



LEADERSHIP FOR INNOVATION

Balanced, Conscious and Inspired
Leadership that creates a climate for
Innovation

Pam Boney
Tilt, Inc.
Summary of Thesis in 2008

Pam Boney, S. Bartholomew Craig,
Copy Editor, Steven Toaddy
North Carolina State University

Table of Contents

The World Needs a New Kind of Leader	2
A Changing Landscape for Leaders	2
Leadership of strategy: Advantage through Innovation	2
Leadership of Relationships: Social Intelligence is key.....	3
Leadership of Community: Social Responsibility on the Rise	3
Leadership of Self: Balanced Character Strengths for Stability	3
Current Leadership Theories.....	4
Traditional Approaches	4
Transcendent Leadership: An Emergent Multi-Level Theory	5
Multi- Rater Feedback and Leadership Development	6
Why We Need a Different Kind of 360 ^o Instrument	7
The Solution – The Tilt 360 Leadership Predictor (Tilt360LP)	9
The Solution – The Tilt 360 Leadership Predictor (Tilt360LP)	9
Rigorous Psychometric Evaluation of the initial Tilt 360 LP.....	10
Psychometric Characteristics of the Tilt 360 LP	11
Re-evaluation and Revision of the Tilt 360 LP	12
Conclusions	13
Pam Boney, CEO of Tilt Inc.....	14

The World Needs a New Kind of Leader

The enormous and wide-reaching failures of institution we have witnessed in recent times seem to be calling forth a public demand for a new kind of leader. In an increasingly global and complex world with equally increasing complex and tightly-coupled systems, the risk of ineffective leadership has become a growing cause of concern. Leaders able to transcend a one-dimensional self-interest and serve the greater interest of the organization, its stakeholders and the community at large are needed. This broad responsibility in leadership happens only when leaders understand the potential consequences of their actions, both intentional and unintentional. Leading in this way also requires a high degree of self-awareness, self-regulation and especially self-leadership. In short, this commitment requires the maturation of strongly-developed character strengths that are balanced and supported by the underpinnings of timeless principles.

Some have called the lack of focus on character strengths in leadership “the great blind spot of our time.” Though this void may be largely attributed to Western ideals fraught with opportunistic materialism and narcissism, it may also be due, in part, to the unavailability of a common vocabulary and sound measurement instruments for use in the development of character strengths and leader integrity.

A Changing Landscape for Leaders

Today’s business environment includes four notable areas of challenge for leaders, all contributing to the complex set of skills most needed by effective leaders today: Leadership of strategy, leadership of relationships, leadership of community and leadership of self. Building on this growing discussion, it is important to explain more specific challenges associated with each of the leadership objectives to help us understand the necessity for an innovative and tested measurement instrument.

Leadership of strategy: Advantage through Innovation

Words used to describe today’s business climate are

disruptive, rapidly changing, hostile and turbulent. Along with the inherent advantages brought by the Information Age, many companies are now competing globally to maintain strategic advantage. The era of globalization

has dramatically changed the tone of organizational culture and the world of work has evolved accordingly.

The establishment of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), the World Trade Organization (WTO), and the impact of China's appointment into the WTO have accelerated the globalization of multinational business opportunities and broadened the scope of leadership responsibility almost overnight.

Rampant technological innovation and knowledge transparency have stimulated unprecedented change, ambiguity and risk. These changes have increased the importance of effective strategic response capabilities, adding pressure on leaders to be able to navigate the complexities of business in an ever-changing global environment.

Leadership of Relationships: Social Intelligence is key

Advancements in global digital communication have not only affected the competitive strategies of enterprise, but have also influenced the way leaders work with others. The enabling technologies of social networking platforms have shifted the balance of power to the masses and are eliminating the formalities of working through traditional hierarchical channels. Work is increasingly accomplished through connective networks and collaboration, heightening the need for positive social relationships to accomplish objectives. This has been coined "social capital" and suggests that leaders must build positive and expansive relationships across all organizational boundaries. The popularity of research about the relationship of emotional intelligence and leadership effectiveness demonstrates practical acceptance of the importance of positive social relationships for success at work.

