

# **Strengths Engagement Track (SET) Development and Benchmark Research**

## **Technical Report**

Prepared by  
Dr. Courtney McCashland

---

This written report, the literature property therein, and the common law copyright thereto are the exclusive property of Strengths Research, LLC. The report is privileged, confidential communication. The report is not to be copied from, published, or divulged to others without the written consent or knowledge of Strengths Research, LLC.

---

Strengths Research, LLC  
March 1, 2007

## **Introduction**

In studying organizational effectiveness, we won't unbundle the learning until we focus in on the heart of matter: the strengths of the individuals and teams called upon to deliver. Many have concluded that the greatest untapped resource of our working world lies beneath the capacity of each contributing member who fails to capitalize on his or her strengths (Schmidt and Hunter, 1996). The Strengths Engagement Track (SET) Survey is the product of a need to fuel the Strengths Revolution with a reliable, valid metric of "Strengths Engagement." The SET Survey measures a participant's mental focus, investment of time, and emotional experience through activities using his or her strengths at work.

## **Rationale**

Strengths Research, LLC, in partnership with The Marcus Buckingham Company (TMBC), conducted qualitative and quantitative research to develop and refine an instrument to measure how engaged individuals' strengths are at work. The Strengths Engagement Track (SET) is designed to provide individuals and teams with a metric of how engaged their strengths are as compared to the rest of the working world. It is not a measure of productivity, but instead a measure of the current level of strengths capacity being applied for each individual or team being measured.

## **Research Methodology**

The Instrument Development for the Strengths Engagement Track (SET) Survey applied a mixed-method research design where both qualitative and quantitative analyses were conducted to create a valid, reliable instrument. A composite of all qualitative research was reviewed to ensure content validity of the questions and constructs defined for each relevant measure of strengths engagement and the questions and constructs were further refined through quantitative research analyses to make up the SET "Present" and SET "Future" domains.

### **Phase I: Qualitative Research**

Through years of qualitative research, strengths-based training, and individual coaching sessions with thousands of associates globally, Marcus Buckingham and company have identified the "Mindset" or

beliefs of individuals that prepare them to more intentionally apply their strengths at work. In addition, Buckingham's research identified the "Actions" most consistently found when individuals intentionally apply their strengths at work.

This qualitative data from individual interviews and team workshops were reviewed over time and the content was validated with several leading organizations. The refined constructs led to the development of the questions that now comprise the SET "Future" metric, which helps individuals determine if their thinking and actions are positioning them to better move into their areas of strength through their daily work activities.

During this qualitative process, the "Outcome" of applying one's strengths through work activities was defined as an individual's strengths engagement. This "Outcome" construct was refined through later stages of research and evolved into the core set of questions that now comprise the SET "Present" metric of an individual's strengths engagement.

## **Phase II: Quantitative Research**

In 2006, TMBC joined forces with a team of doctoral measurement analysts and statisticians at Strengths Research, LLC, and completed the research and development of the Strengths Engagement Track (SET). A research questionnaire was developed and tested to measure an individual's current level of strengths engagement, previously defined as the "Outcome" construct through qualitative analyses. Researchers from Strengths Research, LLC, applied their expertise in measurement science and decades of experience in conducting strengths research to assist Buckingham in refining the measurement of the "Outcome" construct, which has been modified to create the SET "Present" score on the SET Survey. The SET "Present" Score measures an individual's present mental focus, investment of time, and emotional experience through work activities using his or her strengths at work.

As part of the quantitative research process, the research team also examined the constructs for "Mindset" and "Actions" defined in the qualitative research process. Through a combination of expert

judgment and quantitative analyses, the questions comprising these constructs were grouped and modified to create the SET “Future” Score, which provides a summary of the constructs found, during the qualitative research process, to drive future levels of strengths engagement. In effect, the SET “Future” score is an indicator of the individual or team’s ability to maintain or increase the “Present” level of strength engagement.

In summary, the content and questions to measure SET “Present” and SET “Future” were refined to build an updated research questionnaire, which was again tested with a representative international sample of the workforce, then subsequently with a national sample representative of the working U.S. Population. Below is a summary of the specific research analyses and findings applied to develop the SET Survey. Following the Instrument Development phase, the SET Survey was most recently validated through a Benchmark Study with a group of high performing teams across a select group of national and global companies. The findings from the SET Benchmark Research Study are provided in a subsequent section of this report.

