

Manual

McConochie Constructive Leadership Attitudes Scale (McCLAS)

6/12/08

Copyright William A. McConochie, 2007

Introduction:

The McConochie Constructive Leadership Attitudes Scale (McCLAS) is based on research on many psychological traits related to pro-social and anti-social attitudes about government. As of October, 2007 it has not been validated. Nor has reliability been computed. However, as the scale is, in essence, the mirror image of the author's Warmongering-Proneness scale, high reliability and validity are anticipated. The Warmongering-proneness scale has high reliability (.98) and validity with independent ratings (.90).

The scale is designed as a tool that may eventually be useful to journalists or other well-informed, concerned adults of a nation to assess candidates for political office, with two objectives:

1. Avoiding anti-social political leaders (those who promote selfishness, criminality, special-interest-group favoritism, and warmongering.) and,
2. Selecting pro-social leaders (those who support positive foreign policies, human rights, sustainable policies and programs, the best interests of the community overall, and peaceful relationships).

Research underpinnings; trait selection.

The author has conducted dozens of studies involving over two dozen scales for measuring traits related to political behavior (1). Two different factor analyses were performed on two batches of data gathered from a total of over 400 adults from a variety of sources, including community college students, university students, business managers, churchgoers of many faiths, foreign students and Slavic immigrants, among others.

The factor loadings of traits on pro-civilization, pro-social attitudes are presented below. From these data approximately 3 questionnaire items were written for each of 17 traits as indicated by asterisks.

Pro-civilization factor, study A.	Pro-social factor, study B.	Pro-citizen involvement in government factor, study B	Rating scale items.	Trait measured:
-.37				Gender (- means males lower)
.35				Years of Education.
-.81			42-44	*Social disenfranchisement, Eidelson worldviews, from individual point of view.
-.82			45-47	*Social disenfranchisement, Eidelson worldviews, from group point of view.
.38			48-50	*Big Five Agreeableness.
.30			51-53	*Big Five Emotional stability.
.78			35-37	*Sustainable policies and programs endorsement.
.58			38-40	*Endorsement of proportional budgeting in public schools (versus favoring teacher union contracts).
-.88			14-16	*Warmongering endorsement.
.79			1-3	*Endorsement of public democracy government model, serving the common good versus special interest groups.
	.13	.74	1-3	*Pro-public democracy
	.02	.84	4-7	*Direct citizen involvement in gov't.
	.82	.18	8-10	*Desire for improved gov't services.
	.83	.03	11-13	*Positive foreign policy endorsement.
	-.56	-.30	14-16	*Warmongering endorsement.
	-.43	-.74	17-19	*Terrorism endorsement.
	-.46	-.62	20-22	*Violence-proneness.
	-.37	.03	23-25	*Authoritarianism endorsement.
	-.23	-.19	26-28	*Religious fundamentalism.
	.53	.50	29-31	*Kindly religious beliefs orientation.
	.77	.38	32-34	*Human rights endorsement.
	.89	.02	35-38	*Sustainable policies and programs endorsement.
	-.07	.32	39-41	*Endorsement of proportional budgeting in public schools (versus

				favoring teacher union contracts).
--	--	--	--	------------------------------------

Scoring.

As all three of the above factors are pro-social, rating scale items for negatively correlated dimensions (items 14-28 and 42-47) are reverse-scored by subtracting the original value from 6. Then, the total raw score across the 53 items is computed and divided by 53 to get the mean item score. Tentatively, score ranges are categorized as follows:

1.0-1.8	1.9-2.6	2.7-3.4	3.5-4.2	4.3-5.0
Very low	Low	Average	High	Very high

Predictions/ anticipated reliability and validity.

Based on statistics for the mirror image warmongering-proneness scale, the reliability of averaged scores for well-known political and historical figures is estimated to be above .95. The validity, as measured by a single item scale of pro-social, pro-civilization government policies and practices, is estimated to be above .85.

Because some of the scale items are of limited relevance to historical figures and are of an ideal nature even for current political candidates, the reliability may be somewhat lower than the estimate above when used on historical figures.

Research collaboration encouraged.

