan, Ashton, Cloninger, & Gough, 2006) is an online, public domain collection of over 3,000 personality assessment items researchers can use to create 274 scales. We present correlations with scales aligned with the Five-Factor Model (FFM) of personality reflected in the NEO-PI-R (Costa & McCrae, 1992): Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, and Openness to Experience. This inventory consists of 100 five-point, Likert-type items. Goldberg et al. (2006) describe technical features of the IPIP, including norming samples, scale construction, and validity indices. The IPIP website (<http://ipip.ori.org>) provides additional information.

*Honesty-Humility from HEXACO.* The Honesty-Humility scale from the HEXACO personality inventory (HEXACO-100; Lee & Ashton, 2004; Lee & Ashton, 2016) consists of 16 five-point, Likert-type items and contains four subscales: Sincerity, Fairness, Greed Avoidance, and Modesty. Lee and Ashton (2016) used 100,000 online respondents and 2,000 Canadian undergraduate students to examine and report the psychometric properties of the HEXACO-100.

*IPC-7.* We used the Positive Valence and Negative Valence scales of the Inventory of Personality Characteristics (IPC-7; Benet & Waller, 1995; Tellegen, Grove, & Waller, 1991). For both scales, participants rate themselves on 10 adjectives using a five-point, Likert-type response. The Positive Valence scale includes adjectives that portray a person in a highly positive light (e.g., “excellent”, “special”, or “impressive”), and the Negative Valence scale includes adjectives that portray a person as highly negative (e.g. “evil”, “wicked”, or “awful”). Benet and



Waller (1995) provide psychometric information for these scales for separate samples of 569 U.S. adults and 435 Spanish university students.

*MACH-IV.* The MACH-IV (Christie & Geis, 1970) includes 20 five-point, Likert-type items that assess Machiavellianism, which involves having a cynical worldview and being willing to manipulate others for one's personal gain. Christie and Geis (1970) provide information regarding the development and psychometric evidence for the MACH-IV.

*NPI.* The Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI; Raskin & Terry, 1988) consists of 40 forced-choice response items and contains seven subscales: Authority, Self-Sufficiency, Superiority, Exhibitionism, Exploitativeness, Vanity, and Entitlement. Raskin and Terry (1988) used over 1,000 U.S. undergraduate students to construct the NPI and examine its psychometric properties.

*PID-5.* The Personality Inventory for DSM-5 (PID-5; American Psychiatric Association, 2013; Krueger, Derringer, Markon, Watson, & Skodol, 2012) provides scale configurations that align with personality disorders from the DSM-5. Although the American Psychiatric Association (2013) does not recommend researchers use the PID-5 for clinical diagnoses, they do recommend it for research purposes or as a supplement when evaluating how personality functioning changes over time. The PID-5 includes 220 four-point, Likert-type responses and contains 25 scales: Anhedonia, Anxiousness, Attention Seeking, Callousness, Deceitfulness, Depressivity, Distractibility, Eccentricity, Emotional Lability, Grandiosity, Hostility, Impulsivity, Intimacy Avoidance, Irresponsibility, Manipulativeness, Perceptual Dysregulation, Perseveration, Restricted Affectivity, Rigid Perfectionism, Risk Taking, Separation Insecurity, Submissiveness, Suspiciousness, Unusual Beliefs and Experiences, and Withdrawal.

*Grit.* We measured Grit (Duckworth, Peterson, Matthews, & Kelly, 2007) using a scale consisting of 10 five-point, Likert-type items and two subscales: Perseverance of Effort and Consistency of Interests. Based on data from multiple samples, including U.S. adults and college students, Duckworth et al. (2007) provided psychometric information for the scale, including its development, factor analysis, and validity.

*Judgment.* The Hogan Judgment Report (Hogan Assessment Systems, 2014) measures Verbal and Numerical information processing, four information processing styles, three decision-making approach dichotomies (Threat Avoidance vs. Reward Seeking, Tactical vs. Strategic Thinking, and Data-driven vs. Intuitive Decisions), three decision reaction dichotomies (Defensive vs. Cool-headed, Denial vs. Acceptance, and Superficial vs. Genuine Engagement), and openness to feedback and coaching. Its normative sample includes data from over 750 global executives, managers, and other high-level professionals (Hogan Assessment Systems, 2014).

*LTST.* Jones, Corwin, Anderson, and McKenna's (2016) Long Term Strategic Thinking (LTST) scale includes 28 seven-point, Likert-type items that measure the propensity to engage in strategic thinking, long-term planning, and the likelihood of considering the consequences of one's actions. Jones et al. (2016) provide initial psychometric information, including development and validity evidence.

*HBRI.* The Hogan Business Reasoning Inventory (HBRI; R. Hogan, Barrett, & Hogan, 2007) contains 24 items that assess cognitive skills. Items reflect cognitive tasks with content reflecting business operations for managers and professionals. The HBRI includes an Overall Reasoning score comprised of Strategic and Tactical Reasoning scales. The HBRI technical manual (R. Hogan, Barrett, & Hogan, 2007) provides information on the technical features of the test, including reliability, scale construction, factor analysis, and validity.



*RQ.* The Relationship Questionnaire (RQ; Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991) consists of four seven-point, Likert-type items. Each item describes one of four relationship styles that align with four attachment styles: Secure, Anxious-Preoccupied, Fearful-Avoidant, and Dismissive-Avoidant. We worded these items to reflect a general attitude toward close relationships. Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) used 144 U.S. college students to construct and examine the psychometric properties of the RQ.

#### 4.1.3 Results of Scale to Scale Correlates

The following tables present selected correlations between Hogan High Potential Model competencies and conceptually aligned scales from other assessments. Appendix B provides full correlation matrices with these assessments.

*Getting Along.* Table 4.1 presents selected correlations for the Getting Along competency.

**Table 4.1** Construct Validity Evidence for Getting Along Competency

Assessment	Scale	Getting Along
IPIP	Agreeableness	.69**
Judgment	Defensive vs. Cool-headed	.65**
RQ	Secure Style	.44**
HEXACO	Honesty-Humility	.40**
PID-5	Callousness	-.50**
PID-5	Hostility	-.55**
PID-5	Withdrawal	-.56**
MACH-IV	Machiavellianism	-.59**

*Note:* \*\* Correlation is significant at .01 level.

Results highlight the agreeable and pleasant nature of the Getting Along competency. Others are likely to describe people with high scores as friendly and warm (IPIP Agreeableness) and not cynically self-interested (MACH-IV), socially isolated (PID-5 Withdrawal), antagonistic (PID-5 Hostility), or insensitive (PID-5 Callousness). People may also view high scorers as calm when receiving negative feedback (Judgment Cool-headed) and socially confident (RQ Secure Style), although not overly so (HEXACO Honesty-Humility).

*Thinking Broadly.* Table 4.2 presents selected correlations for the Thinking Broadly competency.

**Table 4.2** Construct Validity Evidence for Thinking Broadly Competency

Assessment	Scale	Thinking Broadly
IPIP	Openness to Experience	.51**
Judgment	Tactical vs. Strategic Thinking	.49**
Judgment	Threat Avoidant vs. Reward Seeking	.41**
LTST	Strategic Thinking	.37**
Judgment	Data-Driven vs. Intuitive	-.38**

*Note:* \*\* Correlation is significant at .01 level.

Results highlight the open and curious attributes of the Thinking Broadly competency. Others are likely to describe people with high scores as open-minded and curious (IPIP Openness to Experience) and long-term,



strategic thinkers (Judgment Strategic Thinking, LTST Strategic Thinking). Others may also view high scorers as focused on opportunities for gain (Judgment Reward Seeking) and interested in reviewing information before making a decision (Judgment Data-driven).

*Following Process.* Table 4.3 presents selected correlations for the Following Process competency.

**Table 4.3** Construct Validity Evidence for Following Process Competency

Assessment	Scale	Following Process
HEXACO	Honesty-Humility	.32**
IPIP	Conscientiousness	.29**
Grit	Grit	.24**
PID-5	Deceitfulness	-.25**
PID-5	Impulsivity	-.33**
PID-5	Risk Taking	-.38**
Judgment	Threat Avoidance vs. Reward Seeking	-.46**

*Note:* \*\* Correlation is significant at .01 level.

Results highlight the dependable nature of the Following Process competency. Others are likely to describe people with high scores as detail-oriented (IPIP Conscientiousness) and dedicated (Grit), but not reckless (PID-5 Risk Taking) or lacking in self-control (PID-5 Impulsivity). Others may also view high scorers as honest (HEXACO Honesty-Humility, PID-5 Deceitfulness) and generally safe and risk averse (Judgment Threat Avoidance).

*Leadership Foundations.* Table 4.4 presents selected correlations for the Leadership Foundations dimension.

**Table 4.4** Construct Validity Evidence for Leadership Foundations Dimension

Assessment	Scale	Leadership Foundations
IPIP	Agreeableness	.59**
IPIP	Conscientiousness	.49**
LTST	Strategic Thinking	.46**
IPIP	Openness to Experience	.39**
HEXACO	Honesty-Humility	.34**
PID-5	Deceitfulness	-.30**
PID-5	Impulsivity	-.33**
PID-5	Callousness	-.45**
PID-5	Hostility	-.45**
PID-5	Withdrawal	-.45**
MACH-IV	Machiavellianism	-.51**

*Note:* \*\* Correlation is significant at .01 level.

Results highlight the career management skills inherent in the Leadership Foundations dimension. Others are likely to view people with high scores as friendly, warm, and rewarding to be around (IPIP Agreeableness, MACH-IV Machiavellianism, PID-5 Withdrawal, PID-5 Hostility, PID-5 Callousness), open-minded and strategic (IPIP Openness to Experience, LTST Strategic Thinking), and hardworking, dependable, and honest (IPIP Conscientiousness, PID-5 Impulsivity, PID-5 Deceitfulness). However, others may also view high scorers as humble and not self-promoting (HEXACO Honesty-Humility).





*Standing Out.* Table 4.5 presents selected correlations for the Standing Out competency.

**Table 4.5** Construct Validity Evidence for Standing Out Competency

Assessment	Scale	Standing Out
NPI	Positive Valence	.75**
NPI	Superiority	.65**
PID-5	Attention-Seeking	.60**
NPI	Exhibitionism	.59**
IPC-7	Positive Valence	.56**
PID-5	Grandiosity	.52**
IPIP	Extraversion	.48**
PID-5	Withdrawal	-.20**
Judgment	Receptiveness to Feedback	-.37**
Judgment	Denial vs. Acceptance	-.70**
HEXACO	Honesty-Humility	-.71**

*Note:* \*\* Correlation is significant at .01 level.

Results highlight the self-promotional nature of the Standing Out competency. Others are likely to describe people with high scores as socially outgoing (IPIP Extraversion, PID-5 Withdrawal), likely to think highly of themselves (NPI Positive Valence, IPC-7 Positive Valence), and interested in drawing attention to themselves (PID-5 Attention Seeking, NPI Exhibitionism). Others may also view high scorers as expecting recognition and respect from others (HEXACO Honesty-Humility, NPI Superiority, PID-5 Grandiosity). However, high scorers may have difficulty accepting and being receptive to feedback (Judgment Denial, Judgment Receptiveness to Feedback).

*Building Connections.* Table 4.6 presents selected correlations for the Building Connections competency.

**Table 4.6** Construct Validity Evidence for Building Connections Competency

Assessment	Scale	Building Connections
IPIP	Extraversion	.70**
Judgment	Tactical vs. Strategic Thinking	.51**
Judgment	Threat Avoidance vs. Reward Seeking	.45**
RQ	Secure Style	.40**
IPIP	Neuroticism	-.36**
RQ	Fearful-Avoidant Style	-.37**
PID-5	Withdrawal	-.56**

*Note:* \*\* Correlation is significant at .01 level.

Results highlight the sociable and outgoing nature of the Building Connections competency. Others are likely to describe people with high scores as outgoing and friendly (IPIP Extraversion, PID-5 Withdrawal) and comfortable building relationships (RQ Fearful-Avoidant Style, RQ Secure Style). Others may also view high scorers as calm (IPIP Neuroticism), strategic in their perspective (Judgment Strategic Thinking), and more likely to seek potential gains than avoid potential threats (Judgment Reward Seeking).



*Influencing Others.* Table 4.7 presents selected significant correlations for the Influencing Others competency.

**Table 4.7** Construct Validity Evidence for Influencing Others Competency

Assessment	Scale	Influencing Others
IPIP	Extraversion	.70**
Judgment	Defensive vs. Cool-Headed	.60**
Grit	Grit	.57**
Judgment	Superficial vs. Genuine Engagement	.57**
IPIP	Conscientiousness	.52**
Judgment	Tactical vs. Strategic Thinking	.52**
IPIP	Agreeableness	.49**
Judgment	Denial vs. Acceptance	-.46**
RQ	Fearful-Avoidant Style	-.54**
PID-5	Withdrawal	-.59**
IPIP	Neuroticism	-.69**

*Note:* \*\* Correlation is significant at .01 level.

Results highlight the dominant and persuasive nature of the Influencing Others competency. Others are likely to describe people with high scores as outgoing (IPIP Extraversion, RQ Fearful-Avoidant), friendly (IPIP Agreeableness, PID-5 Withdrawal), persistent (IPIP Conscientiousness, Grit), and skilled in motivating others toward long-term goals (Judgment Strategic Thinking). Others may also view high scorers as calm (IPIP Neuroticism, Judgment Cool-headed) and sincere (Judgment Genuine) when receiving negative feedback, even though they may deflect feedback with which they disagree (Judgment Denial).

*Leadership Emergence.* Table 4.8 presents selected correlations for the Leadership Emergence dimension.

**Table 4.8** Construct Validity Evidence for Leadership Emergence Dimension

Assessment	Scale	Leadership Emergence
IPIP	Extraversion	.79**
Judgment	Tactical vs. Strategic Thinking	.70**
NPI	Positive Valence	.65**
NPI	Authority	.64**
NPI	Exhibitionism	.46**
RQ	Secure Style	.43**
RQ	Fearful-Avoidant Style	-.39**
IPIP	Neuroticism	-.50**
PID-5	Withdrawal	-.55**
Judgment	Denial vs. Acceptance	-.72**

*Note:* \*\* Correlation is significant at .01 level.

Results highlight the social skill and ascendancy inherent in the Leadership Emergence dimension. Others are likely to describe people with high scores as outgoing (IPIP Extraversion, PID-5 Withdrawal), socially confident (RQ Secure Style, RQ Fearful-Avoidant Style), and self-promoting (NPI Positive Valence, NPI Exhibitionism, NPI Authority), perhaps to the point of accepting recognition and deflecting blame (Judgment Denial). Others may also view high scorers as calm (IPIP Neuroticism) and strategic thinkers (Judgment Strategic Thinking).



*Leading People.* Table 4.9 presents selected correlations for the Leading People competency.

**Table 4.9** Construct Validity Evidence for Leading People Competency

Assessment	Scale	Leading People
IPIP	Agreeableness	.69**
Judgment	Defensive vs. Cool-headed	.68**
Judgment	Receptiveness to Feedback	.56**
IPIP	Extraversion	.54**
RQ	Secure Style	.50**
PID-5	Callousness	-.47**
RQ	Fearful-Avoidant Style	-.49**
PID-5	Withdrawal	-.54**
IPIP	Neuroticism	-.57**
PID-5	Hostility	-.58**

*Note:* \*\* Correlation is significant at .01 level.

Results highlight the motivational attributes of the Leading People competency. Others are likely to describe people with high scores as friendly (IPIP Agreeableness, PID-5 Hostility, PID-5 Callousness) and outgoing (IPIP Extraversion, PID-5 Withdrawal, RQ Secure Style, RQ Fearful-Avoidant Style). Others may also view high scorers as calm and receptive to feedback (IPIP Neuroticism, Judgment Cool-headed, Judgment Receptiveness to Feedback).

*Leading the Business.* Table 4.10 presents selected correlations for the Leading the Business competency.

**Table 4.10** Construct Validity Evidence for Leading the Business Competency

Assessment	Scale	Leading the Business
NPI	Authority	.66**
Judgment	Tactical vs. Strategic Thinking	.65**
NPI	Positive Valence	.57**
IPIP	Extraversion	.52**
Grit	Grit	.40**
PID-5	Distractibility	-.27**
IPIP	Neuroticism	-.33**
PID-5	Withdrawal	-.33**

*Note:* \*\* Correlation is significant at .01 level.

Results highlight the authoritative and outcome-focused nature of the Leading the Business competency. Others are likely to describe people with high scores as outgoing (IPIP Extraversion, PID-5 Withdrawal) and interested in positions of leadership (NPI Positive Valence, NPI Authority). Others may also view high scorers as calm under pressure (IPIP Neuroticism), persistent (Grit), and focused (PID-5 Distractibility) on accomplishing the organization's overarching strategy (Judgment Strategic Thinking).



*Managing Resources.* Table 4.11 presents selected correlations for the Managing Resources competency.

**Table 4.11** Construct Validity Evidence for Managing Resources Competency

Assessment	Scale	Managing Resources
Judgment	Data Driven vs. Intuitive	.43**
HEXACO	Honesty-Humility	.42**
Judgment	Denial vs. Acceptance	.35**
Judgment	Receptiveness to Feedback	.34**
Judgment	Defensive vs. Cool-headed	.26**
Judgment	Tactical vs. Strategic Thinking	-.36**
PID-5	Impulsivity	-.40**
PID-5	Attention Seeking	-.41**
NPI	Positive Valence	-.42**
Judgment	Threat Avoidance vs. Reward Seeking	-.54**

*Note:* \*\* Correlation is significant at .01 level.

Results highlight the detailed and tactical nature of the Managing Resources competency. Others are likely to describe people with high scores as modest (NPI Positive Valence, PID-5 Attention Seeking, HEXACO Honesty-Humility), effective at identifying immediate resource needs (Judgment Tactical Thinking), and generally receptive to negative feedback (Judgment Acceptance, Judgment Cool-headed, Judgment Receptiveness to Feedback).

*Leadership Effectiveness.* Table 4.12 presents selected correlations for the Leadership Effectiveness dimension.

**Table 4.12** Construct Validity Evidence for Leadership Effectiveness Dimension

Assessment	Scale	Leadership Effectiveness
Judgment	Defensive vs. Cool-headed	.62**
IPIP	Agreeableness	.62**
Grit	Grit	.55**
IPIP	Extraversion	.55**
IPIP	Conscientiousness	.52**
Judgment	Receptiveness to Feedback	.45**
RQ	Secure Style	.44**
LTST	Strategic Thinking	.44**
Judgment	Tactical vs. Strategic Thinking	.33**
PID-5	Impulsivity	-.38**
PID-5	Callousness	-.45**
PID-5	Distractibility	-.46**
RQ	Fearful-Avoidant Style	-.50**
PID-5	Withdrawal	-.54**
PID-5	Hostility	-.55**
IPIP	Neuroticism	-.58**

*Note:* \*\* Correlation is significant at .01 level.



Results highlight the secure and strategic nature of the Leadership Effectiveness dimension. Others are likely to describe people with high scores as interpersonally skilled (IPIP Agreeableness, PID-5 Hostility, PID-5 Callousness), outgoing (IPIP Extraversion, PID-5 Withdrawal), and socially confident (RQ Secure Style, RQ Fearful-Avoidant Style). Moreover, others may view high scorers as focused on planning and accomplishing tasks (IPIP Conscientiousness, PID-5 Distractibility, PID-5 Impulsivity, Grit) and strategic thinkers (Judgment Strategic Thinking and LTST) who can remain calm when under pressure (IPIP Neuroticism) or receiving negative feedback (Judgment Cool-headed, Judgment Receptiveness to Feedback).

### 4.2 Correlations with Others' Descriptions

Correlations with observer ratings are one of the most important sources of information for interpreting scores. According to socioanalytic theory, the same processes underlie social interaction and responding to assessment items. In theory, this is the reason certain scores are associated with certain peer descriptions (Mills & Hogan, 1976). Thus, finding correlations between scores on our model and others' descriptions allows us to evaluate the validity of our model for predicting people's reputations at work.

We obtained peer rating information from two sources, the Eugene-Springfield Community Sample (ESCS; Goldberg, 2008) and the Hogan 360° multi-rater feedback evaluation tool (Peter Berry Consultancy, 2015). The next section contains selected correlations between our competencies and observer ratings from these sources. For full correlation matrices between scales used to score our competencies and descriptors from the Eugene-Springfield Community Sample, consult the technical manuals for the HPI, HDS, and MVPI. For full correlation matrices with the Hogan 360°, consult Appendix B.