## **Data Analyses**

### **Phase I: Qualitative Analyses**

The Strengths Research team worked with Marcus Buckingham to complete rigorous analyses to validate the SET Survey content as a measure of strengths engagement. These content validity analyses were conducted with individual cases, teams and companies over a three-year period. Results were triangulated across sources and samples; then analyzed using the expert judgment of two content experts. The content experts -- Dr. Courtney McCashland and Marcus Buckingham -- have each studied hundreds of thousands of high performing individuals and teams during the last two decades to create the conceptual model of strengths engagement that serves as the underpinning of the research questionnaire.

During the content analyses, each question was examined to determine whether it was an appropriate measure of the construct hypothesized as essential for sustained strengths engagement. Each question was also evaluated to determine whether it was conceptually clear and whether target respondents would

be able to understand the wording of the statement. Only questions that met these criteria were included in the research questionnaire.

### **Research Questionnaire**

This qualitative review enabled the research team to tighten the strengths construct definitions and to develop new questions to measure each of the constructs: Mindset, Action and Outcome. The research questionnaire contained 20 questions designed to measure these three constructs. Research questions by construct are provided in Table 1 below.

**Table 1: List of Questions and Constructs in Pilot Questionnaire**

<b>Construct</b>	<b>Questions</b>
<b>Mindset (Belief)</b>	Finding your weaknesses and fixing them is the best way to achieve outstanding performance.
	As I get older my personality changes.
	I am the best judge of my strengths.
	On great teams everyone should be able to play every role equally well.
	On great teams people should put their strengths aside and do whatever it takes to help the team.
	Which do you think will help you be most successful: building your strengths or improving your weaknesses?
<b>Action</b>	In the last month, I have had opportunities to change my job to fit my strengths and weaknesses.
	I have the freedom to modify my work to fit my strengths better.
	When I meet with my manager, we typically discuss what I am doing to improve upon my weaknesses.
	When your manager discusses your performance with you, do you spend more time talking about how to build your strengths or how to improve your weaknesses?
	When discussing your work, how often do you catch yourself whining?
	What most influenced your decision to leave your previous job and apply for your current position?
	Which of the following best describes your ideal job?
<b>Outcome</b>	How frequently do you feel an emotional high from your work?
	How often do you find yourself feeling positive anticipation about work when you are not working?
	How often do you get so involved in what you are doing at work that you lose track of time?
	What percentage of the time do you feel invigorated when you reach the end of a long, busy day?
	What percentage of a typical work day do you spend doing things that you really like to do?
	How do you typically feel when you come to work?

## **Phase II: Quantitative Analyses**

Three nationally representative samples of the working population were polled, 35,000 employees were surveyed, the responses were collected and data was run. Data gathered from the most recent national and international studies in 2006 were applied to evaluate the revised research questionnaire; to evaluate the psychometric properties of each question and construct; and to create a valid, reliable metric of Strengths Engagement. The 2006 data were also used to develop a benchmark of the national workforce for comparison with best practice samples of high performing teams.

### **National Sample Characteristics (United States)**

During the third quarter of 2006, the most recent version of the SET Research Questionnaire was prepared and administered on-line to a nationally representative sample of the U.S. working population of n=600 participants. Sample characteristics of the national sample are summarized in the Table 2 below.

		n	Distribution %
Total		<b>600</b>	<b>100</b>
Gender	Male	300	50.0
	Female	300	50.0
Age	Under 40 years of age	314	52.3
	40 years of age or older	286	47.7
Employment	Employed	600	100.0
Country	USA	600	100.0

### **Descriptive Statistics**

The Strengths Engagement Track (SET) Survey yields two scores for each participant or group of participants who complete the survey: A SET “Present” Score, and a SET “Future” Score. All questions on the survey were coded and scored before calculating the SET Present and SET Future scores. The SET Present Score is a T-score of the five questions in the “Outcome” construct summarized above. The SET Present score ranged from a low of 19.97 to a high of 101.60. The mean SET Present score of the national sample was 50.002 with a standard deviation of 22.206. The SET Future Score is a T-score of

13 questions that include those that measure the “Mindset” and “Action” dimensions. The SET Future score ranged from a low of 14.65 to a high of 97.50. The mean SET Future score of the entire national sample was 51.131 with a standard deviation of 16.986.

