

Leadership Synergy Scale — Second Edition ©

LSS-2 Report Summary

Leader: Alex Chen



LSS-2 Report Summary

Leader assessed: Alex Chen - April 2026

Demographics

Team	Date of Last Administration	Wave	Team Members
Acme Team 2	12/04/2026	Leadership Test 1	7
Sophie Andersen Priya Sharma Marcus Webb	James Okafor Keiko Tanaka		Darius Osei Lina Torres

Leadership Performance and Synergy

Leadership Performance Index (LPI)

63.6%

Developing Leadership Performance

The assessed leader is rated by their team as demonstrating moderate overall leadership effectiveness. While strengths are evident across some domains, the team's ratings suggest development opportunities in one or more areas. This level of effectiveness represents a solid foundation with meaningful room for growth. Targeted development in the lower-rated constructs and domains is recommended.

Leadership Synergy Index (LSI)

71.7%

High Agreement

Team members largely agree about the assessed leader's performance across leadership constructs. The level of consensus indicates that the team shares a broadly consistent experience of the leader's strengths and development areas. Feedback will be reliably representative. Some variation may exist in a small number of constructs, warranting attention in coaching discussions.

Domain Performance

Character Domain

69.3%

Synergy: 79.7%

The internal foundations of effective leadership — integrity, emotional intelligence, and resilience under pressure. Concerns what the leader brings to every interaction regardless of context.

Relational Domain

56.7%

Synergy: 64.8%

How the leader engages people — the interpersonal climate they create through psychological safety, coaching, and servant leadership. Concerns the quality of the leader's relationships and how they enable others.

Strategic Domain

63.1%

Synergy: 68.1%

How the leader sets direction and decides — the cognitive and executive functions of leadership. Concerns vision, clarity of purpose, and the quality of decision making.

Adaptive Domain

65.9%

Synergy: 73.7%

How the leader responds to complexity and change — the capacity to redirect, remain effective, and intellectually stimulate the team in volatile environments.

Key Observations

- Biggest blind spots are in the relational and strategic and adaptive and character domain — Psychological Safety Creation, Decision Quality, Coaching & Development, Servant Leadership, Adaptive Leadership, Emotional Intelligence, Resilience Under Pressure, Integrity & Authenticity show gaps of +20.4% to +42.4%, suggesting Alex over-rates their impact in these areas.
- All gaps are positive — Alex consistently rates themselves higher than the team across every construct.

Character Domain

Performance: 69.3%

Synergy: 79.7%

The internal foundations of effective leadership — integrity, emotional intelligence, and resilience under pressure. Concerns what the leader brings to every interaction regardless of context.

The leader shows moderate Character Domain performance. While character strengths are visible in some areas, inconsistencies in honesty, emotional management, or composure under pressure may be limiting trust and team confidence. Development across one or more character constructs would strengthen the leader's overall leadership foundation.

Emotional Intelligence

P: 66.5% S: 77.6%

The leader shows moderate Emotional Intelligence. While they are capable of empathic responses in some situations, team members may notice inconsistency in how the leader reads emotional cues or manages their own emotional reactions, particularly under pressure. Development in emotional self-regulation and interpersonal attunement would improve the leader's impact on the team's emotional climate.

Team members largely agree about the leader's emotional intelligence. The leader's empathic responsiveness and emotional composure are perceived consistently, with minor variation across individuals.

Integrity & Authenticity

P: 71.0% S: 80.5%

The leader demonstrates strong Integrity and Authenticity. Team members generally experience a leader who is honest, follows through on commitments, and is self-aware about their own strengths and limitations. Occasional gaps between intent and action exist, but the leader is broadly trusted. This strong foundation of integrity supports a productive working relationship with the team.

Team members largely agree about the leader's integrity and authenticity. Minor differences in perception exist but the overall picture is consistent, reflecting a broadly trusted leader.

Resilience Under Pressure

P: 70.2% S: 81.0%

The leader demonstrates strong Resilience Under Pressure. They generally maintain composure and solution-focus during challenging periods, providing stability for the team when circumstances are difficult. Occasional signs of strain may be visible under extreme pressure, but the leader recovers quickly and keeps the team moving forward effectively.

Team members largely agree about the leader's resilience under pressure. The leader's composure and recovery under adversity are perceived consistently across the team.

Relational Domain

Performance: 56.7%

Synergy: 64.8%

How the leader engages people — the interpersonal climate they create through psychological safety, coaching, and servant leadership. Concerns the quality of the leader's relationships and how they enable others.

The leader shows moderate Relational Domain performance. While relational strengths are present, inconsistencies in psychological safety creation, development investment, or servant orientation may be limiting the team's experience of genuine support and growth. Development in one or more relational constructs would strengthen team engagement and trust.

Coaching & Development

P: 56.7% S: 59.5%

The leader shows moderate engagement in Coaching and Development. While they provide some development support, team members may experience this as inconsistent or insufficiently personalised. Feedback may not always be growth-oriented or tailored to individual needs. The leader would benefit from investing more deliberately in understanding each team member's development goals and providing more targeted coaching.