#### 4.2.1 Procedures, Samples, and Instruments

*Adjective Descriptions and Personality Phrases.* As part of Goldberg's (2008) longitudinal community research, respondents and observers (e.g., significant others, spouses, friends, acquaintances, coworkers) completed the Self/Peer Inventories, which include 88 items taken from Saucier's (1994) 40-item Big-Five "Mini-Markers," the 44-item Big Five Inventory (John & Srivastava, 1999; Benet-Martinez & John, 1998), and two additional items in each inventory measuring physical attractiveness. In this survey, respondents described how well each adjective or phrase described either themselves or the target individual using a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*Extremely Inaccurate*) to 5 (*Extremely Accurate*).

Each participant, and up to four observers of each participant, completed these items. The sample of 196 participants providing self-ratings included 87 males and 109 females. Ages of subjects ranged from 21 years to 72 years with a mean of 45.45 years ( $SD = 8.72$ ). Observers also responded to items assessing how and how well they knew the target, how much they liked the target, and basic demographic questions on gender and age.

The sample of 538 respondents providing observer ratings included 208 males and 330 females. Ages of observers ranged from 7 years to 89 years with a mean of 41.50 years ( $SD = 16.24$ ). Observers included spouses and other relatives ( $N = 300$ ), friends, coworkers, acquaintances, and significant others ( $N = 207$ ), and 31 observers not indicating their relationship to the target. Most observers indicated knowing the target "well" or "very well" ( $N = 522$ ), and most indicated they liked the target or liked the target "very much" ( $N = 520$ ).

For each of the items, we averaged observer ratings to create a composite on each item for each target. We used these mean responses ( $N = 196$ ) to calculate correlations between observer ratings and our competencies.



*Hogan 360°*. The 50-item Hogan 360° is a multi-rater feedback evaluation tool (Peter Berry Consultancy, 2015). As part of the feedback process, each individual's supervisors, peers, and subordinates indicate how well each item describe the target individual on a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*Does not describe this person at all*) to 7 (*Describes this person exactly*).

The Hogan 360° model includes four higher-order domains: Self-Management, Relationship Management, Working in the Business, and Working on the Business. Each domain includes two or more competencies. Self-Management includes Integrity and Resilience. Relationship Management includes Communication, People Skills, Team Player, and Customer. Working in the Business includes Capability, Efficiency, Results, and Engaging. Finally, Working on the Business includes Accountability, Motivation, Strategy, and Innovation. We calculated scores on these four domains by averaging competency ratings under each.

Our sample included data for 1,621 target individuals and ratings from 19,634 total observers. Target individuals included 1,057 males, 364 females, and 200 individuals who did not indicate their gender. Target individuals' ages ranged from 20 years to 66 years with a mean of 34.52 years ( $SD = 17.18$ ). Observers included subordinates ( $N = 7,445$ ), peers ( $N = 9,326$ ), and supervisors ( $N = 2,863$ ).

For each item, we pooled observer ratings into three composites by calculating a mean observer rating for subordinates, peers, and supervisors. We used these three mean responses for each target ( $N = 1,621$ ) as the basis for calculating correlations between ratings from each source and our competencies. The number of observer ratings for each target ranged from 1 to 36 with a mean of 10.00 ratings ( $SD = 3.59$ ).

## 4.2.2 Results of Observer Description Correlates

*Getting Along*. Tables 4.13 and 4.14 provide selected correlations for the Getting Along competency.

**Table 4.13** Adjective Checklist Correlates for Constituent Scales of Getting Along Competency

HPI Adjustment		HPI Interpersonal Sensitivity		MVPI Altruistic	
Emotionally stable/not easily upset	.44**	Likes to cooperate with others	.28**	Kind	.34**
Remains calm in tense situations	.41**	Has a forgiving nature	.28**	Sympathetic	.32**
Relaxed/handles stress well	.36**	Warm	.28**	Helpful and unselfish with others	.29**
Moody	-.35**	Cold	-.23**	Withdrawn	-.24**
Fretful	-.36**	Harsh	-.23**	Quiet	-.25**
Can be tense	-.41**	Finds fault with others	-.24**	Unsympathetic	-.32**

*Note:* \*\* Correlation is significant at .01 level.

Results reflect the interpersonally rewarding nature of the Getting Along competency. Others describe individuals with high scores as calm, warm, and preferring to cooperate with and help others, and those with low scores as cold, harsh, unsympathetic, and fault-finding.

**Table 4.14** Hogan 360° Correlates of Getting Along Competency

Observer Description Item	Observer		
	Subordinate	Peer	Supervisor
People Skills	.13**	.14**	.15**
Team Player	.08**	.10**	.12**
Overall Relationship Management	.06*	.07*	.10**
Overall Score	.10**	.12**	.15**

*Note:* \* Correlation is significant at .05 level; \*\* Correlation is significant at .01 level.

Hogan 360° results highlight the pleasant and warm attributes of the Getting Along competency. Others across rater groups view individuals with high scores as having good people skills, being a team player, being effective at managing relationships, and generally effective at their job. These relationships are strongest for the People Skills competency, and ratings from supervisors are generally stronger than those from subordinates or peers.

*Thinking Broadly.* Tables 4.15 and 4.16 provide selected correlations for the Thinking Broadly competency.

**Table 4.15** Adjective Checklist Correlates for Constituent Scales of Thinking Broadly Competency

HPI Inquisitive		HPI Learning Approach		HDS Imaginative	
Likes to reflect/play with ideas	.41**	Intellectual	.41**	Inventive	.36**
Deep	.34**	Ingenious/deep thinker	.32**	Creative	.31**
Original/comes up with new ideas	.30**	Philosophical	.24**	Curious about many different things	.30**
Uncreative	-.23**	Prefers routine work	-.11	Prefers routine work	-.20**
Unintellectual	-.25**	Uncreative	-.13	Uncreative	-.21**
Prefers routine work	-.31**	Unintellectual	-.26**	Has few artistic interests	-.27**

*Note:* \*\* Correlation is significant at .01 level.

Results reflect the intellectual and open-minded component of the Thinking Broadly competency. Others describe individuals with high scores as creative, original, and curious deep-thinkers, and those with low scores as uncreative, unintellectual, and preferring routine work.

**Table 4.16** Hogan 360° Correlates of Thinking Broadly Competency

Observer Description Item	Observer		
	Subordinate	Peer	Supervisor
Strategy	-.02	-.06*	-.03
Efficiency	-.07*	-.14**	-.09**
Innovation	.08*	.02	.02

*Note:* \* Correlation is significant at .05 level; \*\* Correlation is significant at .01 level.





Hogan 360° results highlight the intellectual nature of the Thinking Broadly competency. Others tend to view people with high scores as innovative thinkers who may be uninterested in the details of implementation. Although subordinates view individuals with high scores as innovative, peers and supervisors do not. Combined with the results from non-work observers in Table 4.15, these results suggest that the strategic perspective and open-mindedness of Thinking Broadly may be easier to notice in everyday circumstances, but more difficult to perceive than the interpersonal aspects of Getting Along.

*Following Process.* Tables 4.17 and 4.18 provide selected correlations for the Following Process competency.

**Table 4.17** Adjective Checklist Correlates for Constituent Scales of Following Process Competency

HPI Prudence		HDS Dutiful		MVPI Tradition	
Organized	.23**	Prefers routine work	.28**	Likes to cooperate with others	.17*
Makes plans and follows through	.21**	A reliable worker	.22**	Warm	.17*
Perseveres until the task is finished	.19**	Does a thorough job	.19**	Helpful and unselfish with others	.15*
Tends to be disorganized	-.19**	Can be somewhat careless	-.12	Sometimes shy/inhibited	-.18*
Sloppy	-.20**	Tends to be disorganized	-.16*	Withdrawn	-.20**
Inefficient	-.22**	Sloppy	-.17*	Can be cold and aloof	-.26**

*Note:* \*Correlation is significant at .05 level; \*\* Correlation is significant at .01 level.

Results reflect the organization, dependability, and persistence characteristic of the Following Process competency. Others describe individuals with high scores as reliable, thorough, helpful and unselfish, persistent, and cooperative, and those with low scores as disorganized, sloppy, careless, inefficient, and unsocial.

**Table 4.18** Hogan 360° Correlates of Following Process Competency

Observer Description Item	Observer		
	Subordinate	Peer	Supervisor
Resilience	.09**	.13**	.09**
People Skills	.08**	.15**	.07*
Team Player	.05	.13**	.05
Overall Self-Management	.08**	.12**	.08**

*Note:* \* Correlation is significant at .05 level; \*\* Correlation is significant at .01 level.

Hogan 360° results highlight the resilience common to the Following Process competency. Others across rater groups view individuals with high scores as resilient and good with people, especially in team settings where results are strongest for peers.

*Leadership Foundations.* Table 4.19 provides selected correlations for the Leadership Foundations dimension. Because participants in the ESCS did not complete all three Hogan assessments (i.e., HPI, HDS, MVPI) required to calculate High Potential Model competencies and dimensions, we could not calculate correlations between this dimension and Adjective Checklist items.

**Table 4.19** Hogan 360° Correlates of Leadership Foundations Dimension

Observer Description Item	Observer		
	Subordinate	Peer	Supervisor
Resilience	.07*	.07*	.07*
People Skills	.08*	.10**	.07*
Team Player	.05	.07*	.05
Motivation	.05	.06	.02
Overall Self-Management	.05	.04	.04
Overall Relationship Management	.03	.04	.03
Overall Score	.06	.10**	.07*

*Note:* \* Correlation is significant at .05 level; \*\* Correlation is significant at .01 level.

Results highlight the general career management focus of the Leadership Foundations dimension. Others view individuals with high scores as resilient, interpersonally skilled, good team players, and motivated to manage themselves and their relationships with others to meet performance goals. Across rater groups, others view these individuals as people they can count on to get along with others and reliably complete their work.

*Standing Out.* Tables 4.20 and 4.21 provide selected correlations for the Standing Out competency.

**Table 4.20** Adjective Checklist Correlates for Constituent Scales of Standing Out Competency

HDS Bold		HDS Colorful		MVPI Recognition	
Has an assertive personality	.14*	Generates a lot of enthusiasm	.37**	Extraverted	.25**
Generates a lot of enthusiasm	.14*	Bold	.36**	Has an assertive personality	.23**
Energetic	.13	Full of energy	.27**	Bold	.19**
Sometimes shy/inhibited	-.10	Shy	-.30**	Quiet	-.18*
Likes to cooperate with others	-.11	Is reserved	-.32**	Bashful	-.23**
Has a forgiving nature	-.20*	Tends to be quiet	-.34**	Sometimes shy/inhibited	-.25**

*Note:* \*Correlation is significant at .05 level; \*\* Correlation is significant at .01 level.

Results reflect the charisma and sociability associated with the Standing Out competency. Others describe individuals with high scores as enthusiastic, extraverted, competitive, and assertive, and those with low scores as quiet, shy, cooperative, forgiving, and inhibited.

**Table 4.21** Hogan 360° Correlates of Standing Out Competency

Observer Description Item	Observer		
	Subordinate	Peer	Supervisor
Results	-.02	-.11**	-.08**
Engaging	.11**	.10**	.10**
Overall Self-Management	-.04	-.10**	-.09**

*Note:* \* Correlation is significant at .05 level; \*\* Correlation is significant at .01 level.



Hogan 360° results provide an interesting mix of positive and negative findings. Others across rater groups view individuals with high scores as highly engaging at work. However, this engagement may come at the expense of self-management and a focus on results.

*Building Connections.* Tables 4.22 and 2.23 provide selected correlations for the Building Connections competency.

**Table 4.22** Adjective Checklist Correlates for Constituent Scales of Building Connections Competency

HPI Sociability		HDS Reserved		MVPI Affiliation	
Extraverted	.30**	Generates a lot of enthusiasm	-.37**	Extraverted	.45**
Outgoing/sociable	.28**	Outgoing/sociable	-.36**	Outgoing/sociable	.45**
Quiet	-.20**	Unsympathetic	.24**	Can be cold and aloof	-.30**
Is reserved	-.24**	Can be cold and aloof	.24**	Bashful	-.31**
Shy	-.26**	Is reserved	.28**	Unsympathetic	-.32**

*Note:* \*\* Correlation is significant at .01 level.

Results reflect the relationship-building capabilities at the core of the Building Connections competency. Others describe individuals with high scores as extraverted, outgoing, enthusiastic, and sociable, and those with low scores as quiet, shy, reserved, unsympathetic, and reserved.

**Table 4.23** Hogan 360° Correlates of Building Connections Competency

Observer Description Item	Observer		
	Subordinate	Peer	Supervisor
People Skills	.05	.07*	.09**
Customer	.06*	.09**	.14**
Engaging	.12**	.14**	.14**
Overall Relationship Management	.04	.06*	.09**

*Note:* \* Correlation is significant at .05 level; \*\* Correlation is significant at .01 level.

Hogan 360° results are strongest for the Relationship Management domain. Others across rater groups view individuals with high scores as highly engaging, driven to meet customers' needs, interpersonally skilled, and effective at managing relationships. It is also worth noting that results are strongest for supervisors.



*Influencing Others.* Tables 4.24 and 4.25 provide selected correlations for the Influencing Others competency.

**Table 4.24** Adjective Checklist Correlates for Constituent Scales of Influencing Others Competency

HPI Ambition		HDS Excitable		HDS Cautious	
Has an assertive personality	.34**	Relaxed/handles stress well	-.21**	Has an assertive personality	-.41**
Bold	.33**	Emotionally stable/not easily upset	-.17*	Bold	-.26**
Easily distracted	-.33**	Can be tense	.19**	Bashful	.37**
Sometimes shy/inhibited	-.37**	Temperamental	.26**	Sometimes shy/inhibited	.39**
Gets nervous easily	-.38**	Can be moody	.28**	Is reserved	.44**

*Note:* \*Correlation is significant at .05 level; \*\* Correlation is significant at .01 level.

Results reflect the assertive and bold elements of the Influencing Others competency. Others describe individuals with high scores as assertive, emotionally stable, bold, and resilient to stress, and those with low scores as nervous, tense, temperamental, moody, and bashful.

**Table 4.25** Hogan 360° Correlates of Influencing Others Competency

Observer Description Item	Observer		
	Subordinate	Peer	Supervisor
People Skills	.03	-.02	.07*
Team Player	.01	-.03	.08**
Engaging	.15**	.13**	.19**
Overall Relationship Management	.03	-.01	.10**

*Note:* \* Correlation is significant at .05 level; \*\* Correlation is significant at .01 level.

Hogan 360° results are strongest for the Relationship Management and Working in the Business domains, but findings somewhat depend on rater group. Others across rater groups view individuals with high scores as effective at engaging others, and supervisors view these same individuals as interpersonally skilled team players who can effectively manage relationships. However, peers view individuals with high scores as engaging but somewhat lacking in the other attributes rated favorably by supervisors.



*Leadership Emergence.* Table 4.26 provides selected correlations for the Leadership Emergence dimension. Because participants in the ESCS did not complete all three Hogan assessments (i.e., HPI, HDS, MVPI) required to calculate High Potential Model competencies and dimensions, we could not calculate correlations between this dimension and Adjective Checklist items.

**Table 4.26** Hogan 360° Correlates of Leadership Emergence Dimension

Observer Description Item	Observer		
	Subordinate	Peer	Supervisor
Integrity	-.06	-.12**	-.07*
Communication	.04	.01	.05
People Skills	.03	.01	.05
Team Player	.02	-.01	.07*
Customer	.08**	.06*	.13**
Capability	-.06*	-.11**	-.02
Efficiency	-.05	-.06*	.02
Results	-.03	-.11**	-.04
Engaging	.16**	.16**	.18**
Accountability	.01	.04	.10**
Motivation	.04	.05	.09**
Strategy	.03	.04	.07*
Innovation	.08**	.06*	.09**
Overall Self-Management	-.03	-.09**	-.04
Overall Relationship Management	.04	.02	.08**
Overall Working on the Business	.05	.05	.10**
Overall Score	.08*	.07*	.13**

*Note:* \* Correlation is significant at .05 level; \*\* Correlation is significant at .01 level.

Hogan 360° results highlight the attributes of the Leadership Emergence dimension that help an employee get attention at work. Others view individuals with high scores as engaging and motivated workers who can find innovative solutions to meet customer needs. As a result, they are likely to see these individuals as skilled at managing relationships and working on the business. However, others may view these same individuals as sometimes lacking in integrity, capability, efficiency, results-orientation, and self-management.

*Leading People.* Tables 4.27 and 4.28 provide selected correlations for the Leading People competency.

**Table 4.27** Adjective Checklist Correlates for Constituent Scales of Leading People Competency

HPI Interpersonal Sensitivity		HDS Excitable		HDS Skeptical	
Sympathetic	.32**	Relaxed/handles stress well	-.21**	Has a forgiving nature	-.18*
Has a forgiving nature	.28**	Remains calm in tense situations	-.18*	Emotionally stable/not easily upset	-.17*
Likes to cooperate with others	.28**	Emotionally stable/not easily upset	-.17*	Likes to cooperate with others	-.13
Cold	-.23**	Can be tense	.19**	Can be cold and aloof	.12
Finds faults with others	-.24**	Worries a lot	.23**	Harsh	.14*
Unsympathetic	-.32**	Can be moody	.28**	Starts quarrels with others	.20**

*Note:* \*Correlation is significant at .05 level; \*\* Correlation is significant at .01 level.



Results reflect the interpersonal skill and emotional stability inherent in the Leading People competency. Others describe individuals with high scores as calm, emotionally stable, cooperative, and patient, and those with low scores as cold, fault-finding, tense, and quarrelsome.

**Table 4.28** Hogan 360° Correlates of Leading People Competency

Observer Description Item	Observer		
	Subordinate	Peer	Supervisor
Team Player	.09**	.11**	.16**
People Skills	.14**	.14**	.18**
Resilience	.15**	.12**	.16**
Motivation	.09**	.07*	.13**
Engaging	.09**	.07*	.08**
Overall Self-Management	.13**	.10**	.13**
Overall Relationship Management	.08**	.09**	.14**

*Note:* \* Correlation is significant at .05 level; \*\* Correlation is significant at .01 level.

Hogan 360° results are strongest for the Relationship Management and Self-Management domains. Others across rater groups view individuals with high scores as good team players, interpersonally skilled, resilient, motivated, engaging, and effective at managing themselves and others. On average, these findings are strongest for supervisors.

*Leading the Business.* Tables 4.29 and 4.30 provide selected correlations for the Leading the Business competency.

**Table 4.29** Adjective Checklist Correlates for Constituent Scales of Leading the Business Competency

HPI Ambition		MVPI Commercial		HDS Power	
Has an assertive personality	.34**	Outgoing/sociable	.13	Has an assertive personality	.20**
Bold	.33**	Relaxed/handles stress well	.10	Outgoing/sociable	.19**
Energetic	.32**	Full of energy	.06	Bold	.18*
Tends to be lazy	-.30**	Prefers routine work	-.12	Withdrawn	-.14*
Easily distracted	-.33**	Fretful	-.14*	Bashful	-.17*
Gets nervous easily	-.38**	Shy	-.19**	Shy	-.20**

*Note:* \*Correlation is significant at .05 level; \*\* Correlation is significant at .01 level.

Results highlight the achievement orientation focus of the Leading the Business competency. Others view individuals with high scores as assertive, energetic, and bold in their pursuit of business goals, and those with low scores as unfocused, lazy, distractible, nervous, and withdrawn.

**Table 4.30** Hogan 360° Correlates of Leading the Business Competency

Observer Description Item	Observer		
	Subordinate	Peer	Supervisor
Overall Working on Business	.09**	.04	.08*
Strategy	.08**	.05	.08*
Accountability	.10**	.08**	.09**
Engaging	.14**	.13**	.14**

*Note:* \* Correlation is significant at .05 level; \*\* Correlation is significant at .01 level.

Hogan 360° results are strongest for the Working on the Business domain and one aspect of Working in the Business. Others across rater groups view individuals with high scores as engaging, accountable, and strategic in their pursuit of business goals. On average, results are strongest for engaging ratings across rater groups.

*Managing Resources.* Tables 4.31 and 4.32 provide selected correlations for the Managing Resources competency.

**Table 4.31** Adjective Checklist Correlates for Constituent Scales of Managing Resources Competency

HPI Prudence		MVPI Mischievous		MVPI Scientific	
Organized	.23**	Prefers routine work	-.33**	Prefers routine work	-.18*
Makes plans and follows through	.21**	Systematic	-.17*		
Efficient	.21**	Practical	-.14*		
Sloppy	-.20**	Can be somewhat careless	.18*	Careless	.09
Can be somewhat careless	-.20**	Easily distracted	.22**	Inventive	.20**
Easily distracted	-.27**	Tends to be disorganized	.24**	Likes to reflect/play with ideas	.25**

*Note:* \*Correlation is significant at .05 level; \*\* Correlation is significant at .01 level.

Results reflect the organization and efficiency characteristic of the Managing Resources competency. Others view individuals with high scores as organized, efficient, systematic, and practical, and those with low scores as sloppy, careless, disorganized, and easily distracted.