Other quantitative analyses included reliability analyses of the constructs and total instrument; correlational analyses among the questions and constructs; and finally regression analyses with SET “Present” as the dependent variable. Sixteen of the 20 questions were retained from the Research Questionnaire to create the Final SET Survey with five questions per construct and a summary question at the end, which is not scored in the SET “Present” or SET “Future” algorithms. The final SET Survey questions by construct are provided in Table 3 below.

**Table 3: List of Questions and Constructs in SET Survey**

Construct	Questions
Mindset	Finding your weaknesses and fixing them is the best way to achieve outstanding performance.
	As I get older my personality changes.
	I am the best judge of my strengths.
	On great teams everyone should be able to play every role equally well.
	On great teams people should put their strengths aside and do whatever to help the team.
Action	I have the freedom to modify my work to fit my strengths better.
	When discussing your work, how often do you catch yourself whining?
	What most influenced your decision to leave your previous job and apply current position?
	When your manager discusses your performance with you, do you spend more time talking about how to build your strengths or how to improve your weaknesses?
	Which of the following best describes your ideal job?
Outcome	How frequently do you feel an emotional high from your work?
	How often do you find yourself feeling positive anticipation about work when you are not working?
	How often do you get so involved in what you are doing at work that you lose track of time?
	What percentage of the time do you feel invigorated when you reach the end of a long, busy day?
	What percentage of a typical work day do you spend doing things that you really like to do?
Summary	Overall, which do you think will help you be most successful: building your strengths or improving your weaknesses?

### International Sample Characteristics

The SET Present and SET Future scores were also tested with an International sample of the working population from the U.S. and the United Kingdom for a combined sample of n =1200 participants. Sample characteristics of the International sample are summarized in the Table 4 below.

<b>Table 4</b>			
<b>International Sample Characteristics</b>			
		n	Distribution %
Total		<b>1200</b>	<b>100</b>
Gender	Male	600	50.0
	Female	600	50.0
Age	Under 40 years of age	623	51.9
	40 years of age or older	577	48.1
Employment	Employed	1200	100.0
Country	USA	600	50.0
	United Kingdom	600	50.0

### International Descriptive Statistics

The same analyses were run to calculate the SET Present and SET Future scores with the International sample to include both the U.S. and the United Kingdom. All questions on the survey were coded and scored before calculating the SET Present and SET Future scores. The SET Present score for the international sample ranged from a low of 19.97 to a high of 101.60. The mean SET Present score for the international sample was 44.913 with a standard deviation of 21.018. The SET Future score ranged from a low of 14.65 to a high of 97.50. The mean scores, and the associated standard deviations, of the national and international samples for SET Present and SET Future are summarized in Table 5 Below.

### Descriptive Statistics for SET Present and SET Future

<b>Table 5</b>				
<b>Descriptive Results for SET Present and SET Future National and Global Samples</b>				
Construct	National (n=600)		International (N=1200)	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
SET Present	50.002	22.206	44.913	21.018
SET Future	51.131	16.986	47.804	16.444

## Data Results

### Correlations Among SET Dimensions

The next analysis involved an examination of the correlations among the SET dimensions for the national and international samples. The numbers in the correlation matrices (Tables 6a and 6b below) are Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficients. Each of these correlation coefficients is a statistic that indicates the degree of relationship between two variables; in this case, the degree of relationship between two SET constructs.

Regarding Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficients:

- A correlation coefficient of +1.00 indicates a perfect positive relationship. This means that, as one variable increases or decreases, the other variable also consistently increases or decreases.
- A correlation coefficient of -1.00 indicates a perfect negative relationship. This means that, as one variable increases, the other variable consistently decreases and vice versa.
- Correlation values can range between +1.00 and -1.00. That is, between zero and 1 in magnitude, with numbers closer to one indicating a stronger relationship than numbers closer to zero.
- It should be noted that correlation values do not imply causation; they merely imply the likelihood that changes in the scores on one variable will be accompanied by changes in the scores on the other variable.

