Validation of the FIRO-B® Instrument with Benchmarks® Performance Dimensions

Nicole A. Krause, Michael G. Anderson, and
Richard C. Thompson

CPP, Inc

This study, which built upon the work of Fleenor and Van Velsor (1993), examined the validity of the FIRO-B® instrument using the updated scales of the Benchmarks® 360-degree feedback tool. Aggregated Benchmarks® performance ratings from multiple sources (boss, supervisor, peer, and direct report) that were hypothesized to be related to interpersonal needs were correlated with the FIRO-B® scales. Results indicated a number of relationships were similar to those found by Fleenor and Van Velsor (1993); however, effect sizes were small and not all Hypotheses were supported.

The Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-Behavior (FIRO-B®) instrument is a self-report assessment used to measure behaviors associated with interpersonal needs (Hammer & Schnell, 2000). The FIRO-B® instrument was developed in 1958 (Schutz) for the purpose of establishing high-performance teams in the US Military and is often used in several research initiatives, including the prediction of team performance, leadership orientation research, and therapist-client compatibility research (Beutler, Storm, & Kirkish, 1985; Kuehl, DiMarco, & Wims, 1975; Malloy, 1981). In addition, the FIRO-B® instrument has served in a host of organizational development areas including personal developmental seminars, communication workshops, management development, career development, and team building and development (Waterman & Rogers, 1996). As the FIRO-B® instrument is often used in the professional development of managers; the current study will assess its validity by correlating the FIRO-B® scale scores with a number of leadership performance dimensions obtained through a multi-rater appraisal process, similar to the work done by Fleenor and Van Velsor (1993).

Interpersonal Needs

Interpersonal needs, as defined by Schutz (1958, p. 15), are needs that are "satisfied only through the attainment of a satisfactory relation with others." The FIRO-B® instrument is based upon the theory that fulfillment of these interpersonal needs (i.e., the needs for Inclusion, Control, and Affection) serve as motivation of behavior in daily functioning. As such, the FIRO-B® instrument examines behaviors derived from interpersonal needs in an attempt to increase interpersonal effectiveness

Poster presented at the 2008 Annual Conference of the American Psychological Association, Boston, Massachusetts, August 14-17, 2008.   Page - 1
Please do not reference without permission from the first author. nkrause@cpp.com
FIRO-B is a registered trademark of CPP, Inc.

and ultimately improve relationships with others (Hammer & Schnell, 2000).

Specifically, the interpersonal need for Inclusion refers to the extent to which individuals need to have social interactions and associations with others (Hammer & Schnell, 2000). Individuals with a high need for Inclusion seek attention, contact, and recognition from others (Waterman & Rogers, 1996), often stemming from a desire to belong and to be noticed by others (Hammer & Schnell, 2000). The need for Inclusion pertains not only to the need to be accepted by others, but also to the extent to which those individuals interact with or invite others to join a group. Individuals who engage in Inclusion behaviors go out of their way to attract attention from others in group settings. They partake in behaviors that serve to distinguish themselves and thus make them identifiable from others (Schutz, 1958).

In contrast, the interpersonal need for Control refers to the extent to which individuals want to lead and influence others and the extent to which they prefer to be lead and influenced as well (Hammer & Schnell, 2000). Individuals high on this construct enjoy being a decision-maker, having authority, and independence (Waterman & Rogers, 1996) as well as establishing and maintaining a level of mutual respect with others (Schutz, 1958). The interpersonal need for Control can pertain to one-on-one relationships or to relationships with those in group settings.

Finally, the interpersonal need for Affection refers to the emotional connections among people (Schnell & Hammer, 1993) and the extent to which individuals seek to establish relationships with others, particularly one-on-one relationships (Waterman &

Rogers, 1996). Individuals high on this construct prefer showing warmth to others and having it shown to them in return. They engage in behaviors that are directed toward satisfying their need for affection (Schultz, 1958) such as encouraging, confiding in, and developing friendships with others (Waterman & Rogers, 1996).

