Assessing Leadership Readiness Using Developmental Personality Style: A tool for leadership coaching

K. Candis Best, Smithfield/Magnolia, Inc., USA
Email: coaching@candisbest.com

Abstract

This article presents a conceptual application for use in executive and leader development coaching engagements. The Leadership Readiness Index uses developmental personality style theory to establish categories of leadership readiness that can be used during the assessment phase of a coaching relationship. The article begins with an overview of leader development and is followed by a description of developmental personality style theory and its role in the construction of the Leadership Readiness Index. A brief discussion of potential uses for the index within the context of executive/leader coaching is provided. The article concludes with a discussion of the limitations of the index, future research strategies that can be applied to evaluate its viability and a summary of its potential contributions to evidence-based coaching practice.

Keywords: executive coaching, leader development, developmental personality style, leadership readiness

Introduction

Developing good leaders continues to be an important and highly sought after objective. It requires not only an understanding of leadership theory, but an appreciation for the personality traits and behavioral characteristics that are present in the best leaders. Companies invest significant resources in developing the leadership potential of their employees (Levenson, 2009). Executive coaching has emerged as a growth industry as a direct result of this interest (Coutu & Kauffman, 2009).

To be effective in their consulting relationships, coaches require theories and models of development as well as coaching strategies that can be proven effective in helping current and future leaders to be successful in their positions. In that regard, Nelson and Hogan (2009) identify the assessment phase of a coaching relationship as an indispensable component of the process. This article describes a potential assessment tool - the Leadership Readiness Index (LRI), which could be a useful addition to a coach's toolkit. To begin, a discussion of leader development is provided followed by a brief overview of executive coaching and its role as a strategy in the leader development process. The theoretical foundation of the LRI as an assessment tool is then introduced followed by a detailed description of the index itself.

The LRI consists of a matrix of clinical personality types that is aligned with the attributes of effective leaders. It is based on Sperry's (1996, 2002, 2004) work on developmental personality style, work styles and their implication for executive coaching. This matrix supports an index that can be used in the identification of pre-dispositional factors that would influence an individual's readiness to assume a

leadership position. The LRI builds upon existing literature that identifies personality styles and dispositions as being indicative of leadership effectiveness (De Vries, 2006; Nelson and Hogan, 2009).

For example, Maccoby (2000) provides a compelling picture of the strengths and weaknesses of leaders with narcissistic personality styles. The strengths include the capacity for creating a compelling vision, high levels of ambition and self-efficacy and the ability to attract a legion of followers. However, according to Maccoby, leaders with this personality style also tend to be poor listeners who are sensitive to criticism and demonstrate low levels of emotional intelligence.

This profile begs the questions of if, how and to what extent other personality styles align with the competencies of effective leadership. To that end, associations to leadership have indeed been made with paranoid, histrionic, dependent and passive-aggressive styles as well (Sperry, 1996). Thus the groundwork has been set for placing personality styles within a context of leadership readiness.

This index should provide executive and leadership coaches with a device that can be used to support effective leader development strategies. By recognizing the need to first distinguish between a client with a histrionic personality style versus one who may demonstrate a more obsessive-compulsive personality style, a coach will be better able to assist a client with one of the most important aspects of any development routine - self awareness (Auerbach, 2001; Nelson and Hogan, 2009). More importantly, the strategy presented does not seek to pathologize behavioral traits but rather displays these styles on a continuum of functioning. This permits coaches to reinforce the notion that growth potential is inherent in every personality style and in turn fosters the empowerment ethos that has come to define the coaching practice. After elaborating on these concepts in greater detail, the article concludes with a discussion of the limitations of the index and future research that will be needed to validate its stated aims.

Leader Development

The requirements for leadership are multi-faceted due to the complex and ever evolving demands that are placed upon individuals who hold leadership positions. It has been noted by others that it can be difficult to arrive at a consensus definition of leadership (Bass and Bass, 2008; Bolden, 2004; Lussier and Achua, 2007). Nahavandi (2009) defines leadership as a goal directed, group phenomenon that is organized hierarchically. This definition, while not exhaustive or specifically focused on the role of the leader, suggests that a leader would need to demonstrate the competencies necessary to successfully influence the pursuit of goal directed activities.

The proliferation of research and scholarship on leadership has afforded the opportunity for its components and contexts to be elevated to independent and sometimes competing articulations of what truly represents the meaning of leadership. This is most often illustrated through a review of the evolution of leadership theories that takes the reader from trait, to behavioral to situational and most recently to transformational and servant-leader models of leadership (Bolden, 2004; Bass and Bass, 2008, Nahavandi, 2009).