Leadership of Community: Social Responsibility on the Rise

Other contextual implications to leadership effectiveness include rampant evidence of leadership failure due to moral and ethical breakdowns in leadership integrity. These leadership failures have been widely publicized and are creating a public discourse on the perils of Western ideals for prosperity and rampant materialism. The failures of Worldcom, Enron, Tyco, and more recently, the crumbling of Wall Street's financial markets resulting from scandalous decision-making have contributed to widespread concern about the lack of transparency and integrity in leadership today. The general public is left wondering where character in leadership has gone. The unyielding transparency of digital communication is revealing moral and ethical breakdowns at every level of many failed organizations, ensuring a new level of accountability that leaders can no longer ignore.

Leadership of Self: Balanced Character Strengths for Stability

To lead effectively in today's turbulent economy, leaders must actively develop personal character strengths to rely upon to address complex problems containing moral, ethical and strategic issues. If the leaders are not self-aware, then they are not likely to be aware of the blind spots in their personal biases and preferences, thus they may not possess a balanced perspective in decision-making. Authentic awareness of one's limitations is challenging, even for experienced leaders. Leaders must understand the manner in which these potential "blind spots" influence strategic decisions and are driven by personal thoughts, feelings, actions, and other individual differences.

Current Leadership Theories

The history of research on leadership and the “right” formula for leading effective performance includes a plethora of models. Hundreds of books are published each year offering new ideas for leadership and adding to the confusion regarding which “theory” to adopt for ultimate success. The ‘theories’ espoused by these publications are often accepted into the domain of leadership practice in organizations, often without being researched or evaluated empirically for validation. Additionally, most of the research and focus of leadership effectiveness addresses leadership theories concerning leadership of others and leadership of strategy, but few address the important aspect of leadership of self, which contains the all important capacity for leadership character, ethics and integrity. This theory starts the dialogue for how today’s leaders could benefit from learning how to master their intentional and unintentional behaviors through improvement of self-awareness, self-regulation and self-leadership.

Traditional Approaches

The literature on leadership theories is extensive and sometimes contradictory. Theories range from the traditional “Transactional” Leadership model, widely accepted in the Industrial Age, to more recent bodies of research based on more current themes such as Trans-formational and Authentic Leadership.

Though transactional leadership is still crucial to maintain order and predictability, the more contemporary body of research on “Transformational” Leadership better addresses the widening complexities in the leadership agenda. Transformational leadership is a theory based on the leader’s ability “to lift people into their better selves” through relationship. The extensive re-search on Transformational - or Charismatic - Leadership addresses how certain leaders are able to achieve extraordinary levels of follower motivation, admiration, loyalty, and performance.

Contributions to the science of leadership in the late twentieth century began to address increasing complexity with the integration of these accepted models. Transactional and transformational leadership were synthesized into the dual-frame theory of situational leadership, which called for different

leadership responses to different situations. The practice was widely accepted in practice in the 1990s and is still in use today, despite the need for a new model addressing the multiple complexities of today’s environment.

More recently, an emergent group of thought leaders are postulating that the future model for effective leadership requires much higher levels of development by the leader in order to address the dynamic complexity of today’s leadership challenges. The discourse on “higher levels of consciousness” demonstrated by the “most effective leaders” caught attention with the 2001 release of Jim Collins’, “Good to Great.” “Level-Five leaders,” as supported by research, were not particularly charismatic at all, but instead demonstrated a combination of personal humility and professional will. The surprising finding in this study reported that transformational “charisma can be as much a liability as an asset, as the strength of your leadership personality can deter people from bringing you the brutal facts.”

Some have termed the new leadership theory as “Authentic Transformational Leadership,” a label that

clarifies the need for a higher level of awareness and regulation that helps keep the charismatic aspects of influence in check. Others are leaning toward a new definition for the theory entirely. Proponents of this opinion suggest that the theory should address the complexities of this higher order of personal development and should include the wide range of strengths and versatility required to expand strategic response skills in “Transcendent Leadership.”