**Table 4.32** Hogan 360° Correlates of Managing Resources Competency

Observer Description Item	Observer		
	Subordinate	Peer	Supervisor
Strategy	.03	.08*	.04
Efficiency	.06*	.12**	.13**
Overall Working in the Business	.05	.10**	.09**
Integrity	.12**	.12**	.13**
Resilience	.10**	.14**	.11**
People Skills	.10**	.13**	.13**

*Note:* \* Correlation is significant at .05 level; \*\* Correlation is significant at .01 level.

Hogan 360° results are strongest for the Working in the Business domain, with other significant findings in the Self-Management and Working on the Business domains. Others across rater groups view individuals with high scores as strategic, efficient, effective with managing tactical elements in the business, demonstrating integrity, being resilient, and having good people skills.





*Leadership Effectiveness.* Table 4.33 provides selected correlations for the Leadership Effectiveness dimension. Because participants in the ESCS did not complete all three Hogan assessments (i.e., HPI, HDS, MVPI) required to calculate High Potential Model competencies and dimensions, we could not calculate correlations between this dimension and Adjective Checklist items.

**Table 4.33** Hogan 360° Correlates of Leadership Effectiveness Dimension

Observer Description Item	Observer		
	Subordinate	Peer	Supervisor
Integrity	.08*	.01	.06*
Resilience	.14**	.09**	.13**
Communication	.05	.05	.09**
People Skills	.12**	.09**	.14**
Team Player	.09**	.08*	.13**
Customer	.09**	.08**	.13**
Efficiency	.04	.04	.12**
Results	.05	.02	.06
Engaging	.13**	.14**	.13**
Accountability	.03	.06	.10**
Motivation	.10**	.08**	.12**
Strategy	.06*	.07*	.08**
Innovation	.08**	.03	.05
Overall Self-Management	.11**	.05	.11**
Overall Relationship Management	.09**	.08**	.13**
Overall Working in the Business	.07*	.05	.11**
Overall Working on the Business	.08*	.06*	.10**
Overall Score	.13**	.11**	.18**

*Note:* \* Correlation is significant at .05 level; \*\* Correlation is significant at .01 level.

Hogan 360° results are positive across all four domains and for overall performance, highlighting that Leadership Effectiveness concerns actual leadership performance. Across rater groups, others view individuals with high scores as resilient, customer-focused, engaging, motivating, strategic, and skilled at managing relationships with individuals and teams to accomplish key performance objectives. Others from at least two rater groups also view these individuals as trustworthy workers who can effectively manage themselves. Others within specific groups also rate these individuals as efficient and innovative communicators who enforce accountability for work outcomes. These findings demonstrate why we consider Leadership Effectiveness as the most important dimension of the Hogan High Potential Model – it facilitates outstanding leadership performance across a broad range of important work domains.



## 4.3 Criterion-Related Validity

Aguinis, Henle, and Ostroff (2001) described criterion-related validity in terms of the relationship between a predictor and some criterion measure (e.g., job performance), with the goal of answering the basic question, “How accurate are scores in predicting criterion performance?” The *Uniform Guidelines* state that “evidence of the validity of a test...by a criterion-related validity study should consist of empirical data demonstrating that the [test] is predictive of or significantly correlated with important elements of job performance” (29 C.F.R. §§ 1607.5 (B)).

### 4.3.1 Procedure

We used regression to evaluate the criterion validity for the competencies in our model, using the predictive scales for each High Potential competency to predict supervisory job performance ratings aligned with competencies from the Hogan Competency Model (HCM; Hogan Assessment Systems, 2009a). However, because the parameters for our regressions came from differing data sources, we used matrix input to run regressions in SPSS.

First, we identified correlations between each variable needed for individual regression analyses. For example, to examine the relationship between Getting Along from the High Potential Model and an aligned criterion (i.e., supervisor ratings of Leveraging People Skills), we needed correlations between the following four elements: (a) HPI components of Getting Along, (b) HDS components of Getting Along, (c) MVPI components of Getting along, and (d) supervisor ratings of Leveraging People Skills. This produced a 4x4 correlation matrix we inputted as data in SPSS using the MATRIX DATA function (“Overview (MATRIX DATA command)”, 2011). This function also requires entering means and standard deviations for these variables. We obtained descriptive statistics and correlations between the first three components from our global sample of professionals, managers, and executives ( $N = 20,828$ ). We obtained correlations between these components and supervisory ratings from the Hogan Synthetic Tables (Hogan Assessment Systems, 2010b). These tables report results from meta-analyses examining relationships between each HPI, HDS, and MVPI scale with supervisory ratings aligned with all 62 competencies in the HCM. Finally, because sample sizes differed based for each component of the correlation matrix based on data source, we used a harmonic mean as the sample size for each regression.

We used the results from these regressions to evaluate the criterion validity evidence for each competency in our model. We also provide an estimate of the validity for each of the dimensions in our model by averaging the regression results across the competencies under that dimension. The following section provides results.

### 4.3.2 Criterion Results for Hogan High Potential Competencies

Tables 4.34 through 4.36 provide criterion-related validity results for each dimension and its respective competencies.

**Table 4.34** Criterion Validity Evidence for Leadership Foundations

HIPO Competency	HCM Competency	HPI		HDS		MVPI		Scale			Validity
		<i>K</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>K</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>K</i>	<i>N</i>	1	2	3	
Getting Along	Leveraging People Skills	63	7,047	4	302	18	2,118	.24	.18	.05	.26
Thinking Broadly	Solving Problems	37	3,468	5	267	23	2,288	.16	.08	.26	.37
Following Process	Rule Compliance	46	4,131	6	675	19	1,981	.23	.06	.06	.23
LEADERSHIP FOUNDATIONS	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.29

*Note:* HIPO = Hogan High Potential Model; HCM = Hogan Competency Model; *K* = Number of studies; *N* = Number of participants across *K* studies; Scale 1 – 3 = Meta-analytic validity coefficients for constituent scales in predicting HCM competency.

Results for all three Leadership Foundations competencies support our scoring algorithms for predicting aligned performance outcomes. Getting Along, concerned with being cooperative, positive, and rewarding to deal with, positively predicts Leveraging People Skills, which has to do with being tactful, behaving appropriately in social situations, and getting along well with others. Thinking Broadly, concerned with solving a wide range of business problems by adopting a strategic perspective and thinking outside the box, positively predicts Solving Problems, which has to do with identifying and implementing appropriate solutions given available information. Following Process, concerned with following organizational procedures and respecting established conventions, positively predicts Rule Compliance, which has to do with adhering to directions, policies, and organizational or legal guidelines. Across competencies, the average validity coefficient supports the overall predictive validity of the Leadership Foundations dimension.

**Table 4.35** Criterion Validity Evidence for Leadership Emergence

HIPO Competency	HCM Competency	HPI		HDS		MVPI		Scale			Validity
		<i>K</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>K</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>K</i>	<i>N</i>	1	2	3	
Standing Out	Displaying Confidence	18	2,134	2	118	8	726	.10	.18	.01	.26
Building Connections	Networking	8	683	1	25	5	330	.15	.37	.22	.37
Influencing Others	Influencing Others	12	1,573	4	271	6	526	.32	.30	.16	.39
LEADERSHIP EMERGENCE	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.34

*Note:* HIPO = Hogan High Potential Model; HCM = Hogan Competency Model; *K* = Number of studies; *N* = Number of participants across *K* studies; Scale 1 – 3 = Meta-analytic validity coefficients for constituent scales in predicting HCM competency.

Results for all three Leadership Emergence competencies support our scoring algorithms for predicting aligned performance outcomes. Standing Out, concerned with proudly making others aware of one's contributions and accomplishments, positively predicts Displaying Confidence, which has to do with projecting poise and self-assurance at work. Building Connections, concerned with growing, maintaining, and leveraging strategic business contacts, positively predicts Networking, which has to do with building and maintaining a system of strategic business connections. Influencing Others, concerned with persuading others to pursue a desired course to help achieve organizational objectives, positively predicts the same competency from the HCM. Across competencies, the average validity coefficient supports the overall predictive validity of the Leadership Emergence dimension.

**Table 4.36** Criterion Validity Evidence for Leadership Effectiveness

HIPO Competency	HCM Competency	HPI		HDS		MVPI		Scale			Validity
		<i>K</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>K</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>K</i>	<i>N</i>	1	2	3	
Leading People	Leading Others	30	3,399	6	404	15	1,363	.10	.12	.25	.26
Leading the Business	Driving Strategy	11	1,491	6	661	7	708	.38	.06	.14	.38
Managing Resources	Managing Resources	14	1,416	7	706	15	1,419	.23	.01	.10	.28
LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.31

*Note:* HIPO = Hogan High Potential Model; HCM = Hogan Competency Model; *K* = Number of studies; *N* = Number of participants across *K* studies; Scale 1 – 3 = Meta-analytic validity coefficients for constituent scales in predicting HCM competency.

Results for all three Leadership Effectiveness competencies support our scoring algorithms for predicting aligned performance outcomes. Leading People, concerned with motivating others to put aside personal agendas in the pursuit of shared organizational goals, positively predicts Leading Others, which has to do with demonstrating general leadership ability. Leading the Business, concerned with pushing one's business unit to accomplish key objectives, positively predicts Driving Strategy, which has to do with directing efforts to achieve long-term business objectives. Managing Resources, concerned with obtaining, deploying, and maximizing the use of key material, financial, and personnel assets, positively predicts the same competency from the HCM. Across these competencies, the average validity coefficient supports the overall predictive validity of the Leadership Effectiveness dimension.



## 5. ANALYSIS OF ADVERSE IMPACT FOR THE HOGAN HIGH POTENTIAL MODEL

### 5.1 Introduction

For organizations interested in using the Hogan High Potential Model to identify high-potential employees, it is important to conduct Adverse Impact (hereafter “AI”) analyses. This helps ensure that decisions based on candidate scores from our model do not disproportionately impact employees based on age, gender, or race/ethnicity. This chapter defines Adverse Impact and presents results for simulations using our model to identify high-potential employees. For a more detailed description of this topic, various methods for examining AI, case law from relevant court decisions, and group differences on the Hogan assessments, please consult our Adverse Impact White Paper or request a copy from your Hogan consultant.

### 5.2 Defining Adverse Impact

The *Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures* (UGESP, 1978) defines AI as “a substantially different rate of selection in hiring, promotion, or other employment decisions which works to the disadvantage of members of a race, sex or ethnic group” (see section 1607.16). In examining the potential for AI, the *Uniform Guidelines* outlines the four-fifths rule, stating that the “selection rate for any race, sex or ethnic group which is less than four-fifths (4/5) (or eighty percent) of the rate for the group with the highest rate will generally be regarded by the Federal enforcement agencies as evidence of adverse impact.” (1978, see section 1607.4 D). Because the Age Discrimination in Employment Act (ADEA) of 1967 prohibits discrimination in selection contexts against individuals 40 years of age or older, courts have also applied this rule to cases involving potential age discrimination.

Organizations are not required to conduct validity studies for selection procedures where no AI exists. However, best practices require examining the potential for AI and accumulating validity evidence for each step of any selection process. In such efforts, statistical significance tests for mean group differences on assessment scale scores is often informative, but does not provide evidence of AI when a selection profile includes multiple assessment scales. For example, competencies and dimensions from the Hogan High Potential Model reflect scores from multiple HPI, HDS, and MVPI scales. As such, organizations must examine AI at the point at which selection decisions are made rather than differences on individual assessment scales underlying a competency or dimension.

### 5.3 Adverse Impact and the Hogan High Potential Model

To investigate the potential for AI in our model, we examine mean group differences based on age, sex, and race/ethnicity for our competencies and dimensions. Because AI concerns the impact of decisions made on high-stakes testing, we conducted analyses using data from over 3,000 professionals, managers, and executives who completed the HPI, HDS, and MVPI as part of an applicant screening process for hiring.

#### 5.3.1 Age Differences

Table 5.1 provides mean group differences for competencies and dimensions based on age groups. Because the Age Discrimination in Employment Act (ADEA) targets individuals 40 years of age or older as a group in need of protection, we compare scores of participants under 40 to those 40 and above. We used ANOVAs to examine



the statistical significance of mean score differences, and Cohen's *d* effect sizes (Cohen, 1988) to evaluate the practical meaning of those differences.

**Table 5.1** Mean Differences on Hogan High Potential Model Competencies & Dimensions by Age

Competencies & Dimensions	Under 40		40 & Above		<i>F</i>	<i>d</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
Getting Along	69.90	20.21	67.79	19.56	7.69**	0.11
Thinking Broadly	55.63	19.79	53.38	18.92	9.16**	0.12
Following Process	64.80	18.01	63.22	17.72	5.25*	0.09
LEADERSHIP FOUNDATIONS	63.45	13.27	61.46	12.12	16.87***	0.16
Standing Out	52.59	22.41	47.31	22.23	37.86***	0.24
Building Connections	54.00	20.89	49.14	20.74	36.84***	0.23
Influencing Others	59.27	20.94	60.58	20.60	2.73	0.06
LEADERSHIP EMERGENCE	55.28	16.71	52.33	16.20	21.71***	0.18
Leading People	60.75	19.35	62.20	18.97	3.90*	0.08
Leading the Business	61.07	21.19	59.58	20.00	3.59	0.07
Managing Resources	56.26	19.11	56.44	18.28	.06	0.01
LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS	59.38	11.78	59.41	11.15	.01	0.00

*Note:* *N* = 3,728; Competencies listed in Title Case, Dimensions CAPITALIZED; *M* = Mean; *SD* = Standard Deviation; \* *F* statistic is significant at .05 level; \*\* *F* statistic is significant at .001 level; \*\*\* *F* statistic is significant at .0001 level; *d* = Cohen's *d* effect size (.00 - .19 = negligible; .20 - .49 = small; .50 - .79 = moderate; .80+ = large).

Mean scores for those under 40 are higher than those 40 and older for all competencies and dimensions except Influencing Others, Leading People, Managing Resources, and Leadership Effectiveness. Differences are statistically significant for the Leadership Foundations dimension and all its competencies, the Leadership Emergence dimension and two of its competencies (i.e., Standing Out, Building Connections), and the Leading People competency under Leadership Effectiveness. However, an examination of effect sizes indicates that most of these differences are negligible in terms of their practical meaning. Standing Out and Building Connections show the largest mean differences, although these effects are still small.



### 5.3.2 Sex Differences

Table 5.2 provides mean group differences based on participants' reported sex. Consistent with existing legal and professional guidelines, we treat females as the protected group. We used ANOVAs to examine the statistical significance of mean score differences, and Cohen's *d* effect sizes to evaluate their practical meaning.

**Table 5.2** Mean Differences on Hogan High Potential Model Competencies & Dimensions by Sex

Competencies & Dimensions	Male		Female		<i>F</i>	<i>d</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
Getting Along	67.74	19.69	74.61	18.01	104.01***	0.36
Thinking Broadly	56.96	19.17	54.45	20.06	13.17***	0.13
Following Process	64.50	17.47	65.09	16.98	0.92	0.03
LEADERSHIP FOUNDATIONS	63.06	12.73	64.72	12.38	13.89***	0.13
Standing Out	52.29	22.70	49.95	21.83	8.75**	0.10
Building Connections	53.68	21.55	53.97	20.44	0.15	0.01
Influencing Others	62.72	19.93	59.38	21.04	21.50***	0.16
LEADERSHIP EMERGENCE	56.22	16.55	54.42	16.49	9.51**	0.11
Leading People	61.04	18.95	64.93	17.99	34.98***	0.21
Leading the Business	65.10	19.21	56.70	20.76	143.31***	0.42
Managing Resources	53.25	18.23	61.16	17.73	153.44***	0.44
LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS	59.80	11.35	60.94	10.92	8.25**	0.10

*Note:* *N* = 3,728; Competencies listed in Title Case, Dimensions CAPITALIZED; *M* = Mean; *SD* = Standard Deviation; \* *F* statistic is significant at .05 level; \*\* *F* statistic is significant at .001 level; \*\*\* *F* statistic is significant at .0001 level; *d* = Cohen's *d* effect size (.00 - .19 = negligible; .20 - .49 = small; .50 - .79 = moderate; .80+ = large).

Mean scores for female participants are higher than those for males for all competencies and dimensions except Thinking Broadly, Standing Out, Influencing Others, Leadership Emergence, and Leading the Business. Sex-based mean score differences are statistically significant for all competencies and dimensions except Following Process and Building Connections. However, an examination of effect sizes indicates that most of these differences are negligible in terms of their practical meaning. Getting Along shows small meaningful differences by sex, as do the Leadership Effectiveness competencies. Females score higher on Getting Along, Leading People, and Managing Resources, whereas males score higher on Leading the Business.

### 5.3.3 Race/Ethnicity Differences

Table 5.3 provides mean group differences based on race/ethnicity. The EEOC compliance manual (Office of Management and Budget, 2006) defines the following race/ethnicity groups: (a) American Indian or Alaska Native, (b) Asian, (c) Black or African-American, (d) Hispanic, (e) Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, and (f) White. Consistent with these guidelines, we compare scores of White participants as the majority group to participants from all other racial/ethnic categories as minority groups. Because our sample provided sufficient data for White, Black/African-American, Hispanic/Latino, and Asian participants, we report results for those groups only. We used ANOVAs and Dunnett post-hoc comparison tests to examine the statistical significance of mean score differences, and Cohen's *d* effect sizes to evaluate the practical meaning of those differences.





**Table 5.3** Mean Differences on Hogan High Potential Model Competencies by Race/Ethnicity

Competencies & Dimensions	White		F	Black/African-American					Hispanic/Latino					Asian				
	M	SD		M	SD	MD	d	M	SD	MD	d	M	SD	MD	d	M	SD	MD
Getting Along	68.57	19.77	5.57***	76.08	15.67	7.51*	.39	74.42	17.93	5.85*	.30	68.74	18.80	0.17	.01			
Thinking Broadly	53.49	19.31	6.05***	56.87	19.62	3.38	.18	56.85	17.54	3.36	.17	62.86	19.70	9.38*	.49			
Following Process	63.81	17.78	9.45***	73.48	15.37	9.67*	.55	69.04	16.12	5.23*	.30	61.68	16.51	-2.13	.12			
LEADERSHIP FOUNDATIONS	61.96	12.42	10.85***	68.81	11.91	6.85*	.55	66.79	12.60	4.84*	.39	64.41	12.42	2.45	.20			
Standing Out	48.28	22.32	6.57***	54.11	20.96	5.83*	.26	48.74	23.41	0.46	.02	59.43	22.90	11.15*	.50			
Building Connections	51.33	21.04	2.44*	47.80	19.05	-3.53	.17	50.21	19.60	-1.12	.05	56.88	22.48	5.56*	.27			
Influencing Others	59.99	20.82	1.73	61.53	16.82	1.54	.07	62.17	20.21	2.18	.11	55.56	19.86	-4.42	.22			
LEADERSHIP EMERGENCE	53.19	16.56	1.44	54.46	14.84	1.27	.08	53.63	16.65	0.44	.03	57.29	15.81	4.10	.25			
Leading People	62.05	19.12	3.22*	61.96	17.74	-0.09	.00	63.59	18.16	1.54	.08	54.78	19.19	-7.27*	.38			
Leading the Business	59.95	20.47	1.08	60.96	22.12	1.01	.05	60.91	20.68	0.96	.05	63.25	19.40	3.30	.16			
Managing Resources	56.62	18.61	7.38***	62.58	16.84	5.96*	.32	60.96	16.03	4.34	.24	49.07	16.80	-7.55*	.41			
LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS	59.55	11.45	4.41**	61.83	9.77	2.28	.20	61.86	10.12	2.32	.21	55.74	10.28	-3.81*	.34			

Note: N = 3,728; Competencies listed in Title Case, Dimensions CAPITALIZED; M = Mean; SD = Standard Deviation; MD = Mean Difference; \* F statistic is significant at .05 level; \*\* F statistic is significant at .001 level; \*\*\* F statistic is significant at .0001 level; d = Cohen's d effect size (.00 - .19 = negligible; .20 - .49 = small; .50 - .79 = moderate; .80+ = large).



Illustrating the lack of racial or ethnic bias in our model, White participants did not show the highest mean scores on *any* competency or dimension. For six competencies and dimensions (i.e., Getting Along, Thinking Broadly, Leadership Foundations, Standing Out, Leadership Emergence, Leading the Business), mean scores were higher for Black/African-American participants, Hispanic/Latino participants, and Asian participants than for White participants. For an additional four competencies and dimensions (i.e., Following Process, Influencing Others, Managing Resources, Leadership Effectiveness), mean scores were higher for Black/African-American participants and Hispanic/Latino participants than for White participants. With the remaining competencies, mean Building Connections scores were higher for Asian participants than for White participants, and mean Leading People scores were higher for Hispanic/Latino participants than for White participants.