This perspective is often iterative in that it suggests that each successive leadership theory is an improvement upon and thus supplants the ones that preceded it. Yet as Bolden (2004) notes, "[d]espite the fact that trait and behavioural theories of leadership have proven unsuccessful in isolating a definitive set of leader characteristics, the competency approach to leadership development and assessment is becoming increasingly widespread"(p. 15). This perhaps may best be explained by considering that the

ability to appropriately identify the situational contexts of leadership, inspire transformation, or adopt a servant/team leadership posture is strongly influenced by the personality traits and behavioral characteristics that a leader brings to these tasks.

For instance, Resick, Whitman, Weingarden and Hiller (2009) reported a relationship between positive and negative personality characteristics and organizational outcomes for CEOs of major league baseball teams using a historiometric analysis. And while this methodological approach carries limitations as to its generalizability, the study found a relationship between personality characteristics, leadership style and performance outcomes that is consistent with other published studies. Johnson and Hill (2009) conducted a study of the personality characteristics of military leaders classified as either effective or ineffective and found patterns consistent with earlier studies that also predicted leader effectiveness to be correlated with personality traits. These studies focused on the Five Factor Model of personality and found positive correlations to traits like extraversion, openness to experience, agreeableness and conscientiousness (Judge and Bono, 2000). One such study was conducted by De Hoogh, Den Hartog, & Koopman (2005) and found similar correlations while finding these relationships to be context dependent.

Even more directly related to the thesis of this article, DeVries (2006) draws express linkages between personality function and leadership style, noting that "dysfunctional leaders often show one or more pathologies" (p. 44). More recently, Nelson and Hogan (2009) provided a detailed exposition on the impact of "dysfunctional dispositions" and flawed interpersonal behaviors on leader efficacy. However, as prevalent as the use of the Five Factor Model is in these studies, it provides only one perspective on the personality traits relevant to leadership.

In their seminal treatise on leadership, Bass and Bass (2008) provide a comprehensive list of the traits and characteristics indicative of leaders. They include physical stature, energy, health, appearance, communication style, knowledge, academic achievement, judgment, insight, originality, adaptability, persistence, self-sufficiency, ambition, and industry, among others.

Others have defined successful leaders as those able to inspire others to positive action (Dubrin, 2007). This cross-section of definitions suggests that in addition to tactical abilities, effective and successful leaders should also be charismatic. In fact, charisma has been identified as a key characteristic shared by transformational leaders (Popper, Mayseless & Castelnovo, 2000). In addition to masterful communication skills, these leaders also have in common a visionary outlook, the ability to inspire trust and competence in others, high energy, an action orientation and high levels of emotional intelligence (Dubrin, 2007).

Evaluating leadership from yet another perspective, Clawson (2009) has identified three levels of leadership that reflect the level of focus that the leader applies to individual employees and organization-wide goals. This is consistent with those leadership theorists who argue that leadership is less an individual phenomenon than it is a property of group action (Bolden, 2004). Level one leaders are concerned with the most superficial level of attention and concentrate on surface level behaviors. Level two reflects an acknowledgement that actions are precipitated by conscious thoughts which may or may not be explicitly expressed. Level three leaders attend to the underlying values, assumptions, beliefs and expectations (VABE) that inform thoughts and guide behaviors (Clawson, 2009).   Level two and three leadership practices also support the type of double-loop learning that Argyris and Schon (1995) associate with highly effective organizations. This may be due to the reflective component inherent in a leadership style based on addressing VABEs and the thoughts underlying behavior.

By contrast, single loop learning is primarily adaptive and as a consequence reflects a level one approach evident in many if not most management and leadership activities. That is, they are concerned with controlling and manipulating employee behavior without addressing the thoughts and VABEs that trigger and support those behaviors. Contemporary research on transformational leadership is consistent with leadership approaches that incorporate levels two and three (Dubrin, 2007) and the double-loop styles of organizational learning that support it. That said, none of these descriptions are impervious to the influence of a leader's effectiveness or ineffectiveness at communicating a clear vision, aligning that vision with positive VABES or creating an organizational culture that supports double-loop learning.