Interested researchers are invited to contact the author to coordinate efforts. For example, a researcher can obtain a code number so that his research subjects, e.g. university students or other adults, can rate political or historical figures over the author's web site (politicalpsychologyresearch.com) and the researcher can obtain a file of their scores. Research subjects immediately receive a printed report of their score for the leader they rate and its implied meaning.

Appendix: The scale:

[McConochie Constructive Leadership Attitudes Scale \(McCLAS\). \(Version for online administration\)](#)

William A. McConochie, Ph.D. Copyright 2007.

Introduction: This scale is new as of 10/07. It is designed to measure traits characteristic of pro-social political leaders, in contrast to the Warmongering-Proneness scale, which measures traits related to anti-social, warmongering leaders. No norm data is yet available. Score ranges (low, average, high) are currently estimates. As data on leaders is accumulated, mean scores for the leaders will be published on this site.

Please do your ratings carefully. Ideally, you will be rating leaders you know very well. Some questionnaire items may be irrelevant for historical persons or be difficult for you to assess for a current leader because the leader simply hasn't revealed his or her attitude or position on the topic. For these items, enter a "3".

You will immediately receive a report of the score your rating yields and an estimate of the meaning of that score (low, average, high, etc.).

Instructions: For a leader you know very well, as from media articles, voting record, public speeches, writings, historical accounts, etc., make one rating on each of the items below using this code:

1	2	3	4	5
Definitely not true for this person	Probably not true for this person.	Uncertain or between 2 and 4	Probably true for this person.	Definitely true for this person.

- 1 2 3 4 5 1. Endorses the idea of government that serves the best interests of the community overall more than special interest groups per se.
- 1 2 3 4 5 2. Is dedicated mainly to serving the "common good", what is good for all groups of people in the community.
- 1 2 3 4 5 3. Supports policies and programs that help disadvantaged or weak citizens in the community.
- 1 2 3 4 5 4. Promotes the idea that everyone should have an effective voice in group decisions.
- 1 2 3 4 5 5. Encourages all persons affected by government decisions to have a say in those decisions, as via referenda presented by government and initiatives sponsored by citizen groups.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6. Promotes and encourages all groups of citizens to vote in elections.
- 1 2 3 4 5 7. Promotes local citizen direct control over local government policies, programs, taxes and budget decisions.
- 1 2 3 4 5 8. Believes that government is a necessary and constructive aspect of society.

- 1 2 3 4 5 9. Does not promote either highly limited government or overly-dominating government.
- 1 2 3 4 5 10. Promotes good, balanced government services and programs, not favoring some services or programs at the expense of other services.
- 1 2 3 4 5 11. Promotes a positive, helpful foreign policy.
- 1 2 3 4 5 12. Believes nations should cooperate with each other more than compete against each other.
- 1 2 3 4 5 13. Believes one's nation should be generous in sharing resources and wealth with weaker nations.
- 1 2 3 4 5 14. Promotes aggressive war, starting wars against other nations.
- 1 2 3 4 5 15. Believes in striving to be the most powerful nation in the world, and that "might makes right".
- 1 2 3 4 5 16. Promotes regular increases in military budgets even in peacetime.
- 1 2 3 4 5 17. Believes that some nations deserve severe punishment, such as bombing of civilians.
- 1 2 3 4 5 18. Believes in torturing prisoners if necessary to get information out of them or to extract confessions.
- 1 2 3 4 5 19. Is indifferent to genocide, deliberately engineered deaths of large populations of civilians via starvation, war or other means.
- 1 2 3 4 5 20. Has a criminal record or associates with known or suspected criminals.
- 1 2 3 4 5 21. Seems to enjoy observing or participating in violent entertainment or recreation.
- 1 2 3 4 5 22. Seems to feel rejected socially by persons or groups by which he/she had hoped to be accepted.
- 1 2 3 4 5 23. Tends to strongly support and admire top government leaders, regardless of their policies.
- 1 2 3 4 5 24. Believes that wrong doers should be punished and rewards provided only to those who comply with leader ideals.
- 1 2 3 4 5 25. Believes that there are "good-guys" and "bad-guys" and that he/she is one of the "good-guys".
- 1 2 3 4 5 26. Thinks that only his/her religious beliefs are the right or good ones and that persons who think otherwise are wrong.
- 1 2 3 4 5 27. Believes that God is more likely to punish than to forgive wrongdoers.
- 1 2 3 4 5 28. Believes that government and religion should be closely intertwined rather than separate aspects of society.
- 1 2 3 4 5 29. Believes that God appears in different forms for different peoples around the world.
- 1 2 3 4 5 30. Is tolerant and respectful of religious beliefs different from his/her own.