Transcendent Leadership: An Emergent Multi-Level Theory

The emerging literature on transcendent leadership is rich with potential research. Larkin coined the term Transcendent Leadership to describe a special leadership observed among leaders who “transcended self into compassionate being and action.” Others have added to the new multi-level theory of leadership that begins with leadership of self, and ends in contribution to the greater

community within which the enterprise exists. Other early contributors to this theory included Lisa Aldon and John J. Gardiner. Aldon was the first to write a book regarding what she described as a newly emerging consciousness in spiritual evolution toward transcendence. Gardiner contributed a proposed structure mapping a theory and practice of governance that leads to transcendence.

A multi-level model encompassing leadership of self, leadership of others, leadership of organization (strategy) and leadership of community was first proposed in 2007 by Crossan and colleagues. The theory suggests that today’s leader must transcend to balance all four of these strategic demands to produce performance that is sustainable over the long term. The approach draws on the body of research in social science to close the gap for leadership of community to include shared governance and collaborative decision-making as key drivers of sustainable performance.



A link between leadership – specifically the quality of leader-follower relationships – and organizational climate has been well established by extensive research. The ability to thrive in today’s environment is increasingly determined by a leader’s ability to harvest innovative productivity from those they lead. A recent survey of executives on leadership, cited in the September 2007 issue of the McKinsey Quarterly, confirmed “innovation will be one of the top three drivers of growth

for their companies in the next three to five years.” It is reasonable to surmise that the development of a climate for innovation may require a special set of skills demonstrated by the leader. Team-level climate that contains low levels of conflict and high levels of support for collaborative contribution produces conditions that free the members to contribute in ways that they would not likely attempt in an environment containing more psychological risk.

Much of the science of leadership development over the last forty years has been conducted using measures of personality, with limited success. Although personality traits and other individual differences have implications for a leader's ability to create a climate for productivity, a group of positive psychology researchers have suggested that the future work of leadership effectiveness and positive team-level climate are dependent on the maturity of moral character in the leader. This positive outcome model includes consideration of the important "can do" aspects of behavior that can regulate "will do" attributes such as general intelligence, personality, experience, and functional competence. However, only a limited number of measurement tools have been designed to measure dimensions of character strength and their effects on leaders' individual differences.

The capacity for self-reflection and introspection are key strengths that can be developed and embodied in action toward achievement of better decision-making. Further, the development of self-regulation can align the leader's core values to organizational values and lend credibility to the leadership agenda. These capabilities include making one's motives, objectives, intentions and values transparent to followers, ensuring a consistent pattern of integrity and congruence between what is said and what is done. This enables systemic stability provided by more honest transactions with multiple constituents, building trust that is foundational to emotional engagement in the team-level climate and producing better outcomes. Leadership of self is particularly related to personality traits and the development of character strengths to self-regulate behavior so that the psychological affect on the team is positive and intentional. Personality is a strong indicator of leader behavior and therefore important to the development of leadership of self.

Self-leadership is also important for understanding one's unique capabilities and strengths that can be used to leverage knowledge, experience and individual differences. Many leaders have a tendency to underestimate

their strengths as well as their blind spots, so feedback can be valuable to leverage strengths associated with the perception gap.

Multi-Rater Feedback and Leadership Development

The repertoire of leadership development methods used in the last two decades includes the use of multi-rater feedback employed to increase self-awareness and self-regulation. This practice is fast becoming the standard way of providing leaders with constructive data for change and has quickly spawned a large body of research in an attempt to evaluate the effectiveness of such methods.

Important research questions, such as whether performance and outcomes change as a result of 360-feedback, remain unanswered. Perhaps an even more important question is the validity of the data in relationship to other key performance measures. In work by Smither and colleagues, a review of the data concluded that multi-source ratings are related to a variety of performance measures and provide evidence for concurrent validity. Data are available to support the notion that individual self-assessment does have a stronger relationship with performance appraisal ratings over time. Most researchers concur that multi-rater perception data can be an effective tool for leadership development if the process and situational factors are managed effectively.