Directing an organization or organizational unit from a level three perspective or according to any other model of successful organizational performance requires an adept and functional leader. The most effective leaders are found to be those who operate from a stable center, who are personally grounded, other-directed and create the kinds of secure and supportive environments where creativity and productivity thrive (Clawson, 2009). It has been argued that their success is due in part to the relationships that these types of leaders are able to forge with the members of their organizations. Specifically, the resulting successes that these organizations produce have been attributed to the role that leaders play as attachment figures in the lives of their employees (Davidovitz, Mikulincer, Shaver, Izsak, & Popper, 2007) as well as to instances of transference that take place between leaders and followers whereby followers imbue leaders with idealized abilities (De Vries, 2006).

To be meaningful then, coaching interventions must account for all of the powerful interpersonal transactions in which leaders engage on a daily basis. Thus, a coach must find ways to assess the psychological capacity that a leader possesses to meet these demands. When considered in this light, engagements that take place for the purpose of leadership development would be more accurately described as *leader* development. This is a concept that has been defined as "the expansion of a person's capacity to be effective in leadership roles and processes" (McCauley and Velsor, 2004, p.2).

McCormick and Burch (2008) advocated the use of the Five Factor Model of personality for the design of coaching interventions aimed at developing leaders. However, as the aforementioned descriptions attest, the Five Factor Model is only one among several personality trait models associated with effective leadership that could be used as the basis for developing leadership coaching strategies.

Thus, however leadership may be defined, there is strong evidence that underlying personality traits should serve as key considerations when assessing leadership performance and by extension, leadership potential. This is particularly important given that while the *skills* associated with effective leadership (e.g. communication, interpersonal, strategic thinking) can be cultivated through training, the personality traits that influence leadership style are less amenable to modification (Bolden, 2005). Consequently, while knowledge of the traits of effective leadership is important, leader development coaching is necessarily complicated by the inherent behavioral tendencies and psychosocial capacities that a current or aspiring leader brings to a coaching relationship. The foregoing expositions on the traits, characteristics and behaviors of effective leaders strongly suggest that they are apt to be aligned with some personality styles while being diametrically opposed to others. Accordingly, as Nelson and Hogan (2009) point out, an assessment of the personality style of a coaching client is an indispensable prerequisite of the leader coaching process.

Executive Coaching

In the Center for Creative Leadership's handbook on coaching for leader development Ting and Riddle (2006) define the intent of leader coaching as helping "leaders understand themselves more fully so that they can draw on their strengths and use them more effectively and intentionally, improve identified development needs, and develop untested potential" (p.11). While this definition does not explicitly refer to personality traits, the connection can certainly be inferred from the statement. Current scholarship on executive coaching builds upon this definition by including an application of psychological skills and techniques and narrowing the goals of the coaching relationship to those strategies that will enhance leader effectiveness (Sperry, 2004; Peltier, 2009).

To accomplish the espoused goals of leader development coaching, coaches are well served by rooting their strategies in one or more appropriate theoretical orientations, some of which mirror or are indirectly derived from psychotherapeutic techniques (Peltier, 2009; see also Ward; 2008). Psychodynamic approaches, as one example, provide coaching with a theoretical grounding based on a complementary discipline that also has as its focus the goal of helping individuals to help themselves. Another theory that would be instrumental in this regard is based on the developmental counseling therapy model, or what could be termed *developmental personality style theory*.

Developmental Personality Styles

Developmental personality style theory emanates from a counseling model that seeks to reframe client distress and counterproductive behavior as a logical adaptation to setbacks or traumas that have occurred during the course of development. Ivey and Ivey (1998) refer to this model as developmental counseling and therapy (DCT). A central feature of DCT is that it uses categories derived from the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, fourth edition (DSM-IV)(American Psychiatric Association, 2000) as classifications of *personality styles* rather than descriptors of personality disorders.

The DSM-IV is the standard reference for use in the classification of mental disorders. According to the DSM-IV, a personality disorder involves a pattern of clinically significant behavior that can be associated with distress or impairment (American Psychiatric Association, 2000). DSM-IV classifications are typically used for the purpose of diagnosis and are almost exclusively associated with problem focused, deficit oriented treatment strategies. However, growth oriented models of treatment intervention use the DSM classification as a framework for establishing corollary personality styles that can acknowledge the potential for growth in clients who demonstrate behaviors consistent with these disorders (Sperry, 2002).