A priori, certain dimensions can be hypothesized to be more highly correlated with each other than with other dimensions; such hypotheses were tested empirically. Because SET Future measures if the individual's "Mindset" and "Actions" are focused on his or her strengths, we would expect SET Future to have a significant positive relationship to SET Present. Strong statistically significant relationships between SET Present and SET Future are found with both samples. Results to support this hypothesized relationship are provided in Tables 6a and 6b below.

## Correlation Matrix

**Table 6a**  
**National Correlations**  
(n =600)

	SET Present	SET Future
SET Present	---	
SET Future	.869**	---

\*p < .05, \*\*p < .01

**Table 6b**  
**International Correlations**  
(n=1200)

	SET Present	SET Future
SET Present	---	
SET Future	.876**	---

\*p < .05, \*\*p < .01

### Reliability of SET Present and SET Future

The Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficients estimate the internal consistency of each metric. It is most desirable that each of the reliability coefficients displayed be at or above an alpha of .700. Cronbach's Alpha for SET "Present" is .76 across the international workforce sample of 1200 to include representation from both U.S. and the United Kingdom. Cronbach's Alpha for SET "Future" is .70 for the same international sample. Both of the reliability coefficients are at or above the desirable range. Therefore, since Cronbach alpha is an internal consistency measure of reliability, these values suggest that people responded to the questions comprising each scored SET Metric -- SET Present and SET Future -- in a consistent manner.

### Regression Analysis

Qualitative analyses suggest that if individuals focus their "Mindset" and "Actions", which are measured by the SET Future metric, around the activities that strengthen them, this focus will lead to improved levels of strength engagement, which is measured by the SET Present metric. To review this statistically, a stepwise regression was performed with the questions on the SET Survey to determine how well the SET Future questions explain the variance of scores for the SET Present variable. Six of the SET Future

questions were found to explain 32 percent of the variance in the SET Present dependent variable. Other items were retained to create a reliable metric based on content, even though there was not unique variance explained through the additional questions. The SET Future questions in the final instrument provide a statistically significant model with an R value of .524. These results reported in Tables 7a and 7b below support the qualitative data and correlation matrices finding a significant positive relationship between SET Present and SET Future Metrics.

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.524 <sup>a</sup>	.274	.264	5.83332	.274	27.898	8	591	.000

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.379 <sup>a</sup>	.144	.143	6.29766	.144	100.547	1	598	.000
2	.456 <sup>b</sup>	.208	.205	6.06401	.064	47.972	1	597	.000
3	.512 <sup>c</sup>	.262	.259	5.85609	.055	44.145	1	596	.000
4	.540 <sup>d</sup>	.292	.287	5.74158	.030	25.012	1	595	.000
5	.556 <sup>e</sup>	.309	.303	5.67611	.017	14.803	1	594	.000
6	.565 <sup>f</sup>	.320	.313	5.63732	.011	9.204	1	593	.003

Listed below are the six SET Future questions that loaded into the Stepwise Regression to explain the variance in the SET Present dimension in order of impact as per the “Model Summary” above.

- 1 - **ACTION:** Which of the following best describes your ideal job?
- 2 - **ACTION:** I have the freedom to modify my work to fit my strengths better.
- 3 - **ACTION:** When discussing your work, how often do you find yourself whining? (Reverse)
- 4 - **ACTION:** What most influenced your decision to leave your previous job and apply for your current position?
- 5 - **MINDSET:** Finding your weaknesses and fixing them is the best way to achieve outstanding performance. (Reverse)
- 6 - **MINDSET:** On great teams people should put their strengths aside and do whatever it takes to help the team. (Reverse)

The qualitative research involved in the initial stages of the SET development - including discovery interviews, focus groups and consulting sessions conducted by Buckingham and McCashland - supports that the “Mindset” of an individual with a focus on strengths will increase the likelihood of “Actions” by that individual that are focused around his or her strengths. These “Actions,” which include intentionally seeking a job to capitalize on strengths, will intuitively increase the likelihood that the individual will progress to a higher level of “Present” strengths engagement.

