

# Checkpoint 360<sup>™</sup> Research Report



**CheckPoint 360<sup>OTM</sup>  
Research Report**

Version 1.0

**WILEY**

This edition published in 2020 by John Wiley & Sons, Inc.,  
400 Highway 169 South, Suite 300, Minneapolis, MN 55426,  
USA.

©2020 by John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, except as permitted by law. Advice on how to obtain permission to reuse material from this title is available at <http://www.wiley.com/go/permissions>.

*Global Headquarters*

111 River Street, Hoboken, NJ 07030, USA

For details of our global editorial offices, customer services, and more information about Wiley products visit us at [www.wiley.com](http://www.wiley.com).

*Limit of Liability/Disclaimer of Warranty*

While the publisher and authors have used their best efforts in preparing this work, they make no representations or warranties with respect to the accuracy or completeness of the contents of this work and specifically disclaim all warranties, including without limitation any implied warranties of merchantability or fitness for a particular purpose. No warranty may be created or extended by sales representatives, written sales materials or promotional statements for this work. The fact that an organization, website, or product is referred to in this work as a citation and/or potential source of further information does not mean that the publisher and authors endorse the information or services the organization, website, or product may provide or recommendations it may make. This work is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering professional services. The advice and strategies contained herein may

not be suitable for your situation. You should consult with a specialist where appropriate. Further, readers should be aware that websites listed in this work may have changed or disappeared between when this work was written and when it is read. Neither the publisher nor authors shall be liable for any loss of profit or any other commercial damages, including but not limited to special, incidental, consequential, or other damages.

Printed in the United States of America 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2

## **Contents**

Introduction.....	1
The Need for 360° Instruments.....	1
Development History.....	3
The Eight Universal Management Competencies.....	6
CheckPoint 360° Feedback Report.....	7
Features and Benefits of CheckPoint Reports.....	9
Psychometric Properties.....	9
Reliability.....	9
Validity and Norms.....	12
Favorable Zone.....	14
Flags.....	15
Gaps.....	16

## **Introduction**

### The Need for 360° Instruments

Beginning in the early part of the Industrial/Organizational Psychology movement, methods were sought that could help managers perform one of their most difficult tasks; evaluating employee performance. Traditional performance evaluations were implemented but halo effects soon rendered them ineffective. Supervisors came to apply them in ways that served little additional purpose but to reinforce their single-point assessments. In an effort to add another level of review, peer-assessments were initially attempted. This trend lasted through several iterations but with some of the same inadequacies. Impact was also felt from a variety of self-report measures, (psychological tests, interest inventories, skill measures, etc.), with the addition of more observers. Although these other perspectives added something to the process, not all that was needed was included.

Observations made from the use of organizational surveys and employee opinion surveys also added an element to 360° assessments. They contributed by demonstrating the benefit of using a group of information providers to add to the accuracy of the obtained information. This new knowledge led to the use of a focused, smaller group to record observations and opinions concerning the individual or “Self.”

## 2 *CheckPoint 360<sup>o</sup>™ Research Report*

360° instruments, so named because they take their view from a “circle” of observers, were developed to accomplish several objectives:

- To add another level of objectivity to an often subjective process
- To solicit input from those who work with and for the individual, creating a wider perspective
- To minimize the impact of a single observer’s overly biased view
- To fulfill a need in perceived accuracy (thereby lending credibility) and the fairness necessary to hold support

## Development History

The development of the *CheckPoint 360° Competency Feedback System™* began in 1992 when a major oil company asked us to create a custom 360° instrument for use by their Corporate Management Development Team. The project development team consisted of two internal industrial/organizational psychologists and one I/O psychologist from Reid, Merrill, Brunson, and Associates. Focus groups (which were cross-functional groups of employees from various levels) were organized to define and develop the critical competencies needed in the organization to sustain the competitive advantage in the marketplace.

The core competencies sought were to be somewhat different than those used in the past. The development team was charged with naming and defining competencies according to the definition including measurable, observable behaviors (skills, traits, and characteristics) that are subject to modification or change.

