

Disc

DESCRIPTION

The Leadership Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ) provides measures of two important dimensions of leadership — Consideration (C) and Structure (S). Originally identified in the Ohio State University leadership studies (Fleishman, 1951, 1953a, 1953b, 1953c; Halpin & Winer, 1952; Hemphill, 1955; Shartle, 1956; Stogdill & Coons, 1957), these two broad patterns have been shown to be meaningful in a wide variety of supervisor-subordinate situations.

The instrument in its present form is the product of more than thirty years of research and use in a variety of organizational settings. It provides a brief measure (40 items) of leadership attitudes regarding two basic dimensions. Individuals respond in terms of how frequently they feel they should engage in the behavior described in each item. There is no time limit; most people will complete the LOQ in fifteen minutes.

The two dimensions measured by this questionnaire are defined as follows:

*Consideration (C)* reflects the extent to which an individual is likely to have job relationships with subordinates characterized by mutual trust, respect for their ideas, consideration of their feelings, and a certain warmth between the individual and them. A high score is indicative of a climate of good rapport and two-way communication. A low score indicates the individual is likely to be more impersonal in relations with group members.

*Structure (S)* reflects the extent to which an individual is likely to define and structure his or her own role and those of subordinates toward goal attainment. A high score on this dimension characterizes individuals who play a very active role in directing group activities through planning, communicating information, scheduling, criticizing, trying out new ideas, and so forth. A low score indicates the individual is likely to be relatively inactive in giving direction in these ways.

An important research finding is that these dimensions are *independent*. This means that supervisors may be high on both dimensions, low on both, or high on one and low on the other.

~~uses~~ → USES

The LOQ has been used in a wide variety of organizations. These include industrial and business organizations, educational institutions, hospitals and nursing schools, research and development laboratories, military organizations, and various governmental institutions. Studies with the LOQ have been carried out in a number of foreign countries, including Sweden, India, Japan, Israel, Brazil, the Netherlands, Germany, England, Canada, France, and Norway.

Q  
Q  
T

## ing the LOQ with the SBD

The Ohio State University leadership studies yielded some of the most widely researched measures of leader behavior, including the LOQ and the Supervisory Behavior Description (SBD), also published by Science Research Associates. The two instruments have the same origin and measure the same two dimensions of a leader's behavior, namely Consideration and Structure.

The primary difference between the two instruments is the point of view of the items. The LOQ items ask you, as a manager or supervisor, what you believe you "should" do as a leader. The SBD asks "what does your supervisor actually do?". This difference in viewpoints makes the LOQ and SBD ideal companion instruments for measuring differences in perception between managers and their subordinates. For example a manager completes the LOQ, yielding Consideration and Structure scores which reflect how he feels he should behave. Then the subordinates complete the SBD, yielding their perceptions of how their managers behave in terms of Consideration and Structure. A comparison of a manager's LOQ scores with an aggregate of his or her subordinates' SBD scores can provide valuable information which can be used as a guide to improve situations which the manager or organization find unfavorable.

## development

The LOQ is one of several leadership-style questionnaires resulting from the Ohio State University leadership studies. An early comprehensive review of these studies is found in Stodgill & Coons (1957). Other reviews have been published in Fleishman (1973) and Bass (1981). The work of Hemphill (1950) provided the early impetus. Originally Hemphill categorized leader behavior into ten categories, but subsequent research indicated that efficient measurement could be obtained by the two broad dimensions of Consideration and Structure.

The dimensions were based on factor analysis of 140 items administered to supervisors. Items with the highest loadings on each factor (Consideration and Structure) were identified as most diagnostic of that factor. Items selected had a high loading on one factor and a very low loading on the other, in order to provide independent measures of each factor. A number of different factor analyses with different types of supervisors and managers have confirmed these factors (Fleishman, 1953a; Halpin & Winer, 1957; Landy, 1978; and Tscheulin, 1973). (For further details on the development and construction of the LOQ, see Fleishman, 1951, 1953a, 1953b; Fleishman, Harris, & Burt, 1955.)

2

An important feature of the LOQ is that the scores on each scale, Consideration and Structure, are independent of each other. This is partly a function of the factor-analytic development of the questionnaire. It is also a function of careful item analysis and selection. Independence of the scales means that a person can score high on both scales, low on both scales, or high on one and low on the other. Table 1 shows the correlations between Consideration and Structure for 60 groups. The median of the correlations in Table 1 is  $-.06$ . Thus, "halo" and "social desirability" tendencies, common biases in instruments of this type, do not appear to affect the independence of the scales of the LOQ.