The DSM-IV recognizes eleven personality disorders that according to the DCT model can be reframed as developmental personality styles. They are: *narcissistic, obsessive-compulsive, histrionic, antisocial, avoidant, schizoid, dependent, passive aggressive, borderline, paranoid*, and *schizotypal*. Ivey and Ivey (1998) conceptualized the difference between traditional DSM-IV diagnosis and DCT as moving away from a pathology orientation toward a view of classified behavior as a logical response given the appropriate identification of the individual's context of development. This interpretation draws a striking parallel to the view that leadership is a property of both the leader's traits and behaviors and the situational context to which those traits and behaviors will be subjected.

Extending this point of view, Sperry (2002) created a continuum of functioning for each of the eleven developmental personality styles shown in Table 1 (see Appendix 1). This approach illustrates the DCT perspective that all personality styles have strengths and benefits that are potentially useful for adaptive functioning when applied appropriately. Sperry (1996) also developed work personality styles that correspond with each of the eleven developmental personality styles. De Vries (2006) states that "everyone has a core drama that contributes to a unique personality style" which in turn contributes to a leader's managerial and leadership approach (p. 44). These styles can range from the positive to the pathological and thus there is considerable value to be gained from assessing and reflecting on these psychological styles when devising coaching interventions related to a client's leadership practice.

A common motivation for engaging an executive coach is to support the transition of management personnel to leadership positions (Coutu and Kauffman, 2009). Generic coaching strategies assume that coaching goals will be client driven and that the client possesses the resources with which to achieve them. However, that may not always be the case with management to leadership transitions. Promotions to leadership positions may be made for reasons having more to do with expediency than readiness, may be the result of ambition that outpaces current capabilities or in some instances may be thrust upon an individual who is reluctant or uninterested in assuming more responsibility. Therefore, a coach cannot successfully fulfill the expectations of a leader development coaching engagement if all potential coaching clients are treated the same. More importantly, without appropriate attention to the personality dimensions of a client's behavior, any coaching strategies aimed at developing leader potential will be incomplete at best and misguided at worst.

The Leadership Readiness Index

In Laske's (1999) developmental coaching model, he posits that the developmental context contains two aspects – *agentic*, referring to the role of human agency and *ontic* which refers to how development is experienced over time. Based upon this premise, he goes on to assert that effective coaching "depends on the ontic-developmental preconditions that determine where an executive is when entering a coaching relationship" (p. 141). The LRI is firmly rooted in this assumption.

The LRI is intended to serve as a tool to guide coaches during the assessment phase of a leader coaching engagement. Most coaching models incorporate a data gathering or assessment phase during which the coach is oriented to the client. It is during this phase that the intrapersonal resources possessed by the client are evaluated (Auerbach, 2001; Nelson and Hogan, 2009; Peltier, 2009). In an executive coaching engagement, it would be during this phase that the coach could use the LRI to determine how well a client's personality style would position him or her to move into a leadership role. Many assessments conducted during this phase of the coaching engagement rely upon some form of personality assessment. This index uses developmental personality style as a foundation for enhancing this step in the process by identifying how well a client's personality style aligns with the traits and characteristics found in effective leaders.

LRI Construction

The LRI was derived from a four step formula. First, the eleven personality styles identified based upon the DSM-IV classifications of Axis II personality disorders were defined along with their corresponding work styles as described by Sperry (1996). Next, the personality styles were further defined along a tripartite continuum of functioning that ranges from *disordered* to *normal* to *optimal,* based upon Sperry's (2002) developmental model (Table 1). The descriptions contained in the personality style grid will aid the user/coach in accurately identifying the most likely personality/work style classification for the client.

The third step identified twenty-nine (29) leadership attributes drawn from existing literature on leadership which explicitly identifies personality traits associated with leadership effectiveness (Bass and Bass, 2008; Bono and Judge, 2004; Daft, 2008; Hendricks and Payne, 2007; Judge and Bono, 2000). Each personality style was rated according to whether, and the extent to which, each leadership attribute would be considered a defining characteristic of that personality style, either positively or negatively (Table 2, see Appendix). This alignment was achieved by evaluating the personality styles at each level of functioning (optimal, adequate, disordered) and determining whether the description could be explicitly or implicitly linked to each leadership attribute using a layperson's perception. In cases of ambiguity, no alignment was noted. Personality traits mentioned in multiple sources were highlighted in bold.