Inherent in this definition is the notion that before you measure competencies, there must be a need. Part of that need is to assess where gaps occur in the various observations, but most is centered on the potential to make changes where needed. Where gaps occur in defined competencies, there should be a way to make a change that is good for both the individual and the organization.



As “core competencies” that supported the visions and values of the organization were identified, the focus groups also developed statements associated with each of them. These brief statements were written clearly in the active voice and became the basis of the survey for gathering input from a group of raters.

The survey questions were refined to achieve content validity, measure the determined competencies, and distinguish the performance level of individuals against these competencies.

This survey was then reviewed and critiqued by the design team, senior management, the legal department, human resources, and the functional users to determine suitability for the organization. Next, a pre-test was conducted to determine readability, completeness, and clarity. A pilot of 40 people was completed, refinements were made, and the survey was used company-wide for line, middle, and senior managers. A total of 450 people participated. Following the completion by all members in the organization at these levels, feedback was solicited and refinements were made as appropriate.

Independent measures of performance such as productivity figures and supervisor’s appraisals were used to determine the validity of the feedback. Using this model, similar projects were completed for the leading call center operation in the United States (TeleTech), the largest regional specialty equipment

distributor and installation company (I.S.E.C.), and one of the largest producers of social greetings products in the world (American Greetings).

By 1994, the expanded design team for the 360° project was established. It consisted of clinical psychologists, industrial/organizational psychologists, business people, graphics designers, and software programmers (with well over 60 years of combined professional experience in assessment design, validation, use, and implementation). This design team completed extensive research into the utility, implementation, theory, and pertinent literature published on 360° instruments. Also studied were general leadership development processes, features used in current 360° instruments, the clarity and usability of existing survey instruments, and various feedback reports. Research and meta-analysis techniques were used to refine the survey and the report. This process allowed the removal of duplicate items, selection of items that contributed uniquely to the scales, a strengthening of the scales, and a movement toward clear behavioral statements.

The result was a standardized survey consisting of:

- 8 Management Competencies
- 18 key Skill Sets
- 70 survey questions

## The Eight Universal Management Competencies

The structure of the instrument defines the eight core competencies which represent the most critical leadership performance areas. These competencies are:

**Communication** – Includes skills involving listening to others, processing information, and communicating effectively.

**Leadership** – Covers the ability to instill trust, provide direction, and delegate responsibility.

**Adaptability** – Encompasses the skills of adjusting to circumstances and thinking creatively.

**Relationships** – Assesses the capabilities to build relationships and facilitate team success.

**Task Management** – Gauges the level of aptitude for working efficiently and competently.

**Production** – Appraises the ability to initiate action and achieve results.

**Development of Others** – Measures proficiencies in cultivating individual talents and in successfully motivating others.

**Personal Development** – Includes behaviors consistent with commitment and seeking self-improvement.

These universal competencies were determined to be the most suitable based on the research completed by the design team. The individual survey questions were designed to define the actual measurable skills and behaviors for these core competencies.

## CheckPoint 360<sup>°</sup>™ Feedback Report

The *CheckPoint 360<sup>°</sup>™ Feedback Report* was developed with the goal of distilling and presenting this complex data in a meaningful, simple, and graphic way. The usability of the report by the actual user was of paramount importance here.

The report is structured to appeal to all types of users by revealing an increasing level of detail, page by page. For those who prefer the summary format, the opening pages reveal only big picture information. For those who want all the details and specifics, there are complete descriptions and statistics. These details begin with comparisons of “Self” with all other observers. Then it progressively works through more levels until finally the items themselves are ranked.

The design team researched other 360<sup>°</sup> feedback products and found that most 360<sup>°</sup> reports are based on compiled survey results, perceptual differences, and comparisons to normed data. The team’s goal was to present data in a clear, concise, complete report, avoiding the confusing formats and presentations of other 360<sup>°</sup> products that often exhibited serious flaws such as omissions of essential information.

The *CheckPoint 360<sup>°</sup>™ Feedback Report* took the unique approach of presenting the information in color using simple graphical comparisons with detailed explanations relevant to each page. This use of color, the

## 8 *CheckPoint 360<sup>oTM</sup> Research Report*

graphical presentation style, and simplicity made the *CheckPoint 360<sup>oTM</sup>* stand out as a unique and superior 360° report. (Please see sample report for complete view).

