

ID: 20101119

Title: Learning Styles and the Leading Dimensions Profile (LDP)

Author: Dr. R. Douglas Waldo, SPHR

Date: November 19, 2010

Summary

The Leading Dimensions Profile (LDP) utilizes a framework that includes two primary factors and ten supporting characteristics to convey personality dimensions that reveal how individuals influence, lead, and sell others. The two primary factors produce an overall profile or style, based on the interaction of *Achievement Drive* and *Relational Drive*, while the ten supporting characteristics include:

- Achieving Dimensions
 - *Work Intensity*
 - *Assertiveness*
 - *Uncertainty Avoidance*
 - *Adaptability*
 - *Perception*
- Relating Dimensions
 - *Status Motivation*
 - *Affiliation*
 - *Consideration*
 - *Openness*
 - *Self-Protection*

While other research briefs have reported the construct validity of the LDP in relation to personality characteristics, this current brief explores the potential for leveraging the LDP to assess learning styles. Given the potential to apply the LDP dimensions in training, developing, and coaching individuals, there is considerable interest in linking LDP dimensions to specific learning styles.

Although a number of learning style frameworks has been published, one particular framework has received considerable support: The Index of Learning Styles (ILS) by Felder and Soloman. The ILS measures four learning dimensions based on research by

Felder, Soloman, and Silverman, with a distinct style reported for each dimension. The four ILS dimensions include:

- *Active versus Reflective Learners*
- *Sensing versus Intuitive Learners*
- *Sequential versus Global Learners*
- *Visual versus Verbal Learners*

For this study, the ILS was administered to a group of 30 participants who also took the LDP in September, 2010. Results derived from the two assessments were analyzed for statistical correlation.

Findings

The following table shows the correlation statistics derived from the data analysis:

LDP Dimensions	<i>Active v. Reflective</i>	<i>Sensing v. Intuitive</i>	<i>Sequential v. Global</i>	<i>Visual v. Verbal</i>
Achievement Drive	-.42*	.35*	.35*	
Achieving Dimensions				
<i>Work Intensity</i>				
<i>Assertiveness</i>	-.51**		.42*	
<i>Uncertainty Avoidance</i>	.49**		-.33^	
<i>Adaptability</i>		.38*		
<i>Perception</i>		.48**	.53**	
Relational Drive				
Relating Dimensions				
<i>Status Motivation</i>		.36*		
<i>Affiliation</i>				
<i>Consideration</i>			-.37*	
<i>Openness</i>				
<i>Self-Protection</i>	.36*			

** = Correlation is significant at the 99% confidence level

* = Correlation is significant at the 95% confidence level

^ = Correlation is indicated at the 90% confidence level

Results indicate a correlation between several of the LDP's dimensions and three of the ILS's learning style measures.

Conclusion

The data analysis provided support for the following findings:

- The *Active/Reflective* learning style describes an individual's preference to learn by doing and experimenting, versus by reflecting on the content and thinking through the matter before taking action. Based on the statistics reported, the following preferences may be expected:
 - The *Active* learning approach appears to be preferred most by individuals with higher *Achievement Drive* and higher *Assertiveness*, while those with lower *Achievement Drive* and lower *Assertiveness* may prefer a more *Reflective* approach.
 - The *Reflective* learning approach appears to be preferred most by individuals with higher *Uncertainty Avoidance* and higher *Self-Protection*, while those with lower *Uncertainty Avoidance* and lower *Self-Protection* may prefer a more *Active* approach.
- The *Sensing/Intuitive* learning style describes an individual's preference to learn facts, solve problems, examine details carefully, and use established methods, versus by exploring relationships, innovating with new approaches, and considering abstract concepts. Based on the statistics reported, the following preferences may be expected:
 - The *Intuitive* learning approach appears to be preferred most by individuals with higher *Achievement Drive*, higher *Adaptability*, higher *Perception*, and higher *Status Motivation*, while those with lower *Achievement Drive*, lower *Adaptability*, lower *Perception*, and lower *Status Motivation* may prefer a more *Sensing* approach.
- The *Sequential/Global* learning style describes an individual's preference to learn by a step-by-step, linear process that leverages logic and structure, versus by a more "big picture" approach whereby one finds their own path to identify patterns and understand complex material. Based on the statistics reported, the following preferences may be expected:
 - The *Global* learning approach appears to be preferred most by individuals with higher *Achievement Drive*, higher *Assertiveness*, and higher *Perception*, while those with lower *Achievement Drive*, lower *Assertiveness*, and lower *Perception* may prefer a more *Sequential* approach.
 - The *Sequential* learning approach appears to be preferred most by individuals with higher *Uncertainty Avoidance* and higher *Consideration*,

while those with lower *Uncertainty Avoidance* and lower *Consideration* may prefer a more *Global* approach.

- No statistical relationship was found between LDP dimensions and the *Visual/Verbal* learning style. This particular style identifies an individual's preference for physical demonstrations versus verbalized content in grasping new material.

Application

The LDP presents its primary factors on a 2x2 grid, where *Achievement Drive* is expressed as a continuum on the x-axis and *Relational Drive* is expressed as a continuum on the y-axis. Four "styles" are presented from the interaction of *Achievement Drive* and *Relational Drive*, describing the general approach with which individuals seek to influence or lead others. These styles are derived as follows:

- The Counselor Profile (collaborative Style): Lower *Achievement Drive*, Higher *Relational Drive* (upper left)
- The Coach Profile (adaptive style): Higher *Achievement Drive*, Higher *Relational Drive* (upper right)
- The Director Profile (directive style): Higher *Achievement Drive*, Lower *Relational Drive* (lower right)
- The Advisor Profile (contemplative style): Lower *Achievement Drive*, Lower *Relational Drive* (lower left)

The ILS's learning styles refer to an individual's preferred or dominant approach to grasping and applying new material, although individuals will likely use each of the styles at times. Based on the mean scores of each style, it would appear that the LDP profiles/styles may correspond to the ILS's learning styles in the following manner:

- The Counselor Profile (collaborative style) may tend to prefer the *Reflective* (rather than *Active*), *Sensing* (rather than *Intuitive*) and *Sequential* (rather than *Global*) learning styles.
- The Coach Profile (adaptive style) may tend to prefer the *Active* (rather than *Reflective*), *Sensing* (rather than *Intuitive*) and *Sequential* (rather than *Global*) learning styles, although the latter two preferences are quite mild.
- The Director Profile (directive style) may tend to prefer the *Active* (rather than *Reflective*), *Intuitive* (rather than *Sensing*), and *Global* (rather than *Sequential*) learning styles.

- The Advisor Profile (contemplative style) may tend to prefer the *Reflective* (rather than *Active*), *Sensing* (rather than *Intuitive*), and *Sequential* (rather than *Global*) learning styles.

Given these findings, it would appear that the LDP primary factors may be helpful in identifying an individual's learning approach. While findings do indicate certain preferences, it is important to note that each of the learning styles may be used at one time or another by each of the LDP profiles/styles. The correlation statistics reported herein simply convey potential tendencies, and do not suggest that a given profile/style will use only one particular approach to learning.

Contact

For more information, please contact the author at:
doug.waldo@leadingdimensions.com.