Consistent with these qualitative findings, the stepwise regression analysis found that the “Action” questions from the SET “Future” metric have a direct impact on an individual’s SET “Present” results. The four Action questions listed explain the greatest amount of variance in the SET “Present” metric and each question represents unique content comprising the “Action” dimension. Note, that the last two questions to load onto the SET “Future” dependent variable are “Mindset” questions that are foundational to an individual’s actions toward improved strengths engagement -- SET “Present.”

## **Benchmark Study**

In January of 2007, 13 organizations participated in a benchmark study of strengths engagement. With international representation across industries, each of these companies was invited to identify five high-performing teams. These teams came from different levels within the organizations, and from multiple countries (U.S., UK, India, and China were all represented). According to the metrics available within each organization, they were all high performing teams. A total of 65 teams and 783 select individuals comprising these high-performing teams participated from the following organizations.

- Accenture
- Best Buy
- Black & Decker
- Chick-fil-A
- Coca-Cola
- EMC
- Husqvarna
- Intrawest
- Microsoft
- McKesson
- SAP
- Stryker
- Universal Studios

**Comparison of International Sample and Total Benchmark Results**

The Benchmark Study was designed to explore performance of an international sample of high performing individuals and teams across companies on the SET Present and SET Future metrics in order to create “Best Practice” Benchmarks for future comparison. A summary of the descriptive results from the Benchmark Study of the Total Best Practice Sample as compared to the original International Sample are provided in Table 8a below.

Dimension	International (n=1200)		Benchmark Total (n=783)	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Belief	9.777	2.270	10.890	4.112
Action	10.237	5.112	11.928	5.211
Outcome	8.417	6.664	12.656	6.784
TOTAL	28.432	10.337	35.475	11.048
SET Present	47.458	21.761	61.299	22.152
SET Future	49.468	16.793	60.906	17.950

Initial analyses of these results were conducted to explore how the SET results of the high performing individuals and teams compared to the original international sample of n = 1200. As shown in Table 8b below, when the average SET Present scores of the international sample and best practice groups were compared using an independent samples t-test, a statistically significant t-value of 13.747 (df = 1981, p < .001) was found. When the average SET Future scores of the international sample and best practice groups were compared using an independent samples t-test, a statistically significant t-value of 14.426 (df = 1981, p < .001) was found.

	n	Mean	Std. Dev.	t-Value	df	sig
<b>Set Present</b>						
International	1200	47.458	21.761	13.747	1981	0.000
Benchmark	783	61.299	22.152			
<b>Set Future</b>						
International	1200	49.468	16.793	14.426	1981	0.000
Benchmark	783	60.906	17.950			

In both cases, at an alpha level of 0.01, the average score of the Total Best Practice sample was statistically significantly different from the average score of the International Contrast sample. This means that with a sample of n = 1200, it is highly unlikely that this difference was due to chance. Thus, high performing individuals and teams are much more likely to score higher on the SET Present and SET Future scores on the SET Survey than a contrasting representative sample of the workforce.

**Comparison of National Sample and Benchmark Results**

An additional research objective of the Benchmark Study was to isolate a Best Practice Benchmark to apply as a National comparison. From the best practice individuals and teams who participated in the Benchmark Study, the top three quartiles based on their overall “Present” level of engagement were isolated for a comparative Benchmark sample of n =600 to apply as the Best Practice Benchmark. The purpose of this Best Practice Benchmark is to set a high standard of individual and collective engagement for individuals and teams to compare when reviewing their results. Descriptive results from the Top 75 Percent Best Practice Sample of n = 600 as compared to the original National Sample of n = 600 are provided in Table 9a below.

<b>Table 9a Benchmark National Results Summary</b>				
Dimension	National (n=600)		Benchmark 75% (n=600)	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Belief	9.735	2.389	10.796	4.139
Action	9.828	4.635	12.875	4.961
Outcome	9.196	6.800	15.485	4.920
TOTAL	28.76	9.849	39.156	9.252
SET Present	50.002	22.206	70.535	16.065
SET Future	51.131	16.986	66.889	15.030

Further analyses of these results were conducted to explore how the SET results of the Best Practice Sample of n = 600 compares to the National Sample of n = 600. As shown in Table 9b below, when the average SET Present scores of the national sample and best practice groups were compared using an independent samples t-test, a statistically significant t-value of 18.35 (df = 1198, p < .01) was found. When the average SET Future scores of the national sample and best practice groups were compared using an independent samples t-test, a statistically significant t-value of 17.76 (df = 1198, p < .01) was found. This means that in both cases, at an alpha level of 0.01, the average score of the Best Practice group was statistically significantly different from the average score of the original national sample of n = 600.