The FIRO-B® instrument provides a measure of the degree to which each of the three interpersonal needs are *expressed* or *wanted* (Schnell & Hammer, 1993). *Expressed* needs refer to the initiation of a behavior associated with an interpersonal need (Hammer & Schnell, 2000), i.e., behaviors demonstrated toward others (Schutz, 1958). Conversely, *wanted* needs refer to the extent to which an individual wants those behaviors associated with their interpersonal needs shown toward them (Hammer & Schnell, 2000), i.e., behaviors exhibited toward an individual regarding the areas of interpersonal interaction (Schutz, 1958). Thus, the FIRO-B® instrument attempts to provide not only a measure of interpersonal needs, but to predict future interactions with others based upon level of expressed or wanted needs.

Psychometric Properties of the FIRO-B® Instrument

Historically, the psychometric properties of the FIRO-B® instrument have been examined in terms of factor structure (Macrosson, 2000), internal consistency reliability (Schutz, 1978), and test-retest reliability (Gluck, 1983; Hutchinson, 1965; Schutz, 1978). The validity of the FIRO-B® instrument has also been assessed by examining it in relation to other personality-based assessments such as the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator® instrument (Fleenor, 1997; Myers, McCaulley, Mitchell, Quenk, &

Kummerow, 1997; Quenk, & Hammer, 1998; Schnell & Hammer, 1997), the California Psychological Inventory (as reported in Gough & Bradley, 2005), the Adjective Check List (as reported in Hammer & Schnell, 2000), the Interpersonal Behavior Inventory Instrument (Hurley, 1991), the Big Five Inventory (Mahoney & Stasson, 2005), and the NEO Personality Inventory (Furnham, 1996). In addition, the FIRO-B® instrument has been examined in terms of its relation to varying measures of leadership such as Fiedler's Least Preferred Co-Worker Scale (Kuehl, DiMarco, & Wims, 1975; Tucker, 1983), the Ohio State Leadership Opinion Questionnaire (Kuehl et al., 1975), and Benchmarks® 360-degree feedback tool (Fleenor & Van Velsor, 1993).

The current study builds upon the work of Fleenor and Van Velsor (1993) by examining the relationship of the FIRO-B® instrument to ratings on the updated scales of the Benchmarks® tool aggregated from multiple sources (i.e., boss, supervisor, peer, and direct report). The scales included in the Benchmarks® 360-degree feedback instrument are factors that have been indicated by managers and executives as integral in the development of successful leaders. They pertain not only to leadership skills that are developed throughout the course of one's career but also to values and perspectives that are learned over time and influence a leader's interactions and relationships with others. As the FIRO-B® instrument serves as a measure of interpersonal preferences, it is logical that dimensions within the Benchmarks® tool pertaining to interpersonal relationships should be related to the interpersonal needs assessed by the FIRO-B® instrument. For example, Expressed Inclusion, or the extent to which an individual makes an effort to include others and to be included in a

group (Hammer & Schnell, 2000) may be conceptually related to showing compassion and warmth to others (i.e., Compassion and Sensitivity), while not conceptually related to quickly mastering new technical knowledge (i.e., Being a Quick Study). The current study seeks to provide an up-to-date assessment of the construct validity of the FIRO-B® instrument by examining the relationship of its scale scores to the performance dimensions of the Benchmarks® tool. Specifically, FIRO-B® scales are hypothesized to be related to a number of contextual behaviors measured by the Benchmarks® 360-degree feedback tool pertaining to leader's interactions and relationships with others.

Hypotheses

H1. Expressed Inclusion will be positively related to Leading Employees, Participative Management, Building and Mending Relationships, Compassion and Sensitivity, Putting People at Ease, and Differences Matter, while negatively related to Problems with Interpersonal Relationships and Difficulty Building and Leading a Team.

H2. Wanted Inclusion will be positively related to Doing Whatever it Takes, Building and Mending Relationships, Compassion and Sensitivity, and Putting People at Ease; while negatively related to Problems with Interpersonal Relationships.

H3. Expressed Control will be positively related to Doing Whatever it Takes, Decisiveness, Leading Employees, and Confronting Problem Employees; while negatively related to Difficulty Building and Leading a Team.

H4. Wanted Control will be positively related to Difficulty Building and Leading a Team; while negatively related to

Poster presented at the 2008 Annual Conference of the American Psychological Association, Boston, Massachusetts, August 14-17, 2008.   Page - 3
Please do not reference without permission from the first author. nkrause@cpp.com
FIRO-B is a registered trademark of CPP, Inc.