Why We Need a Different Kind of 360° Instrument

Many challenges have surfaced over the past decade due to the popularity of 360-feedback. For example, technology has enabled the creation of instant 360 instruments by uninformed practitioners. Hundreds of companies sell MRF solutions to human resource professionals and independent consultants, who often create their own feedback systems with little to no psychometric rigor. Thousands of assessments are sold each day to the uninformed buyer and are used broadly in practice for both performance evaluation and development practices. Individuals may receive MRF results attached to performance evaluation with very little data reliability. This practice can adversely affect career outcomes, performance processes, and business cultures if left unchecked.

The current approach to building the framework for a 360-degree feedback system is competency modeling, an approach creating sets of KSAI's (Knowledge, Skills, Abilities and Individual Differences) that could represent an effective range of leadership behavior. Initially, these dimensions or competencies were designed for a specific organization and were carefully researched and refined for specific circumstances. Yet, when the approach became more popular, its rampant adoption by untrained consultants eventually led to deterioration in the quality of implementation. Today, the KSAI approach is often conducted internally by teams who employ subjective means to development of company competencies, often perpetuating the problems they already have in their culture.

Some of the assumptions that cause the greatest risk are contained in the following questionable assumptions:

1. A single set of characteristics can adequately describe effective leaders;
2. Each of these characteristics is independent of the others, and of the context, so therefore having more of each of these characteristics makes a person a better leader;
3. Because senior management usually blesses the competencies and sometimes even helps generate them, they are the most effective way to think about leadership behavior;
4. When HR systems are based on these competencies, these systems work effectively.

In short, the widespread use of competency modeling as the basis for customized 360-feedback leaves a lot to be desired. KSAI's are complex sets of attributes that are difficult to measure with reasonable reliability. These approaches are most often employed utilizing subjective selection by the senior team or other raters regarding top competencies of importance, which may not generate a complete picture of what it is to lead effectively. Complex attributes and dimensions are grouped in ways that can create

confusion and low levels of reliability. The uninformed acceptance of the technique can have negative consequences to those who are subjected to the process as well as those who are counting on its contribution to performance outcomes.

Another gap in the practice lies in the absence of a taxonomy of leadership strengths that hang together to create a comprehensive approach to the development of self-leadership. Many 360-degree assessments measure one aspect of leadership development such as the MRF instruments measuring emotional intelligence. While emotional and social intelligence are recognized as needed for effective leadership, the domains of self-awareness and self-regulation that relate to other constructs of the human development path do not always receive similar attention within measures. This results in challenges for measuring the perception of cognitive, instinctual or philosophical strengths, which are all required for higher levels of wisdom in leadership of complex situations. When charismatic leadership is partnered with destructive motivations and a susceptible followership, the result can be catastrophic. One recent example is the leadership of Bernie Madoff's scheme to provide unrealistic investment returns to a gullible public, suggesting that measuring intelligence factors may not be enough, since high levels of intelligence can potentially lead to unearned trust.

In another study, findings validated that "constructive thinking" as measured by resilient cognitive skills was a mediating factor for performance. In another study based on Bandura's social cognitive theory, self-efficacy and self-confidence contribute to leadership effectiveness. In short, 360-degree assessments based on a single construct are not enough, despite their progress in the right direction.

Recent advances in leadership development have benefited from a new interest in positive psychology. For example, a widely adopted practice is "focus on strengths" made popular by Buckingham's book and self-assessment (Buckingham, 2001). This approach has changed the way many think about improving performance and the theory has made its way into HR systems quickly (Buckingham, 2001). The new belief is that people change by moving away from negative experience and by moving toward positive experience. While combining positive psychology and leadership research has been well received, the investigation of a taxonomy of strengths specifically for leadership or other specific roles is in its early stages.

Since the majority of 360-degree feedback instruments widely used today contain dimensions and competencies as the organizing principle for developmental feedback, rigorous psychometric evaluation of such systems is needed to ensure usefulness, reliability, and validity for these categorizations.

