

MANUAL
for the
LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE – Form XII
An Experimental Revision
Ralph M. Stogdill

Fisher College of Business
The Ohio State University

1963

LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE – Form XII

The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, often referred to as LBDQ, was developed for use in obtaining descriptions of a supervisor by the group members whom he supervises. It can be used to describe the behavior of the leader, or leaders, in any type of group or organization, provided the followers have had an opportunity to observe the leader in action as a leader of their group.

Origin of the Scales

The LBDQ grew out of work initiated by Hemphill (10). Further development of the scales by the staff of the Ohio State Leadership Studies has been described by Hemphill and Coons (13). Shartle (16) has outlined the theoretical considerations underlying the descriptive method. He observed that “when the Ohio State Leadership Studies was initiated in 1945, no satisfactory theory or definition of leadership was available.” It was subsequently found in empirical research that a large number of hypothesized dimensions of leader behavior could be reduced to two strongly defined factors. These were identified by Halpin and Winer (9) and Fleishman (3) as Consideration and Initiation of Structure.

The two factorially defined subscales, Consideration and Initiation of Structure, have been widely used in empirical research, particularly in military organizations (5, 6), industry (2, 3, 4), and education (6, 8, 12). Halpin (7) reports that “in several studies where the agreement among respondents in describing their respective leaders has been checked by a ‘between-group vs. within-group’ analysis of variance, the F ratios all have been found significant at the .01 level. Followers tend to agree in describing the same leader, and the description of different leaders differ significantly.”

The Development of Form XII

It has not seemed reasonable to believe that two factors are sufficient to account for all the observable variance in leader behavior. However, as Shartle (16) observed, no theory was available to suggest additional factors. A new theory of role differentiation and group achievement by Stogdill (17), and the survey of a large body of research data that supported that theory, suggested that a number of variables operate in the differentiation of roles in social groups. Possible factors suggested by the theory are the following: tolerance of uncertainty, persuasiveness, tolerance of member freedom or action, predictive accuracy, integration of the group, and reconciliation of conflicting demands. Possible new factors suggested by the results of empirical research are the following: representation of group interests, role assumption, production emphasis, and orientation toward superiors.

Items were developed for the hypothesized subscales. Questionnaires incorporating the new items were administered to successive groups. After item analysis, the questionnaires were revised, administered again, reanalyzed, and revised.

Marder (14) reported the first use of the new scales in the study of an army airborne division and a state highway patrol organization. Day (1) used a revised form of the questionnaire in the study of an industrial organization. Other revisions were employed by Stogdill, Goode, and Day (20, 21, 22) in the study of ministers, leaders in the community development, United States senators, and presidents of corporations. Stogdill (18) has used the new scales in the study of industrial and governmental organizations. Form XII represents the fourth revisions of the questionnaire. It is subject to further revision.

Definition of the Subscales

Each subscale is composed of either five or ten items. A subscale is necessarily defined by its component items and represents a rather complex pattern of behaviors. Brief definitions of the subscales are listed below:

1. Representation – speaks and acts as the representative of the group. (5 items)
2. Demand Reconciliation – reconciles conflicting demands and reduces disorder to system. (5 items)
3. Tolerance of Uncertainty – is able to tolerate uncertainty and postponement without anxiety or upset. (10 items)
4. Persuasiveness – uses persuasion and argument effectively; exhibits strong convictions. (10 items)
5. Initiation of Structure – clearly defines own role, and lets followers know what is expected. (10 items)
6. Tolerance and Freedom - allows followers scope for initiative, decision and action. (10 items)
7. Role Assumption – actively exercises the leadership role rather than surrendering leadership to others. (10 items)
8. Consideration – regards the comfort, well being, status, and contributions of followers. (10 items)
9. Production Emphasis – applies pressure for productive output. (10 items)
10. Predictive Accuracy – exhibits foresight and ability to predict outcome accurately. (5 items)
11. Integration – maintains a closely knit organization; resolves inter-member conflicts. (5 items)
12. Superior Orientation – maintains cordial relations with superiors; has influence with them; is striving for higher status. (10 items)

Scoring Key

The subject indicates his response by drawing a circle around one of the five letters (A, B, C, D, E) following an item. As indicated on the Scoring Key, most items are scored: A B C D E

5 4 3 2 1

A circle around A gives the item a score of 5; a circle around B gives it a score of 4; and a circle around E gives the items a score of 1.