Group mean differences between racial/ethnic groups were statistically significant for all competencies and dimensions except Influencing Others, Leadership Emergence, and Leading the Business. Post-hoc comparisons show that differences between Black/African-American and White participants were statistically significant for Getting Along, Following Process, Leadership Foundations, Standing Out, and Managing Resources. Effect sizes show that differences for Following Process and Leadership Foundations are moderate, and effects for Getting Along, Standing Out, and Managing Resources are small. Although the mean score difference between Black/African-American and White participants on Leadership Effectiveness did not reach statistical significance, effect sizes also show that this difference is also small. For all these competencies and dimensions, mean scores for Black/African-American participants were higher than those for White participants.

Differences between Hispanic/Latino and White participants were statistically significant for Getting Along, Following Process, and Leadership Foundations, but effect sizes were small for each. Although the mean score difference between Hispanic/Latino and White participants on Managing Resources and Leadership Effectiveness did not reach statistical significance, an examination of effect sizes shows that these difference are also small. For all these competencies and dimensions, mean scores for Hispanic/Latino participants were higher than those for White participants.

Differences between Asian and White participants were statistically significant for Thinking Broadly, Standing Out, Building Connections, Leading People, Managing Resources, and Leadership Effectiveness. Effect sizes for Standing Out are moderate, and differences for Thinking Broadly approached moderate levels. Effects for Building Connections, Leading People, Managing Resources, and Leadership Effectiveness are small. Although the mean score differences between Asian and White participants on Leadership Foundations, Influencing Others, and Leadership Emergence did not reach statistical significance, these difference are also small. Mean scores for Asian participants were higher than those for Whites for all competencies and dimensions except Influencing Others, Leading People, Managing Resources, and Leadership Effectiveness.

### **5.4 Adverse Impact Analysis in the Operational Use of the Hogan High Potential Model**

This examination of mean group scores shows that differences tend to be small or moderate, and often benefit minority groups. However, as previously stated, mean differences do not indicate AI. To examine the potential for AI in operational use, we need to evaluate the decision points an organization might apply to screen employees into or out of high-potential programs. Below, we provide five examples of possible decision rules.

We selected decision rules based on dimension scores instead of specific competencies from our model, and used interpretive score ranges to guide our decisions. We designated dimension scores of 0-35 as low, 36-50 as below average, 51-65 as above average, and 66-100 as high. Any organization using different cut-score ranges should evaluate the potential for AI based on the specific scores they use for making or influencing hiring decisions.



### 5.4.1 Selecting High-Potential Employees Using Foundations, Emergence, & Effectiveness

Table 5.4 presents a profile where individuals must earn a score of over 50% on all three dimensions (i.e., Leadership Foundations, Leadership Emergence, and Leadership Effectiveness) to pass. Table 5.5 presents selection statistics and AI ratios based on this profile.

**Table 5.4** Recommended Selection Decision Rule for Using Leadership Foundations, Emergence, & Effectiveness

Dimension	Fails to Meet Cutoff Scores	Meets Cutoff Scores
Leadership Foundations	$\leq 50$	$\geq 51$
Leadership Emergence	$\leq 50$	$\geq 51$
Leadership Effectiveness	$\leq 50$	$\geq 51$

**Table 5.5** Selection and Adverse Impact Ratios for Using Leadership Foundations, Emergence, & Effectiveness

		Fails to Meet Cutoff Scores		Meets Cutoff Scores		AI Ratio
		N	%	N	%	
Total		1,738	46.6	1,990	53.4	N/A
Sex	Male	950	46.6	1,090	53.4	N/A
	Female	614	46.7	700	53.3	1.00
Age	Under 40	577	49.5	589	50.5	N/A
	40 and Over	862	53.7	744	46.3	0.92
Race/Ethnicity	Black/AfrAm	53	44.2	67	55.8	1.17
	Hispanic/Lat	55	47.0	62	53.0	1.12
	Asian	50	48.5	53	51.5	1.08
	White	1,108	52.5	1,003	47.5	N/A

*Note:* N = 3,728; AI = Adverse Impact; N/A = Not Applicable.

Results indicate that females should pass at the same rate as males, that candidates 40 years of age and older should pass nearly as often as younger candidates, and that candidates from minority racial/ethnic groups should pass at a slightly higher rate than White candidates.

### 5.4.2 Selecting High-Potential Employees Using Emergence and Effectiveness

Table 5.6 presents a profile where individuals must earn a score of over 50% on both Leadership Emergence and Leadership Effectiveness dimensions to pass. Table 5.7 presents selection statistics and AI ratios based on this profile.

**Table 5.6** Recommended Selection Decision Rule for Using Leadership Emergence and Effectiveness

Dimension	Fails to Meet Cutoff Scores	Meets Cutoff Scores
Leadership Emergence	$\leq 50$	$\geq 51$
Leadership Effectiveness	$\leq 50$	$\geq 51$

**Table 5.7** Selection and Adverse Impact Ratios for Using Leadership Emergence and Effectiveness

		Fails to Meet Cutoff Scores		Meets Cutoff Scores		AI Ratio
		N	%	N	%	
Total		1,606	43.1	2,122	56.9	N/A
Sex	Male	871	42.7	1,169	57.3	N/A
	Female	576	43.8	738	56.2	0.98
Age	Under 40	532	45.6	634	54.4	N/A
	40 and Over	801	49.9	805	50.1	0.92
Race/Ethnicity	Black/AfrAm	51	42.5	69	57.5	1.12
	Hispanic/Lat	53	45.3	64	54.7	1.07
	Asian	47	45.6	56	54.4	1.06
	White	1,028	48.7	1,083	51.3	N/A

*Note:* N = 3,728; AI = Adverse Impact; N/A = Not Applicable.

Results indicate that females should pass at nearly the same rate as males, that candidates 40 years of age and older should pass nearly as often as younger candidates, and that candidates from minority racial/ethnic groups should pass at a slightly higher rate than White candidates.

#### 5.4.3 Selecting High-Potential Employees Using Leadership Emergence

Table 5.8 presents a profile where individuals must earn a score of over 50% on the Leadership Emergence dimension to pass. Table 5.9 presents selection statistics and AI ratios based on this profile.

**Table 5.8** Recommended Selection Decision Rule for Using Leadership Emergence

Dimension	Fails to Meet Cutoff Scores	Meets Cutoff Scores
Leadership Emergence	≤ 50	≥ 51

**Table 5.9** Selection and Adverse Impact Ratios for Using Leadership Emergence

		Fails to Meet Cutoff Scores		Meets Cutoff Scores		AI Ratio
		N	%	N	%	
Total		1,355	36.3	2,373	63.7	N/A
Sex	Male	710	34.8	1,330	65.2	N/A
	Female	509	38.7	805	61.3	0.94
Age	Under 40	429	36.8	737	63.2	N/A
	40 and Over	707	44.0	899	56.0	0.89
Race/Ethnicity	Black/AfrAm	43	35.8	77	64.2	1.12
	Hispanic/Lat	47	40.2	70	59.8	1.04
	Asian	26	25.2	77	74.8	1.30
	White	898	42.5	1,213	57.5	N/A

*Note:* N = 3,728; AI = Adverse Impact; N/A = Not Applicable.

Results indicate that females should pass at nearly the same rate as males, that candidates 40 years of age and older should pass nearly as often as younger candidates, and that candidates from minority racial/ethnic groups should pass at a slightly higher rate than White candidates.



#### 5.4.4 Selecting High-Potential Employees Using Leadership Effectiveness

Table 5.10 presents a profile where individuals must earn a score of over 50% on the Leadership Effectiveness dimension to pass. Table 5.11 presents selection statistics and AI ratios based on this profile.

**Table 5.10** Recommended Selection Decision Rule for Using Leadership Effectiveness

Dimension	Fails to Meet Cutoff Scores	Meets Cutoff Scores
Leadership Effectiveness	$\leq 50$	$\geq 51$

**Table 5.11** Selection and Adverse Impact Ratios for Using Leadership Effectiveness

		Fails to Meet Cutoff Scores		Meets Cutoff Scores		AI Ratio
		N	%	N	%	
Total		717	19.2	3,011	80.8	N/A
Sex	Male	420	20.6	1,620	79.4	N/A
	Female	221	16.8	1,093	83.2	1.05
Age	Under 40	262	22.5	904	77.5	N/A
	40 and Over	334	20.8	1,272	79.2	1.02
Race/Ethnicity	Black/AfrAm	21	17.5	99	82.5	1.04
	Hispanic/Lat	19	16.2	98	83.8	1.06
	Asian	34	33.0	69	67.0	0.85
	White	440	20.8	1,671	79.2	N/A

*Note:* N = 3,728; AI = Adverse Impact; N/A = Not Applicable.

Results indicate that females should pass at a slightly higher rate than males, that candidates 40 years of age and older should pass at a slightly higher rate than younger candidates, and that Black/African-American and Latino candidates should pass at a slightly higher rate than White candidates. Asian candidates passed slightly less frequently than White candidates, but this selection ratio was still above the .80 threshold.

#### 5.4.5 Selecting High-Potential Employees Using Leadership Foundations

Table 5.12 presents a profile where individuals must earn a score of over 50% on the Leadership Foundations dimension to pass. Table 5.13 presents selection statistics and AI ratios based on this profile.

**Table 5.12** Recommended Selection Decision Rule for Using Leadership Foundations

Dimension	Fails to Meet Cutoff Scores	Meets Cutoff Scores
Leadership Foundations	$\leq 50$	$\geq 51$

**Table 5.13** Selection and Adverse Impact Ratios for Using Leadership Foundations

		Fails to Meet Cutoff Scores		Meets Cutoff Scores		AI Ratio
		N	%	N	%	
Total		596	16.0	3,132	84.0	N/A
Sex	Male	342	16.8	1,698	83.2	N/A
	Female	179	13.6	1,135	86.4	1.04
Age	Under 40	197	16.9	969	83.1	N/A
	40 and Over	305	19.0	1,301	81.0	0.97
Race/Ethnicity	Black/AfrAm	11	9.2	109	90.8	1.11
	Hispanic/Lat	13	11.1	104	88.9	1.09
	Asian	15	14.6	88	85.4	1.04
	White	385	18.2	1,726	81.8	N/A

*Note:* N = 3,728; AI = Adverse Impact; N/A = Not Applicable.

Results indicate that females should pass at a slightly higher rate than males, that candidates 40 years of age and older should pass nearly as often as younger candidates, and that candidates from minority racial/ethnic groups should pass at a slightly higher rate than White candidates.



## REFERENCES

Adler, A. (1939). *Social interest*. New York, NY: Putnam.

Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 [ADEA], Pub. L. No. 90-202, et seq.

Aguinis, H., Henle, C. A., & Ostroff, C. (2001). Measurement in work and organizational psychology. In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H.K. Sinangil, & C. Viswesvaran (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial, work, and organizational psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 27-50). London, UK: Sage.

Allport, G. (1961). *Patterns and growth in personality*. New York, NY: Wiley.

Allport, G. W., Vernon, P. E., & Lindzey, G. (1960). *Study of values* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Houghton-Mifflin.

American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *The Personality Inventory for DSM-5 (PID-5) — Adults*. Retrieved from [https://www.psychiatry.org/File%20Library/Psychiatrists/Practice/DSM/APA\\_DSM5\\_The-Personality-Inventory-For-DSM-5-Full-Version-Adult.pdf](https://www.psychiatry.org/File%20Library/Psychiatrists/Practice/DSM/APA_DSM5_The-Personality-Inventory-For-DSM-5-Full-Version-Adult.pdf)

Arneson, S., Millikin-Davies, M., & Hogan, J. (1993). Validation of personality and cognitive measures for insurance claims examiners. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 7, 459-473.

Bakan, D. (1966). *The duality of human existence: Isolation and communion in Western man*. Boston, MA: Beacon.

Barge, B. N., & Hough, L. M. (1988). Utility of interest assessment for predicting job performance. In L. M. Hough (Ed.), *Utility of temperament, biodata, and interest assessment for predicting job performance* (ARI Research Note 88-02). Alexandria, VA: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.

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

Barrick, M. R., Mount, M. K., & Judge, T. A. (2001). Personality and performance at the beginning of the new millennium: What do we know and where do we go next? *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 9, 9-30.

Bartholomew, K., & Horowitz, L. M. (1991). Attachment styles among young adults: A test of a four-category model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 61, 226-244.

Bartling, H. C., & Hood, A. B. (1981). An 11-year follow-up of measured interest and vocational choice. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 28, 27-35.

Bell, S. T. (2007). Deep-level composition: Variables as predictors of team performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 595-615.

Benet, V., & Waller, N. G. (1995). The 'Big Seven' model of personality description: Evidence for its cross-cultural generality in a Spanish sample. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69, 701-718.

Benet-Martinez, V., & John, O. (1998). Los Cinco Grandes across cultures and ethnic groups: Multitrait-multimethod analyses of the Big Five in Spanish and English. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75, 729-750.

Bentz, V.J. (1967). The Sears experience in the investigation, description, and prediction of executive behavior. In F. R. Wickert & D.E. McFarland (Eds.), *Measuring executive effectiveness* (pp. 147-206). New York, NY: Appleton-Century-Crofts.



- Bentz, V. J. (1985a, August). *A view from the top: A thirty-year perspective on research devoted to discovery, description, and prediction of executive behavior*. Paper presented at the 93rd Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Los Angeles, CA.
- Bentz, V. J. (1985b). Research findings from personality assessment of executives. In J. H. Bernardin & D.A. Bownas (Eds.), *Personality assessment in organizations* (pp. 182-244). New York, NY: Praeger.
- Bentz, V. J. (1990). Contextual issues in predicting high-level leadership performance. In K. E. Clark & M. B. Clark (Eds.), *Measures of leadership* (pp. 131-144). West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America.
- Bono, J. E., & Judge, T. E. (2004). Personality and transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*, 901-910.
- Boyle, M. (2009, May 11). The art of succession. *BusinessWeek*, pp. 31-32.
- Bradley, B. H., Baur, J. E., Banford, C. G., & Postlethwaite, B. E. (2013). Team players and collective performance: How agreeableness impacts team performance over time. *Small Group Research, 44*, 680-711.
- Brandt, J. E., & Hood, A. B. (1968). Effect of personality adjustment on the predictive validity of the Strong Vocational Interest Blank. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 15*, 547-551.
- Burke, L. (1997, March/April). Developing high-potential employees in the new business reality. *Business Horizons, 40*, 18-24.
- Cairo, P. C. (1982). Measured interests versus expressed interests as predictors of long-term occupational membership. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 20*, 343-353.
- Campbell, D. P. (1966). Occupations ten years later of high school seniors with high scores on the SVIB Life Insurance Salesman scale. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 50*, 51-56.
- Carson, R. C. (1969). *Interaction concepts of personality*. Chicago, IL: Aldine.
- Cascio, W. F. (2011). Leadership succession: How to avoid a crisis. *Ivey Business Journal, 75*, 6-12.
- Christie, R., & Geis, F. (1970). *Studies in Machiavellianism*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Church, A. H., & Rotolo, C. T. (2013). How are top companies assessing their high-potentials and senior executives? A talent management benchmark study. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 65*, 199-223.
- Church, A. H., Rotolo, C. T., Ginther, N. M., & Levine, R. (2015). How are top companies designing and managing their high-potential programs? A follow-up talent management benchmark study. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 67*, 17-47.
- Church, A. H., & Wacławski, J. (2009). Take the Pepsi challenge: Talent development at PepsiCo. In R. F. Silzer & B. E. Dowell (Eds.), *Strategy-driven talent management: A leadership imperative* (pp. 617-640). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Collins, J. (2001). *Good to great: Why some companies make the leap...and others don't*. New York, NY: Harper.
- Costa, P. T. Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI): Professional manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Digman, J. M. (1990). Personality structure: Emergence of the Five Factor model. *Annual Review of Psychology, 41*, 417-440.





- Dolliver, R. H., Irvin, J. A., & Bigley, S. S. (1972). Twelve-year follow-up of the Strong Vocational Interest Blank. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 19*, 212-217.
- Dolliver, R. H., & Will, J. A. (1977). Ten-year follow-up of the Tyler Vocational Card Sort and the Strong Vocational Interest Blank. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 24*, 48-54.
- Duckworth, A. L., Peterson, C., Matthews, M. D., & Kelly, D. R. (2007). Grit: Perseverance and passion for long term goals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 92*, 1087-1101.
- Dudley, N. M., Orvis, K. A., Lebiecki, J. E., & Cortina, J. M. (2006). A meta-analytic investigation of Conscientiousness in the prediction of job performance: Examining the intercorrelations and the incremental validity of narrow traits. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*, 40-57.
- Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Office of Management and Budget (2006). Section 15: Race and Color Discrimination. *EEOC compliance manual*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Civil Service Commission, U.S. Department of Labor, & U.S. Department of Justice. (1978). *Uniform guidelines on employee selection procedures*. Federal Register, 43, 38290-38309.
- Foster, J. L., Gaddis, B. H., & Hogan, J. (2012). Personality-based job analysis. In M. A. Wilson, W. Bennett, S. G. Gibson, & G. M. Alliger (Eds.), *The handbook of work analysis: The methods, systems, applications, and science of work measurement in organizations* (pp. 249-266). London, UK: Routledge Academic.
- Gade, E. M., & Soliah, D. (1975). Vocational preference inventory high point codes versus expressed choices as predictors of college major and career entry. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 22*, 117-121.
- George, B. (2007, Nov. 29). An embarrassment of succession fiascos. *Business Week*. Downloaded from <http://www.businessweek.com/> on October 15, 2016.
- Goldberg, L. R. (1992). The development of markers for the Big Five factor structure. *Psychological Assessment, 4*, 26-42.
- Goldberg, L. R. (1999). A broad-bandwidth, public domain, personality inventory measuring the lower-level facets of several five-factor models. In I. Mervielde, I. Deary, F. De Fruyt, & F. Ostendorf (Eds.), *Personality psychology in Europe* (Vol. 7, pp. 7-28). Tilburg, Netherlands: Tilburg University Press.
- Goldberg, L. R. (2008). *The Eugene-Springfield Community Sample: Information available from the research participants*. Oregon Research Institute Technical Report Vol. 48, No. 1. Eugene, Oregon: Oregon Research Institute.
- Goldberg, L. R., Johnson, J. A., Eber, H. W., Hogan, R., Ashton, M. C., Cloninger, C. R., & Gough, H. C. (2006). The International Item Pool and the future of public-domain personality measures. *Journal of Research in Personality, 40*, 84-96.
- Grainger, J. D. (2009). *Alexander the Great failure: The collapse of the Macedonian empire*. London, UK: Continuum Books.
- Hagerty, J. R., & Tita, B. (2010, Dec. 21). 3M works on succession. *The Wall Street Journal*, p. B2.
- Hansen, J. C. (1986). *12-year longitudinal study of the predictive validity of the SVIB-SCII*. Paper presented at the 94th Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington, DC.
- Hansen, J. C., & Swanson, J. L. (1983). Stability of vocational interests of adolescents and young adults. *Measurement and Evaluation in Guidance, 13*, 173-178.



- Hogan Assessment Systems (2009a). *The development of the Hogan Competency Model*. Tulsa, OK: Author.
- Hogan Assessment Systems (2009b). *JET: Technical information*. Tulsa, OK: Author.
- Hogan Assessment Systems (2010a). *Hogan archive*. Tulsa, OK: Author.
- Hogan Assessment Systems (2010b). *Hogan Competency, Domain, and Job Family Synthetic Validation Results from the Hogan Personality Inventory and the Hogan Development Survey*. Tulsa, OK: Author.
- Hogan Assessment Systems. (2014). *Hogan Judgment Assessment technical manual*. Tulsa, OK: Author.
- Hogan, J., Davies, S., & Hogan, R. (2007). Generalizing personality-based validity evidence. In M. S. McPhail (Ed.), *Alternative validation strategies: Developing new and leveraging existing validity evidence* (pp. 181-229). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Hogan, J., & Hogan, R. (2010). *Motives, Values, Preferences Inventory manual: 2010 administrative and norming updates*. Tulsa, OK: Hogan Press.
- Hogan, J., & Holland, B. (2003). Using theory to evaluate personality and job-performance relations: A socioanalytic perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 100-112.
- Hogan, R. (1983). A socioanalytic theory of personality. In M. M. Page (Ed.), *1982 Nebraska symposium on motivation* (pp. 55-89). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- Hogan, R. (1991). Personality and personality measurement. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (Vol. 2, 2nd ed., pp. 327-396). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Hogan, R. (1996). A socioanalytic perspective on the five-factor model. In J. S. Wiggins (Ed.), *The five-factor model of personality* (pp. 163-179). New York, NY: Guilford.
- Hogan, R., Barrett, P., & Hogan, J. (2009). *Brief technical manual: Hogan Business Reasoning Inventory*. Tulsa, OK: Hogan Assessment Systems.
- Hogan, R., & Hogan, J. (2001). Assessing leadership: A view from the dark side. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 9, 40-51.
- Hogan, R., & Hogan, J. (2007). *Hogan Personality Inventory manual* (3rd ed.). Tulsa, OK: Hogan Assessment Systems.
- Hogan, R., & Hogan, J. (2009). *Hogan Development Survey manual* (2nd ed.). Tulsa, OK: Hogan Press.
- Hogan, R., Hogan, J., & Roberts, B. W. (1996). Personality measurement and employment decisions: Questions and answers. *American Psychologist*, 51, 469-477.
- Hogan, R., Raskin, R., & Fazzini, D. (1990). The dark side of charisma. In K. E. Clark & M. B. Clark (Eds.), *Measures of leadership* (pp. 343-354). West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America.
- Holland, J. L. (1966). *The psychology of vocational choice: A theory of personality types and model environments*. Waltham, MA: Ginn.
- Holland, J. L. (1985). *Making vocational choices: A theory of careers*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Horney, K. (1950). *Neurosis and human growth*. New York, NY: Norton.