Decisiveness and Confronting Problem Employees.

H5. Expressed Affection will be positively related to Building and Mending Relationships, Compassion and Sensitivity, and Putting People at Ease; while negatively related to Problems with Interpersonal Relationships.

H6. Wanted Affection will be positively related to Participative Management and Compassion and Sensitivity; while negatively related to Confronting Problem Employees.

METHOD

Participants

Participants included 1,236 individuals (34% female, 66% male), currently living in the United States, who attended training at the Center for Creative Leadership and completed the FIRO-B® instrument as part of their training. Participants were employed in over 20 organizational functions, with 27% of participants reported being Executives or Top Management, 47% Upper Middle Level Management, 23% Middle Management, and 2% First Level Management. The reported age range was 26 years to 62 years (M = 42, SD = 6.92). In addition, 3% indicted a High School diploma as their highest completed degree, 3% an Associate's degree, 29% a Bachelor's degree, 43% a Master's degree, and 21% a Doctorate or other Professional degree.

Materials

Two assessments were used in the current study, the FIRO-B® instrument and the Center for Creative Leadership's Benchmarks® 360-degree feedback tool. The FIRO-B® instrument consists of 54 items, measuring the aforementioned interpersonal needs: Inclusion, Control, and Affection. Two dimensions for each need are measured; expressed needs, or the extent to which an individual prefers to initiate a behavior and wanted needs, or the extent to which an individual prefers to have others initiate a behavior towards them (Waterman & Rogers, 1996). Interpersonal needs were measured using one of two six-point Likert scales (1 = *Never* to 6 = *Usually* and 1 = *Nobody* to 6 = *Most People*). Representative items include "I try to get close and personal with people" and "I like people to invite me to join their activities".

The Benchmarks® 360-feedback tool, used to aid in individual development and developmental needs analysis (Dalton, Lombardo, McCauley, McDonald-Mann, Moxley, Wachholz, 1997) is comprised of 164 items resulting in the assessment of two sections, (a) Leadership Skills and Perspectives, and (b) Problems That Can Stall a Career. Scales within Section One include: 1) Resourcefulness, 2) Doing Whatever it Takes, 3) Being a Quick Study, 4) Decisiveness, 5) Leading Employees, 6) Confronting Problem Employees, 7) Participative Management, 8) Change Management, 9) Building and Mending Relationships, 10) Compassion and Sensitivity, 11) Straightforwardness and Composure, 12) Balance Between Personal Life and Work, 13) Self-Awareness, 14) Putting People at Ease, 15) Differences Matter, and 15) Career Management. Scales within Section Two include: 1) Problems with Interpersonal Relationships; 2) Difficulty Building and Leading a Team, 3) Difficulty Changing or Adapting, 4) Failure to Meet Business Objectives, and 5) Too Narrow a Functional Orientation. Specifically, the Leadership Skills and Perspectives section focuses primarily on the skills and perspectives of executive in meeting challenges faced within the job context,

Poster presented at the 2008 Annual Conference of the American Psychological Association, Boston, Massachusetts, August 14-17, 2008.   Page - 4
Please do not reference without permission from the first author. nkrause@cpp.com
FIRO-B is a registered trademark of CPP, Inc.

behaviors directed toward leading people, and respecting oneself and others. The Problems That Can Stall a Career section focuses on potential developmental blocks throughout one's managerial career (Dalton, Lombardo, McCauley, McDonald-Mann, Moxley, Wachholz, 1997). Ratings for participants were provided by supervisor, peer, boss, and direct reports. Ratings were aggregated such that each participant received one overall indicator of performance. Specifically, the average ratings from each source (i.e., boss, supervisor, peer, and direct report) were calculated. These averages were then combined to form a single rating from all sources for each participant who took the FIRO-B® assessment.

RESULTS

Descriptive statistics for both the FIRO-B® instrument and the Benchmarks® tool have been provided in Tables 3 and 4, respectively. To assess the validity of the FIRO-B® instrument, correlations were computed between the FIRO-B® scale scores (i.e., Expressed Inclusion, Wanted Inclusion, Expressed Control, Wanted Control, Expressed Affection, and Wanted Affection) and assessment ratings on the Benchmarks® 360-degree feedback instrument (e.g., Resourcefulness, Decisiveness, etc.). Correlation coefficients were corrected for range restriction, as the variability in the FIRO-B® instrument scores of the current sample may be smaller than the variability found in an actual population (Schultz & Whitney, 2005). Uncorrected validity coefficients are presented in Table 5 and corrected validity coefficients are presented in Table 6. Results pertaining to the corrected correlation coefficients found for each interpersonal need assessed by the FIRO-B® instrument have been provided briefly in the following sections.