Finally, based upon an aggregation of attributes as depicted in Table 2, each personality style was placed in the Leadership Readiness Index under one of three categories – *Leadership Prone, Leadership Neutral,* or *Leadership Averse* (Table 3, see Appendix). Personality styles with multiple alignments were plotted first, with special attention paid to whether the preponderance of traits clustered in the disordered or adequate/optimal end of the continuum of functioning. Personality styles that aligned with all three points on the continuum for multiple traits were rated as *leadership prone*, while those plotting primarily as disordered or not appearing on the grid at all, were rated as *leadership neutral* or *leadership averse* depending on the significance of the traits involved.

Sperry's (2004) analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the corresponding work styles for each personality style was also used to settle on a final determination of category placement. Table 3 also identifies the most appropriate interventional approaches recommended by Sperry for each personality/work style. These recommendations should be useful in identifying the most constructive approaches for adopting appropriate leader development goals and coaching strategies.

Potential Applications

The assessment phase of most coaching relationships often includes the use of psychometric instruments. While psychometric instruments are both popular and useful for leadership coaching engagements, their results must be used in conjunction with a coach's interpretation of information from a variety of sources including non-psychometric questionnaires, interviews and personal observations (Nelson and Hogan, 2009). The LRI serves as a contextualizing instrument for translating this raw data into a feedback mechanism for purposes of setting and evaluating coaching goals relative to the client's prospects for effective leadership.

Goals and action plans can be developed and documented based in part upon the client's leadership readiness position as indicated by the LRI. Action plans could include strategies to modify

cognitive-behavioral tendencies, develop emotional intelligence, role-play assertive engagement or in the alternative, the ultimate result may be a determination that a leadership role is in fact, not the best career path for the client to follow. As with all evaluative techniques, the LRI is only one tool among many at a coach's disposal when determining the most appropriate intervention strategy for a client.

Limitations and Opportunities for Future Research

The primary limitation of this index is that it presumes that a coach will be able to effectively identify and distinguish between different personality styles. Coaches can use many of the same interview and observation data collection methods to determine the appropriate developmental personality style for client as would ordinarily be used during the assessment phase of a coaching relationship. Coaches possessing limited familiarity with the personality styles described in the LRI can supplement their current interview approaches with questions from DSM-IV interview guides such as the one developed by Zimmerman (1994). However, because the index described in this article draws heavily on a familiarity with personality styles derived from personality disorders, it is particularly important to emphasize that it is not intended to be used to "diagnose" a client. In other words, identification of an antisocial *personality style* should not be communicated as a diagnosis of antisocial *personality disorder*.

Accordingly, future research to test the efficacy of the LRI would need to take not only the proficiency of the coach into account with regard to the use of DSM related categories but would also need to address inter-rater reliability. To that end, mentor or "buddy" coaching arrangements would be excellent settings for evaluating the LRI in leadership or executive coaching engagements. Both coaches would have the opportunity to discuss whether they could reach consensus on the developmental personality style presented by an individual client. Independent validation could then be determined through the use of multi-rater feedback instruments to evaluate whether the personality style identified aligns with the feedback provided as well as the leadership readiness category to which that style was assigned.

Criticisms could also be raised as to the validity of the alignment drawn between the eleven personality styles and the leadership attributes selected during step three of the LRI's development. This could be consequential since this step serves as the basis for the LRI categories themselves. However, it should be stressed that the LRI is not being presented as a personality *instrument* but rather as an interpretive framework for use in evaluating the various sources of information that a coach will gather about a client during the course of the engagement. Here again, field testing of the LRI will help to elucidate the extent to which this index provides any added insights that would improve a coach's effectiveness in selecting and making use of the most appropriate intervention strategies for developing current and future leaders.

Conclusions

A growing body of literature supports a conceptualization of effective coaching as involving the application of psychological skills to support the development of a coaching client (Cox and Jackson, 2009; Peltier, 2009; Ting and Scisco, 2006). These skills are thought to include active listening, self awareness, empathy, process observation, giving and getting feedback, cognitive restructuring and learned optimism, effective use of reinforcement, resistance management among other professional skills.

To avoid applying these skills in a haphazard manner, it can be helpful for a coach to apply one or more theoretical orientations to a coaching engagement. Here again, psychological training provides access to a number of valuable theoretical orientations from which to choose including psychodynamic, behaviorism, cognitive therapy, family systems and transpersonal among others (Cox, Bachkirova & Clutterbuck, 2009; Peltier, 2009). In fact, as Sperry (2004) suggests, a coach who is also trained as a mental health professional is able to expand the range of services offered to executives from executive coaching to what he calls executive psychotherapy, if needed.