**TABLE 1**

**Correlations Between Consideration and Structure**

N	Supervisory Positions	r
105	Accounting Managers	.02
80	Bakery Supervisors	-.19
359	Banking & Insurance Managers	-.13**
21	Chemical Company Supervisors	.06
46	First-line Industrial Supervisors	-.07
122	First-line Industrial Supervisors	-.01
60	General Foremen	-.23
60	Hospital Department Managers	.15
215	Human Resource Managers	-.04
935	Managers	-.14**
128	Manufacturing Managers	-.12
198	Office Managers	-.19**
80	Pharmaceutical Company Foremen	.10
83	Retail Managers	-.25*
189	Sales Managers	-.05
661	Supervisors	-.09*
57	Trucking Company Production Foremen	-.33*
59	Utility Company Supervisors	.05
N	Administrative Positions	r
121	Administrative Assistants	-.23*
73	Administrators	.14
305	Directors	.00
37	Hospital Directors	-.35*
175	Presidents & Vice Presidents	.13
45	Small Business Owners	-.31*
22	Top Executives	.03

Internal consistency reliabilities for the LOQ have been obtained in a number of studies using the split-half method (correlations between odd and even numbered items within each scale, corrected for the full length of each scale). These together with test-retest reliabilities for two samples are given in Table 2.

**TABLE 2**  
**Reliability Estimates of the LOQ Scales**

24	Air Force NCOs	.77*	.67*
120	Executives	.62	.80
122	First-line Industrial Supervisors	.70	.79
31	First-line Supervisors	.80*	.74*
394	Manufacturing Employees	.89	.88
80	Pharmaceutical Company Foremen	.70	.69
202	ROTC Cadets	.80	.82
90	Swedish Supervisory Candidates	.74	.82
554	Teachers	.74	.64

\*Test-retest reliabilities. There was a one-month interval between test periods for the sample of 24 Air Force NCOs and a three-month interval between test periods for the sample of 31 first-line supervisors.

The LOQ was developed to maximize construct validity. The two dimensions measured by the questionnaire were developed by factor-analytic procedures, and item analyses were carried out to provide homogeneous measures of Consideration and Structure. This questionnaire can be used when an assessment of these characteristics is desired for a certain individual or group.

It is urged that criterion-related validity studies, correlating these dimensions to independent criteria of effectiveness, be carried out. For initial guidance, Tables 3 and 4 report correlations between the LOQ scales and a variety of different criteria obtained in diverse types of organizations with different types of supervisory personnel. It can be seen that many significant validities have been obtained, but the pattern is not universal. However, no studies have found low Consideration correlating significantly with positive aspects of performance (e.g., low turnover, good employee attitudes, low stress, or high proficiency ratings). Thus, low Consideration scores are more often indicative of an undesirable situation.

In general, the pattern that emerges as most *undesirable* for many situations is the one in which supervisors are low in both Consideration and Structure. At least two studies have shown that such managers are more likely to be bypassed by subordinates and may not even be seen as the functional manager (Fleishman, 1973; Fleishman, Harris, & Burt, 1955). The high Structure – low Consideration supervisor is more likely to have more turnover, grievances, and stress among subordinates. There is also evidence (Fleishman & Harris, 1962) that managers high in Consideration can be higher in Structure without these adverse effects. For many criteria and situations, the high Consideration – high Structure pattern

The section that follows presents more detailed descriptions of criterion-related validity studies of the LOQ.

**TABLE 3**  
**Summary of Criterion-related Validities of LOQ Scales**  
**Described in Studies 1, 2, 3, 4, and 8**

Sample	Criteria	C	S
Sales Supervisors	Rank-order performance ratings 3 years later	.32*	.05
Pharmaceutical Company Foreman	Attitudes toward supervisors	.51**	.22*
	Performance and instrumentality	.24*	.22*
	Supervisory recognition	.45**	.05
	Order-pricing errors	-.10	.23*
	Order-filling errors	-.11	.15
	Productivity	.13	.07
	Employment Security	-.06	.21
	Warehouse size	-.06	.22*
First-line Supervisors in a petrochemical plant	Forced-choice performance rating 2 years later	.29*	-.09
Department Managers in a shoe manufac- turing company	Overall proficiency ratings regardless of manager rank	.30**	.50**
	Overall proficiency ratings within manager groups of equal rank	.43**	.61**
Registered Nurses	Staff satisfaction	-.55**	-.01

he .05 level.  
the .01 level.