Inclusion

Correlation coefficients between Expressed Inclusion and the Benchmarks® 360-degree feedback instrument for hypothesized relationships ranged from $r = .02$ to $r = .21$. As predicted in Hypothesis 1, Expressed Inclusion was significantly related to Putting People at Ease ($r = .21$, $p < .05$). Correlations between Wanted Inclusion and the Benchmarks® instrument ranged from $r = -.04$ to $r = .10$. However, predicted relationships between Wanted Inclusion and the Benchmarks® dimensions were not found to be significant (Hypothesis 2).

Control

Correlations between Expressed Control and the Benchmarks® 360-degree feedback instrument for hypothesized relationships ranged from $r = .00$ to $r = -.10$; however, no predicted relationships were significant (Hypothesis 3). Correlations between Wanted Control and the Benchmarks® instrument ranged from $r = .08$ to $r = -.17$ for hypothesized relationships. As predicted, Wanted Control was negatively related to Decisiveness ($r = -.17$, $p < .01$) and Confronting Problem Employees ($r = -.14$, $p < .01$), providing partial support for Hypothesis 4.

Affection

Correlations between Expressed Affection and the Benchmarks® 360-degree feedback instrument for hypothesized relationships ranged from $r = -.08$ to $r = .21$. As predicted in Hypothesis 5, Expressed Affection was positively related to Building and Mending Relationships ($r = .10$, $p < .05$), Compassion and Sensitivity ($r = .13$, $p < .01$), Putting People at Ease ($r = .21$, $p < .01$); while negatively related to Problems

Poster presented at the 2008 Annual Conference of the American Psychological Association, Boston, Massachusetts, August 14-17, 2008.   Page - 5
Please do not reference without permission from the first author. nkrause@cpp.com
FIRO-B is a registered trademark of CPP, Inc.

with Interpersonal Relationships (r = -.08, p < .05). Thus, Hypothesis 5 was fully supported. Correlations between Wanted Affection and the Benchmarks® instrument for hypothesized relationships ranged from r = .00 to r = .07; however no significant relationships were found in support of Hypothesis 6.

DISCUSSION

The current study examined the validity of the FIRO-B® instrument through a correlational analysis with the 21 performance dimensions included in the Benchmarks® 360-degree feedback instrument. Ratings on the Benchmarks® tool were provided by bosses, supervisors, peers, and direct reports and aggregated to a single rating for each participant. Mixed results were found as Hypothesis 5 was fully supported and Hypotheses 1 and 4 were partially supported. No support was found for Hypotheses 2, 3, and 6.

Specifically, Expressed Affection was related to all hypothesized Benchmarks® dimensions including having positive relationships with Building and Mending Relationships, Compassion, and Sensitivity, and Putting People at Ease. Individuals high on Expressed Affection are comfortable being open and may try to engage with others on a more personal level (Hammer & Schnell, 2000) and thus, may be well equipped to build and sustain relationships with and among their coworkers. Additionally, it is logical that individuals who score high on Expressed Affection may show concern for the personal lives' of others (Hammer & Schnell, 2000), and therefore also be perceived by others as having compassion and sensitivity and being able to make others feel comfortable when working with them.

Wanted Control was found to be negatively related to both Decisiveness and Confronting Problem Employees, as predicted. Individuals high on Wanted Control are comfortable in working environments where expectations are well-defined. Moreover, these individuals may prefer to have others make important decisions and manage others. In turn, they may not be seen by others as decisive or as willing to deal with controversial or problematic employees.

Finally, Expressed Inclusion was found to be positively related to Putting People at Ease. Individuals high on Expressed Inclusion are said to make an effort to invite or include others in activities (Hammer & Schnell, 2000). Similarly, they may be perceived by others within their organization as being able to put the tension of others at ease by involving people and making sure that others are not excluded from group functions.