The Solution – The Tilt 360 Leadership Predictor (Tilt360LP)

The instrument that addresses these important areas is the Tilt 360 Leadership Predictor. This instrument provides a comprehensive model for leadership behavior that is based on the development of personality trait maturity in four dimensions of leadership character strengths, specifically, emotional strengths, cognitive strengths, instinctual strengths and philosophical strengths. While the science of leadership effectiveness based on personality traits organized into developable character-strengths is still in its infancy (O’Neill, 2007), the development of balance in these four core aspects of personality preference can provide a framework for examining the personal components required for leadership effectiveness. The instrument does not assume measurement of the functional competencies that are complex in nature, but instead measures the personal capacity to self regulate behavior that creates the psychological conditions mediating team-level climate. In addition to a climate for innovation, the instrument purports to measure the conditions that create effective collaboration, although that is not the focus of this study.

The Tilt 360 LP is the result of 20 years of research and development, which was observed and recorded by its author, Pam Boney. The first version of the instrument was a paper version developed in 1993. Over the course of the next nine years, Boney conducted qualitative research in the form of journals where she recorded observed trait-based behaviors of leaders in the hospitality industry. Specifically, she collected her qualitative observations of positive and negative traits that appeared to influence performance outcomes. These trait-based behaviors were registered in her journal in continuums where perception of “balance” on commendable traits could be observed by raters. The collection of over nine years of hand-recorded data resulted in a pattern of leadership behaviors that

connected in interesting ways to personality structure. In 2004, Boney developed the first taxonomy of leadership that was used in automated 360-degree software and results were collected over 3 years until the circular nature of the relationship between the scales was observed and she decided to contract for the programming of the instrument to allow for two-dimensional graphic design for reporting the results. At this time, she began to correlate the traits and categorize them into a four-quadrant system and organized them according to other four quadrant personality models used in practice, such as the DISC and the Big Five. Judge and colleagues provided ample support for a four-factor model for leadership, resulting in positive correlations for leadership behavior to four factors including Extraversion, Openness to experience, Conscientiousness and Agreeableness. This provides support for a four-factor structure organized into a four-quadrant model of leadership behavior based on commendable traits associated with the development of character in personality. Once the trait patterns were organized, the author completed a test for the quadrants against a psychobiological model of personality temperament and character traits created by Dr. Robert Cloninger. This process was completed over a two-year period where she mapped the traits into a spreadsheet comparing the four-quadrant models of human behavior isolated by Cloninger and organized into character development continua. The four quadrants defined by Cloninger were Persistence, Novelty Seeking, Harm Avoidance, and Reward Dependence. The traits in these quadrants paired nicely with the four quadrants of numerous personality models and were sorted by the author into an extensive spreadsheet used to select the traits used in the Tilt Model.

Expert validation was employed on the final version to test the personality trait categories with Dr. Mary Bast, a personality expert in levels of development by type. In 2006, the traits were tested against a set of nine criteria for leadership character traits fashioned after the criteria used by Peterson and Seligman.

At this point in the research the traits were given clear, short definitions to increase specificity and context. Then they were subjected to an additional test against the three item-testing criteria outlined by Kaiser and Craig. The author used the three testing criteria in Kaiser and Craig to test each item for specificity, contextual meaning and simple concepts that are not multi-barreled.

The five-point Likert scales for the new instrument were developed to indicate levels of character development as observed by raters regarding the effectiveness of the leadership traits and strengths. Several other scales were tested in and eliminated before landing on the choice to use a 5-point scale that most closely matches scales commonly used in performance evaluations.

The initial version of the Tilt 360 LP was an online instrument collecting both quantitative and qualitative data for leadership development of trait-based character strengths. It was commercialized for testing in 2008 and had 18 months of data for a longitudinal study.

Rigorous Psychometric Evaluation of the initial Tilt 360 LP

The purported advantage of 360-degree feedback over other forms of evaluation for leader effectiveness is the increased accuracy and objectivity resultant from the use of multiple raters. This has not always proven true in studies evaluating various multi-rater methods. Many complex factors have an influence on the validity of the instrument used for multi-rater feedback. The psychometric soundness and the concurrent validity of the feedback contribute strongly to the value of the data. Research has produced little validity in inter-rater agreement between rating sources, and results are not much better for within-rater agreement. It can be argued that there is value to the participant to isolate data from different sources since the relationships and content may vary by rater group. Still, it is very important that 360-degree feedback be tested by rigorous methods to

assure internal construct validity. Incremental validity is also important so that feedback can be validated through an external relationship with other outcome measures for performance.