<b>Table 9b</b>						
<b>National Comparison to Best Practice Results</b>						
	n	Mean	Std. Dev.	t-Value	df	Sig.
Set Present						
National	600	50.002	22.206	18.35	1198	0.000
Best Practice	600	70.535	16.065			
Set Future						
National	600	50.360	17.145	17.76	1198	0.000
Best Practice	600	66.889	15.030			

\*\*p < .01

In addition to the SET Present and SET Future scores, when sample sizes are sufficient, Strengths Research will report response distributions for a business unit for each question on the survey along with response distributions for select comparative samples.

As part of the Benchmark Study, Strengths Research analyzed the differences between the SET results on each question for the Best Practice Benchmark of n = 600 as compared to the National Sample of n = 600. As shown in Table 10, when the average scores by question of the National (n = 600) and Best Practice samples (n = 600) were compared using an independent samples t-test, a

statistically significant t-value was found ( $p < .01$ ) for every question on the survey. This means that, at an alpha level of 0.01, the average score of the Best Practice group was statistically significantly different from the average score of the National group for every question.

<b>Table 10 Item Comparison of National Random Sample to Best Practice Sample</b>					
	Mean	Std. Dev.	t-Value	df	Sig.
SET 1					
National	1.760	0.720	-8.77	1193	0.000
Best Practice	2.328	1.411			
SET 2					
National	2.320	0.949	-2.64	1198	0.000
Best Practice	2.485	1.203			
SET 3					
National	2.480	0.908	-17.31	1185	0.000
Best Practice	3.490	1.095			
SET 4					
National	2.650	1.019	-20.64	1197	0.000
Best Practice	3.838	0.960			
SET 5					
National	3.060	1.146	-2.08	1198	0.000
Best Practice	3.220	1.491			
SET 6					
National	2.590	0.986	-2.84	1198	0.000
Best Practice	2.783	1.312			
SET 7					
National	1.838	1.925	-13.41	1192	0.000
Best Practice	3.203	1.570			

Table 10 Continued Item Comparison of National Random Sample to Best Practice Sample					
	Mean	Std. Dev.	t-Value	df	Sig.
SET 8					
National	1.711	1.948	-15.47	1194	0.000
Best Practice	3.303	1.583			
SET 9					
National	2.961	2.000	-8.54	1195	0.000
Best Practice	3.840	1.528			
SET 10					
National	1.135	1.738	-11.61	1193	0.000
Best Practice	2.408	2.029			
SET 11					
National	1.550	1.911	-11.42	1197	0.000
Best Practice	2.826	1.945			
SET 12					
National	2.341	2.497	-6.49	1196	0.000
Best Practice	3.207	2.071			
SET 13					
National	1.875	2.422	-9.22	1083	0.000
Best Practice	3.237	2.391			
SET 14					
National	2.485	2.188	-8.49	1150	0.000
Best Practice	3.510	1.895			
SET 15					
National	1.216	2.147	-6.46	1187	0.000
Best Practice	2.088	2.467			
SET 16					
National	1.866	2.420	-5.80	1196	0.000
Best Practice	2.692	2.494			

## **Summary**

Qualitative research conducted by Marcus Buckingham and Dr. Courtney McCashland independently was collectively analyzed to develop the conceptual framework and question content for the Strengths Engagement Track (SET) research questionnaire in 2006. This qualitative research was all conducted with high performing teams and individuals over a three-year period beginning in 2003. A prior hypotheses from qualitative analyses were developed regarding the “Mindset” and “Actions” of individuals that predispose them to increased levels of strengths engagement, which is the “Outcome” of taking part in activities that apply one’s natural strengths.