✓

TABLE 11

## Means and Standard Deviations for the LOQ Scales

Sample		Consideration		Structure	
		MEAN	SD	MEAN	SD
<b>SUPERVISORY POSITIONS</b>					
105	Accounting Managers <sup>b</sup>	52.8	6.6	45.4	7.7
168	Assistant Store Managers <sup>a</sup>	51.0	7.6	56.7	7.1
80	Bakery Supervisors <sup>a</sup>	62.1	7.1	48.9	8.5
45	Bank Management Trainee Applicants <sup>a</sup>	53.9	6.2	53.9	7.9
33	Bank Managers (centralized) <sup>a</sup>	55.2	6.5	52.3	7.6
32	Bank Managers (decentralized) <sup>a</sup>	56.7	8.0	52.8	8.4
359	Banking & Insurance Managers <sup>b</sup>	52.3	6.3	51.0	8.2
29	Branch Bank Managers <sup>a</sup>	54.5	4.5	51.9	5.4
29	Chemical Managers <sup>a</sup>	55.1	5.3	52.7	8.2
71	Civil Service Supervisors <sup>a</sup>	54.8	7.0	42.6	7.9
158	Department Managers (catalog order plant) <sup>a</sup>	56.3	8.3	53.8	8.2
25	Department Managers (detergent manufacturer) <sup>a</sup>	56.8	7.2	55.6	6.2
424	Division Managers (catalog order plant) <sup>a</sup>	56.4	7.2	53.1	5.5
102	Electronics Company Managers (all levels) <sup>a</sup>	53.9	6.6	49.0	5.9
84	Electronics Company Managers (first-line) <sup>a</sup>	53.9	6.7	49.0	6.1
21	Engineering Supervisors <sup>a</sup>	52.8	5.9	50.2	8.2
60	General Foremen <sup>a</sup>	58.0	6.4	52.4	7.6
60	Hospital Department Managers	52.5	6.6	45.9	8.4
215	Human Resource Managers <sup>b</sup>	54.8	7.2	47.2	7.8
241	Industrial Foremen <sup>a</sup>	54.4	7.5	53.3	7.8
935	Managers <sup>b</sup>	53.0	7.0	49.6	8.4
593	Middle Managers <sup>a</sup>	52.0	5.5	49.6	6.0
198	Office Managers <sup>b</sup>	53.2	6.5	45.9	8.3
86	Office Supervisors <sup>a</sup>	53.2	8.0	54.3	7.0
80	Pharmaceutical Company Foremen <sup>a</sup>	54.7	6.9	51.9	7.1
14	Production Line Foreman Candidates <sup>a</sup>	49.3	9.7	54.8	8.2
23	Research Managers <sup>a</sup>	55.2	6.0	50.9	5.6
24	Research & Engineering Managers <sup>a</sup>	54.0	5.3	50.3	5.4
83	Retail Managers	51.1	7.4	52.1	8.3
189	Sales Managers <sup>b</sup>	53.3	6.9	48.1	7.7
169	Store Managers (national chain) <sup>a</sup>	53.0	7.2	56.0	6.5
661	Supervisors <sup>b</sup>	51.1	8.3	49.5	8.8
59	Utility Supervisors <sup>a</sup>	54.7	6.6	46.8	6.4
28	Youth Opportunity Center Supervisors <sup>a</sup>	52.1	6.4	47.8	6.4
<b>ADMINISTRATIVE POSITIONS</b>					
		MEAN	SD	MEAN	SD
121	Administrative Assistants <sup>b</sup>	53.1	6.7	46.2	8.7
73	Administrators <sup>b</sup>	51.9	8.0	45.5	9.4
40	Central Bank Officers <sup>a</sup>	56.7	8.1	53.2	8.8
305	Directors <sup>b</sup>	53.2	7.2	47.9	8.2
68	Executives <sup>a</sup>	55.3	6.5	50.6	7.0
51	Hospital Administrators <sup>a</sup>	56.0	5.7	43.0	7.8
37	Hospital Directors	52.7	7.9	46.2	8.0
175	Presidents & Vice Presidents <sup>b</sup>	53.8	7.6	49.0	9.4
45	Small Business Owners	50.1	8.0	45.4	8.2

