

Statistics Webinar – Leadership Circle, February 2022

Follow up – Replies to Questions Posted in Chat

Access to Practitioner Resources:

There are dozens of terrific resources available in our resource's library on LCgo. This is a password protected site ONLY for LC certified practitioners. We encourage you to log in, play around and have fun with this:

- Log into LC website: <https://leadershipcircle.com/en/>
- Click: "Community Login" (far right corner of page)
- Enter Password: **Creative1TLC** (please do not share this password)
- Click: LCGo Fundamentals
- Scroll down and click on the product or service you'd like to explore.

How many leaders have taken the LCP, and how many raters?

To date, approximately 250,000 leaders have taken the LCP. With an overall average of 11 evaluators each, the data base includes evaluator feedback from about 2.7 million evaluators. You may wonder why we do not have an exact number. Over time, there have been several system upgrades and combining of global platforms. At these times, we attempt to clean out duplicates, re-opens of a single assessment, and various IT tests. So, the actual number will never be known, but these numbers are very close.

I often see some discouragement when people see they are in the 50th percentile.

A reminder that the percentiles are in comparison to the entire norm group. So, 50% is right in the middle, suggesting they are in fact focused on this competency, and people are experiencing this in them. Then, with your coaching, help the leader identify one or two Creative Competencies they see would be the most helpful, and focus the development attention there, with the support of the Profile Interpretation Manual. Also, focus on one Reactive Tendency.

What many leaders are surprised about is research confirms that intentional focus on any competency will likely lift them all. A mindful or conscious decision to focus anywhere, tends to impact many competencies. As is often quoted, "a rising tide lifts all ships".

Reflections from the group (in chat box):

I find it helpful to refer people to the actual questions answered when people are confused or curious about a rating. "Let's look at the questions that people were responding to..." (this includes the SAME questions the leader him/herself also responded to).

+1 Mike, I start there too - with the questions.

It's the best resource!

"Ideal" number of raters to invite (like no more than 17 ish)...

We encourage people to aim for 10-12 evaluators, to ensure they receive the required minimum of 5 completed evaluator surveys for the Profile report to process. Interestingly, more than 15 completed evaluator surveys doesn't tend to influence the report one way or another, but the data begins repeating itself.

There is a document in LCgo titled, "**Guidelines for Selecting Evaluators**", which gives further suggestions. Please follow the instructions above for accessing LCgo and then follow this thread:

LCgo Fundamentals / Leadership Circle Profile / Navigate the System / Project Center Information / Scroll to Launch & Manage a Project / Download document: Guidelines for Selecting Evaluators

I have had a number of people ask about the reliability/validity across races and genders.

We have been watching the gender differences for years. The screen shot below is taken from research prior to 2016, and referenced in the **Mastering Leadership** book (see pages 104-106). Another study, which is much more complete, is expected to be released in the next few months. More soon.

We are currently doing a significant research study on the validity across races. This is a significant and important study and seen as high importance. We do not yet have a date for when the research will be published, but you will be informed when available.

GENDER DIFFERENCE CORRELATIONS TO LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS	WOMEN		MEN		Effect Size
	Average	Percentile	Average	Percentile	
Relating	4.06	56%	3.89	39%	-0.27
Caring Connection	4.08	60%	3.8	37%	-0.39
Achieving	4.15	53%	4.06	41%	-0.17
Creative Dimensions	4.09	57%	3.97	40%	-0.21
Reactive Dimensions	2.06	42%	2.21	61%	0.25
Creative Reactive Score	2.01	59%	1.75	40%	-0.27
Leadership Effectiveness	4.09	53%	3.97	41%	-0.15

N = 250,000 raters. All differences between the Average scores of Men and Women are statistically significant at P < .001

Do you have the numbers that are in the various databases? You used an example of 10,000 for a database but what are the actual figures.

We do have documents in LCgo detailing the demographics for the 1.5 static database of 10,000 leaders. Please follow the instructions above for accessing LCgo and then follow this thread:

LCgo Fundamentals / Leadership Circle Profile / Scroll to Data Correlations and Validity / Download the document titled, LCP 1.5 Demographics

I would benefit from discussion about the reactive "weighting":

We may have confused things by using the word “weighting”, as it’s not entirely applicable. The reality is that each question has a different impact on overall leadership effectiveness. A leader might ask something like, “If there are only 3 questions under Caring Connection, how can my average self-score be a 3.72; it does not add up mathematically?” This is due to the design and research within the model and the statistical concept is called **Factor Structure Analysis**. You might recognize the screen shot below from your certification materials.