- 1 2 3 4 5 31. Believes in the Golden Rule, in treating other persons as you would have them treat you.
- 1 2 3 4 5 32. Is more likely to endorse than to reject human rights treaties.
- 1 2 3 4 5 33. Endorses individual women's rights to make their own personal childbearing decisions.
- 1 2 3 4 5 34. Endorses citizen rights to privacy, a fair trial and freedom of speech, even speech critical of government leaders.
- 1 2 3 4 5 35. Endorses sustainable policies and programs to protect the environment and plant and animal species at risk of extinction.
- 1 2 3 4 5 36. Endorses limiting and reversing global warming, air pollution and other such threats to plant, animal and human survival.
- 1 2 3 4 5 37. Promotes programs to replace fossil fuels with hydrogen, solar or other non-polluting energy.
- 1 2 3 4 5 38. Promotes birth control to limit human population growth to sustainable levels only.
- 1 2 3 4 5 39. Endorses the concept of public school budgets protecting all aspects of a balanced program, sharing each school dollar proportionally.
- 1 2 3 4 5 40. Endorses the concept of public school budgets preserving all programs and reasonable class sizes over teacher union contract demands.
- 1 2 3 4 5 41. Under tight public school budgets, values the needs and desires of parents and children over the desires of tenured teachers.
- 1 2 3 4 5 42. Talks often of feeling vulnerable to threats.
- 1 2 3 4 5 43. Seems especially concerned about persons or groups that he/she believes cannot be trusted.
- 1 2 3 4 5 44. Often seems to think he/she or his/her constituents have been treated unjustly.
- 1 2 3 4 5 45. Seems concerned that a group he/she is in may become helpless unless special steps are taken.
- 1 2 3 4 5 46. Promotes the idea that his/her group, political party or nation is superior to other ones.
- 1 2 3 4 5 47. Promotes the idea that his group is vulnerable to domination or mistreatment by other groups.
- 1 2 3 4 5 48. Tends more often to agree and compromise rather than disagree and argue when in conflict with others.
- 1 2 3 4 5 49. Promotes discussion and negotiation more than demands and intimidation when dealing with opposing groups.
- 1 2 3 4 5 50. Has a reputation for being nice, generous and kind toward strangers, minority groups, the unfortunate and the needy.
- 1 2 3 4 5 51. Tends to remain calm and poised when under threat.
- 1 2 3 4 5 52. Rarely or never seems unusually anxious or depressed.

1 2 3 4 5 53. Seems emotionally and psychologically stable and healthy.

Scoring instructions:

1. Reverse score items 14-28 and 42-47 by subtracting obtained score from 6.
2. Add scores across all 53 items to get total raw score. The lowest possible score is 53, highest 265.
3. Divide by 53 to get mean item score. The lowest possible is 1, the highest 5.
4. Compare to tentative scale below:

1.0-1.8	1.9-2.6	2.7-3.4	3.5-4.2	4.3-5.0
Very low	Low	Average	High	Very high

Report Format:

Subject: (Name of leader rated)

Your rating gave _____(name of leader) a score of _____ (enter mean item score) on the McConochie Constructive Leadership Attitudes Scale questionnaire. The chart below gives the score ranges estimated for low to high levels of Constructive Leadership as measured by this questionnaire. This instrument is still in the research phase and so no detailed information regarding its reliability or validity is yet available.

The 53 items in this scale are based on extensive research by the author that reveals pro-social and anti-social political attitudes on about 18 topics. For details see in particular items 4 and 7 on the Publications page of the Politicalpsychologyresearch.com web site.

Thank you for your assistance.

Yours truly,

William McConochie, Ph.D.

Range Label:	Very low	Low	Average	High	Very high
Score	1.0-	1.9-	2.7-3.4	3.5-	4.3-

range:	1.8	2.6		4.2	5.0
Rated leader's score:					

References:

Political psychology research, Inc. web site (Politicalpsychologyresearch.com). See in particular items 4 and 7, Publications page.