As indicated, a number of the hypothesized relationships between FIRO-B® instrument and the Benchmarks® 360-degree feedback tool were not found to be statistically significant. Additionally, a majority of the correlation coefficients, although significant, had small effect sizes. This may be due to the fact that the FIRO-B® instrument, while developed to help understand interrelationships among people, was not designed specifically to predict the dimensions included in the Benchmarks® tool. The Benchmarks® 360-degree feedback instrument is a measure of skills and perspectives that have been identified as critical to successful management (Dalton et. al, 1997). Although a number of the Benchmarks® performance dimensions are a measure of contextual performance, and thus, examine aspects of performance related to one's interpersonal work environment,

Poster presented at the 2008 Annual Conference of the American Psychological Association, Boston, Massachusetts, August 14-17, 2008.   Page - 6
Please do not reference without permission from the first author. nkrause@cpp.com
FIRO-B is a registered trademark of CPP, Inc.

they do not directly tap interpersonal needs. Rather, the interpersonal needs examined by the FIRO-B® instrument, may simply be reflected in the some of the behaviors measured by the 21 performance dimensions of the Benchmarks® instrument.

A strength of the current research includes the similarity of the results to previous work assessing the relationship between the FIRO-B® instrument and the Benchmarks® 360-degree feedback tool. A number of the relationships identified between the FIRO-B® instrument and the updated Benchmarks® tool were similar to those found by Fleenor and Van Velsor (1993). Additionally, the current study found relationships to exist using the objective, aggregated ratings of bosses, supervisor, peers, and direct reports, rather than just self-ratings as found by Fleenor and Van Velsor (1993). Research has shown that self-ratings tend to have low rates of agreement with other rating sources (Landy & Farr, 1980; Harris, & Schaubroeck, 1988) as self-ratings are often inflated. Thus, it is not always certain whether large correlations between self-performance ratings and other measures are due to the existence of true relationships, or to self-ratings erroneously increasing the size of the correlations found. As the current study used ratings from sources other than self, and found a number of the relationships to be consistent with those found by Fleenor and Van Velsor (1993), more confidence can be placed in the results.

Finally, this study highlights the ability of the FIRO-B® instrument to successfully predict some of the interpersonal behaviors measured by the Benchmarks® 360-degree feedback tool. As the FIRO-B® instrument is commonly used for professional development (Waterman & Rogers, 1996), it is important to continue

to assess interpersonal behaviors associated with the needs examined by the FIRO-B® tool. Future research may be conducted to further explore the relationship between the FIRO-B® instrument and other established measures of interpersonal leadership behavior.

REFERENCES

Avolio, B. J., Yammarino, F. J., & Bass, B. M. (1991). Identifying common methods variance with data collected from a single source: An unresolved sticky issue. Journal of Management, 17, 571-587.

Beutler, L. E., Storm, A., & Kirkish, P. (1985). Parameters in the prediction of police officer performance. Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 16, 324-335.

Dalton, M., Lombardo, M. M., McCauley, C. D., McDonald-Mann, D. Moxley, R.,& Wachholz, J. (1997).

Benchmarks® Trainer's Manual. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.

Fleenor, J. W. (1997). The relationship between the MBTI® and measures of personality and performance in management groups. In C. Fritzgerald and L. Kirby (Eds.), Developing Leaders: Research and applications in psychological type and leadership development (pp. 115-138). Mountain View, CA: Davies-Black Publishing.

Fleenor, J. W., & Van Velsor, E. (1993). The relationship between Benchmarks® and personality measures used in the Leadership Development Program.

Poster presented at the 2008 Annual Conference of the American Psychological Association, Boston, Massachusetts, August 14-17, 2008.   Page - 7
Please do not reference without permission from the first author. nkrause@cpp.com
FIRO-B is a registered trademark of CPP, Inc.

Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.

Gough, H. G., & Bradley, P. (2005). *CPI 260 manual.* Mountain View, CA: CPP, Inc.

Gluck, G. A. (1983). *Psychometric Properties of the FIRO-B®: A guide to research.* Mountain View, CA: CPP, Inc.

Hammer, A. L., & Schnell, E. R. (2000). *FIRO-B® Technical Guide*. Mountain View, CA: CPP, Inc.