Quantitative validation of these qualitative observations involved a series of statistical analyses with representative national (n = 600) and international (n = 1200) samples of the working population. Through a series of correlational analyses, reliability analyses, regression analyses and independent t-tests, Strengths Research developed a valid, reliable metric - The Strengths Engagement Track (SET) Survey - for tracking strengths engagement.

The SET Survey was tested through a Benchmark Study in 2007, which found that the composite mean SET “Present” and SET “Future” scores of top performing teams and individuals were consistently higher at a statistically significant level ( $p < .001$ ) than the composite means for representative national (n = 600) and international (n = 1200) samples of the workforce respectively. Thus, high performing individuals and teams are more likely to score higher on the SET Present and SET Future scores than a contrasting representative sample of the workforce.

## **Conclusion**

The SET Survey provides a valid, reliable tracking system to measure and manage for improved strengths engagement. The SET “Present” and SET “Future” metrics can be appropriately applied to focus individuals, teams and companies on the “Mindset,” “Actions,” and “Outcomes” of strengths engagement. The results of SET guide participants’ time and energy to better tap into our individual and collective strengths capacity ... and ultimately to mine our greatest untapped resources - the strengths of our people.

## REFERENCES

- American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, National Council on Measurement in Education (1999). Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing. Washington, DC: Author.
- Anastasi, A. (1986). Evolving concepts of test validation. Annual Review of Psychology, Vol. 37, pp. 1-115.
- Angoff, W.H. (1988). Validity: An evolving concept. In H. Wainer & H. Braun, (Eds.) Test Validity (pp. 19-32). Hillsdale, NJ: LEA & Associates.
- Geisinger, K.F. (1992). The metamorphosis of test validation. Educational Psychologist, Vol. 27, pp. 197-222.
- Hunter, J. E. (1986). Cognitive Ability, Cognitive Aptitudes, Job Knowledge and Job Performance. Journal of Vocational Behavior, Vol. 29, pp. 340-362.
- Hunter, J.E. & Schmidt, F.L. (1983). Quantifying the effects of psychological interventions on employee job performance and work force productivity. American Psychologist, Vol. 38, pp. 473-473.
- Hunter, J.E. & Schmidt, F.L. (1982). Fitting people to jobs: The impact of personnel selection on national productivity. In E.A. Fleishman and M.D. Dunnette (Eds.), Human performance and Productivity: Vol. 1: Human Capability assessment (pp. 232-284). Hillsdale, N.J. Erlbaum.
- Messick, S. (1989). Validity. In R.L. Linn (Ed.) Educational Measurement 3rd ed., (pp. 1-103). New York: American Council on Education and Macmillan.
- Pearlman, K., Schmidt, F. L. and Hunter, J. E. (1980). Validity Generalization Results for Tests Used To Predict Job Proficiency and Training Success in Clerical Occupations. Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 65, pp. 373-406.
- Schmidt, F. L. and Hunter, J. E. (1996). Measurable Personnel Characteristics: Stability Variability, and Validity for Predicting Future Job Performances and Job-Related Learning. Chapter in Kleinmann, Martin Strauss and Bernd (Eds.), Instruments for Potential Assessment and Personnel Development. Gottinger, Germany: Hogrefe.
- Schmidt, F. L., Hunter, J. E. and Urry, V. W. (1976). Statistical Power in Criterion-Related Validation Studies. Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 61, pp. 473-485.
- Schmidt, F. L., Ones, D.S. and Hunter, J. E. (1992). Personnel Selection. Annual Review of Psychology, Vol. 43, pp. 627-670.
- Schmidt, F. L. & Rader, M. (1999). Exploring The Boundary Conditions For Interview Validity: Meta-Analytic Validity Findings For A New Interview Type. Personnel Psychology, Vol. 52, pp. 446-464.
- Schmidt, F. L., Hunter, J.E., McKenzie, R.C. & Muldrow, T.W. (1979). Impact of valid selection procedures on work-force productivity. Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 64, pp. 609 - 626.
- Schmidt, F. L. and Rauschenberger, J. (1986). Utility Analysis for Practitioners: A Workshop. First Annual Conference, Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, April 1986.
- Shepard, L.A. (1993). Evaluating test validity. Review of Research in Education, Vol. 19, pp. 405-450.