The 20 starred items on the Scoring Key are scored in the reverse direction, as follows: A B C D E

1 2 3 4 5

In use at the Bureau of Business Research, the score is written after each item in the margin of the test booklet (questionnaire).

Scoring Key

*Starred items are scored 1 2 3 4 5

All other items are scored 5 4 3 2 1

1	22	*42	*62	82
2	23	43	63	83
3	24	44	64	84
4	25	45	*65	85
5	*26	*46	*66	86
*6	27	47	67	*87
7	28	48	*68	88
8	29	49	69	89
9	30	50	70	90
10	31	51	*71	*91
11	32	52	72	*92
*12	33	*53	73	93
14	34	54	74	94
15	35	55	75	95
*16	*36	*56	76	96
17	37	*57	77	*97
18	38	58	78	98
19	39	59	79	99
20	40	60	80	100
21	41	*61	81	

Record Sheet: Scoring the Subscales

The assignment of items to different subscales is indicated in the Record Sheet. For example, the Representation subscale consists of items 1, 11, 21, 31, and 41. The sum of the scores for these five items constitutes the score for the subscales Representation. The score for Demand Reconciliation consists of the sum of the scores assigned to items 51, 61, 71, 81, and 91. The score for Tolerance of Uncertainty consists of the sum of the scores on items 2, 12, 22, 32, 42, 52, 62, 72, 82, and 92.

By transferring the item scores from the test booklet to the Scoring Sheet, it is possible to add the item scores quickly to obtain an accurate score for each subscale.

LBDQ Form XII – RECORD SHEET

											<u>Total</u>
1. Representation	1__	11__	21__	31__	41__						()
2. Reconciliation	51__	61__	71__	81__	91__						()
3. Tol. Uncertainty	2__	12__	22__	32__	42__	52__	62__	72__	82__	92__	()
4. Persuasion	3__	13__	23__	33__	43__	53__	63__	73__	83__	93__	()
5. Structure	4__	14__	24__	34__	44__	54__	64__	74__	84__	94__	()
6. Tol. Freedom	5__	15__	25__	35__	45__	55__	65__	75__	85__	95__	()
7. Role Assumption	6__	16__	26__	36__	46__	56__	66__	76__	86__	96__	()
8. Consideration	7__	17__	27__	37__	47__	57__	67__	77__	87__	97__	()
9. Production Emph	8__	18__	28__	38__	48__	58__	68__	78__	88__	98__	()
10. Predictive Acc	9__		29__		49__	59__			89__		()
11. Integration		19__		39__			69__	79__		99__	()
12. Superior Orient	10__	20__	30__	40__	50__	60__	70__	80__	90__	100__	()

Subscale Means and the Standard Deviations

There are no norms for the LBDQ. The questionnaire was designed for use as a research device. It is not recommended for use in selection, assignments, or assessment purposes.

The means and standard deviations for several highly selected samples are shown in Table 1. The samples consist of commissioned and noncommissioned officers in an army combat division, the administrative officers in a state highway patrol headquarters office, the executives in an aircraft engineering staff, ministers of various denominations of an Ohio Community, leaders in community development activities throughout the state of Ohio, presidents of “successful” corporations, presidents of labor unions, presidents of colleges and universities, and United States Senators.

Reliability of the Subscales

The reliability of the subscales was determined by a modified Kuder-Richardson formula. The modification consists in the fact that each item was correlated with the remainder of the items in its subscale rather than with the subscale score including the item. This procedure yields a conservative estimate of subscale reliability. The reliability coefficients are shown in Table 2.