The main theoretical orientation of the Leadership Readiness Index and one that is particularly well suited to coaching is developmental counseling theory. Developmental counseling theory is steeped in both psychodynamic theory as well as a positive developmental approach that emphasizes the context of a client's history as being central to understanding client behavior (Ivey and Ivey, 1998). It emphasizes that all behavior, no matter how counterproductive, represents the client's best attempt at logical adaptation to their circumstances. This approach reframes interventions away from an emphasis on deficits toward an emphasis on the potential for positive growth regardless of the presenting condition. It is this emphasis on the positive potential in all clients that aligns it so ideally with coaching.

The skilled coaching practitioner is one who has successfully integrated the knowledge and competencies of the coaching profession and is adept at applying them in unique and innovative ways to help clients reach their goals. The Leadership Readiness Index is designed to contribute to these practice goals and to the body of knowledge that supports coaching in general. In so doing, it is intended to provide another coaching tool for a practitioner to draw upon.   It is consistent with the spirit of building upon existing strengths and affirming growth potential that makes the coaching profession such a valuable participant in the practice of leader and executive development.

References

American Psychiatric Association. (2000). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders DSM-IV-TR* (4th ed.). Washington, D.C.: American Psychiatric Publishing.

Argyris, C., & Schon, D. (1995). *Organizational learning II: Theory, method and practice*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Auerbach, J. E. (2001). *Personal and executive coaching: The complete guide for mental health professionals*. Ventura, CA: Executive College Press.

Bass, B. M., & Bass, R. (2008). *The bass handbook of leadership: Theory, research and managerial application* (4th ed.) New York: Free Press.

Bolden, R. (2004). *What is leadership?* Exeter, UK: University of Exeter: Leadership South West.

Bolden, R. (2005). *What is leadership development: Purpose and practice*. Exeter, UK: University of
Exeter Leadership South West.

Bono, J. E., & Judge, T. A. (2004). Personality and transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-
analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(5), pp. 901-910.

Clawson, J. G. (2009). *Level three leadership: Getting below the surface* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River,
NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Coutu, D., Kauffman, C., Charan, R., Peterson, D. B., Maccoby, M., Scoular, P. A., et al. (2009). What
can coaches do for you? *Harvard Business Review, 87*(1), pp. 91-97.

Cox, E., Bachkirova, T., & Clutterbuck, D. (Eds.). (2009). *The Complete Handbook of Coaching*.
London: Sage Publications.

Cox, E., & Jackson, P. (2009). Developmental coaching. In E. Cox, T. Bachkirova & D. Clutterbuck
(Eds.), *The Complete Handbook of Coaching* (pp. 217-230). London: Sage Publications.

Daft, R. L. (2008). *The Leadership Experience* (4th ed.). Mason, OH: Thomson/South-Western.

Davidovitz, R., Mikulincer, M., Shaver, P. R., Izsak, R., & Popper, M. (2007). Leaders as attachment
figures: Leaders' attachment orientations predict leadership-related mental representations and
followers' performance and mental health. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 93*(4), pp.
632-650.

De Vries, M. K. (2006). Lured to the dark side. *Director (00123242), 60*(3), pp. 44-44.

Dubrin, A. J. (2007). *Leadership: Research findings, practice and skills* (5th ed.). Boston: Houghton
Mifflin Company.

Hendricks, J. W., & Payne, S. C. (2007). Beyond the big five: Goal orientation as a predictor of
leadership effectiveness. *Human Performance, 20*, 317-343.

Ivey, A. E., & Ivey, M. B. (1998). Reframing DSM-IV: Positive strategies from developmental
counseling and therapy. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 76*(3), p. 334 – 350.

Johnson, J. L., & Hill, W. R. (2009). Personality traits and military leadership. *Individual Differences
Research, 7*(1), pp.1-13.

Judge, T. A., & Bono, J. E. (2000). Five-factor model of personality and transformational leadership.
Journal of Applied Psychology, 85(5), pp. 751-765.

Laske, O. E. (1999). An integrated model of developmental coaching. *Consulting Psychology Journal:
Practice and Research, 51*, 139-159.

Levenson, A. (2009). Measuring and maximizing the business impact of executive coaching. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 61*(2), pp.103-121.

Lussier, R. N., & Achua, C. F. (2007). *Leadership: Theory, application, & skill development* (3rd ed.). Mason, Ohio: South-Western Cengage Learning.

Maccoby, M. (2000). Narcissistic leaders. (cover story). *Harvard Business Review, 78*(1), pp. 68-77.