In addition, when completing the user research for *CheckPoint 360<sup>o</sup>*, it was determined that one of the most important and desired features was the *Development Suggestions* section which contains action steps. Our design team solicited the help of experts in the field of leadership development and management training to design and write the action steps and development summary pages. They are considered to be one of the most useful features of the *CheckPoint 360<sup>o</sup>*.

Use for self-improvement was a major design consideration of the *CheckPoint 360<sup>o</sup>*. The reports needed to allow managers to understand areas for improvement and let them focus on appropriate methods to accomplish these improvements.

Another goal was to provide a method of assessing and aligning the perceptions of the “Boss” and the “Self” in the areas of objectives, concerns, and need for improvement. It was decided that six critical skill groups would be selected independently by “Self,” and six independently selected by the “Boss.” These were then compared and contrasted as critical Skill Groups which are special areas for consideration and development.

## Features and Benefits of CheckPoint Reports

- Simple sources of input using paper and pencil, Internet, or computer
- Behavioral focus assuring credibility of responses
- Ramp-up training and usage training follows report style
- Self-improvement for the user
- Reports are clear, visually pleasing, and technically sound
- Readability aimed at all types of consumers.

## Psychometric Properties

### **Reliability**

Three studies were conducted to establish the reliability of *CheckPoint 360<sup>o</sup>™* for both internal consistency and test-retest reliability. The internal consistency sample consisted of 81,720 observers who completed the *CheckPoint 360<sup>o</sup>* in 2017 through 2019. The purpose of internal consistency is to ensure there is homogeneity of content within the Skill Sets. It is important that the items within each of the eight management and leadership competencies correlate and that conceptual clarity is maintained. Results of the internal consistency analyses (Table 3.1) display alpha coefficients ranging from .93 to .85.

**Table 3.1.**

Internal consistency alpha coefficients; N=72,229

<b>Competencies - Skill Sets</b>	<b>Alpha's</b>
Leadership	.92
Adaptability	.90
Relationships	.91
Task Management	.88
Production	.92
Development of Others	.90
Personal Development	.85
Communication	.93

To assess the reliability measure of test-retest, (the stability of an instrument over time), data were collected from 49 managers during two time periods at intervals of approximately eight weeks each. Looking at self-ratings, the test-retest reliability for the eight competencies ranged from .21 to .83, with a 95%, or greater, level of confidence. While nine items did not prove to be stable over time, the overall competencies that contained each of these items were found to maintain good stability (Tables 3.2 and 3.3).follows:

**Table 3.2.**

Test-retest reliability for items; N=49

1) .41	21) .41	41) .73	61) .55
2) .52	22) .46	42) .34	62) .28ns
3) .78	23) .79	43) .74	63) .36
4) .24ns	24) .60	44) .55	64) .72
5) .77	25) .63	45) .41	65) .58
6) .38	26) .24ns	46) .56	66) .63
7) .47	27) .70	47) .30ns	67) .78
8) .49	28) .77	48) .51	68) .72
9) .52	29) .29ns	49) .68	69) .39
10) .69	30) .38	50) .81	70) .77
11) .36	31) .52	51) .73	
12) .30ns	32) .29	52) .40	
13) .34	33) .24ns	53) .52	
14) .77	34) .56	54) .29ns	
15) .40	35) .72	55) .63	
16) .37	36) .83	56) .68	
17) .21ns	37) .68	57) .66	
18) .49	38) .59	58) .29	
19) .63	39) .66	59) .48	
20) .55	40) .47	60) .60	

\*Note: All items  $p < .05$  unless marked ns



**Table 3.3.**

Test-retest reliability for competencies; N=49

Communication	.48
Leadership	.52
Adaptability	.43
Relationships	.33
Task Management	.58
Production	.53
Development of Others	.50
Personal Development	.44