Table 1. Means and Standard Deviations

Subscale	Army Division		Highway Patrol		Aircraft		Ministers		Community Leaders	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
1. Representation	20.0	3.0	19.9	2.8	19.8	2.8	20.4	2.4	19.6	2.4
2. Dem Recon					19.2	2.8	19.8	3.1	19.7	3.3
3. Tol Uncertainty	36.2	4.7	35.6	4.6	33.2	6.2	37.5	6.3	37.7	5.6
4. Persuasiveness	38.3	6.2	37.9	5.9	36.5	5.5	42.1	4.7	39.5	5.5
5. Initiating Struct	38.6	5.7	39.7	4.5	36.6	5.4	38.7	4.9	37.2	5.7
6. Tol Freedom	35.9	6.5	36.3	5.3	38.0	5.9	37.5	6.0	36.4	5.0
7. Role Assumpt	42.7	6.1	42.7	5.3	40.9	5.6	41.5	5.4	39.8	5.6
8. Consideration	37.1	5.6	36.9	6.5	37.1	5.8	42.5	5.8	41.1	4.7
9. Prod Emph	36.3	5.1	35.8	5.7	36.1	5.6	34.9	5.1	35.4	6.8
10. Pred Accuracy	18.1	2.1	17.8	2.1	19.2	2.6	20.5	2.3	19.8	2.5
11. Integration	19.5	2.6	19.1	2.7						
12. Sup Orientat.	39.9	4.9	39.1	5.1	38.6	4.2				
Number of cases	235		185		165		103		57	

Subscale	Corporation Presidents		Labor Presidents		College Presidents		Senators	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
1. Representation	20.5	1.8	22.2	2.2	21.4	1.9	20.7	2.5
2. Dem Recon	20.6	2.7	21.5	3.2			20.7	3.5
3. Tol Uncertainty	35.9	5.4	40.4	5.6	37.2	5.5	35.3	7.6
4. Persuasiveness	40.1	4.2	43.1	4.8	41.1	4.2	42.5	4.6
5. Initiating Struct	38.5	5.0	38.3	5.6	37.7	4.2	38.8	5.5
6. Tol Freedom	38.9	4.9	38.0	4.0	39.6	3.9	36.6	6.2
7. Role Assumpt	42.7	3.5	43.3	5.5	43.5	4.5	41.0	5.7
8. Consideration	41.5	4.0	42.3	5.5	43.5	4.5	41.0	5.7
9. Prod Emph	38.9	4.4	36.0	5.0	36.2	5.0	41.2	5.2
10. Pred Accuracy	20.1	1.8	20.9	2.0				
11. Integration								
12. Sup Orientat.	43.2	3.1			42.9	2.9		
Number of cases	55		44		55		44	

Table 2. Reliability Coefficients (Modified Kuder-Richardson)

Subscale	Army Division	Highway Patrol	Aircraft Executives	Ministers	Community Leaders	Corporation Presidents	Labor Presidents	College Presidents	Senators
1. Representation	.82	.85	.74	.55	.59	.54	.70	.66	.80
2. Demand Reconciliation			.73	.77	.58	.59	.81		.81
3. Tolerance Uncertainty	.58	.66	.82	.84	.85	.79	.82	.80	.83
4. Persuasiveness	.84	.85	.84	.77	.79	.69	.80	.76	.72
5. Initiating Structure	.79	.75	.78	.70	.72	.77	.78	.80	.64
6. Tolerance Freedom	.81	.79	.86	.75	.86	.84	.58	.73	.65
7. Role Assumption	.85	.84	.84	.75	.83	.57	.86	.75	.85
8. Consideration	.76	.87	.84	.85	.77	.78	.83	.76	.38
9. Production Emphasis	.70	.79	.79	.59	.79	.71	.65	.74	
10. Predictive Accuracy	.76	.82	.91	.83	.62	.84	.87		
11. Intergration	.73	.79							
12. Superior Orientation	.64	.75	.81			.66		.60	

Administering the LBDQ

The LBDQ is usually employed by followers to describe the behaviors of their leader or supervisor. However, the questionnaire can be used by peers or superiors to describe a given leader whom they know well enough to describe accurately. With proper changes in instructions, the questionnaire can also be used by a leader to describe his own behavior.

The questionnaire can be administered individually or in groups. It is usually not necessary for the person making the description to write his name on the test booklet. However, the name of the leader being described should be written on the test booklet. It is necessary to identify the person being described whenever it is desired to add together (and obtain an average of) the description of several describers.