**NORM TABLES**

Verbal Description	Percentile	Total Sample		Males		Females		Accounting Managers		Banking & Insurance Managers		Research & Development Managers		Percentile
		C	S	C	S	C	S	C	S	C	S	C	S	
Very High	99	69	68	69	69	69	66	71	71	66	66	66	62	99
	98	68	66	68	67	68	64	69	69	65	65	65	59	98
	97	67	65	67	66	67	63	68	68	64	64	65	58	97
High	95	65	63	65	64	65	60	67	59	63	65	65	57	95
	90	62	60	62	61	62	58	61	56	61	63	63	54	90
	85	60	58	60	59	61	56	59	53	59	60	62	50	85
	80	59	56	59	58	59	54	58	52	58	58	61	49	80
	75	58	55	58	56	58	53	57	50	57	57	60	48	75
Average	70	57	53	57	55	57	51	56	48	56	56	59	47	70
	65	56	52	56	54	56	50	56	48	55	55	58	46	65
	60	55	51	55	53	56	49	55	47	55	54	57	46	60
	55	54	50	54	52	55	48	55	46	54	53	57	45	55
	50	54	49	53	51	54	47	54	45	53	52	56	44	50
	45	53	48	52	50	53	46	53	44	52	51	55	44	45
	40	52	47	51	49	52	45	52	44	49	49	55	43	40
	35	51	46	50	48	51	44	51	43	49	50	54	42	35
	30	50	45	50	47	50	43	50	43	47	49	53	42	30
	25	49	43	49	45	49	42	50	41	46	48	53	40	25
Low	20	48	42	47	44	48	40	49	40	47	47	52	39	20
	15	46	40	46	42	47	39	47	39	46	46	51	38	15
	10	45	38	44	40	45	36	45	38	45	45	48	37	10
	5	42	35	41	37	42	33	42	35	43	43	46	35	5
	3	39	32	39	34	40	30	41	32	41	41	46	34	3
Very Low	2	36	30	36	32	37	29	41	32	40	45	45	28	2
	1	30	23	30	26	30	21	38	29	38	38	38	26	1
	Mean	52.84	48.33	52.48	50.21	53.11	46.58	52.84	45.45	52.26	50.99	56.32	44.91	Mean
SD	7.28	8.68	7.29	8.52	7.23	8.49	6.63	7.72	6.30	8.24	5.36	6.49	SD	
N	5716	5716	2717	2717	2897	2897	105	105	359	359	117	117	N	



**NORM TABLES (continued)**

Verbal Description	Percentile	Human Resource Managers		Managers		Male Managers		Female Managers		Office Managers		Percentile
		C	S	C	S	C	S	C	S	C	S	
Very High	99	72	65	69	68	69	69	70	67	69	66	99
	98	70	62	68	66	68	67	70	65	66	65	98
	97	68	61	67	65	67	65	68	64	65	64	97
High	95	67	60	65	63	65	63	66	62	64	61	95
	90	64	58	62	61	62	61	61	58	61	57	90
	85	62	55	60	59	60	60	60	57	60	55	85
	80	61	54	59	57	59	58	59	56	59	53	80
	75	60	53	58	56	57	56	58	54	58	52	75
Average	70	59	52	57	55	57	56	57	53	57	51	70
	65	59	51	56	54	56	55	56	51	56	50	65
	60	58	50	55	53	55	54	56	50	56	48	60
	55	57	49	54	51	54	53	54	49	55	47	55
	50	56	48	53	50	54	51	53	48	54	46	50
	45	55	47	53	49	52	50	50	47	53	45	45
	40	54	46	52	48	52	50	50	46	52	44	40
	35	53	45	51	47	51	49	49	44	51	43	35
	30	52	44	50	46	50	47	47	44	50	42	30
	25	51	43	49	44	49	45	45	42	49	41	25
Low	20	50	41	48	43	48	44	48	42	48	39	20
	15	48	39	47	41	47	42	46	41	47	37	15
	10	46	37	45	40	45	40	44	38	46	36	10
	5	42	35	42	36	42	36	41	35	43	33	5
	3	39	33	41	34	41	35	40	32	40	31	3
Very Low	2	39	31	38	32	38	33	37	31	39	30	2
	1	38	30	31	27	31	30	31	26	38	28	1
Mean SD N		54.80 7.24 215	47.17 7.85 215	53.01 7.04 935	49.63 8.38 935	53.00 6.98 564	50.70 8.33 564	53.08 7.16 367	47.95 8.22 367	53.19 6.49 198	45.94 8.30 198	Mean SD N