Team members show moderate agreement about the leader's coaching and development. Some members may experience more development attention than others, suggesting the leader's investment in growth may not be equally distributed across the team.

Psychological Safety Creation

P: 51.8% S: 70.2%

The leader shows moderate ability in creating Psychological Safety. While some team members feel encouraged to speak up, others may feel hesitant to challenge ideas or raise concerns, particularly around sensitive topics. The leader's responses to difficult or unpopular inputs may be inconsistent. Development in actively inviting diverse perspectives and responding constructively to dissent would strengthen the team's psychological safety.

Team members largely agree about the leader's contribution to psychological safety. The environment of openness and safety for speaking up is perceived consistently across most team members.

Servant Leadership

P: 61.6% S: 64.8%

The leader shows moderate Servant Leadership. While there are clear moments of team-centredness, team members may also notice the leader's personal agenda or desire for recognition occasionally taking precedence over team needs. Barriers are not always proactively removed, and the leader may not consistently enable others to lead and contribute freely. Development in genuine service orientation and ego subordination would strengthen the leader's impact.

Team members show moderate agreement about servant leadership. Some members may experience the leader as more team-centred than others, possibly reflecting variation in how the leader allocates support or removes obstacles across different individuals.

Strategic Domain

Performance: 63.1%

Synergy: 68.1%

How the leader sets direction and decides — the cognitive and executive functions of leadership. Concerns vision, clarity of purpose, and the quality of decision making.

The leader shows moderate Strategic Domain performance. While some strategic clarity exists, the team may not consistently experience a compelling shared purpose or full confidence in the leader's decision-making. Development in visionary communication or decision-making processes would improve alignment and team confidence.

Decision Quality

P: 58.4% S: 54.8%

The leader shows moderate Decision Quality. Team members have some confidence in the leader's decisions, but inconsistencies are noticeable — the leader may sometimes move too quickly without adequate consultation, too slowly under pressure, or in ways that do not fully leverage the team's expertise. Development in decision-making processes and inclusive judgment would improve the team's confidence in this area.

Team members show moderate agreement about decision quality. Some members may have higher confidence in the leader's judgment than others, possibly depending on how closely they have observed specific decision-making situations.

Visionary Leadership

P: 67.8% S: 81.4%

The leader shows moderate Visionary Leadership. While they communicate direction and goals, team members may not consistently experience a compelling sense of purpose or clear connection between their daily work and the larger mission. The inspirational aspect of the leader's vision may be underdeveloped. Development in articulating and communicating a more motivating and meaningful direction would enhance team alignment and engagement.

Team members largely agree about the leader's visionary leadership. The team's shared sense of direction and purpose is well-established, with minor variation in how inspired individuals feel.

Adaptive Domain

Performance: 65.9%

Synergy: 73.7%

How the leader responds to complexity and change — the capacity to redirect, remain effective, and intellectually stimulate the team in volatile environments.

The leader shows moderate Adaptive Domain performance. While they can manage some change and complexity effectively, inconsistencies in adaptive capacity or intellectual stimulation may limit the team's ability to respond confidently to novel challenges. Development in situational flexibility and creating a more innovation-oriented team environment would strengthen this domain.

Adaptive Leadership

P: 65.3%

S: 67.9%

The leader shows moderate Adaptive Leadership. While they can respond to some change effectively, team members may notice the leader struggling with more complex or ambiguous situations, reverting to familiar approaches even when the context demands something different. Development in situational awareness and the willingness to change approach in response to new information would strengthen this area.

Team members show moderate agreement about adaptive leadership. Some members may observe more flexibility and responsiveness than others, possibly depending on how directly they have been involved in change or uncertainty situations.

Intellectual Stimulation

P: 66.5%

S: 79.5%

The leader shows moderate Intellectual Stimulation. While they occasionally challenge assumptions and encourage creative thinking, this is not a consistent feature of how the team operates. Team members may feel that new ideas are not always genuinely welcomed or that the environment does not consistently reward curiosity and innovation. Development in creating a more consistently intellectually stimulating climate would enhance the team's innovative capacity.

Team members largely agree about intellectual stimulation. The leader's encouragement of creative thinking and challenge of assumptions is perceived consistently across most team members.

Leadership Attunement

Leader assessed: Alex Chen - April 2026

Leadership Attunement Index (LAI)

27.3%

Very Low Attunement

The leader demonstrates very low attunement between their self-assessment and the team's ratings. Substantial discrepancies exist across the leadership constructs assessed, indicating a significant disconnect between self-perception and the team's experience. This level of misalignment warrants immediate attention through intensive coaching and systematic 360-degree feedback.