How many describers are required to provide a satisfactory index score of the leader's behavior? Halpin (7) suggests that "a minimum of four respondents per leader is desirable, and additional respondents beyond ten do not increase significantly the stability of the index scores. Six or seven respondents per leader would be a good standard."

In explaining the purpose and nature of a research project to a group of respondents, it has not been found necessary to caution them about honesty or frankness. It has been found sufficient to say, "All that is required is for you to describe your supervisor's behavior as accurately as possible." Whenever possible to do so, it is desirable to assure the respondents that their descriptions will not be seen by any of the persons who they are asked to describe.

REFERENCES

1. Day, D.R. Basic Dimensions of Leadership in a Selected Industrial Organization. Doctor's Dissertation. Columbus: The Ohio State University Library, 1961.
2. Fleishman, E.A. The description of supervisory behavior. J. Appl. Psychol. 1953, 37, 1-6
3. Fleishman, E.A. A leader behavior description for industry. In R.M. Stogdill, and A.E. Coons (Eds.), Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement. Columbus: The Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research, Monograph No. 88, 1957.
3. Fleishman, E.A., Harris, E.F. and Burt, H.E. Leadership and Supervision in Industry. Columbus: The Ohio State University, Bureau of Educational Research, Monograph No. 33, 1956.
4. Fleishman, E.A., Harris, E.F. and Burt, H.E. Leadership and Supervision in Industry. Columbus: The Ohio State University, Bureau of Educational Research, Monograph No. 33, 1956.
5. Halpin, A.W. The leadership behavior and combat performance of airplane commanders, J. Abnorm. and Soc. Psychol., 1954, 49, 19-22.
6. Halpin, A.W. The leader behavior and leadership ideology of educational administrators and aircraft commanders. Harvard Educ. Rev., 1955, 25, 18-32.
7. Halpin, A.W. Manual for the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. Mimeo. Columbus: The Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research, 1957.
8. Halpin, A.W. The Leadership Behavior of School Superintendents: A Study of 50 Ohio Superintendents. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, 1958.
9. Halpin, A.W., and Winer, B.J. A factorial study of the Leader Behavior Descriptions. In R.M. Stogdill, and A.E. Coons (Eds.), Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement. Columbus: The Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research, Monograph No. 88, 1957.
10. Hemphill, J.K. Situational Factors in Leadership. Columbus: The Ohio State University, Bureau of Educational Research, Monograph No 32, 1949.
11. Hemphill, J.K. Leadership behavior associated with the administrative reputation of college departments. J Educ. Psychol., 1955, 46, 385-401.
12. Hemphill, J.K. Relations between the size of the group and the behavior of "superior" leaders. J. Soc. Psychol., 1950, 32, 11-22.

13. Hemphill, J.K. and Coons, A.E. Development of the Leader behavior Description Questionnaire. In R.M. Stogdill, and A.E. Coons (Eds.), Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement. Columbus: The Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research, Monograph No. 88, 1957.
14. Marder, E. Leader Behavior as Perceived by Subordinates as a Function of Organizational Level. Master's Thesis. Columbus: The Ohio State University Library, 1960.
15. Shartle, C. L. Executive Performance and Leadership. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1956.
16. Shartle, C. L. Introduction. In R. M. Stogdill, and A. E. Coons (Eds.) Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement. Columbus: The Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research, Monograph No. 88, 1957.
17. Stogdill, R.M. Individual Behavior and Group Achievement. New York: Oxford University Press, 1959.
18. Stogdill, R.M. Managers, Employees, Organizations. Columbus: The Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research, 1965.
19. Stogdill, R.M., and Coons, A.E., (Eds.) Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement. Columbus: The Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research, Monograph No. 88, 1957.
20. Stogdill, R.M., Goode, O.S., and Day, D.R. New leader behavior description subscale. J. Psychol., 1962, 54, 259-269.
21. Stogdill, R.M., Goode, O. S., and Day, D. R. The leader behavior of United States senators. J. Psychol., 1963, 56, 3-8.
22. Stogdill, R. M., Goode, O. S., and Day, D. R. The leader behavior of corporation presidents. Personnel Psychol., 1963, 16, 127-132