Harris, M. M., & Schaubroeck, J. (1988). A meta-analysis of self-supervisor, self-peer, and peer-supervisor ratings. *Personnel Psychology, 4,* 43-62.

Hurley, J. R. (1991). FIRO-B®'s dissociation from two central dimensions of interpersonal behavior. *Psychological Reports, 68,* 243-254.

Hutchinson, D. (1965). Junior high school social studies teacher-pupil compatibility: Its relation to pupil sex, social level and indices of achievement. *Journal of Educational Research, 59,* 39-44.

Kuehl, C. R.; DiMarco, N., & Wims, E. W. (1975). Leadership orientation as a function of interpersonal need structure. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 60,* 143-145.

Landy, F. J., & Farr, J. L. (1980). Performance ratings. *Psychological Bulletin, 87,* 72-107.

Macrosson, W. D. K. (2000). FIRO-B®: Facets and factors. *Psychological Reports, 86*(1), 311-320.

Malloy, T. E. (1981). The relationship between therapist-client interpersonal compatibility, sex of therapist, and therapeutic outcome. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 37,* 316-322.

Mitchell, W. D., Quenk, N. L., & Kummerow, J. M. (1997). *A description of the scales: A guide for the MBTI® Step II Expanded Reports.* Mountain View, CA: CPP, Inc.

Myers, I. B., Mc Caulley, M. H., Quenk, N. L., and Hammer, A. L. (1998). *MBTI® manual: A guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator®* (3rd ed.). Mountain View, CA: CPP, Inc.

Podsakoff, P. M., & Organ, D. W. (1986). Self-reports in organizational research: Problems and prospects. J*ournal of Management, 12,* 531-544.

Schnell, E. R., & Hammer, A. (1993). *Introduction to the FIRO-B® in organizations.* Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.

Schultz, K. S., & Whitney, D. J. (2005). *Measurement theory in action. Case studies and exercises.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Schutz, W. C. (1958). *FIRO: A three-dimensional theory of interpersonal behavior.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Schutz, W. C. (1978). *FIRO® Awareness Scales Manual.* Mountain View, CA: CPP, Inc.

Poster presented at the 2008 Annual Conference of the American Psychological Association, Boston, Massachusetts, August 14-17, 2008.   Page - 8
Please do not reference without permission from the first author. nkrause@cpp.com
FIRO-B is a registered trademark of CPP, Inc.

Waterman, J. A., & Rogers, J. (1996). *Introduction to the FIRO-B®.* Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.

Poster presented at the 2008 Annual Conference of the American Psychological Association, Boston, Massachusetts, August 14-17, 2008.   Page - 9
Please do not reference without permission from the first author. nkrause@cpp.com
FIRO-B is a registered trademark of CPP, Inc.

Table 1

FIRO-B® Instrument Definitions

FIRO-B® Scales	Definitions
Expressed Inclusion	The extent to which you make an effort to include others in your activities, to join and belong to groups, and to be with people.
Wanted Inclusion	The extent to which you want others to include you in their activities and to invite you to join or to belong to groups; the extent to which you want to be noticed.
Expressed Control	The extent to which you make an effort to control and influence others or situations, to organize and direct others, and to assume responsibility.
Wanted Control	The extent to which you are comfortable working in well-defined situations with clear expectations and instructions.
Expressed Affection	The extent to which you try to get close to people and to engage them on a personal level; your degree of comfort in being open with and supportive of others.
Wanted Affection	The extent to which you want others to act warmly toward you and to take a personal interest in you; the extent to which you want others to share things with you and to encourage you.

Table 2

Benchmarks® 360-Degree Feedback Instrument Definitions

Benchmarks® Dimensions	Definitions
Resourcefulness	Can both think strategically and make good decisions under pressure; can set up complex work systems and engage in flexible problem-solving behavior; can work effectively with higher management in dealing with the complexities of the management job.
Doing Whatever it Takes	Has perseverance and focus in face of obstacles; takes charge; is capable of standing alone yet is open to learning from others when necessary.
Being a Quick Study	Quickly masters new technical and business knowledge
Decisiveness	Prefers quick and approximate actions to slow and precise ones in many management situations.
Leading Employees	Delegates to employees effectively, broadens employee opportunities, acts with fairness toward direct reports, and hires talented people for his/her team.
Confronting Problem Employees	Acts decisively and with fairness when dealing with problem employees.
Participative Management	Uses effective listening skills and communication to involve others, build consensus and influence others in decision-making.
Change Management	Uses effective strategies to facilitate organizational change initiatives and over come resistance to change.
Building and Mending Relationships	Knows how to build and maintain working relationships with co-workers and external parties: can negotiate and handle work problems without alienating people; understands others and is able to get their cooperation in non-authority relationships.