Attunement Score Key

Well-Attuned

Gap < +/-10%
Score: 100

Moderate Under-Rating

Gap -10 to -19%
Score: 50-75

Moderate Over-Rating

Gap +10 to +19%
Score: 25-65

Large Under-Rating

Gap <= -20%
Score: 50

Large Blind Spot

Gap >= +20%
Score: 25

Emotional Intelligence

Leader
91.4%

Team
66.5%

Attunement
+24.9%

Significant Over-Rating (Blind Spot)

The leader substantially over-rates their Emotional Intelligence relative to the team's assessment. This significant gap suggests the leader believes they are considerably more attuned to team members' emotions and more self-regulated than the team actually experiences. Coaching that helps the leader examine specific interactions — particularly under stress — is strongly recommended to surface this blind spot.

Integrity & Authenticity

Leader
91.4%

Team
71.0%

Attunement
+20.4%

Significant Over-Rating (Blind Spot)

The leader substantially over-rates their Integrity and Authenticity relative to the team's assessment. This significant gap indicates a potential blind spot in how the leader perceives their own honesty, consistency, and accountability. The team's experience suggests the leader's behaviour may not be as aligned with stated values as the leader believes. Targeted coaching to examine specific instances where integrity was tested is strongly recommended.

Resilience Under Pressure

Leader
91.4%

Team
70.2%

Attunement
+21.2%

Significant Over-Rating (Blind Spot)

The leader substantially over-rates their Resilience Under Pressure relative to the team's assessment. The team experiences the leader as considerably less composed and stable under adversity than the leader believes themselves to be. This blind spot may be preventing the leader from recognising the impact their stress responses are having on the team. Coaching to surface specific high-pressure episodes is recommended.

Coaching & Development

Leader
97.1%

Team
56.7%

Attunement
+40.4%

Significant Over-Rating (Blind Spot)

The leader substantially over-rates their Coaching and Development relative to the team's assessment. The team does not experience the level of growth-oriented feedback, development attention, and stretch opportunities the leader believes they are providing. This significant blind spot is important to address, as it suggests the leader may be unaware of how infrequently meaningful development conversations and coaching actually occur.

Psychological Safety Creation

Leader
94.3%

Team
51.8%

Attunement
+42.4%

Significant Over-Rating (Blind Spot)

The leader substantially over-rates their ability to create Psychological Safety relative to the team's assessment. The team does not experience the degree of openness and safety to speak up that the leader believes they are creating. This significant blind spot is particularly important: leaders who believe the environment is safe may inadvertently suppress concerns they are not receiving. Targeted coaching using specific examples is strongly recommended.

Servant Leadership

Leader
97.1%

Team
61.6%

Attunement
+35.5%

Significant Over-Rating (Blind Spot)

The leader substantially over-rates their Servant Leadership relative to the team's assessment. The team does not experience the degree of team-centredness, obstacle removal, and enabling behaviour that the leader believes they demonstrate. This blind spot is significant because leaders who see themselves as servant leaders but are experienced as self-focused can undermine trust and engagement.

Decision Quality

Leader
100.0%

Team
58.4%

Attunement
+41.6%

Significant Over-Rating (Blind Spot)

The leader substantially over-rates their Decision Quality relative to the team's assessment. The team does not experience the level of sound, timely, and inclusive decision-making the leader believes they are providing. This significant blind spot may mean the leader is unaware of the team's low confidence in their judgment. Seeking structured feedback on specific decisions would be valuable.

Visionary Leadership

Leader
85.7%

Team
67.8%

Attunement
+18.0%

Moderate Over-Rating (Partial Blind Spot)

The leader moderately over-rates their Visionary Leadership relative to the team's assessment. The leader perceives the team's sense of shared direction and purpose as stronger than the team experiences. Exploring how the vision is being communicated and what is creating the gap would be valuable.

Adaptive Leadership

Leader
91.4%

Team
65.3%

Attunement
+26.1%

Significant Over-Rating (Blind Spot)

The leader substantially over-rates their Adaptive Leadership relative to the team's assessment. The team does not experience the degree of flexibility, situational awareness, and directional adjustment the leader believes they demonstrate. This significant blind spot may mean the leader is unaware of the rigidity or slowness the team experiences when circumstances change.

Intellectual Stimulation

Leader
82.9%

Team
66.5%

Attunement
+16.3%

Moderate Over-Rating (Partial Blind Spot)

The leader moderately over-rates their Intellectual Stimulation relative to the team's assessment. The leader perceives their encouragement of creative thinking and innovation as somewhat stronger than the team experiences. Seeking specific examples from team members about what would make them feel more intellectually challenged would be a productive coaching focus.

Key Observations

- Biggest blind spots are in the relational and strategic and adaptive and character domain — Psychological Safety Creation, Decision Quality, Coaching & Development, Servant Leadership, Adaptive Leadership, Emotional Intelligence, Resilience Under Pressure, Integrity & Authenticity show gaps of +20.4% to +42.4%, suggesting Alex over-rates their impact in these areas.
- All gaps are positive — Alex consistently rates themselves higher than the team across every construct.