- Hough, L. M., Ones, D. S., & Viswesvaran, C. (1998, April). Personality correlates of managerial performance constructs. In R. Page (Chair), *Personality determinants of managerial potential, performance, progression and ascendancy*. Symposium conducted at the 13th Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Dallas, TX.
- Hunter, J. E., & Schmidt, F. L. (1990). *Methods of meta-analysis*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Hurtz, G. M., & Donovan, J. J. (2000). Personality and job performance: The big five revisited. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 869-879.
- John, O. P. (1990). The "Big-Five" factor taxonomy: Dimensions of personality in the natural language and in questionnaires. In L. A. Pervin (Ed.), *Handbook of personality theory and research* (pp. 66-100). New York, NY: Guilford.
- John, O., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big Five Trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (2nd ed., pp. 102-138). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Jones, R. G., Corwin, E., Anderson, S., & McKenna, M. G. (2016, April). *Long term strategic thinking: Predictor construct for performance and sustainability*. Poster presented at the Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Anaheim, CA.
- Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Ilies, R., & Gerhardt, M. W. (2002). Personality and leadership: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 765-780.
- Judge, T. A., LePine, J. A., & Rich, B. L. (2006). Loving yourself abundantly: Relationship of the narcissistic personality to self and other perceptions of workplace deviance, leadership, and task and contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 762-776.
- Korn/Ferry survey reveals more interest than action in CEO succession planning among top companies. (2010, Dec. 21). *The Sacramento Bee*. Downloaded from <http://www.sacbee.com/> on October 15, 2016.
- Krueger, R. F., Derringer, J., Markon, K. E., Watson, D., & Skodol, A. E. (2012). Initial construction of a maladaptive personality trait model and inventory for DSM-5. *Psychological Medicine*, 42, 1879-1890.
- Lau, A. W., & Abrahams, N. M. (1971). *Reliability and predictive validity of the Navy Vocational Interest Inventory*. (Research Report SSR 71-16). San Diego, CA: Navy Personnel and Training Research Laboratory.
- Leary, T. (1957). *Interpersonal diagnosis of personality*. New York, NY: Ronald Press.
- Lee, K. & Ashton, M. C. (2004). Psychometric properties of the HEXACO personality inventory. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 39, 329-358.
- Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2016). Psychometric properties of the HEXACO-100. *Assessment*, doi: 10.1177/1073191116659134.
- Lee, K., Ashton, M., & Shin, K. (2005). Personality correlates of workplace anti-social behavior. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 54, 81-98.
- Lord, R. G., de Vader, C. L., & Alliger, G. M. (1986). A meta-analysis of the relation between personality traits and leadership perceptions: An application of validity generalization procedures. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 402-410.
- Luthans, F. (1988). Successful vs. effective real managers. *The Academy of Management Executive*, 2, 127-132.



- Luthans, F., Hodgetts, R. M., & Rosenkrantz, S. A. (1988). *Real managers*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- Luthans, F., Rosenkrantz, S. A., & Hennessey, H. W. (1985). What do successful managers really do? An observation study of managerial activities. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 21, 255-270.
- Martin, J., & Schmidt, C. (2010). How to keep your top talent. *Harvard Business Review*, 88, 54-61.
- McCall, M. W., Jr., & Lombardo, M. M. (1983). *Off the track: Why and how successful executives get derailed* (Technical Report No. 21). Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (1987). Validity of the five-factor model of personality across instruments and observers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 81-90.
- Mills, C. J., & Hogan, R. (1978). A role-theoretical interpretation of personality scale item responses. *Journal of Personality*, 46, 778-785.
- Moscato, S., & Salgado, J. F. (2004). "Dark side" personality styles as predictors of task, contextual, and job performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 12, 356-362.
- Mount, M. K., Barrick, M. R., & Stewart, G. L. (1998). Five-factor model of personality and performance in jobs involving interpersonal interactions. *Human Performance*, 11, 145-165.
- Murray, H. A. (1938). *Explorations in personality*. New York, NY: Oxford University.
- Nocera, J. (2010, Aug. 13). Real reason for ousting H.P.'s chief. *The New York Times*, downloaded from <http://www.nytimes.com/> on October 15, 2016.
- Ogden, D., & Wood, J. (2008, March 25). Succession planning: A Board imperative. n.d., [www.businessweek.com](http://www.businessweek.com), April 28, 2008.
- Ones, D. S., Dilchert, S., Viswesvaran, C., & Judge, T. A. (2007). In support of personality assessment in organizational settings. *Personnel Psychology*, 60, 995-1027.
- Overview (MATRIX DATA command). (2011). Retrieved from [http://www.ibm.com/support/knowledgecenter/SSLVMB\\_20.0.0/com.ibm.spss.statistics.help/syn\\_matrix\\_data\\_overview.htm](http://www.ibm.com/support/knowledgecenter/SSLVMB_20.0.0/com.ibm.spss.statistics.help/syn_matrix_data_overview.htm).
- Peeters, M. A. G., Van Tuijl, H. F. J. M., Rutte, C. G., & Reymen, I. M. M. J. (2006). Personality and team performance: A meta-analysis. *European Journal of Personality*, 20, 377-396.
- Penney, L., & Spector, P. (2002). Narcissism and counterproductive work behavior: Do bigger egos mean bigger problems? *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 10, 126-134.
- Peter Berry Consultancy. (2015). *Hogan 360° technical manual*. North Sydney, Australia: Author.
- Rank, O. (1945). *Will therapy and truth and reality*. New York, NY: Knopf.
- Raskin, R., & Terry, H. (1988). A principal-components analysis of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory and further evidence of its construct validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 890-902.
- Saucier, G. (1994). Mini-markers: A brief version of Goldberg's unipolar Big-Five markers. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 63, 506-516.



- Scherbaum, C. A. (2005). Synthetic validity: Past, present, and future. *Personnel Psychology*, 58, 481-515.
- Schneider, B. (1987). The people make the place. *Personnel Psychology*, 40, 437-453.
- Shin, H., & Holland, B. (2004, April). *P-O fit as a moderator of personality-job performance relations*. Paper presented at the 19th Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Chicago, IL.
- Silzer, R., & Church, A. (2009). The pearls and perils of identifying potential. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice*, 2, 377-412.
- Smith, M. L., & Glass, G. V. (1977). Meta-analysis of psychotherapy outcome studies. *American Psychologist*, 32, 752-760.
- Spranger, E. (1928). *Types of men: The psychology and ethics of personality*. Halle, Germany: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Strock, J. (2015). Lincoln leadership failure: Succession planning. Serve to Lead: 21<sup>st</sup> Century Leadership. Downloaded from <http://servetolead.org/lincoln-leadership-failure-succession-planning>.
- Strong, E. K., Jr. (1935). Predictive value of the Vocational Interest Test. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 26, 332.
- Strong, E. K., Jr. (1943). *Vocational interests of men and women*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Sullivan, H. S. (1953). *The interpersonal theory of psychiatry*. New York, NY: Norton.
- Tellegen, A., Grove, W. M., & Waller, N. G. (1991). Inventory of Personal Characteristics #7 (IPC- 7). Unpublished materials, University of Minnesota.
- Tett, R. P., & Christiansen, N. D. (2007). Personality tests at the crossroads: A response to Morgeson, Campion, Dipboye, Hollenbeck, Murphy, and Schmitt (2007). *Personnel Psychology*, 60, 967-993.
- Viswesvaran, C., Ones, D. S., & Schmidt, F. L. (1996). Comparative analysis of the reliability of job performance ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 557-574.
- Wiggins, J. S. (1979). A psychological taxonomy of trait-descriptive terms: The interpersonal domain. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37, 395-412.
- Wiggins, J. S., & Trapnell, P. D. (1996). A dyadic-interactional perspective on the Five-Factor model. In J. S. Wiggins (Ed.), *The Five-Factor model of personality* (pp. 88-162). New York, NY: Guilford.
- Worthington, E. L., Jr., & Dolliver, R. H. (1977). Validity studies of the Strong Vocational Interest Inventories. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 24, 208-216.
- Zytowski, D. G. (1976). Predictive validity of the Kuder Occupational Interest Survey: A 12- to 19-year follow-up. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 23, 221-233.



## APPENDIX A: SAMPLE HOGAN HIGH POTENTIAL REPORT



# HIGH POTENTIAL TALENT

Core competencies for emerging leadership

---

**Report for:** Sam Poole

**ID:** HC560419

**Date:** 2.06.2017

**Norm:** Global

© 2016 Hogan Assessment Systems Inc. All rights reserved.



### INTRODUCTION

In business the competition for talent is fierce, and the future of many companies depends on finding and developing leaders for key senior roles. Smart organizations make it a top priority to identify and prepare talented people for advancement. However, most organizations struggle to find accurate and useful ways to identify and develop people with the most potential for success as leaders.

People who seem to have leadership potential are often not effective leaders; conversely, many effective employees are overlooked for promotion because they don't stand out. The Hogan high potential (HIPO) model simplifies the process of finding talented people who can be developed, and who then will go on to achieve positive business outcomes.



### BACKGROUND

The Hogan HIPO Model and The Hogan High Potential Talent Report are grounded in a substantial research base. Three performance dimensions that are crucial for leader success define the model; the dimensions concern: (1) foundations; (2) emergence, and (3) effectiveness. Each dimension contains three competencies that are critical for success in that dimension.

- **Leadership Foundations** concerns the degree to which people are able to manage their careers, are rewarding to deal with, and are good organizational citizens.
- **Leadership Emergence** evaluates the likelihood that people will stand out, emerge, and be labeled as leaders in their organization.
- **Leadership Effectiveness** involves the ability to successfully guide teams toward productive outcomes.

These three dimensions of our HIPO model are linked to personality. This report identifies a person's strengths and gaps along these three dimensions, and suggests specific, targeted developmental actions that can be used to address them.

### HOW TO USE THIS REPORT

The Hogan High Potential Talent Report is intended to help leaders and organizations identify a person's natural leadership style. Although there is no such thing as "good" or "bad" scores, this report is intended to help emergent leaders become more effective, and help effective leaders become more emergent. The goal is to identify performance areas where focus and attention can be profitably directed in order to maximize leadership potential.







### REPORT SECTION SUMMARY



#### SECTION 1: LEADERSHIP FOUNDATIONS

Leadership potential is based on certain personal attributes that form the building blocks for career effectiveness. Before people can lead others, they must first demonstrate their ability to contribute to a team and they must establish a personal reputation as dependable and productive.

##### COMPETENCY AREA

**Following Process:** following rules and respecting convention

**Thinking Broadly:** solving a wide range of business-related problems

**Getting Along:** being cooperative, pleasant, and rewarding to deal with

##### LOWER SCORES

Flexible and fast-moving; may be impulsive and limit testing.

Grounded, pragmatic, tactical, and less visionary.

Willing to challenge others; may seem blunt and direct.

##### HIGHER SCORES

Conscientious, dedicated, and dependable organizational citizens.

Inventive, open minded, strategic, and more visionary.

Cooperative and friendly; may seem tactful and diplomatic.



#### SECTION 2: LEADERSHIP EMERGENCE

Leadership potential depends significantly on the degree to which people are perceived as leaders. People who emerge as leaders are able to create a leader-like impression by standing out, being noticed, and seeming influential.

##### COMPETENCY AREA

**Standing Out:** making others aware of one's contributions

**Influencing Others:** persuading others to pursue certain desired outcomes

**Building Connections:** creating strategic networks and relationships

##### LOWER SCORES

More interested in being productive than in being recognized; may be reluctant to promote themselves.

Competent and self-reliant, but unable or unwilling to influence others in a particular direction.

Confident, independent, self-reliant, and reluctant to depend on others.

##### HIGHER SCORES

Charming, confident, charismatic, and comfortable taking credit.

Willing to take charge, make suggestions, and exercise influence.

Gregarious, outgoing, and concerned about developing networks and strategic relationships.



#### SECTION 3: LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS

Leadership potential involves being able to build and maintain high performing teams. Effective leaders attract, retain, and develop talented team members, and then secure resources, remove barriers to success, and achieve strategic business goals.

##### COMPETENCY AREA

**Leading the Business:** achieving critical business outcomes

**Managing Resources:** securing, optimizing, and deploying key assets

**Leading People:** motivating others to pursue shared goals

##### LOWER SCORES

Less assertive when selling ideas to others; may show little interest in taking charge and directing others.

Seeks to minimize risk; may struggle with forecasting resource needs and resist committing to plans.

Independent and task-oriented, may avoid trying to galvanize others to pursue shared goals.

##### HIGHER SCORES

Willing to take charge, set goals, provide direction, and push others toward desired outcomes.

Decisive and comfortable taking smart risks; plans ahead but remains flexible under pressure.

Engaging and patient; inspires commitment, and identifies appropriate group goals.







## HIGH POTENTIAL TALENT REPORT

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Your Hogan High Potential Profile is summarized below. The 9 competencies essential for success are presented in rank order, where 1 is your highest score and 9 is your lowest score.

To help you better understand your strengths and development opportunities, your scores are also color-coded to show how they compare with scores for a global population of professionals, managers, and executives. Please remember that there are potential strengths and shortcomings associated with scores at every level.

	HIGH
	ABOVE AVERAGE
	BELOW AVERAGE
	LOW



#### LEADERSHIP FOUNDATIONS

RANK	COMPETENCY
6	<b>FOLLOWING PROCESS</b> Following rules and respecting convention
2	<b>THINKING BROADLY</b> Solving a wide range of business-related problems
1	<b>GETTING ALONG</b> Being cooperative, pleasant, and rewarding to deal with



#### LEADERSHIP EMERGENCE

RANK	COMPETENCY
7	<b>STANDING OUT</b> Making others aware of one's contributions
8	<b>INFLUENCING OTHERS</b> Persuading others to pursue desired outcomes
4	<b>BUILDING CONNECTIONS</b> Creating strategic networks and relationships



#### LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS

RANK	COMPETENCY
3	<b>LEADING THE BUSINESS</b> Achieving critical business outcomes
5	<b>MANAGING RESOURCES</b> Securing, optimizing, and deploying key assets
9	<b>LEADING PEOPLE</b> Motivating others to pursue shared goals

### MY RECOMMENDED FOCUS AREAS

HIGHEST SCORES			LOWEST SCORES		
SECTION	RANK	COMPETENCY	SECTION	RANK	COMPETENCY
FOUNDATIONS	1	GETTING ALONG	EMERGENCE	7	STANDING OUT
FOUNDATIONS	2	THINKING BROADLY	EMERGENCE	8	INFLUENCING OTHERS
EFFECTIVENESS	3	LEADING THE BUSINESS	EFFECTIVENESS	9	LEADING PEOPLE



## SECTION I: LEADERSHIP FOUNDATIONS

6

### FOLLOWING PROCESS

#### Following rules and respecting convention

People with higher scores on this dimension tend to be conscientious, hard working, careful about details, and good organizational citizens. People with lower scores tend to be flexible, adaptable, and comfortable with uncertainty, but they may also test limits and not attend closely to details.

#### PRUDENCE

The degree to which a person is conscientious, conforming and dependable

72

##### Lower Scores

- ⊕ Flexible, comfortable with ambiguity
- ⊖ Resists supervision, tests limits

##### Higher Scores

- ⊕ Dependable, rule-following, organized
- ⊖ Conforming and resisting change

#### Development Tips

- ⊕ Stop using tried-and-true methods or following rules without asking where they came from why they were formulated. Although you execute well, your preference for clear process parameters may cause you to overlook possible improvements or new approaches. Ask others for input on opportunities for improvement or when changing course may be beneficial.
- ⊖ Ask your direct reports for feedback regarding your level of involvement in their work and how they feel about it. People learn more when they are responsible for their work and mistakes. Give them permission to tell you when you are getting too involved in implementation details. If they bring this up, thank them, and adjust your behavior.
- ⊕ Your work ethic, attention to detail, and responsible performance are a real strength in roles that require careful and precise execution. Your team members will appreciate the structure you create in the work environment as well as your ability to set clear expectations. Capitalize on these skills by seeking operational leadership responsibilities.

#### DUTIFUL

Concerns the risk that eagerness to please comes across as ingratiation and reluctance to take a stand or act independently

5

##### Lower Scores

- ⊕ Independent and willing to dissent
- ⊖ Independent and non-conforming

##### Higher Scores

- ⊕ Supportive, reliable, and dependable
- ⊖ Overly compliant and conforming

#### Development Tips

- ⊕ Avoid using phrases such as "that will never work...here's what we need to do...the truth is..." which may cause your message to be lost. Try to substitute more diplomatic language such as, "May I suggest...if it were my decision, I might...my point of view is..." which will encourage others to listen to your input. This will be especially important when you are working with people in higher-level positions.
- ⊖ Start monitoring your language and communication style with others. When you have strong opinions on a topic, practice shifting your focus from what you think to what others need to hear during your interactions. Begin each interaction by assuming that others know something that you do not.
- ⊕ Your willingness to challenge authority, stand up for your direct reports, and make independent decision are valuable career assets. But it is important to be able to disagree with superiors and challenge received opinion in ways that are respectful and that don't offend or embarrass them.





### SECTION I: LEADERSHIP FOUNDATIONS

6

#### FOLLOWING PROCESS

(Continued)

##### TRADITION

Belief in responsibility, hard work, appropriate social behavior and a lifestyle that reflects dedication to well-defined personal beliefs

36

##### Lower Scores

- ⊕ Informal, value innovation and progress
- ⊖ May introduce change too quickly

##### Higher Scores

- ⊕ Principled, judicious, and steady
- ⊖ May seem to resist change

##### Development Tips

- ⊕ Be careful about criticizing long-standing and accepted organizational processes and practices. If you propose to change them, prepare a list of positives and negatives for the current practice and the proposed new method. Encourage others to come to their own conclusions based on an independent cost/benefit analysis.
- ⊖ Try to present your ideas for change as enhancements to existing organizational processes. Think about how you can show respect for established methods while also providing ideas for improvement. When you propose a change, suggest that it is a natural evolution or extension of a standard procedure and why it is important for the business.
- ⊕ Continue to look for opportunities to improve current organizational policies and practices. Your willingness to change the way things are done will introduce new ways of thinking about work processes. When you propose changes to long-standing practices in your organization, be sure to provide clear and rational reasons why they would be good for the business.





## SECTION I: LEADERSHIP FOUNDATIONS

### 2 THINKING BROADLY

#### Solving a wide range of business-related problems

People with higher scores on this dimension seem curious, imaginative, and well-informed. They stay up to date with new developments in business and technology and tend to think strategically and outside the box. People with lower scores seem grounded, pragmatic, and focused. They tend to be action-oriented tactical thinkers who prefer to learn from experience rather than formal training.

#### INQUISITIVE

Degree to which a person is perceived as curious, creative, and open to new ideas

90

##### Lower Scores

- ⊕ Pragmatic and focused
- ⊖ Limited curiosity

##### Higher Scores

- ⊕ Curious and open to new ideas
- ⊖ Easily distracted

#### Development Tips

- ⊕ Don't assume that every discussion is an opportunity to brainstorm or solve big picture problems. Before important meetings, identify the objective to be achieved before moving into the problem solving phase. Doing so will help your reputation for being focused and pragmatic.
- ⊕ Identify a trusted colleague who has a reputation for questioning how things will work. Ask that person for feedback on your ideas before you go public with them. Team up with that person to test and refine your ideas, especially when the stakes are high.
- ⊕ Your curiosity and open-mindedness are a major resource for your team. Others will appreciate the vision and creativity you bring to problem solving. In addition, your fresh insights will help drive continuous improvement. Be sure to be tolerant of colleagues who are slow to catch on to your views, and help them understand the practical relevance of your proposals.

