

# Society for Industrial-Organizational Psychology

## 2005 SIOP Fall Consortium Results

### Leadership at the Top

#### Module 1: Selection

Presented by:

**David Nadler, Bob Muschewske,  
Seymour Adler, and Rich Arvey**



### Learning Objectives

**Rating Scale** 1 = Little or None - Has superficial familiarity

2 = Some - Could be of some help, but would have deficiencies

3 = Adequate - Could function in a job that requires the KSA

4 = Advanced - Could function independently and competently

5 = Expert - Could serve as a resource for other professionals

	<b>Pre Mean</b>	<b>Post Mean</b>	<b>Difference</b>
1. Understand how the role of the board in CEO succession is evolving	3.00	3.84	<b>0.84</b>
2. Know what "best practices" companies are doing in terms of the board's role in CEO succession	2.57	3.63	<b>1.05</b>
3. Understand the different emerging models of the board's engagement in CEO succession	2.48	3.56	<b>1.09</b>
4. Understand why boards need to drill down to specific criteria when selecting a CEO	3.33	3.95	<b>0.62</b>
5. Know how to develop a profile of competencies required by the next CEO to be successful	3.37	3.79	<b>0.42</b>
6. Know how to use state-of-the-art assessment techniques to make accurate CEO selection decisions	3.40	3.73	<b>0.33</b>
7. Understand the complexities of designing executive assessment for global implementation	3.03	3.67	<b>0.63</b>
8. Aware of the variety of assessment methods to assess executives globally	3.07	3.67	<b>0.60</b>
9. Understand genetic portion of the variance between individuals and their move into leadership roles	2.67	3.61	<b>0.95</b>
10. Understand the genetic portion of variance in leadership role occupancy for both males and females	2.47	3.54	<b>1.08</b>
11. Understand how development practices are related to leadership roles independent of genetic influences	2.61	3.42	<b>0.81</b>



# Society for Industrial-Organizational Psychology

## 2005 SIOP Fall Consortium Results

### Leadership at the Top

#### Module 1: Selection

Presented by:

David Nadler, Bob Muschewske,  
Seymour Adler, and Rich Arvey



### Module Rating

**Rating Scale** 1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

4 = Agree

3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree

5 = Strongly Agree

**Average  
Rating**

**Standard  
Deviation**

1. The module met the stated learning objectives.

4.29

0.76

2. The learning objectives related to the requirements of my job or professional work.

4.33

0.85

3. Compared to other learning experiences this module was, overall, one of the best.

3.93

1.01

4. I would recommend this module to a colleague.

**% Yes**

**% No**

91.67%

8.33%