McCauley, C. D., & Velsor, E. V. (Eds.). (2004). *Handbook of leadership development* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mccormick, I., & Burch, G. S. J. (2008). Personality-focused coaching for leadership development. *Counseling Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 60*(3), pp. 267-278.

Nahavandi, A. (2009). *The art and science of leadership* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Nelson, E., & Hogan, R. (2009). Coaching on the dark side. *International Coaching Psychology Review, 4*, pp. 9-21.

Peltier, B. (2009). *The Psychology of Executive Coaching: Theory and Application* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Popper, M., Mayseless, O., & Castelnovo, O. (2000). Transformational leadership and attachment. *Leadership Quarterly, 11*(2), pp. 267-289.

Resick, C. J., Whitman, D. S., Weingarden, S. M., & Hiller, N. J. (2009). The bright-side and the dark-side of CEO personality: Examining core self-evaluations, narcissism, transformational leadership, and strategic influence. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*(6), pp.1365-1381.

Sperry, L. (1996). *Corporate Therapy and Consulting*. New York: Brunner/Mazel, Inc.

Sperry, L. (2002). From psychopathology to transformation: Retrieving the developmental focus in psychotherapy. *The Journal of Individual Psychology, 58*(5), pp. 398-421.

Sperry, L. (2004). *Executive Coaching: The essential guide for mental health professionals* Brunner-Routledge.

Ting, S., & Riddle, D. (2006). A framework for leadership development coaching. In S. Ting, & P. Scisco (Eds.), *The CCL handbook of coaching: A guide for the leader coach* (pp. 34-62). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Ting, S., & Scisco, P. (Eds.). (2006). *The CCL handbook of coaching: A guide for the leader coach*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Ward, G. (2008). Towards executive change: A psychodynamic group coaching model for short executive programmes. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring, 6*(1), pp. 67-78.

Zimmerman, M. (1994). *Interview guide for evaluating DSM-IV psychiatric disorders and the mental status examination*. East Greenwich, RI: Psych Products Press.

Dr. K. Candis Best is an educator, speaker, coach and author. In May 2008, she made her literary debut with *Leaving Legacies: Reflections from the Prickly Path to Leadership,* an entertaining and moving account of her eleven year odyssey as a public health executive that was recognized by USA Book News as one of the best books of 2008. In addition to a law degree from Villanova University, she possesses a Masters degree in Business Administration from Adelphi University and a Ph.D. in Social Welfare Research and Policy Development from Stony Brook University on Long Island, where she enjoyed the distinction of being a W. Burghardt Turner Fellow. In the spring of 2010 she will add a Masters degree in Psychology with a specialization in Leadership Coaching from Capella University to her list of credentials. She is Board Certified in Health Care Management, a Fellow of the American College of Health Care Executives and a member of the International Association of Coaches. Her research interests include leadership development, career management, transpersonal studies and self-leadership coaching.