#### LEARNING APPROACH

Degree to which a person stays up-to-date, seems to enjoy learning and values educational pursuits

73

##### Lower Scores

- ⊕ Prefers to learn from experience
- ⊖ May not stay up-to-date

##### Higher Scores

- ⊕ Prefers to learn from other experts
- ⊖ May be seen as a "know-it-all"

#### Development Tips

- ⊕ Avoid spending time in training courses just because they sound interesting. Focus your learning on topics that are relevant to your job and that can advance your career. Ask for feedback regarding gaps in your knowledge, and spend time with pragmatic, action-oriented colleagues to learn how to translate training into real world performance.
- ⊕ Start sharing the information you enjoy gathering. Circulate articles, take-always, and information you acquire through various channels, and try to help less focused team members see how they can apply that knowledge on the job. Become a knowledge resource on whom others can depend.
- ⊕ Because you tend to stay up-to-date with developments in business and technology, you can be a resource for the organization regarding market and industry trends. Be prepared to help educate and train team members who don't stay as well informed as you and be a resource for their professional development.





## SECTION I: LEADERSHIP FOUNDATIONS

### 2

### THINKING BROADLY

(Continued)

#### IMAGINATIVE

Concerns the risk that unconventional thought patterns and ideas are seen as eccentric, ungrounded and confusing

96

#### Lower Scores

- ⊕ Grounded, level-headed
- ⊖ Ideas may seem unoriginal

#### Higher Scores

- ⊕ Original, inventive
- ⊖ Eccentric, unfocused

#### Development Tips

- ⊕ Avoid telling others about every idea that occurs to you. You may enjoy brainstorming and considering new possibilities, but others can become fatigued or confused by your many ideas. End your meetings by summarizing your key action items; then ask others whether they received the message you intended to relay, and reconcile any differences before concluding.
- ⊖ Start paying closer attention to others' responses when you share ideas. Although some people may be energized and inspired by your vision, others may think you communicate in a somewhat disorganized or confusing manner. Before important meetings, rehearse what you are going to say. This will help you refine your communication strategy.
- ⓘ Continue to be a source of creative, inventive, and original ideas and problem solving. If your views are presented correctly, you should be seen as an innovative and visionary leader. Your capacity for strategic thinking and your ability to take the long view are an important contribution to your team.





## SECTION I: LEADERSHIP FOUNDATIONS

1

### GETTING ALONG

Being cooperative, pleasant, and rewarding to deal with

People with higher scores on this dimension seem cooperative, friendly, and charming. People with lower scores seem candid, direct, and even challenging; they are willing to speak up and disagree openly.

#### ADJUSTMENT

Degree to which a person seems calm, optimistic, and steady under pressure

98

##### Lower Scores

- ⊕ Passionate, with a sense of urgency
- ⊖ Tense, edgy, defensive

##### Higher Scores

- ⊕ Resilient and composed
- ⊖ May seem to lack sense of urgency

#### Development Tips

- ⊕ Don't assume that others can tolerate stress and organizational pressure as well as you. In fact others may sometimes be seriously stressed and you might not notice. pressure. Avoid dismissing their worries and concerns because you don't share them. Practice expressing more compassion when discussing their stress levels.
- ⊖ You are unusually self-confident, which is a strength that, paradoxically, can sometimes cause problems. Pay close attention to negative feedback and keep track of your mistakes. Stay alert for performance problems and faulty processes and deal with them promptly when you find them. Consciously show a sense of urgency around correcting these matters.
- ⊕ During times of uncertainty and change in the organization, your colleagues count on you to set the tone for the group. Your consistent, optimistic attitude and ability to tolerate stress are a helpful example for others. Others will appreciate your steadiness, maturity, and emotional self-control.

#### INTERPERSONAL SENSITIVITY

Degree to which a person seems socially perceptive, tactful and sensitive to others' needs

69

##### Lower Scores

- ⊕ Straightforward communication style
- ⊖ May seem blunt and abrasive

##### Higher Scores

- ⊕ Diplomatic communication style
- ⊖ May avoid difficult conversations

#### Development Tips

- ⊕ Stop avoiding tough conversations and confronting poor performers. Direct communication and making difficult talent decisions can be uncomfortable, but you have the skills to challenge people without alienating them. Test feedback messages with a trusted colleague to make sure they land with the appropriate power and intention.
- ⊖ Test the limits of your comfort zone by asking people provocative questions and challenging their bogus assumptions. Use your natural agreeableness and tact to raise sensitive issues that others try to avoid. Start challenging others whose performance is not where it should be. Feel free to disagree with others during meetings that involve brainstorming or high-stakes planning.
- ⊕ Your ability to develop and maintain relationships with direct reports, colleagues, and various others is a strength you can leverage. In addition, your network of relationships is a kind of glue that helps hold your team together. You are an important source of morale and cohesion for your part of the organization, and a go-to guy for conflict resolution.







### SECTION I: LEADERSHIP FOUNDATIONS

1

#### GETTING ALONG

(Continued)

##### ALTRUISTIC

Concerns being alert for signs of threat or wrongdoing and, when detected, becoming negative, vindictive and unforgiving

96

##### Lower Scores

- ⊕ Values independence and self-reliance
- ⊖ May seem insensitive and unsympathetic

##### Higher Scores

- ⊕ Values helping others, being service-oriented
- ⊖ May not value personal accountability

##### Development Tips

- ⊕ When you notice that direct reports are struggling, avoid jumping in and solving their problems. Your over-involvement can reduce their feelings of empowerment; it can also send the signal that you are overly protective of them. When people struggle and even fail, they often learn valuable lessons about self reliance and personal accountability.
- ⊕ Start encouraging your team members to become more independent and self-reliant. Develop some personal guidelines regarding when and what kinds of support you will provide your team versus how much you should push them to solve their own problems. Be clear about when you expect others to take ownership of decisions.
- ⊕ Continue to be a resource for helping to develop colleagues who are struggling with their jobs. Your willingness to provide them with support sends a signal that you are a resource for improving the performance of the entire team. It also encourages a culture of teamwork and collaboration, and the fundamental task of leadership is to build a high performing team.





## SECTION 2: LEADERSHIP EMERGENCE

7

### STANDING OUT

### Making others aware of one's contributions

People with higher scores on this dimension seem charming and charismatic, and tend to enjoy self-promotion. People with lower scores seem not interested in being recognized and reluctant to engage in self-promotion.

#### BOLD

Degree to which a person seems leader-like, competitive, energetic and self-confident

43

#### Lower Scores

- ⊕ Modest, humble, and unpretentious
- ⊖ Reluctant to take charge

#### Higher Scores

- ⊕ Fearless and courageous
- ⊖ Overly self-confident and entitled

#### Development Tips

- ⊕ You seem to be reluctant to beat your own drum, but you need to realize that organizations often reward those who are more comfortable with self-promotion. Showcase your core competencies in a way that feels authentic and comfortable. Work with a coach or mentor to determine how best to do so, especially if doing so makes you feel apprehensive.
- ⊕ Your natural modesty may make you reluctant to advertise your accomplishments; nonetheless, it is important that you do so in a nice way. Ask a trusted colleague to help you devise an internal marketing strategy. Before important meetings, think about what you have to say regarding the performance of your team. Ask yourself if you are getting the kind of experience needed to help you reach your next significant career goal in the context of your current job.
- ⊕ Your team members appreciate your apparent humility and your willingness to ask for input, to acknowledge your limitations, to admit your mistakes, and to learn from them. They also appreciate the fact that you don't feel compelled to assert your authority, and your willingness to let others take the lead when it is appropriate for them to do so.

#### COLORFUL

Concerns the risk that a colorful, gregarious persona can also seem overpowering, attentionseeking, and interruptive

34

#### Lower Scores

- ⊕ Modest and self-restrained
- ⊖ Uncomfortable in the spotlight

#### Higher Scores

- ⊕ Entertaining and dramatic
- ⊖ Easily distracted

#### Development Tips

- ⊕ Stop trying to avoid being the center of attention and stop waiting for others to notice your accomplishments. In the right amount, modesty can be attractive, but too much modesty could potentially kill your career. Identify activities and achievements that could elevate your leadership brand in the organization and practice sharing them with others who could benefit from your experiences.
- ⊕ Before team meetings, identify some points you will make, then be sure to make those points out loud. When you read an interesting business article, blog, or essay, share it with your colleagues. Identify projects that, if successful, will increase your visibility in the organization. Make it a priority to set goals over the next year to increase your professional visibility and then pursue them.
- ⊕ Your willingness to listen and to share the stage with others will make you a lot of friends. Your tendency to prioritize organizational goals over your personal objectives will support your reputation as a dependable, team-oriented colleague. Your understated interpersonal style allows others to concentrate at work and provides a good example of a leader who doesn't need to be the center of attention.







## SECTION 2: LEADERSHIP EMERGENCE

7

### STANDING OUT

(Continued)

#### RECOGNITION

A desire for attention, approval, and praise

22

##### Lower Scores

- ⊕ Modest, prefer to work behind the scene
- ⊖ Too discreet, lacks visibility

##### Higher Scores

- ⊕ Seek to be center stage
- ⊖ May not share credit when appropriate

#### Development Tips

- ⊕ Although you don't need much feedback to be happy at work, some of your team members may really need public recognition to stay engaged. Stop focusing so closely on getting work done, and reach out to them. Your modesty and selfless task orientation are important career assets, but effective leadership also requires building staff engagement and commitment by paying attention to their individual needs.
- ⊖ Make sure that your team receives the credit it deserves when it accomplishes something that creates significant business impact. You shouldn't call attention to trivial achievements, but you should regularly think about ways you to recognize key successes so as to make other parts of the organization aware of the value your team creates.
- ⊕ Continue to support your team while sharing credit with others. Others are likely to appreciate how you recognize their good work and your willingness to work behind the scenes to get things done. Keep finding ways for you and your team to contribute to key business outcomes without worrying about whether you personally receive acknowledgement when things go well.





## SECTION 2: LEADERSHIP EMERGENCE

8

## INFLUENCING OTHERS

Persuading others to pursue desired outcomes

People with higher scores on this dimension tend to take charge and push for results; they seem to have a sense of urgency and can be impatient with delays. People with lower scores seem more patient, may seem to lack a sense of urgency, and seem reluctant to push for results.

## AMBITION

Degree to which a person seems leader-like, competitive, energetic and self-confident

73

## Lower Scores

- ⊕ Gains influence by seeking alignment
- ⊖ May be reluctant to take charge

## Higher Scores

- ⊕ Gains influence by taking charge
- ⊖ May sometimes seem too intense

## Development Tips

- ⊕ Stop expecting everyone to move as quickly as you do. Some people are more deliberate in their work and may resist your action-oriented style. Because they may know something you don't, and because your success depends on being able to influence diverse team members to work together, control your natural tendencies to be impatient.
- ⊖ When you find yourself becoming impatient with others' performance, try to determine if there are valid reasons for their lack of progress before you begin pushing for results. Understand that few people actually want to do a poor job; normally people will give you their best effort when they can. Before you start trying to motivate people, be sure there are no external obstacles to their performance.
- ⊕ Continue trying to influence the team's progress toward achieving its goals. Being able to keep peers and direct reports focused on the right priorities and time lines is an important leadership skill, and something that seems to come easily to you. People appreciate leaders who help keep them on track and moving forward without being pushy or overly assertive.

## EXCITABLE

Concerns the risk that initial passion for people and projects is displaced by frustration when setbacks or failures occur

99

## Lower Scores

- ⊕ Patient, calm, easy going
- ⊖ No sense of urgency

## Higher Scores

- ⊕ Intense, energetic, passionate
- ⊖ Emotionally volatile; may over-react

## Development Tips

- ⊕ You seem to be someone who is intense and works with a sense of urgency and who may become annoyed when people don't perform as you expect. When you become irritated with projects or people and feel like walking away, take a break, but finish what you have started. Otherwise, you risk developing a reputation for lacking persistence, which will limit your future influence.
- ⊖ Try to become more aware of your emotions in real time, particularly (1) how you experience them, and (2) how they are perceived by others. When you notice yourself becoming frustrated, impatient, or irritated, take a break (walk, get some tea, stretch). Doing this will give you time to process the emotion, and give you a fresh perspective when you return to the task at hand.
- ⊕ Continue to pursue your projects at work with energy and intensity. When you are working at your best, you provide an excellent example of passionate commitment to bringing projects to completion. Others are likely to appreciate your passion and enthusiasm for your work, and no one will doubt your desire to finish projects in a timely way.





## SECTION 2: LEADERSHIP EMERGENCE

8

### INFLUENCING OTHERS

(Continued)

#### CAUTIOUS

The risk that caution may cross the line to excessive fear of mistakes and avoidance of criticism or failure

86

#### Lower Scores

- ⊕ Willing to try new things
- ⊖ May take unnecessary risks

#### Higher Scores

- ⊕ Seldom make dumb mistakes
- ⊖ Afraid of making mistakes

#### Development Tips

- ⊕ You may worry too much about making mistakes and being criticized for your errors. You may also tend to influence others toward overly-cautious decision making and behaviors. If so, this can limit innovation and stifle creativity, creating teams and organizations that are reluctant to move forward. Give your teams permission to point out when you are being overly cautious, listen to their message, and adjust your behavior accordingly.
- ⊖ Look for opportunities to take calculated risks. Your natural carefulness may sometimes cause you to overlook potential opportunities. Although you rarely make careless mistakes, you may also sometimes seem risk-averse. Identify a topic area in which you would be comfortable taking on more risks and then make a effort to push yourself outside your comfort zone.
- ⊕ Continue to make decisions carefully. Your natural tendency to minimize risk and avoid silly mistakes can save you and others from potentially negative business outcomes. At the same time, be sure to listen to others about opportunities you or your team or organization might miss. This kind of flexibility will support your reputation as a sound decision maker.





## SECTION 2: LEADERSHIP EMERGENCE

## 4

## BUILDING CONNECTIONS

## Creating strategic networks and relationships

People with higher scores on this dimension tend to be seen as gregarious and socially skilled; they are good at expanding their networks and strategic relationships. People with lower scores tend to have smaller networks on which they rely for continued career success. Despite their talent, they may be disadvantaged by their lower profile.

## SOCIABILITY

Degree to which a person seems socially energetic, extroverted and proactively communicative

74

## Lower Scores

- ⊕ Focused, good listener
- ⊖ Remote, quiet and retiring

## Higher Scores

- ⊕ Outgoing and approachable
- ⊖ Distractible; may talk more than listen

## Development Tips

- ⊕ When others are talking, don't show signs of impatience and resist the urge to interrupt. Be careful to avoid dominating social situations, for example, by letting others speak first, offering the floor to team members, and checking to make sure all parties have an opportunity to speak in discussions.
- ⊕ You seem to be a sociable and articulate person; It would also be useful for you to be known as a good listener. In conversations, monitor the amount of time you talk and be sure to listen to how others respond. You also seem to be well connected inside the organization; make it a point to introduce your younger colleagues to your contacts in other parts of the business.
- ⊕ You seem to be someone who is friendly and approachable and who knows a lot of other people in the business. As such you can be a resource for connecting people who need one another to solve problems in the business. You are also likely to be a resource for showing new employees how to get around inside the organization.

## RESERVED

Concerns the risk that being tough and self-reliant comes across as aloof, remote and indifferent to others' feelings

93

## Lower Scores

- ⊕ Tactful and considerate
- ⊖ Overly sensitive

## Higher Scores

- ⊕ Tough and resilient
- ⊖ Detached and uncommunicative

## Development Tips

- ⊕ You are an unusually strong person, you are rarely bothered by criticism or bad news, and you probably take pride in your direct and plain spoken communication style. But few people are as resilient as you. Think before you speak because your frank and candid commentary may unintentionally upset or erode important relationships.
- ⊕ When staffing and business demands change quickly, some members of your team will be stressed. Because you are so resilient, you may not notice that they are upset. Make it a point regularly to ask about staff morale; when you find there are issues, be sure your staff knows you are available to discuss and, if possible, fix those issues.
- ⊕ You seem to be someone who is not afraid of conflict and confrontations and who is willing to challenge people who are not performing as they should. You also seem able to take stress and pressure without losing your focus. Your steadiness under pressure and willingness to hold people accountable for their performance are important leadership attributes, especially during periods of confusion and rapid change.





## SECTION 2: LEADERSHIP EMERGENCE

### 4

### BUILDING CONNECTIONS

(Continued)

#### AFFILIATION

Seeking opportunities to build social networks and collaborate with people.

94

#### Lower Scores

- ⊕ Values independence
- ⊖ May lack interest in expanding networks

#### Higher Scores

- ⊕ Values relationships
- ⊖ May have difficulty working alone

#### Development Tips

- ⊕ Stop assuming that others find meetings and conversations as useful as you do. You enjoy building relationships and connecting with other people, whereas some people may prefer to spend more time focusing and working alone. Monitor others' preferences in this regard, especially if you have direct reports, and determine how much of your time they may actually need.
- ⊖ Start evaluating how you spend your time and whether you should schedule meetings when a more independent approach to problem solving might better serve the organization's goals. Ask your colleagues for feedback regarding the time they spend in meetings and the degree to which the interactions, although enjoyable, are the most efficient approach to achieving results.
- ⊕ Continue to build a network of relationships inside and outside of your organization. Your wide range of contacts serve as a very useful way to promote better and more effective communication in the workplace. By facilitating connections between people, you also build the cohesion, trust, and engagement that helps stabilize the entire operation.





### SECTION 3: LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS

#### 3

#### LEADING THE BUSINESS

#### Achieving critical business outcomes

People with higher scores on this dimension tend to be action-oriented, competitive, and focused on business results. They have high standards and push others toward desired outcomes. People with lower score may be less assertive, less able to sell their ideas to others, and/or have less interest in steering the business agenda.

##### AMBITION

Degree to which a person seems leader-like, competitive, energetic and self-confident

73

##### Lower Scores

- ⊕ Pursues realistic, well-defined goals
- ⊖ Stays within comfort zone

##### Higher Scores

- ⊕ Pursues aggressive business targets
- ⊖ May compete with or intimidate team members

##### Development Tips

- ⊕ You are more intensely action oriented than most people. The fact that some people lack your sense of urgency may sometimes bother you. Your possible irritation is understandable; nonetheless, it would be helpful if you were to resist the temptation to urge other people to greater action, particularly if those people don't work for you.
- ⊖ Spend more time with your team discussing what interests them; talk to them about times they felt the most engaged in their work. Try to find common themes that connect their interests with your agenda for the team. Make sure to separate this conversation from the performance review process to encourage a more open discussion about motivation and career goals.
- ⊕ Continue to demonstrate initiative by identifying challenging goals that benefit the business, and then encouraging your team to pursue them to completion. Check regularly with your team to make sure that they understand and support your a general strategic direction and that they are able to keep up with the associated demands.

##### POWER

A desire to succeed, have influence, attain status, make a difference and outperform one's competition

86

##### Lower Scores

- ⊕ Tends to respect established procedures
- ⊖ May be satisfied with the status quo

##### Higher Scores

- ⊕ Wants to win and beat the competition
- ⊖ Emphasizes winning over all else

##### Development Tips

- ⊕ You have a strong bias toward taking action and getting results. Be sure to resist the temptation to make decisions and move on without seeking input and buy-in from your key colleagues. They are more likely to support your decisions and be engaged in their implementation if they participate in the process and influence the outcome.
- ⊖ When problems arise in the business, think about making the decisions collaboratively in order to build alignment and leverage your team members' expertise. Foster open discussion around these issues so others have some influence over the aligned direction. Be sure to delegate control when possible in order to get the best outcome. Foster the team's development by encouraging members to adopt roles that challenge their natural inclinations.
- ⊕ Your desire to win and your results-focused leadership style should drive your reputation for being a person with high standards who strives to be the best at what you do. The bottom line in business is to outperform the competition, and that only happens when people make high performance a conscious goal.







### SECTION 3: LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS

3

#### LEADING THE BUSINESS

(Continued)

##### COMMERCE

Concerns interest in money, profits, investment, and business opportunities

79

##### Lower Scores

- ⊕ Values non-materialistic goals and outcomes
- ⊖ Relatively unconcerned with the bottom line

##### Higher Scores

- ⊕ Values financial success
- ⊖ Values materialistic goals above all else

##### Development Tips

- ⊕ Don't assume that others are as motivated by financial gain as you are; some people, for example, may be more interested in having their work recognized than they are interested in raises and bonuses. Financial goals are critical to leading a business and focusing on them is appropriate, but a number is not a vision or strategy; it is a good idea to communicate organizational goals in both financial and in strategic or visionary terms.
- ⊕ Think about whether you prioritize the business's financial outcomes over building your team, developing talent, and ensuring employee alignment and engagement. Research shows clearly that these "soft" topics are critical to sustained successful financial performance. When you discuss your decisions and proposals, outline the financial as well as non-financial considerations and consequences of your intended actions.
- ⊕ Continue to focus on creating bottom-line value and making decisions based on their implications for financial impact. You tend to use quantitative measures as the key scorecard for success. Find ways to teach others how to communicate the value of their work outcomes in terms that illustrate their contribution to revenue and profit.