The method of administration, the use of feedback in formal performance appraisal processes, the timing of execution, and the cultural norms all play a role in the acceptance of feedback and can mediate various outcomes. In addition, comparing ratings from different cultures or languages can present problems. Other factors such as individual differences, perceived importance and global self-efficacy in both the participant and the raters can add variability to the feedback data and outcomes. The characteristics of the feedback received and the method used to debrief and interpret the data can also add to variability of outcomes.

Measurement error is another challenge to the reliability of 360-degree feedback. It has been stated that as much as 55% of the variance in latent structure of 360-degree ratings can be attributed to idiosyncratic rater effects—that is, something unique to each individual rater. Kaiser and Craig found that linguistics contributed to the lack of convergence between multiple raters of the same individual and that items are often written in such a way as to invite different interpretations. This study recommended that item reliability could be improved through reduction of measurement error if they are written in such a way that they are behaviorally specific, put in context, and narrowly focused. Despite the existence of rules for writing items, it is clear from this study that further testing of items for other linguistic and syntax characteristics can increase the reliability of results.

The complexity of MRF is no small challenge to manage. Reliability depends on many factors that may not be considered by practitioners who put too much faith in the results without solid empirical support.

Standards for the psychometric rigor of multi-source performance ratings are not novel, but can easily be

ignored by a consumer market looking for easy ways to measure leader performance. Whether the data is used for leadership development or performance feedback, this poses challenges to the practitioner who needs to be informed and rigorous in designing or selecting an optimum solution.

Psychometric Characteristics of the Tilt 360 LP

Analyses have been conducted to evaluate the internal reliability of the initial Tilt 360 LP items for the proposed core leadership strengths. Analyses showed that items were internally consistent for each core leadership strength, suggesting that the initial Tilt 360 LP was internally reliable, even though each strength is only the aggregate of four items. This finding likely reflects the iterative thoughtfulness and expert consultation that was involved in the creation of the instrument. One of the initial Tilt 360 LP instrument's strengths as an instrument designed for rater-friendliness within a wide variety of organizations was its brevity, which may have helped increase the reliability and validity by avoiding rater fatigue. One potential objective may have been reducing the number of items even further; however, analyses did not appear to support the removal of any particular item.

Additional analyses measured the association between core leadership strengths to ascertain whether strengths within meta-factors had significant, positive relationships. All correlations within meta-factors were significant, suggesting that positive relationships existed within the initial arrangement of strengths within their respective meta-factors. However, strong relationships – often, even stronger than within-meta-factor relationships – also existed between strengths arranged in adjacent meta-factors. This finding warranted additional consideration and provided support for the creation of axes and other elements of the Tilt 360 model that incorporate connecting strengths from adjacent quadrants. Furthermore, all correlations

between the twelve core leadership strengths were significant; this finding suggested that the initial Tilt 360 LP measured an aggregate 'perceived character' quality that captures a rater's conception of one's overall nature as a leader.

A factor analysis was performed to uncover the latent structure of the initial Tilt 360 LP, including how items relate and whether any cross-loading items exist. Two methods of ascertaining the appropriate number of factors supported a five-factor structure that appears to be related to the existing arrangement of meta-factors and core leadership strengths within meta-factors. This, again, likely reflected the iterative involvement of subject-matter experts during the instruments design.

The strongest factor appeared to encompass humanity, particularly consideration and trust; the second factor, the adjacent meta-factors of wisdom and courage; the third factor, primarily courage; the fourth factor, primarily resilience; and the fifth factor, the adjacent meta-factors of courage and resilience. This provided additional support for connecting adjacent meta-factors using axes and other proposed elements of the Tilt 360 model to ensure that these empirical connections are captured in one's experience with the instrument during debriefs, the creation of action plans, etc. Furthermore, although a small number of items appeared to be cross-loaded, every item was associated with at least one of the five factors with a factor loading at .25 or above, further suggesting the retention of all existing items within the Tilt 360 LP.