\*Note: All items  $p < .05$

**Validity and Norms**

The normative *CheckPoint 360<sup>o</sup>™* database consists of over 370,000 raters of leaders and managers from a variety of companies and industries. As a matter of routine, concurrent validation research is conducted periodically. This is accomplished by comparing results from the *CheckPoint 360<sup>o</sup>* with performance review criterion data designed to measure the same leadership competencies in a more general way. The latest concurrent study indicates a useful relationship between performance evaluation competencies and *CheckPoint 360<sup>o</sup>* results (Table 3.4).Distortion

**Table 3.4.**

Performance review criterion and competencies correlations; N=138

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Communication	.31**	.27**	.28**	.12	.19*	.21**	.20**	.19*
Leadership	.25**	.22*	.04	.17*	.09	.19*	.28**	.23*
Adaptability	.27**	.17*	.02	.19*	.07	.11	.22**	.26**
Relationships	.19*	.13	.01	-.03	.09	.19*	.25**	.15
Task Management	.03	.10	.33**	.29**	.16	-.01	.05	.13
Production	.23**	.11	.13	.11	.03	.13	.04	.20*
Development of Others	.26**	.19*	.03	.13	.09	.24**	.12	.11
Personal Development	.20*	.05	.03	.11	.02	.09	.13	.15

\* p < .05 \*\* p < .01 (performance review criteria are listed below)

The performance review criteria used for Table 3.4 is as follows:

1. Management of People
2. Teamwork
3. Time/Task Management
4. Decision Making and Judgment
5. Technical Knowledge
6. Communication Skills
7. Interpersonal/Leadership Skills
8. Overall Job Effectiveness

### **Favorable Zone**

The development of the *Favorable Zone* was a positive result of this research. This Zone was formulated to collapse the comparison data into a simple band indicating an expected result for a *CheckPoint 360<sup>oTM</sup>* completed for a good-performing manager. The width of this Zone represents the average standard deviation of all responses to all survey items by all respondents reporting on these good-performing managers.

The placement of the Zone is around the average, or mean, for participants who were judged to be successful according to the above mentioned performance review measures. This includes managers and leaders in a wide range of industries and organizations. The Favorable Zone is not meant to be a standard for individual companies, or a “must-achieve” target, it simply reports collected information. Each user of the *CheckPoint 360<sup>o</sup>*

system is encouraged to review the results for their employees with this Favorable Zone to determine its effectiveness with these key competencies.

## Flags

While some 360° feedback reports describe a dispersion measure, (the variability of the response data), the *CheckPoint 360<sup>o</sup>™ Feedback Report* only gives an indicator of this dispersion when the variability is significant. Our research suggests that a response pattern that varies by three or more points indicates significant dispersion on an item.

Flags are used to indicate this pattern on the *CheckPoint 360° Survey Summary* items. The Flags show which reference group, or groups, have a “lack of consensus.” An example of a flagged item would be the response pattern for that item of 2, 3, 3, and 5 from the Direct Report group of four respondents. The 2 and the 5 responses differ by three or more points, hence the setting of the Flag. Flags in the All Observers category are set when a response pattern across reference groups varies by three or more points. For example, the response pattern of 2(DR), 3(DR), 4(DR), 5(Peer), 4(Peer), 3(Peer), 3(Boss) would yield a Flag for the All Observer category (again a three or more point spread from the 2 in Direct Reports to the 5 in Peer).

## **Gaps**

Gaps are arrows that indicate significant perception differences, or differences between reference groups. The distance between reference groups that triggers a Gap widens as we move from competencies to Skill Sets to individual survey questions. The reason for this is that the distance between competencies (aggregate score of all items within the eight competencies) is more pronounced than the distance between Skill Sets or survey question responses.

## **Summary**

The *Checkpoint 360<sup>o</sup>™* has proven to be a valid and reliable instrument to help employers gather information about their employees from all those involved with each person. The feedback provided by the reports is valuable in giving managers up-to-the-minute data upon which to base decisions regarding staffing and training.

The *Checkpoint 360<sup>o</sup>* was developed through a comprehensive research program and meets or exceeds all EEOC and APA guidelines. Ongoing analysis of results ensures that norming and scoring processes are up to date and accurate.