## SECTION 3: LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS

## 5

## MANAGING RESOURCES

## Securing, optimizing, and deploying key assets

People with higher scores on this dimension plan ahead, seem comfortable with calculated risks, and take decisive action to secure and allocate resources. They create necessary structure but will make changes based on performance data. People with lower scores may resist planning, struggle to forecast resources needs effectively, and seem reluctant to change when standard methods don't yield desired results.

## PRUDENCE

The degree to which a person is conscientious, conforming and dependable

72

## Lower Scores

- ⊕ Adaptable, comfortable with ambiguity
- ⊖ Disorganized; may lack interest in planning

## Higher Scores

- ⊕ Organized, strong planning skills
- ⊖ May struggle with changes to the plan

## Development Tips

- ⊕ Even the best plans sometimes have to be changed. Avoid sticking to a plan past the point where it is useful just because it is your plan. Also remember that there are often exceptions to very useful rules, especially when circumstances change unexpectedly. Practice more flexibility for special cases.
- ⊕ Periodically review your plan for acquiring and expending resources to see if reallocation is needed. Then make it a point to review your resource plan periodically and put it on your calendar. Check with your team to see how work is progressing and compare the results with the current plan. As you do this, be prepared to learn that the resource plan will likely need some realignment.
- ⊕ Your ability to plan your work, stay with your plan, and forecast your needs for resources are important career assets. Others will appreciate the way you conserve and then expend resources in an orderly manner. Your team will also appreciate being able to anticipate your demands and requirements; your planning helps make you more predictable.

## MISCHIEVOUS

Concerns the risk that excitement-seeking behaviors also imply careless risk-taking or reckless decision-making

49

## Lower Scores

- ⊕ Transparent, respects boundaries
- ⊖ Overly conservative or objective

## Higher Scores

- ⊕ Charming, persuasive, charismatic
- ⊖ May be impulsive and take ill-advised risks

## Development Tips

- ⊕ It is important, when making decisions about how to acquire or allocate resources, not to be seen as cautious and/or risk avoidant. No one likes to make obvious mistakes, but in order to take advantage of unexpected opportunities, it is often necessary to take a chance and interpret guidelines flexibly. It is sometimes useful to take a risk.
- ⊕ Create a reputation for being able to respond quickly and flexibly to newly emerging opportunities. It is useful to be seen as someone who will take reasonable chances on new projects and people. Identify someone in your organization who is both fun and successful. Take that person as a model for how to build relationships, identify resources, and find new talent for the team. Identify skills you can emulate, and then take specific actions to support your development in this area.
- ⊕ You seem like a steady, controlled person who makes responsible decisions and pays attention to rules and guidelines. You seem likely to think through the consequences of decisions about resources, to learn from experience, and rarely to promise more than you can deliver. Others will see you as dependable, trustworthy, transparent, and consistent.







## SECTION 3: LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS

5

### MANAGING RESOURCES

(Continued)

#### SCIENCE

Measures interest in knowledge, research, technology, and data

86

##### Lower Scores

- ⊕ Prefers fast and intuitive decision making
- ⊖ Intuitions can be wrong

##### Higher Scores

- ⊕ Prefers data-based decision-making
- ⊖ May put off making decisions while gathering more data

#### Development Tips

- ⊕ Be careful to avoid paralysis by analysis. When decisions need to be made, don't get distracted by searching for more information, especially if a quick judgment call would be sufficient. Although bad decisions should be avoided, there is often a trade off between speed and accuracy. Also resist the temptation to revisit decisions you have already made; what is done is already done.
- ⊕ Find ways to turn your natural comfort with and interest in technology into a competitive advantage for your team. Consider activities that could be made more efficient or effective by applying technology, and devise a technology plan for your group. Leverage your IT team to find ways to aggregate data for decision making or to identify critical business trends that are otherwise invisible.
- ⊕ Your tendency to review the available evidence before making decisions will lead to better outcomes. Others will appreciate your reliance on rational analysis rather than emotional arguments because this makes your decision making more transparent and predictable. Some will also appreciate your willingness to use data to challenge the status quo.





## SECTION 3: LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS

9

## LEADING PEOPLE

## Motivating others to pursue shared goals

People with higher scores on this dimension seem tolerant, patient, and insightful, but also able to drive accountability. They build high-performing teams, inspire commitment, and get results. People with lower scores may seem brusque, independent, and intimidating; they are personally hard working, but may struggle to motivate others to pursue shared goals.

## INTERPERSONAL SENSITIVITY

Concerns the degree to which a person seems socially perceptive, tactful and sensitive to others' needs

69

## Lower Scores

- ⊕ Candid; straightforward communicator
- ⊖ May seem abrupt and insensitive

## Higher Scores

- ⊕ Likeable and patient
- ⊖ May be uncomfortable delivering tough feedback

## Development Tips

- ⊕ Be aware that you may tend to avoid difficult conversations with people who are not performing well. Although it is tempting to focus on providing people with positive feedback, the only way they can improve their performance is to pay attention to their weaknesses. When leaders fail to confront non-performers, others notice and may dial back their own performance.
- ⊖ Most people see you as pleasant, thoughtful, and perceptive. As a result, some people may think you lack serious resolve--i.e., you won't hold them accountable for their job duties. In the context of being consistently considerate, make sure that people understand that, when it comes to job performance, you think people should live up to their responsibilities.
- ⊕ Your communication style encourages others to trust and confide in you; this is especially helpful when coaching direct reports and developing and maintaining cross-functional relationships. People appreciate the diplomatic and tactful way you provide supportive but balanced feedback regarding their performance issues.

## EXCITABLE

Concerns the risk that initial passion for people and projects is displaced by frustration when setbacks or failures occur

99

## Lower Scores

- ⊕ Calm, stable, and consistent
- ⊖ May lack a sense of urgency

## Higher Scores

- ⊕ Passionate, engaged, and intense
- ⊖ Volatile and unpredictable

## Development Tips

- ⊕ Stop allowing yourself to become visibly frustrated or discouraged with projects and/or people. Allow yourself to take a break and create temporary distance from the person or problem, but make it a habit to return and finish what you have started. Otherwise, you run the risk of developing a reputation for lacking persistence or abandoning others during stressful times.
- ⊖ Start identifying the situational factors that tend to trigger strong emotional responses for you. Write down several recent examples of times you expressed frustration at an inappropriate level. Determine what those occasions have in common to help you anticipate the next time you may be susceptible to the emergence of negative emotional reactions. Prepare strategies in advance that you can use to counteract each trigger in real time.
- ⊕ Continue to channel your passion in ways that inspire your team to match your level of energy and commitment. However, be aware of the tendency for your initial enthusiasm to be rapidly displaced by disappointment when you encounter setbacks. Strive to remain positive through difficult times and monitor your tendency to over-react to setbacks and issues.





### SECTION 3: LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS

9

#### LEADING PEOPLE

(Continued)

##### SKEPTICAL

Concerns being alert for signs of threat or wrongdoing and, when detected, becoming negative, vindictive and unforgiving

99

##### Lower Scores

- ⊕ Trusting, optimistic
- ⊖ Takes others at face value

##### Higher Scores

- ⊕ Pays close attention to others' motives
- ⊖ May be cynical, mistrusting, or fault finding

##### Development Tips

- ⊕ Stop looking for the worst in others or trying to "catch" them doing something wrong. Your tendency to see the worst-case-scenario under stress prevents those around you from taking risks and admitting to honest mistakes, damaging your ability to build trusting relationships. Instead, make an effort to try to catch others doing the right thing. Make a concerted effort to praise others' efforts and accomplishments when you notice them.
- ⊖ Start giving others the benefit of the doubt versus assuming the worst. Your skeptical nature indicates you are more likely to point out what could go wrong rather than what may go right, particularly when under stress. Practice considering more positive alternate explanations for situations with which you are unhappy. When feelings of mistrust arise, consult with others to determine if you may be assuming malicious intentions where none exist.
- ⊕ Continue thinking critically about others' intentions when evaluating whether you can trust their words. Your shrewd, discerning nature allows you to be quite insightful about others' motives and agendas. However, this tendency may cause others to view you as negative, mistrusting, and possibly argumentative. Do not allow your circle of trust to become too narrow or insular, which can create perceptions of favoritism on your team and/or degrade the quality of information you have to make important decisions.





## HIGH POTENTIAL TALENT REPORT

### DEVELOPMENT PLANNING

An Individual Development Plan (IDP) is important for keeping you and others involved in and accountable for your professional development. Below is an IDP template; the objective is to help you and those championing your professional growth concentrate on the areas that will deliver the greatest developmental impact. After reflecting on your assessment results, we recommend that you commit yourself to two or three actionable development objectives. Below are some guidelines to help focus your efforts:

- Focusing on average or low (orange/red) scores will have the biggest payoff if you execute on your commitments.
- If you have mostly strong (green/yellow) scores, you may want to focus on new ways to leverage your strengths, or how to prevent overuse of your strengths. Remember, higher scores are not necessarily better in all situations.
- If you have mostly average or low (orange/red) scores, we recommend narrowing your focus to one or two key areas.
- Before you outline your objectives, review your development tips for your lowest scores and use them in defining your development commitments and actions.

*The most critical task is to ensure that the actions you list are specific and easily observable by others.*

### SAMPLE DEVELOPMENT COMMITMENT

**Name:** Jane Sample

**Role:** VP Sales

**Coach/Mentor:** John Sample

COMMITMENT	ACTIONS	TIMELINE	HOW TO MEASURE SUCCESS	SUPPORT/RESOURCES
Development Commitment 1: <i>Delegate more responsibilities to my team.</i>	1.Discern the top 3 areas where I should be spending my time 2.Take inventory how I spent my time over the past month 3.Delegate any non-essential work activities to team 4.Hold weekly accountability meetings	1.June 1 2.June 1 3.June 15 4.Ongoing	Measurable progress in each of my 3 focus areas (will solicit feedback from my manager about progress) Team reports they are receiving more and bigger delegations Delegations are completed accurately and on time	My team members My manager





HIGH POTENTIAL TALENT REPORT

## MY INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Name:

Role:

Coach/Mentor:

COMMITMENT	ACTIONS	TIMELINE	HOW TO MEASURE SUCCESS	SUPPORT/RESOURCES
Development Commitment 1:				
Development Commitment 2:				
Development Commitment 3:				





## APPENDIX B: COMPLETE CORRELATION MATRICES FOR HOGAN HIGH POTENTIAL COMPETENCIES AND DIMENSIONS

**Table B.1** Correlations with International Personality Item Pool (IPIP) Scales

IPIP Scale	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Agreeableness	.69**	.16**	.35**	.59**	-.14*	.27**	.49**	.24**	.69**	.10	.31**	.62**
Conscientiousness	.47**	.25**	.29**	.49**	-.03	.20**	.52**	.28**	.41**	.34**	.17**	.52**
Extraversion	.57**	.37**	.05	.50**	.48**	.70**	.70**	.79**	.54**	.52**	-.14*	.55**
Neuroticism	-.56**	-.31**	-.05	-.46**	-.15**	-.36**	-.69**	-.50**	-.57**	-.39**	-.03	-.58**
Openness	.36**	.51**	-.10	.39**	.19**	.31**	.31**	.34**	.29**	.21**	-.24**	.17**

*Note:*  $N = 298$ ; \* Correlation is significant at the .05 level; \*\* Correlation is significant at the .01 level; 1 = Getting Along; 2 = Thinking Broadly; 3 = Following Process; 4 = Leadership Foundations; 5 = Standing Out; 6 = Building Connections; 7 = Influencing Others; 8 = Leadership Emergence; 9 = Leading People; 10 = Leading the Business; 11 = Managing Resources; 12 = Leadership Effectiveness.

**Table B.2** Correlations with HEXACO Honesty-Humility Scale & Subscales

HEXACO Scale	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Honesty-Humility	.40**	.00	.32**	.34**	-.41**	-.03	.29**	-.08	.42**	-.10	.42**	.41**
Fairness	.42**	.08	.35**	.41**	-.17**	.09	.34**	.10	.40**	.10	.31**	.45**
Greed Avoidance	.25**	.02	.15*	.20**	-.36**	-.11	.16**	-.15*	.29**	-.20**	.29**	.20**
Modesty	.26**	-.11	.26**	.20**	-.48**	-.04	.10	-.20**	.27**	-.18**	.35**	.24**
Sincerity	.23**	-.03	.18**	.18**	-.23**	-.04	.23**	-.03	.27**	-.02	.30**	.30**

*Note:*  $N = 285$ ; \* Correlation is significant at the .05 level; \*\* Correlation is significant at the .01 level; 1 = Getting Along; 2 = Thinking Broadly; 3 = Following Process; 4 = Leadership Foundations; 5 = Standing Out; 6 = Building Connections; 7 = Influencing Others; 8 = Leadership Emergence; 9 = Leading People; 10 = Leading the Business; 11 = Managing Resources; 12 = Leadership Effectiveness.

**Table B.3** Correlations with Inventory of Personality Characteristics (ICP-7) Scales

ICP-7 Scale	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Negative Valence	-.39**	-.13*	-.27**	-.37**	.14*	-.09	-.31**	-.10	-.36**	-.08	-.23**	-.37**
Positive Valence	.24**	.34**	.07	.31**	.56**	.31**	.26**	.49**	.15**	.44**	-.27**	.20**

*Note:*  $N = 285$ ; \* Correlation is significant at the .05 level; \*\* Correlation is significant at the .01 level; 1 = Getting Along; 2 = Thinking Broadly; 3 = Following Process; 4 = Leadership Foundations; 5 = Standing Out; 6 = Building Connections; 7 = Influencing Others; 8 = Leadership Emergence; 9 = Leading People; 10 = Leading the Business; 11 = Managing Resources; 12 = Leadership Effectiveness.



**Table B.4** Correlations with MACH-IV Scale & Subscales

MACH-IV Scale	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Total Score	-.59**	-.14*	-.33**	-.51**	.17**	-.25**	-.48**	-.22**	-.60**	-.11	-.32**	-.58**
Tactics	-.50**	-.12	-.31**	-.45**	.19**	-.15*	-.44**	-.15*	-.50**	-.11	-.31**	-.51**
Views	-.53**	-.14*	-.23**	-.44**	.11	-.30**	-.43**	-.25**	-.57**	-.10	-.23**	-.51**
Morals	-.19**	.02	-.27**	-.20**	.10	-.06	-.08	-.01	-.18**	.04	-.24**	-.21**

*Note:*  $N = 284$ ; \* Correlation is significant at the .05 level; \*\* Correlation is significant at the .01 level; 1 = Getting Along; 2 = Thinking Broadly; 3 = Following Process; 4 = Leadership Foundations; 5 = Standing Out; 6 = Building Connections; 7 = Influencing Others; 8 = Leadership Emergence; 9 = Leading People; 10 = Leading the Business; 11 = Managing Resources; 12 = Leadership Effectiveness.

**Table B.5** Correlations with Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI) Scale & Subscales

NPI Scale	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Total Score	.04	.38**	-.19**	.11	.75**	.41**	.34**	.65**	.01	.57**	-.42**	.11
Authority	.15**	.38**	-.14*	.20**	.63**	.41**	.44**	.64**	.11	.66**	-.34**	.26**
Self-Sufficiency	.15*	.31**	-.02	.21**	.47**	.24**	.40**	.48**	.14*	.46**	-.19**	.24**
Superiority	.03	.32**	-.15**	.10	.65**	.32**	.20**	.51**	-.01	.37**	-.37**	.02
Exhibitionism	-.05	.21**	-.17**	.00	.59**	.35**	.12*	.46**	-.07	.28**	-.30**	-.04
Exploitativeness	.01	.33**	-.22**	.06	.51**	.30**	.24**	.46**	-.01	.39**	-.35**	.04
Vanity	.00	.17**	-.10	.03	.44**	.25**	.14*	.36**	.01	.24**	-.21**	.03
Entitlement	-.21**	.17**	-.22**	-.13*	.57**	.20**	.02	.36**	-.21**	.36**	-.39**	-.12*

*Note:*  $N = 285$ ; \* Correlation is significant at the .05 level; \*\* Correlation is significant at the .01 level; 1 = Getting Along; 2 = Thinking Broadly; 3 = Following Process; 4 = Leadership Foundations; 5 = Standing Out; 6 = Building Connections; 7 = Influencing Others; 8 = Leadership Emergence; 9 = Leading People; 10 = Leading the Business; 11 = Managing Resources; 12 = Leadership Effectiveness.



**Table B.6** Correlations with Personality Inventory for DSM-5 (PID-5) Scales

PID-5 Scale	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Anhedonia	-.50**	-.25**	-.13*	-.44**	-.15*	-.37**	-.58**	-.45**	-.48**	-.33**	-.06	-.50**
Anxiousness	-.42**	-.17**	.01	-.29**	-.07	-.28**	-.62**	-.40**	-.49**	-.31**	-.06	-.50**
Depressivity	-.42**	-.19**	-.10	-.35**	-.08	-.25**	-.50**	-.34**	-.41**	-.26**	-.08	-.44**
Emotional Lability	-.38**	-.06	-.10	-.27**	.10	-.16**	-.47**	-.21**	-.40**	-.20**	-.21**	-.45**
Hostility	-.55**	-.11	-.27**	-.45**	.17**	-.18**	-.45**	-.18**	-.58**	-.07	-.34**	-.55**
Perseveration	-.42**	-.07	-.14*	-.31**	.09	-.18**	-.47**	-.22**	-.43**	-.16**	-.22**	-.46**
Rigid Perfectionism	-.26**	.04	.10	-.08	.12*	-.17**	-.26**	-.11	-.31**	.05	-.08	-.20**
Separation Insecurity	-.28**	-.09	.03	-.18**	.09	-.08	-.45**	-.18**	-.36**	-.15**	-.14*	-.37**
Submissiveness	-.21**	-.12*	.17**	-.10	-.05	-.12*	-.41**	-.24**	-.21**	-.21**	.03	-.23**
Suspiciousness	-.47**	-.10	-.15*	-.36**	.08	-.24**	-.45**	-.24**	-.56**	-.09	-.20**	-.49**
Withdrawal	-.56**	-.22**	-.13*	-.45**	-.20**	-.56**	-.59**	-.55**	-.54**	-.33**	-.06	-.54**
Attention-Seeking	-.11	.22**	-.15**	-.02	.60**	.31**	-.02	.39**	-.14*	.25**	-.41**	-.15*
Callousness	-.50**	-.10	-.34**	-.45**	.19**	-.14*	-.31**	-.09	-.47**	-.01	-.33**	-.45**
Deceitfulness	-.39**	.02	-.25**	-.30**	.31**	-.01	-.33**	.01	-.39**	.00	-.38**	-.42**
Grandiosity	-.16**	.22**	-.14*	-.04	.52**	.12*	-.02	.29**	-.20**	.29**	-.33**	-.12*
Manipulativeness	-.13*	.19**	-.19**	-.06	.44**	.22**	-.04	.28**	-.16**	.24**	-.43**	-.17**
Intimacy Avoidance	-.34**	-.17**	-.18**	-.33**	-.07	-.24**	-.32**	-.26**	-.29**	-.22**	-.08	-.33**
Restricted Affectivity	-.27**	-.03	-.14*	-.21**	-.05	-.23**	-.19**	-.19**	-.24**	-.01	-.16**	-.23**
Distractibility	-.42**	-.18**	-.22**	-.40**	.04	-.19**	-.48**	-.26**	-.38**	-.27**	-.18**	-.46**
Eccentricity	-.40**	.09	-.28**	-.29**	.12*	-.18**	-.40**	-.18**	-.43**	-.11	-.36**	-.50**
Perceptual Dysregulation	-.34**	-.01	-.19**	-.26**	.20**	-.12*	-.37**	-.10	-.35**	-.08	-.31**	-.41**
Risk-Taking	-.03	.26**	-.38**	-.05	.38**	.28**	.14*	.34**	-.05	.36**	-.58**	-.11
Unusual Beliefs and Experiences	-.26**	.11	-.20**	-.17**	.26**	-.04	-.24**	.01	-.28**	.00	-.38**	-.36**
Impulsivity	-.32**	-.05	-.33**	-.33**	.22**	.01	-.24**	.01	-.29**	-.03	-.40**	-.38**
Irresponsibility	-.36**	-.07	-.25**	-.33**	.18**	-.08	-.32**	-.08	-.32**	-.10	-.27**	-.38**

Note:  $N = 297$ ; \* Correlation is significant at the .05 level; \*\* Correlation is significant at the .01 level; 1 = Getting Along; 2 = Thinking Broadly; 3 = Following Process; 4 = Leadership Foundations; 5 = Standing Out; 6 = Building Connections; 7 = Influencing Others; 8 = Leadership Emergence; 9 = Leading People; 10 = Leading the Business; 11 = Managing Resources; 12 = Leadership Effectiveness.