The factor loadings suggested a latent hierarchy within the initial Tilt 360 LP that merited additional investigation. Given the factor loading and variance explained by Factor 1 (i.e., the meta-factor of humanity), raters may have perceived these characteristics as necessary preconditions for other core leadership strengths. The relative importance of various character strengths in a rater's perception of one's leadership potential deserves additional scrutiny.

Further analyses were completed to allow additional insight related to real-world utility of the initial Tilt 360 LP and its relationship to an established measure of innovation within an organization. Analysis confirmed the expectation that higher ratings on the initial Tilt 360 LP are positively associated with climates perceived as innovative. In addition, balance between opposing meta-factor quadrants were associated with increased perceptions of innovativeness. Given the nature the initial Tilt 360 LP – a leadership measure – and the SOQ – a team climate measure – the relationship between leadership strengths and innovative climates is of particular importance. These relationships support continued advocacy of the value of core leadership strengths as measured by the initial Tilt 360 LP for an innovative organizational climate. For example, the correlation between resilience and courage as measured by the initial Tilt 360 LP and “Idea Time”, “Challenge / Involvement”, and “Playfulness / Humor” defined by the more established SOQ may suggest that demonstrating these character strengths may facilitate innovation at the team level.

Re-evaluation and Revision of the Tilt 360 LP

As a result of the psychometric tests discussed above, the author set about gathering the data required to confirm the psychometric qualities of the Tilt 360 LP. In 2012, the author used nearly three thousand new participants’ data to replicate and extend the psychometric testing previously conducted on the instrument. Internal-consistency reliability estimates once again exceeded established thresholds for each core leadership strength, indicating that within each four-item scale items were closely related to one another. Correlations between core leadership strengths were once again in all cases large and positive, indicating conceptual

similarity underpinning all individual strengths. An additional exploratory factor analysis, used in a confirmatory manner, yielded a 6-factor solution with characteristics similar to that of the previously-obtained 5-factor solution (see above), such that the largest factor captured primarily humanity; two factors captured exclusively wisdom; two factors captured primarily courage; and a final factor captured primarily resilience. Based on these replicated findings, the author set about effecting revisions to the specific wording of and, in few cases, assignment of items within the structure of the Tilt 360 LP. The author has begun longitudinal data collection under this revised instrument and anticipates the availability of updated psychometric findings by 2014.

Conclusions

Evidence for the psychometric properties of the Tilt 360 LP has been discussed above, including reliability and factor structure. This evidence helps to establish the Leadership Predictor as possessing an internally consistent structure. Beyond this first step towards usefulness lies the evidence that high ratings and, most importantly, balance between the meta-factors of the Tilt 360 LP are associated with perceptions of innovativeness on the organizational level. Stated another way, use of the Tilt 360 LP can help practitioners predict the degree to which leaders within an organization are acting to facilitate a climate of innovation.

By addressing at the offset the question of which characteristics of leadership are important – through the articulation of the meta-factor quadrants and their constituent characteristics – the conventional shortcoming of 360-degree assessments, in which non-expert raters are tasked with judging what aspects of leadership are most important – is avoided.

These characteristics of the Tilt 360 LP – reliability, validity in association with a measure of climate for innovation, and elimination of rater-derived importance information positions the Predictor as an ideal solution in the search for an instrument to assess leadership, to move towards recommending a specific course of action to improve that leadership, and a consistent framework across which leaders can be compared.

Pam Boney, CEO of Tilt Inc. is the author and creator of Tilt 365 Positive Influence Predictor

Pam is considered a futurist and thought leader for the design of innovative tools for the evolutionary development of future leaders in a dynamic, technological eco-system. Pam is also author of a novel published in 2011-titled *True Tilt, an uncommon quest*, introducing conscious leadership through a personal journey of self-awareness through four archetypes. *Tiltology: A New Paradigm in Typology*, her next book (due out in 2015) introduces an exciting new system for expanding whole-person development of “true self” to center leaders in authentic presence. Her belief is that significant work contribution comes from learning how to balance four core meta-factors necessary for success in a global economy: wisdom, courage, humanity and resilience.

Note: For resource bibliography, inquire about the Long-Version of Pam’s Thesis.