Compassion and Sensitivity	Shows genuine interest in others and sensitivity to employees' needs.
Straightforwardness and Composure	Is steadfast, relies on fact-based positions, doesn't blame others for mistakes, and is able to recover from troubled situations.
Balance Between Work and Personal Life	Balances work priorities with personal life so that neither is neglected.
Self-Awareness	Has an accurate picture of strengths and weaknesses and is willing to improve.
Putting People at Ease	Displays warmth and a good sense of humor.
Differences Matter	Demonstrates a respect for varying backgrounds and perspectives. Values cultural differences.
Career Management	Develops, maintains and uses professional relationships, including mentoring, coaching, and feedback to manage own career.
Problems with Interpersonal Relationships	Difficulties in developing good working relationships with others.
Difficulty Building and Leading a Team	Difficulties in selecting and building a team.
Difficulty Changing or Adapting Self	Resistant to change, learning from mistakes and developing.
Failure to Meet Business Objectives	Difficulties in following up on promises and completing a job.
Too Narrow a Functional Orientation	Lacks depth to manage outside of ones current function.

Table 3

FIRO-B® Instrument Descriptive Statistics for the CCL Leadership Sample

FIRO-B® Scales	Mean	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis
Expressed Inclusion	4.35	2.19	-0.17	-0.81
Wanted Inclusion	3.48	3.27	0.28	-1.50
Expressed Control	4.46	2.64	0.10	-1.00
Wanted Control	3.01	2.07	0.71	0.03
Expressed Affection	4.40	2.37	0.32	-0.87
Wanted Affection	5.17	2.36	-0.29	-0.53

$N = 1,236$

Poster presented at the 2008 Annual Conference of the American Psychological Association, Boston, Massachusetts, August 14-17, 2008.
Please do not reference without permission from the first author. nkrause@cpp.com
FIRO-B is a registered trademark of CPP, Inc.

Page - 13

Table 4

Benchmarks® 360-Degree Feedback Instrument Statistics for the CCL Leadership Sample

Benchmarks® Dimensions	Mean	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis
Resourcefulness	4.03	0.34	-0.48	0.90
Doing Whatever it Takes	4.02	0.36	-0.43	0.41
Being a Quick Study	4.14	0.36	-0.71	1.27
Decisiveness	4.00	0.35	-0.51	0.59
Leading Employees	3.78	0.39	-0.28	0.40
Confronting Problem Employees	3.63	0.39	-0.07	0.17
Participative Management	3.82	0.45	-0.45	0.27
Change Management	3.87	0.39	-0.32	0.34
Building and Mending Relationships	3.90	0.43	-0.64	1.10
Compassion and Sensitivity	3.83	0.48	-0.64	0.42
Straightforwardness and Composure	3.78	0.42	-0.51	0.90
Balance Between Work and Personal Life	4.07	0.50	-0.51	-0.22
Self-Awareness	4.20	0.35	-0.73	1.87
Putting People at Ease	3.84	0.39	-0.38	0.46
Differences Matter	3.83	0.39	-0.22	0.32
Career Management	3.86	0.35	-0.29	1.00
Problems with Interpersonal Relationships	1.84	0.52	1.00	1.11
Difficulty Building and Leading a Team	1.73	0.39	0.91	1.59
Difficulty Changing or Adapting Self	1.88	0.42	0.62	0.46
Failure to Meet Business Objectives	1.72	0.41	1.01	1.53
Too Narrow a Functional Orientation	1.94	0.50	0.71	0.56

N = 1,236

Poster presented at the 2008 Annual Conference of the American Psychological Association, Boston, Massachusetts, August 14-17, 2008.
Page - 14
Please do not reference without permission from the first author. nkrause@cpp.com
FIRO-B is a registered trademark of CPP, Inc.