APPENDIX

Table 1: Developmental Personality Styles - *Adapted from Sperry (2002)*

PERSONALITY STYLE *Work Personality Style*	ANTISOCIAL *Adventurous*	AVOIDANT *Sensitive*	BORDERLINE *Mercurial*	DEPENDENT *Devoted*	HISTRIONC *Dramatic*	NARCISSISTIC *Self-Confident*	OBSESSIVE/ COMPULSIVE *Conscientious*	PARANOID *Vigilant*	PASSIVE/ AGGRESSIVE *Leisurely*	SCHIZOID *Solitary*	SCHIZOTYPAL *Idiosyncratic*
Optimal	Applies assertiveness constructively; disciplined and focused; independent thinkers; make good change agents	Sensitive to interpersonal cues; keen intuition; respectful and compassionate toward others	Sensitive; Introspective; Impressionable; Comfortable with feelings and inner impulses	May seek out the opinions of others on major decisions but makes decisions independently; Inclusive	Self-affirmed; altruistic; gives w/out requiring reciprocity	Energetic; Self-Assured; No expectation of special treatment; Charismatic and focused but also humble; high degree of self-efficacy	Conscientious; spontaneous; generous, kind; personal integrity; hopeful	Highly observant and discerning; Can defend self without becoming aggressive	Easy going; positive but can act decisively and courageously when necessary	Deeply grounding; emotionally connected to the world	Unique capacity to adopt broad and diverse perspectives for the benefit of others
Adequate	Sociable; and communicative but relationships may be superficial; distracted by boredom, can lose commitment with tedious tasks lacking challenge.	Reserved demeanor; sensitive to others opinions of self.	Engages relationships quickly, easily and sometimes impulsively leading to disappointment and rejection at times.	Has capacity to be responsible, make decisions but relies on others for help and advice	Fun-loving; impulsive; can delay gratification; emotionally appropriate	Confident but emotionally vulnerable; favors special treatment; Also charismatic sometimes self-serving	Moderately perfectionist, sometimes rigid, emotionally engaged	Thin-skinned; easily offended; sensitive to criticism positive or negative	Pessimistic; functions at or below capability	Reasonably comfortable around others but requires limits to demands for intimacy and emotional connectedness	Immersed in the unique and unusual without discriminating attention to value or worth
Disordered	Aggressive; impulsive; self-serving; irresponsible	Avoids social and work-related activities; avoids significant interpersonal contact; fearful of criticism, disapproval or rejection	Displays frantic efforts to avoid rejection and abandonment	Needs others to assume responsibility for most major life decisions	Needs to be the center of attention	Grandiose; self-important; demands special treatment	Perfectionism, feeling avoidance, difficulty with task completion; overly rigid, stingy; pessimistic	Unreasonably suspicious of others; fearful of be exploited, harmed or deceived	Consistently pessimistic and negative toward self, others and circumstances; Resistant to efforts toward positive change	Does not desire or enjoy close relationships; No close friends or confidants; Limited or no affective displays	Exhibits odd, eccentric or peculiar behavior, thought or speech.

Table 2: Leadership Attributes Grid

Personality Style / Functioning	Antisocial			Avoidant			Borderline			Dependent			Histrionic			Narcissistic			Obsessive/ Compulsive			Paranoid			Passive/Aggressive			Schizoid			Schizotypal		
	D	A	O	D	A	O	D	A	O	D	A	O	D	A	O	D	A	O	D	A	O	D	A	O	D	A	O	D	A	O	D	A	O
Leadership Attributes																																	
Adaptability																																	
Ego stability																																	
Aggressiveness																																	
Assertiveness																																	
Alertness																																	
Dominance																																	
Emotion regulation																																	
Enthusiasm																																	
Extroversion																																	
Energetic																																	
Independence																																	
Risk tolerance																																	
Objectivity																																	
Tough-mindedness																																	
Personal integrity																																	

Legend:

Functioning		Shading
D – Disordered	⬛	*Negative manifested*
A – Adequate	▨	*Neutrally manifested*
O – Optimal	▫	*Positively manifested*

Table 2 (con't) Leadership Attributes Grid

Personality Style	Antisocial			Avoidant			Borderline			Dependent			Histrionic			Narcissistic			Obsessive/ Compulsive			Paranoid			Passive/Aggressive			Schizoid			Schizotypal		
Functioning	D	A	O	D	A	O	D	A	O	D	A	O	D	A	O	D	A	O	D	A	O	D	A	O	D	A	O	D	A	O	D	A	O
Leadership Attributes																																	
Resourcefulness					░														■		░				■								
Strength of conviction														░		░					░											░	
Stress tolerance							■												■														
Self-confidence							■			■																							
Self-efficacy										■									■														
Ambition																																	
Initiative						░					■	■																					
Persistence	■					░																											
Conscientiousness	■																░																
Task orientation																■	■			░												░	
Sociable	■			■					░				░															■	▨				
Cooperative	■			■												■												■					
Charismatic	■			■														░										■				■	
Nurturing						░																							░				
Tactful						░										■																	
Articulate																		░										■			■		

D – Disordered	■	*Negative manifested*	
A- Adequate	▨	*Neutrally manifested*	
O – Optimal	░	*Positively manifested*	

Table 3: Leadership Readiness Index

Leadership Readiness Classification	Developmental/Work Personality Style	Executive Intervention Strategy
Prone		
	Histrionic/Dramatic	Executive Consultation
	Narcissistic/Self-Confident	Executive Coaching
	Obsessive-Compulsive/Conscientious	Executive Therapy
Neutral		
	Antisocial/Adventurous	Executive Coaching
	Avoidant/Sensitive	Executive Therapy
	Paranoid/Vigilant	
Averse		
	Dependent/Devoted	Executive Coaching
	Schizoid/Solitary	Executive Therapy
	Passive-Aggressive/Leisurely	
	Schizotypal/Idiosyncratic	
	Borderline/Mercurial	