Long and short, all questions in the assessment are validated in and of themselves. All questions within a given competency are also validated to ensure they are all mutually exclusive (different from each other), yet point to the same thing (example: Caring Connection). The research confirms that some questions have more impact than others, so it is not possible to use “weighting” and make a mathematical calculation.

Creative Factor Structure																						
Principle Axis, Pattern Matrix	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
Mentor: People developer/builder	.71							.60					.51	.54								.57
Teamwork: Share leadership	.71							.51					.51									
Teamwork: Promote high levels of teamwork	.68							.57					.55	.57								.60
Mentor: Help people learn, change, improve	.65							.59					.54	.53								.54
Decisive: Efficient decision maker		.78							.51													
Decisive: Make timely decisions		.69							.59													
Community: Impact of decisions on community			.92																			.54
Community: vision beyond org. to world			.72						.54													.57
Community: Balance community welfare w/profit			.70																			.60
Purpose&Vision: communicate compelling vision				.92																		
Purpose&Vision: Inspire others with vision	.56		.53	.78																		
Purpose&Vision: Good role model for vision	.51			.64		.54			.55	.59												.59
Achieve Results: Strive for continuous improve					.55																	
Purpose&Vision: deep sense of purpose					.55										.52							
Integrity: Behavior consistent with values						.85				.52												
Integrity: Hold to values						.71				.50												
Balance: Find enough time for reflection							.89															
Balance: Balance work and personal							.60															
Learner: Search for meaning								.60														
Caring: Form warm/caring relationships	.51																					
Caring: Connect deeply								.88														
Caring: Compassionate								.71														.53
Composed: Composed under pressure																						
Composed: Calming influence									.56	.78												
Selfless: We did it ourselves																						
Selfless: Uninterested in credit																						
Systems Thinking: Redesign to solve multiple problems																						
Systems Thinking: Evolve systems to get results																						
Systems Thinking: Reduce activities -waste resources																						
Sustainable: Balance short term & long term health																						
Sustainable: Balance bottom line w/other org. goals																						
Sustainable: Allocate resources -not use up people																						
Inter. Intel.: Listen openly to criticism and ask																						
Strategic Focus: See integration of all parts																						
Strategic Focus: Anticipate future consequences																						
Strategic Focus: Focus quickly on key issues																						
Achieve Results: Pursue result with drive	.56																					.51
Achieve Results: Proficient at achieving results																						
Achieve Results: Quick to seize opportunities	.55																					
Inter. Intel.: In conflict -restate others opinions																						
Inter. Intel.: Take responsibility for my part																						
Learner: Learn from mistakes									.51													
Learner: Investigate deeper realities									.51													
Learner: Examine assumptions behind action																						
Mentor: Help with development plans																						
Mentor: Provide feedback on prof. growth																						
Collaborate: Create common ground	.54																					
Collaborate: Work for common ground																						
Collaborate: Negotiate for best of both																						
Inter. Intel.: Directly address issues																						
Inter. Intel.: Highly skilled in conflict																						
Community: Ethic of service to the world																						
Community: Role of org. as corp. citizen																						
Teamwork: Create positive climate																						
Courage: Speak directly on controversial																						
Courage: Courageous in meetings																						
Courage: Surface issues -others reluctant																						
Decisive: Make tough decisions																						

Note: Loadings below .5 are deleted to make it easier to read

I believe there were industry percentile norms at one point...still happening?

There once was an available feature to “customize” the norm group. Examples might be a norm group only with healthcare, or only CEOs. While we hope to have this feature available at some point in the future, it is currently disabled.

We recently made important (and required) upgrades to the data security within the project center. This coding added a lot of complexity to the “IT behind the scenes” working of the algorithms. A lot is still required to be able to ensure the security features, while also offering this option.

While it is a common question, we do not have a timeline on when this will again be available.

Any measures that would be more appropriate to the non-profit world?

Years of historical data confirms that there are not significant differences based on industry. Same is true, perhaps surprisingly, with leadership level. You likely experience

this when simply looking at differences in a few different senior leaders within the same company.

The organization itself (their culture, who they hire, who is retained) is always more an influence than industry overall.

As we know, **Context** is so important, and an essential step in the debrief process.