Table 5

Uncorrected Correlations between Benchmarks® 360-Degree Feedback Instrument and FIRO-B® Instrument

	Resourcefulness	Doing Whatever It Takes	Being a Quick Study	Decisiveness	Leading Employees	Confronting Problem Employees	Participative Management	Change Management	Building and Mending Relationships	Compassion and Sensitivity	Straightforwardness and Composure	Balance Between Work and Personal Life	Self-Awareness	Putting People at Ease	Differences Matte	Career Management	Problems with Interpersonal Relationships	Difficulty Changing and Adapting	Difficulty Building and Leading a Team	Failure to Meet Business Objectives	Too Narrow a Functional Orientation
eI	-.05	.01	-.08	.00	-.02	-.04	-.03	.01	-.06	.04	-.03	.09	-.01	-.02	.04	-.02	.03	.05	.02	.10	.08
wI	-.09	-.03	-.04	-.07	-.08	-.09	-.08	-.09	-.09	-.04	-.06	-.03	-.06	-.07	-.03	-.07	.05	.07	.06	.08	.09
eC	-.04	.03	-.03	.00	-.07	-.02	-.11	-.10	-.08	-.07	-.11	-.08	-.10	-.11	-.05	-.05	.11	.07	.05	.09	.05
wC	-.07	-.08	-.05	-.10	-.05	-.08	-.01	-.03	.00	-.08	.00	.00	-.01	-.02	-.01	-.05	-.02	.02	.05	.05	.08
eA	.03	.09	.01	.04	.07	.05	.07	.09	.01	.07	.06	.15	.09	.08	.13	.07	-.06	-.05	-.08	.00	-.04
wA	.00	.02	-.01	-.03	.03	.00	.04	.03	.01	.02	.03	.10	.05	.05	.07	.02	-.05	-.03	-.04	.02	-.01

Note. eI = Expresed Inclusion, wI = Wanted Inclusion, eC = Expressed Control, wC = Wanted Control, eA = Expressed Affection, wA = Wanted Affection.

Poster presented at the 2008 Annual Conference of the American Psychological Association, Boston, Massachusetts, August 14-17, 2008.   Page - 15
Please do not reference without permission from the first author. nkrause@cpp.com
FIRO-B is a registered trademark of CPP, Inc.

Table 6

Corrected Correlations between Benchmarks® 360-Degree Feedback Instrument and FIRO-B® Instrument

	Resourcefulness	Doing Whatever It Takes	Being a Quick Study	Decisiveness	Leading Employees	Confronting Problem Employees	Participative Management	Change Management	Building and Mending Relationships	Compassion and Sensitivity	Straightforwardness and Composure	Balance Between Work and Personal Life	Self-Awareness	Putting People at Ease	Differences Matte	Career Management	Problems with Interpersonal Relationships	Difficulty Changing and Adapting	Difficulty Building and Leading a Team	Failure to Meet Business Objectives	Too Narrow a Functional Orientation
el	-.13	.03	-.19	.00	-.04	-.09	-.04	-.06	-.08	.02	-.16	.10	-.09	.21	-.03	.10	.07	.12	.04	.25	.20
wl	-.10	-.04	-.05	-.08	-.10	-.11	-.08	-.08	-.09	-.10	-.10	-.05	-.07	-.04	-.07	-.04	.06	.08	.07	.09	.10
eC	-.05	.04	-.04	.00	-.10	-.03	-.15	-.08	-.16	-.14	-.12	-.10	-.16	-.11	-.15	-.07	.17	.10	.08	.13	.07
wC	-.11	-.14	-.08	-.17	-.09	-.14	-.03	-.08	-.02	-.04	.00	-.14	.01	.00	-.02	-.02	-.04	.04	.08	.09	.13
eA	.05	.13	.01	.05	.10	.07	.11	.10	.10	.13	.01	.09	.08	.21	.13	.18	-.08	-.07	-.12	.00	-.05
wA	-.01	.03	-.02	-.04	.04	.00	.07	.03	.05	.05	.02	.03	.05	.13	.06	.09	-.07	-.05	-.06	.02	-.01

Note. el = Expresed Inclusion, wl = Wanted Inclusion, eC = Expressed Control, wC = Wanted Control, eA = Expressed Affection, wA = Wanted Affection.