**Table B.7** Correlations with Grit Scale & Subscales

Grit Scale & Subscales	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Total Score	.48**	.27**	.24**	.48**	.08	.22**	.57**	.36**	.42**	.40**	.13*	.55**
Consistency of Interests	.39**	.16**	.23**	.38**	-.02	.15**	.49**	.25**	.37**	.27**	.21**	.48**
Perseverance of Effort	.46**	.33**	.19**	.48**	.17**	.24**	.52**	.40**	.38**	.44**	-.01	.48**

*Note:*  $N = 328$ ; \* Correlation is significant at the .05 level; \*\* Correlation is significant at the .01 level; 1 = Getting Along; 2 = Thinking Broadly; 3 = Following Process; 4 = Leadership Foundations; 5 = Standing Out; 6 = Building Connections; 7 = Influencing Others; 8 = Leadership Emergence; 9 = Leading People; 10 = Leading the Business; 11 = Managing Resources; 12 = Leadership Effectiveness.

**Table B.8** Correlations with Hogan Judgment Report Scales

Judgment Scale	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Verbal Reasoning	.05	.21**	-.02	.12*	-.04	.11	.06	.05	.06	-.05	.00	.01
Numerical Reasoning	-.02	.19**	-.15**	.02	-.01	.06	.01	.02	-.03	.02	-.15**	-.09
Threat vs. Reward	.14*	.41**	-.46**	.08	.28**	.45**	.24**	.42**	.15*	.23**	-.54**	-.06
Tactical vs. Strategic	.26**	.47**	-.16**	.29**	.57**	.51**	.52**	.70**	.21**	.65**	-.36**	.33**
Data-Driven vs. Intuitive	-.12*	-.38**	.24**	-.14*	-.02	-.12*	-.11	-.10	-.06	-.16**	.43**	.09
Defensive vs. Cool-Headed	.65**	.11	.16**	.46**	-.13*	.25**	.60**	.28**	.68**	.11	.26**	.62**
Denial vs. Acceptance	-.23**	-.49**	.09	-.31**	-.70**	-.45**	-.46**	-.72**	-.15*	-.63**	.35**	-.28**
Superficial vs. Genuine	.39**	.27**	-.07	.30**	.13*	.32**	.57**	.42**	.38**	.26**	-.01	.39**
Openness to Feedback	.51**	-.02	.10	.30**	-.37**	.09	.44**	.03	.56**	-.13*	.34**	.45**

*Note:*  $N = 294$ ; \* Correlation is significant at the .05 level; \*\* Correlation is significant at the .01 level; 1 = Getting Along; 2 = Thinking Broadly; 3 = Following Process; 4 = Leadership Foundations; 5 = Standing Out; 6 = Building Connections; 7 = Influencing Others; 8 = Leadership Emergence; 9 = Leading People; 10 = Leading the Business; 11 = Managing Resources; 12 = Leadership Effectiveness.

**Table B.9** Correlations with Long Term Strategic Thinking (LTST) Scores

LTST Scale	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Total Score	.39**	.37**	.18**	.46**	.17**	.20**	.44**	.35**	.31**	.46**	.00	.44**

*Note:*  $N = 285$ ; \* Correlation is significant at the .05 level; \*\* Correlation is significant at the .01 level; 1 = Getting Along; 2 = Thinking Broadly; 3 = Following Process; 4 = Leadership Foundations; 5 = Standing Out; 6 = Building Connections; 7 = Influencing Others; 8 = Leadership Emergence; 9 = Leading People; 10 = Leading the Business; 11 = Managing Resources; 12 = Leadership Effectiveness.

**Table B.10** Correlations with Hogan Business Reasoning Inventory (HBRI) Scales

HBRI Scale	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Overall Score	.03	-.20**	-.05	.09	-.15*	-.05	.02	-.09	.05	-.02	.00	.02
Tactical	.12*	.20**	.05	.17**	-.15*	-.04	.07	-.06	.13*	-.03	.03	.08
Strategic	-.04	.17**	-.11	.01	-.11	-.05	-.03	-.09	-.02	-.02	-.03	-.03

*Note:*  $N = 297$ ; \* Correlation is significant at the .05 level; \*\* Correlation is significant at the .01 level; 1 = Getting Along; 2 = Thinking Broadly; 3 = Following Process; 4 = Leadership Foundations; 5 = Standing Out; 6 = Building Connections; 7 = Influencing Others; 8 = Leadership Emergence; 9 = Leading People; 10 = Leading the Business; 11 = Managing Resources; 12 = Leadership Effectiveness.



**Table B.11** Correlations with Relationship Questionnaire (RQ) Scales

RQ Scale	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Secure	.44**	.15**	.09	.35**	.18**	.40**	.46**	.43**	.50**	.21**	.06	.44**
Fearful-Avoidant	-.42**	-.11	-.06	-.30**	-.05	-.37**	-.54**	-.39**	-.49**	-.24**	-.14*	-.50**
Anxious-Preoccupied	-.30**	-.07	.02	-.18**	.18**	-.07	-.38**	-.10	-.34**	-.08	-.14*	-.32**
Dismissive-Avoidant	-.06	.05	-.16**	-.08	.07	-.15**	.06	.00	-.06	.04	-.08	-.06

*Note:*  $N = 297$ ; \* Correlation is significant at the .05 level; \*\* Correlation is significant at the .01 level; 1 = Getting Along; 2 = Thinking Broadly; 3 = Following Process; 4 = Leadership Foundations; 5 = Standing Out; 6 = Building Connections; 7 = Influencing Others; 8 = Leadership Emergence; 9 = Leading People; 10 = Leading the Business; 11 = Managing Resources; 12 = Leadership Effectiveness.

**Table B.12** Correlations between Getting Along Competency Scores and Hogan 360° Ratings

Hogan 360° Competency	Rater Group		
	Subordinates	Peers	Supervisor
Integrity	.07*	.04	.06
Resilience	.14**	.11**	.13**
Communication	.02	.01	.04
People Skills	.13**	.14**	.15**
Team Player	.08**	.10**	.12**
Customer	.04	.04	.09**
Capability	-.05	-.09**	-.04
Efficiency	-.03	-.05	.02
Results	.00	-.04	-.01
Engaging	.05	.05	.04
Accountability	-.06	-.04	.02
Motivation	.08**	.08**	.10**
Strategy	-.02	.00	.00
Innovation	.02	-.02	.01
Overall: Self-Management	.11**	.08**	.10**
Overall: Relationship Management	.06*	.07*	.10**
Overall: Working in the Business	.00	-.03	.01
Overall: Working on the Business	.01	.00	.04
Overall Score	.10**	.12**	.15**

*Note:* Subordinate  $N = 1,058 - 1,062$ ; Peer  $N = 1,137 - 1,145$ ; Supervisor  $N = 1,077 - 1,083$ ; \* Correlation is significant at .05 level; \*\* Correlation is significant at .01 level.



**Table B.13** Correlations between Thinking Broadly Competency Scores and Hogan 360° Ratings

Hogan 360° Competency	Rater Group		
	Subordinates	Peers	Supervisor
Integrity	-.09**	-.14**	-.11**
Resilience	-.09**	-.10**	-.09**
Communication	-.03	-.06*	-.07*
People Skills	-.06	-.08**	-.08**
Team Player	-.04	-.08**	-.07*
Customer	-.02	-.06*	-.03
Capability	-.04	-.08**	-.08**
Efficiency	-.07*	-.14**	-.09**
Results	-.04	-.09**	-.09**
Engaging	.05	-.02	.00
Accountability	-.04	-.05	-.04
Motivation	-.03	-.06*	-.07*
Strategy	-.02	-.06*	-.03
Innovation	.08*	.02	.02
Overall: Self-Management	-.09**	-.12**	-.10**
Overall: Relationship Management	-.04	-.08**	-.07*
Overall: Working in the Business	-.02	-.09**	-.07*
Overall: Working on the Business	.00	-.04	-.03
Overall Score	.02	-.01	-.02

*Note:* Subordinate  $N = 1,146 - 1,150$ ; Peer  $N = 1,257 - 1,265$ ; Supervisor  $N = 1,194 - 1,201$ ; \* Correlation is significant at .05 level; \*\* Correlation is significant at .01 level.



**Table B.14** Correlations between Following Process Competency Scores and Hogan 360° Ratings

Hogan 360° Competency	Rater Group		
	Subordinates	Peers	Supervisor
Integrity	.07*	.10**	.06
Resilience	.09**	.13**	.09**
Communication	-.03	.04	-.02
People Skills	.08**	.15**	.07*
Team Player	.05	.13**	.05
Customer	.01	.07*	.02
Capability	-.03	.00	-.06
Efficiency	-.01	.03	.01
Results	-.01	.03	-.04
Engaging	.00	.02	-.04
Accountability	-.04	-.01	-.04
Motivation	.05	.09**	.01
Strategy	.01	.04	-.02
Innovation	-.02	.00	-.05
Overall: Self-Management	.08**	.12**	.08**
Overall: Relationship Management	.03	.10**	.02
Overall: Working in the Business	-.02	.03	-.03
Overall: Working on the Business	.01	.03	-.03
Overall Score	.00	.08*	.01

*Note:* Subordinate  $N = 1,058 - 1,062$ ; Peer  $N = 1,136 - 1,144$ ; Supervisor  $N = 1,076 - 1,082$ ; \* Correlation is significant at .05 level; \*\* Correlation is significant at .01 level.



**Table B.15** Correlations between Leadership Foundations Dimension Scores and Hogan 360° Ratings

Hogan 360° Competency	Rater Group		
	Subordinates	Peers	Supervisor
Integrity	.03	.00	.00
Resilience	.07*	.07*	.07*
Communication	-.01	-.01	-.03
People Skills	.08*	.10**	.07*
Team Player	.05	.07*	.05
Customer	.01	.02	.04
Capability	-.07*	-.09**	-.09**
Efficiency	-.05	-.09**	-.04
Results	-.03	-.06*	-.07*
Engaging	.05	.03	.00
Accountability	-.07*	-.05	-.03
Motivation	.05	.06	.02
Strategy	-.02	-.02	-.03
Innovation	.04	.00	-.01
Overall: Self-Management	.05	.04	.04
Overall: Relationship Management	.03	.04	.03
Overall: Working in the Business	-.02	-.05	-.05
Overall: Working on the Business	.01	-.01	-.01
Overall Score	.06	.10**	.07*

*Note:* Subordinate  $N = 1,058 - 1,062$ ; Peer  $N = 1,136 - 1,144$ ; Supervisor  $N = 1,076 - 1,082$ ; \* Correlation is significant at .05 level; \*\* Correlation is significant at .01 level.



**Table B.16** Correlations between Standing Out Competency Scores and Hogan 360° Ratings

Hogan 360° Competency	Rater Group		
	Subordinates	Peers	Supervisor
Integrity	-.07*	-.12**	-.10**
Resilience	-.01	-.06	-.07*
Communication	.04	-.01	-.01
People Skills	.01	-.02	-.03
Team Player	.02	-.04	-.02
Customer	.08*	.04	.05
Capability	-.04	-.09**	-.05
Efficiency	-.01	-.07*	-.04
Results	-.02	-.11**	-.08**
Engaging	.11**	.10**	.10**
Accountability	.03	.03	.02
Motivation	.04	.01	.02
Strategy	.04	.02	.04
Innovation	.09**	.04	.05
Overall: Self-Management	-.04	-.09**	-.09**
Overall: Relationship Management	.04	-.01	.00
Overall: Working in the Business	.02	-.04	-.02
Overall: Working on the Business	.06	.03	.04
Overall Score	.04	.01	.00

*Note:* Subordinate  $N = 1,064 - 1,068$ ; Peer  $N = 1,142 - 1,150$ ; Supervisor  $N = 1,081 - 1,087$ ; \* Correlation is significant at .05 level; \*\* Correlation is significant at .01 level.



**Table B.17** Correlations between Building Connections Competency Scores and Hogan 360° Ratings

Hogan 360° Competency	Rater Group		
	Subordinates	Peers	Supervisor
Integrity	-.03	-.04	-.04
Resilience	-.02	-.02	.00
Communication	.02	.03	.05
People Skills	.05	.07*	.09**
Team Player	.03	.06	.09**
Customer	.06*	.09**	.14**
Capability	-.07*	-.08**	-.02
Efficiency	-.08*	-.04	.01
Results	-.05	-.07*	-.04
Engaging	.12**	.14**	.14**
Accountability	-.02	.02	.07*
Motivation	.04	.07*	.09**
Strategy	.01	.03	.04
Innovation	.03	.05	.05
Overall: Self-Management	-.02	-.03	-.02
Overall: Relationship Management	.04	.06*	.09**
Overall: Working in the Business	-.01	.00	.03
Overall: Working on the Business	.02	.05	.07*
Overall Score	.04	.09**	.11**

*Note:* Subordinate  $N = 1,058 - 1,062$ ; Peer  $N = 1,136 - 1,144$ ; Supervisor  $N = 1,076 - 1,082$ ; \* Correlation is significant at .05 level; \*\* Correlation is significant at .01 level.

**Table B.18** Correlations between Influencing Others Competency Scores and Hogan 360° Ratings

Hogan 360° Competency	Rater Group		
	Subordinates	Peers	Supervisor
Integrity	-.04	-.12**	-.02
Resilience	.02	-.04	.04
Communication	.03	-.01	.07*
People Skills	.03	-.02	.07*
Team Player	.01	-.03	.08**
Customer	.06	.02	.13**
Capability	-.04	-.09**	.03
Efficiency	-.03	-.05	.09**
Results	-.01	-.08**	.03
Engaging	.15**	.13**	.19**
Accountability	.02	.04	.14**
Motivation	.03	.02	.12**
Strategy	.03	.03	.10**
Innovation	.08**	.04	.12**
Overall: Self-Management	-.01	-.08**	.02
Overall: Relationship Management	.03	-.01	.10**
Overall: Working in the Business	.03	-.02	.10**
Overall: Working on the Business	.05	.03	.14**
Overall Score	.10**	.06*	.18**

*Note:* Subordinate  $N = 1,146 - 1,150$ ; Peer  $N = 1,257 - 1,265$ ; Supervisor  $N = 1,194 - 1,201$ ; \* Correlation is significant at .05 level; \*\* Correlation is significant at .01 level.





**Table B.19** Correlations between Leadership Emergence Dimension Scores and Hogan 360° Ratings

Hogan 360° Competency	Rater Group		
	Subordinates	Peers	Supervisor
Integrity	-.06	-.12**	-.07*
Resilience	.00	-.04	-.01
Communication	.04	.01	.05
People Skills	.03	.01	.05
Team Player	.02	-.01	.07*
Customer	.08**	.06*	.13**
Capability	-.06*	-.11**	-.02
Efficiency	-.05	-.06*	.02
Results	-.03	-.11**	-.04
Engaging	.16**	.16**	.18**
Accountability	.01	.04	.10**
Motivation	.04	.05	.09**
Strategy	.03	.04	.07*
Innovation	.08**	.06*	.09**
Overall: Self-Management	-.03	-.09**	-.04
Overall: Relationship Management	.04	.02	.08**
Overall: Working in the Business	.01	-.02	.05
Overall: Working on the Business	.05	.05	.10**
Overall Score	.08*	.07*	.13**

*Note:* Subordinate  $N = 1,058 - 1,062$ ; Peer  $N = 1,136 - 1,144$ ; Supervisor  $N = 1,076 - 1,082$ ; \* Correlation is significant at .05 level; \*\* Correlation is significant at .01 level.



**Table B.20** Correlations between Leading People Competency Scores and Hogan 360° Ratings

Hogan 360° Competency	Rater Group		
	Subordinates	Peers	Supervisor
Integrity	.10**	.07*	.09**
Resilience	.15**	.12**	.16**
Communication	.02	.03	.06*
People Skills	.14**	.14**	.18**
Team Player	.09**	.11**	.16**
Customer	.06*	.06*	.12**
Capability	-.02	-.04	-.01
Efficiency	-.03	-.02	.05
Results	.02	.00	.04
Engaging	.09**	.07*	.08**
Accountability	-.05	-.05	.03
Motivation	.09**	.07*	.13**
Strategy	.00	.00	.03
Innovation	.05	.01	.05
Overall: Self-Management	.13**	.10**	.13**
Overall: Relationship Management	.08**	.09**	.14**
Overall: Working in the Business	.03	.01	.06*
Overall: Working on the Business	.03	.01	.07*
Overall Score	.14**	.15**	.19**

*Note:* Subordinate  $N = 1,146 - 1,150$ ; Peer  $N = 1,257 - 1,265$ ; Supervisor  $N = 1,194 - 1,201$ ; \* Correlation is significant at .05 level; \*\* Correlation is significant at .01 level.

**Table B.21** Correlations between Leading the Business Competency Scores and Hogan 360° Ratings

Hogan 360° Competency	Rater Group		
	Subordinates	Peers	Supervisor
Integrity	-.07*	-.16**	-.08**
Resilience	-.01	-.07*	-.04
Communication	.05	-.01	.02
People Skills	-.01	-.08**	-.04
Team Player	.00	-.08**	-.03
Customer	.08*	.02	.06*
Capability	-.01	-.06	-.01
Efficiency	.04	-.01	.05
Results	.01	-.06*	-.02
Engaging	.14**	.13**	.14**
Accountability	.10**	.08**	.09**
Motivation	.03	-.01	.03
Strategy	.08**	.05	.08*
Innovation	.11**	.04	.07*
Overall: Self-Management	-.04	-.12**	-.07*
Overall: Relationship Management	.03	-.04	.01
Overall: Working in the Business	.05	.00	.05
Overall: Working on the Business	.09**	.04	.08*
Overall Score	.03	-.04	.03

*Note:* Subordinate  $N = 1,058 - 1,062$ ; Peer  $N = 1,137 - 1,145$ ; Supervisor  $N = 1,077 - 1,083$ ; \* Correlation is significant at .05 level; \*\* Correlation is significant at .01 level.

**Table B.22** Correlations between Managing Resources Competency Scores and Hogan 360° Ratings

Hogan 360° Competency	Rater Group		
	Subordinates	Peers	Supervisor
Integrity	.12**	.12**	.13**
Resilience	.10**	.11**	.14**
Communication	.03	.09**	.08**
People Skills	.10**	.13**	.13**
Team Player	.08*	.12**	.11**
Customer	.03	.07*	.06
Capability	.06	.07*	.06*
Efficiency	.06*	.12**	.13**
Results	.07*	.12**	.10**
Engaging	.00	.04	.01
Accountability	.01	.05	.05
Motivation	.06	.10**	.07*
Strategy	.03	.08*	.04
Innovation	-.02	.00	-.02
Overall: Self-Management	.12**	.12**	.14**
Overall: Relationship Management	.06*	.11**	.09**
Overall: Working in the Business	.05	.10**	.09**
Overall: Working on the Business	.02	.06	.04
Overall Score	.07*	.10**	.10**

*Note:* Subordinate  $N = 1,058 - 1,062$ ; Peer  $N = 1,136 - 1,144$ ; Supervisor  $N = 1,076 - 1,082$ ; \* Correlation is significant at .05 level; \*\* Correlation is significant at .01 level.



**Table B.23** Correlations between Leadership Effectiveness Dimension Scores and Hogan 360° Ratings

Hogan 360° Competency	Rater Group		
	Subordinates	Peers	Supervisor
Integrity	.08*	.01	.06*
Resilience	.14**	.09**	.13**
Communication	.05	.05	.09**
People Skills	.12**	.09**	.14**
Team Player	.09**	.08*	.13**
Customer	.09**	.08**	.13**
Capability	.01	-.02	.02
Efficiency	.04	.04	.12**
Results	.05	.02	.06
Engaging	.13**	.14**	.13**
Accountability	.03	.06	.10**
Motivation	.10**	.08**	.12**
Strategy	.06*	.07*	.08**
Innovation	.08**	.03	.05
Overall: Self-Management	.11**	.05	.11**
Overall: Relationship Management	.09**	.08**	.13**
Overall: Working in the Business	.07*	.05	.11**
Overall: Working on the Business	.08*	.06*	.10**
Overall Score	.13**	.11**	.18**

*Note:* Subordinate  $N = 1,058 - 1,062$ ; Peer  $N = 1,136 - 1,144$ ; Supervisor  $N = 1,076 - 1,082$ ; \* Correlation is significant at .05 level; \*\* Correlation is significant at .01 level.